



General Assembly

Seventy-third session

Official Records

Distr.: General
31 January 2019

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 55th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 20 November 2018, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Saikal (Afghanistan)

Contents

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)Agenda item 109: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 123: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Conclusion of the work of the Committee

This record is subject to correction.Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

18-20000 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1 and A/C.3/73/L.61)

Draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1: Rights of the Child

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Bermúdez Álvarez** (Uruguay), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the omnibus resolution on the rights of the child reaffirmed the rights established in previous resolutions and reflected the main contents of the resolutions adopted over the past four years. The current text also included subsections on the eradication of poverty, the right to education, the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health and the right to food.

3. Reading out oral revisions to the text, he said that the second preambular paragraph should read: "Recalling also all of its previous resolutions on the rights of the child, the most recent of which was resolution 72/245 of 24 December 2017, and also recalling all other relevant resolutions, including 71/176". The sixteenth preambular paragraph should read: "Taking note of efforts aimed at promoting and protecting the right to education and facilitate the continuation of education in situations of armed conflict". In the fifth line of the seventeenth preambular paragraph, the words "abstinence syndrome" should be added after "neonatal". The twenty-first preambular paragraph should be deleted.

4. In paragraph 4, "Welcomes the attention paid to the right of the child by" should be replaced with "Takes note of the work of". In paragraph 9, "register" should be replaced with the words "ensure the registration of", and "to ensure their legal protection and to facilitate children's access to services without discrimination" should be deleted. In paragraph 15, "Reaffirms" should be replaced with "Recalls". In paragraph 18, "develop policies and programmes with the support, where appropriate, of international organizations, civil society and non-governmental organizations, giving priority to formal, informal and non-formal education programmes, including" should be deleted, and the paragraph should begin with the words "Calls upon States to scale up scientifically" and continue with the words in the original text until the end of the paragraph.

5. In paragraph 21, the phrase "including sexual and reproductive health" should be deleted. "Reaffirms" should be replaced with "Recalls" at the start of paragraph 27. In paragraph 33, "vulnerable groups" should be replaced with "in vulnerable situations". In paragraph 36, "negotiations on a" should be replaced with "negotiations of the"; and the words "to Adopt the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration" should be deleted following the words "at the Intergovernmental Conference". Paragraph 39 should be deleted. In paragraph 40, the phrase "whether voluntary or otherwise" should be deleted. Paragraph 42 should be deleted. In paragraph 48, "Also calls upon States to ensure" should be replaced with "Urges States to intensify their efforts to ensure".

6. Paragraph 52 should read: "Calls upon all Member States to ensure that children associated or allegedly associated with armed groups should be treated primarily as victims and in line with the best interests of the child, and to consider non-judicial measures as alternatives to prosecution and detention and take measures that focus on rehabilitation and reintegration in an environment that fosters their health, self-respect and dignity of the child, in accordance with relevant provisions of international humanitarian law, as well as human rights law, in particular the Convention of the Rights of the Child".

7. In paragraph 54, the words "or disproportionate" should be deleted; and the words "children must" should be replaced with "they shall". In paragraph 59, "entities and" should be deleted after "United Nations"; "funds and programmes" should be added after "agencies"; and "the context of" should be added after "in supporting Member States in". In subparagraph 61 (g), "November" should be deleted, and "through a modalities resolution" should be added after "to conduct consultations with Member States to finalize".

8. The promotion and protection of children's rights was a key element for the sustainable development of societies and for ensuring their stability and prosperity. The thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, in 2019, would be a good time to renew the commitment of States to those rights.

9. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union, joined Uruguay in introducing the draft resolution. He said that the candidate countries Albania, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia and Moldova aligned themselves with his statement. The draft

resolution recapitulated the resolutions adopted in the previous four years. It addressed some of the challenges faced by children in vulnerable situations and was representative of the global commitment to “leave no one behind”, in accordance with the principles of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It also renewed the mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children.

10. The Convention on the Rights of the Child was the most widely ratified treaty, with 196 States parties. The annual resolution on the rights of the child served as a reminder of international commitments to the protection of children. The text, which was the fruit of extensive negotiations, placed the rights of the child above any specific political agenda.

11. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Armenia, Australia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Canada, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Iceland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Maldives, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia and Turkey had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised.

12. **Mr. Gómez Camacho** (Mexico) said that his delegation had decided to withdraw its sponsorship of the draft resolution after having been a sponsor for many years. A series of long held values and beliefs were once again considered controversial following years of consensus. Despite the different realities of each State, certain limits should not be crossed and States should be particularly responsible when dealing with the rights of children. References to access to sexual and reproductive health care for children should not be excluded from the draft resolution, as such access was essential to ensuring the protection and respect of children’s rights. The exclusion of such references for procedural reasons was both unacceptable and incomprehensible. Mexico had proposed an oral amendment to draft resolution [A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1](#), according to which the words “including sexual and reproductive health” should be reincorporated into paragraph 21 of the text.

13. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the proposed amendment to draft resolution [A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1](#) contained in [A/C.3/73/L.61](#) and noted that it contained no programme budget implications.

14. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan) said that her delegation had serious reservations about the inclusion of any references to the jurisdiction of the International

Criminal Court and about the use of the draft resolution to exert unacceptable pressure on Member States to include such language. Such action jeopardized the ongoing peacebuilding efforts taking place in the Sudan. The removal of the Sudan from the list of violators of children’s rights in the context of the conflict in Darfur was a milestone achievement. Since 2003, the malignant interference of the International Criminal Court had been an impediment to peace.

15. The Court was not a United Nations organ, despite repeated attempts by certain parties to claim otherwise at meetings of the Main Committees of the General Assembly. Since 2008, African Union heads of State had decided at their summit meetings that they would not cooperate with the Court until outstanding issues related to articles 13, 17 and 98 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court had been addressed, and the targeting of African leaders had ceased.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Syrian Arab Republic had joined the sponsors of the proposed amendment.

17. **Mr. Bermúdez Álvarez** (Uruguay), speaking on behalf of the main sponsors of draft resolution [A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1](#), said that the wording of paragraph 53, in the section on children affected by armed conflict, had been agreed language for more than 10 years. The International Criminal Court had been the first permanent tribunal set up to end impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes of concern to the international community, including violations of the rights of the child, and had been an important step towards a rules-based world order. The role of the Court in protecting children affected by armed conflict was well established in several provisions of the Rome Statute. Accordingly, a clear reference should be made in the resolution to the International Criminal Court, in particular in the light of the case of Thomas Lubanga and his conviction for child recruitment. Ensuring accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, aggression and genocide, regardless of who committed them and where they took place, must remain a priority objective for all States. On the basis of those considerations, the main sponsors of the draft resolution understood that the language of paragraph 53 on the International Criminal Court was not only factually correct but also thematically relevant and timely, and it should therefore be retained in its entirety as part of the text.

18. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, said that his delegation noted with disappointment the amendment presented by the delegation of the Sudan. Paragraph 53 of the draft resolution contained agreed language and had been worded carefully to garner maximum support. The European Union believed it was important to maintain an explicit reference to the International Criminal Court in the draft resolution so that crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes involving children could be duly prosecuted.

19. The European Union continued to support the International Criminal Court and considered it an essential mechanism to ensure accountability for the most serious crimes. The Lubanga case of 2012, in which the defendant had been convicted by the International Criminal Court of conscripting children and using them as active participants in hostilities, demonstrated the importance of including the reference to the Court in the draft resolution. The European Union therefore could not accept the proposed amendment.

20. **Mr. Sparber** (Liechtenstein), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that the proposed amendment was unfortunate, as it attempted to change language that had been agreed for the past ten years. The International Criminal Court played a key role in ending impunity in cases where national courts were unwilling or unable to exercise jurisdiction. The fight against impunity for the most serious crimes had been strengthened by the work of the Court, and, in the years since the Rome Statute had come into force, crimes against children had figured prominently in the Court's indictments and verdicts. The objective of such prosecutions was to end impunity for perpetrators. It was deeply disturbing that the established consensus was being attacked for reasons that had nothing to do with the topic of the draft resolution.

21. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment contained in A/C.3/73/L.61.*

In favour:

Bahrain, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Viet Nam.

22. *The amendment contained in document A/C.3/73/L.61 was rejected by 105 votes to 20, with 37 abstentions.*

23. **Mr. Al Khalil** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had supported the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Sudan because the International Criminal Court had become a political tool wielded by certain countries against others and had nothing to do with justice.

24. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the oral amendment proposed by the delegation of Mexico.

25. **Mr. Bermúdez Álvarez** (Uruguay) said that his country had worked through successive rounds of negotiations to reach a compromise that took into

account the interests of all delegations, guided by the spirit of advancing the defence and promotion of the rights of children. It was therefore deeply regrettable that an oral amendment had been tabled, on account of both its substance and its form. The position of Uruguay was clear: it had incorporated references to sexual and reproductive health in the original draft resolution and had defended its inclusion. Indeed, in reaffirming paragraph 25 of resolution [68/147](#) in the draft resolution, Uruguay was reaffirming the call on States to ensure that the right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, including sexual and reproductive health, was fully realized for all children. That call had been maintained with or without a new explicit reference to sexual and reproductive health, which was why his delegation believed that the oral revisions could ensure consensus for the resolution on the rights of the child. For those reasons, Uruguay had requested a vote on the amendment proposed by Mexico and called upon delegations to vote against the amendment.

26. **Ms. Alfeine** (Comoros), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the Group had engaged constructively and in good faith with all delegations in order to arrive at a text that was acceptable to all. The Group had supported the original text but would support the oral revision put forward by the main sponsor in order to preserve consensus. During the negotiations, all delegations had agreed to remove the reference in the twenty-first paragraph to sexual and reproductive health, as it contradicted international obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Convention called upon States parties to protect and promote the right of every child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and ensure that that right was respected, protected and fulfilled. Sexual and reproductive health was not mentioned in the Convention but was implicitly covered. Comoros encouraged all Member States to vote against the amendment proposed by the delegation of Mexico, which had been introduced at the last minute and without any consultations.

27. **Mr. Charwath** (Austria), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution had been negotiated in a spirit of compromise in order to ensure the broadest possible support, with changes made when necessary to ensure sound language. Compromise was at the heart of multilateral work, and delegations were most effective when they were able to put differences aside and work towards a common cause. In cases where differences had arisen the negotiators had reverted to agreed language, and the outcome was a balanced text that was

relevant to the challenges faced by children. The negotiation process had been inclusive and had involved discussions of the issue of sexual and reproductive health. While European Union member States supported the substance of the proposed amendment, they would abstain from voting for purely procedural reasons.

28. **Ms. Cohen** (Australia) said that her country would vote in favour of the amendment proposed by Mexico. From the procedural point of view, it was disappointing that the original text had been orally revised following the completion of negotiations. The amendment to paragraph 21 reverted to the text that had been proposed the previous week, which the Government of Australia had strongly supported. Universal access to sexual and reproductive health care was enshrined in target 5.6 under Goal 5 of the Sustainable Development Goals, which had been adopted by global consensus. It was essential for children and adolescents to have the right of access to evidence based and high quality sexual and reproductive health services so that they could make healthy decisions and live healthy lives. For those reasons, Australia called upon delegations to support the amendment.

29. *A recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to paragraph 21 of draft resolution [A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1](#), as orally revised.*

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Norway, South Africa, Suriname, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia.

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

30. *The oral amendment to paragraph 21 of draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1, as orally revised, was rejected by 74 votes to 11, with 81 abstentions.*

31. **Ms. Stankiewicz von Ernst** (Iceland), speaking in explanation of vote after the voting on behalf of Liechtenstein and New Zealand, said that her delegation agreed with the substance of the amendment proposed by the Government of Mexico. However, on the basis of procedural considerations and in the interest of supporting efforts to preserve consensus on such an important resolution, her delegation had abstained from the vote on the amendment.

32. **Mr. Arbeiter** (Canada) said that his country wished to reiterate its long-standing and consistent position regarding the importance of sexual and reproductive health as a critical component of mental and physical health. His delegation had abstained from the vote on the amendment, but that should not be interpreted to mean that his country disagreed with the substance of the amendment put forward by Mexico.

33. **Ms. Bhengu** (South Africa) said that her country believed that children were inherently vulnerable and thus required the protection of parents or guardians and the State, as set out in the 2030 Agenda. In line with its longstanding commitment to the promotion and protection of the right to health, South Africa had voted in favour of the inclusion of the reference to sexual and reproductive health in paragraph 21 of the draft resolution, as orally revised. That paragraph made reference to all forms of violence, thus making the

provision of sexual and reproductive health services essential in cases where sexual violence occurred, taking into account the physical and mental aspects of the right to health. Her delegation's vote was not intended to undermine consensus; however, her country firmly believed that the maximum protection afforded to the rights of children must be the primary consideration at all times.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.26/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

35. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation) said that her delegation had voted against the amendment. It was disappointing that one delegation had proposed amending a paragraph for which a compromise solution had already been found, and the late submission of the proposal hindered effective cooperation, especially on such a sensitive and important topic. Although her delegation was prepared to show flexibility by joining the consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution as a whole, including the oral amendment contained in document A/C.3/73/L.61, there were a few problems with the text. Her delegation objected, in particular, to references to instruments that had been drawn up outside the United Nations and in the absence of its Member States. The Russian Federation thus disassociated itself from all paragraphs containing references to the Paris Principles. The Russian Government attached considerable importance to the promotion and protection of children's rights, as demonstrated by a presidential decree it had signed the previous day to establish a national council on the implementation of State policies to protect families and children.

36. **Ms. Eckels-Currie** (United States of America) said that the United States had voted in favour of the draft resolution to underscore the priority it gave to the well-being of children. Nevertheless, her delegation wished to clarify its position on several of the provisions. The language "sexual and reproductive health" was problematic for her delegation and remained in the resolution. In that context, the United States disassociated itself from paragraphs 18, 22 and 49 because of its concern that the terms "sexual and reproductive health" and "health-care services" had connotations that suggested the promotion of abortion or a right to abortion, which were unacceptable to her delegation. In its statement on draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.20/Rev.1, her delegation had already stated its position on that issue as well as on its concerns regarding the obligations of States under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the precedence of conventional and customary international law, and access to education.

37. The United States disassociated itself from the eighth preambular paragraph and paragraph 36 of the resolution, as it did not support the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and objected to the inclusion of references to the compact in the resolution. As the United States had not participated in the United Nations process to negotiate the compact and would not endorse the instrument, the United States was not bound by any commitments or outcomes stemming from the compact process or contained in the compact itself. Moreover, the resolution did not imply that States must join or implement obligations under international instruments to which they were not a party, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and any reaffirmation of those documents applied only to those States that were a party to them.

38. Her delegation noted that States could not ensure the enjoyment of human rights, because non-State actors too could have an impact on their enjoyment. While children should have the ability to be heard, there was no general right to be heard.

39. The United States had announced its intention to withdraw from the Paris Agreement as soon as it was eligible to do so, consistent with the terms of the Agreement, unless suitable terms for re-engagement were identified. The language on the Paris Agreement and climate change in the resolution was therefore without prejudice to the position of the United States.

40. The United States strongly supported the registration of all children upon birth and understood the obligations in that regard to be those set out in article 24 (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Her delegation understood that the resolution called on States to ensure that marriage was entered into only with the informed, free and full consent of the intending spouses. In the United States, that provision would be implemented in a manner consistent with the respective federal and state legislation. Her delegation understood the references to consular notifications and access provisions under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations to refer to arranging for legal assistance, not providing it directly; and the references to corporal or violent punishment to mean punishment that rose to the level of child abuse as defined in domestic law. Regarding the reference to sexual harassment as violence in paragraph 20, her delegation had addressed its concerns with that language in its explanation of position on draft resolution [A/C.3/73/L.21/Rev.1](#), on violence against women and girls. Furthermore, not all forms of bullying would be considered physical violence.

41. With respect to children in armed conflict, there were no obligations under international humanitarian law that placed a primary responsibility for protecting children on parties to armed conflict, nor did international law require States to take measures regarding children, as set out in paragraph 51. Regarding the reference made in the draft resolution to the International Criminal Court, the United States had already addressed its concerns in a statement delivered under agenda item 74.

42. **Ms. Kaszás** (Hungary) said that the references made in the draft resolution to international migration did not adequately reflect the position of her country on those matters. Hungary had not signed the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. Irregular migration flows were presenting major challenges to countries of origin, transit and destination, and international efforts should therefore focus on fighting the phenomenon and tackling its root causes. The definition of policies related to migration, integration, resettlement and related services remained a national prerogative, and her delegation interpreted the current resolution in line with those considerations. Bearing in mind the importance of the promotion and protection of the rights of the child as set out in the text, Hungary had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

43. **Ms. Abdelkawy** (Egypt) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it believed that the text would assist States in fulfilling their international obligations under the Convention. However, her delegation objected to references to sexual and reproductive health and to sexual and reproductive health care services for children, as the Convention, on which the resolution was based, did not contain any such references. Egypt also affirmed that parents or legal guardians must consent to any services provided to children under the age of 18 years, as stipulated in Egyptian law. Egypt also had reservations regarding the reference in paragraph 55 to the Paris Principles, as that was not an official United Nations document. Given the inclusion of the above references, Egypt had not sponsored the draft resolution.

44. **Ms. Lim** (Singapore) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. Singapore had been a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child since 1995 and had recently submitted its fourth and fifth periodic reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. Her delegation wished to express its reservations concerning paragraph 43, which reaffirmed paragraphs from previous resolutions on which her delegation had also expressed reservations, as well as paragraphs 19, 26, 33 and 44, in

line with the reservations of her country to the Convention. Singapore had nevertheless voted in favour of the draft resolution in support of its objective of protecting the rights of children.

45. **Mr. Thein** (Myanmar) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. As a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Myanmar was in the final stage of adopting a revised version of the law on children, drafted in conformity with prevailing international norms. However, although Myanmar had joined the consensus, his delegation wished to express its reservation about paragraph 53, which included a reference to the International Criminal Court. Given that Myanmar was not a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, it would not be bound by any reference to the Court.

46. **Ms. Giungi** (Observer for the Holy See) said that her delegation welcomed the purpose and general intention of the draft resolution but remained concerned about the refusal to seek consensus on the health and education of children or to include language concerning the central role of the family and parents in caring for children, as clearly defined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The resolution was meant to be a resolution of the entire General Assembly, not of a group of Member States, and it must consider the norms, cultures, traditions and national policies of every Member State, in the light of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and international law. On a subject matter as important as children, it was essential to avoid politicization and to affirm what was truly in the best interests of the child.

47. The Holy See considered the terms “sexual and reproductive health” and “sexual and reproductive health-care services” to refer to a holistic concept of health, which did not include abortion, access to abortion or access to abortifacients. Regarding information on sexual and reproductive health, the Holy See reaffirmed the primary responsibility and the prior rights of parents, including their right to freedom of religion, in the education and upbringing of their children, as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

48. **Mr. Bermúdez Álvarez** (Uruguay) said that his delegation wished to thank delegations for their flexibility in working towards a text with such widespread support. Member States were on the right path towards advancing the rights of children.

49. **Mr. De La Mora Salcedo** (Mexico) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution but regretted some of the last-minute oral

revisions. With respect to the elimination of the twenty-second preambular paragraph, Mexico remained concerned about the high global number of child deaths from preventable causes in 2017, causes that included lack of access to maternal and neonatal health care.

50. With regard to the oral amendments to paragraph 9, Mexico wished to reiterate that its national policies on civil registration were guided by its international obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, particularly article 2.1, which recognized the right of children and adolescents to have access to services without discrimination, including the right to a name and to acquire a nationality, as well as the obligation of the State to ensure registration immediately after birth, as contemplated in article 7 of the Convention. With respect to the elimination of the term “sexual and reproductive health” from paragraph 21, the Government of Mexico considered that the formulation in the draft resolution was consistent with the language agreed to in paragraph 35 (h) of resolution 72/245. Regarding the reaffirmation of paragraph 25 of resolution 68/147, it should be borne in mind that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development had replaced the Millennium Development Goals. Reaffirmation of paragraphs from five years earlier and the avoidance progress in the language of Third Committee resolutions did not help to advance the agenda for the protection of children.

51. Mexico regretted that the oral revisions had included the elimination of paragraph 39, which referred to discriminatory policies that violated the right to education of migrant children. Considering the obvious negative impact of such policies, which violated the Convention on the Rights of the Child, their absence from the resolution should not be interpreted as an endorsement of exclusionary nationalism, xenophobia or racism.

52. **Ms. Ershadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that her delegation wished to express its reservations regarding the language used in paragraph 22 of the draft resolution, which was not consistent with the specific needs of children.

53. **Mr. Al-Khaqani** (Iraq) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution but had reservations regarding any reference in any paragraph to sexual and reproductive health as well as any implicit references to abortion or to comprehensive sexual health care for children under 18 years of age.

54. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take note of document A/73/41, entitled “Report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child”.

55. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 109: Crime prevention and criminal justice (continued) (A/C.3/73/L.8/Rev.1 and A/C.3/73/L.16/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.8/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

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

57. **Ms. Zappia** (Italy), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.8/Rev.1, said that the number of the resolution referred to in paragraph 6 should be corrected to 9/1. Effective crime prevention and criminal justice were fundamental to peace and development as well as to the concrete implementation of the rights of the person and the community, which the 2030 Agenda had set as one of its central goals. All policies upholding human rights, in particular the rights of the most vulnerable, must also encompass the fight against crime, which exacerbated tensions and divisions at the expense of the least fortunate, draining public resources and undermining fundamental rights and freedoms. The draft resolution introduced important advances to the commitment of Member States to implementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and relevant United Nations programmes. The negotiation process had been characterized by a cooperative spirit and a sense of the importance of resolving the problem of crime.

58. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Andorra, Angola, the Bahamas, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Iceland, India, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Federated States of Micronesia, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.16/Rev.1: Special Session of the General Assembly against Corruption

60. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out a statement, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.16/Rev.1. Pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution, the Secretariat would consult with the Office of the President of the General Assembly to determine the exact dates and duration of the proposed special session of the General Assembly against corruption in 2021. On the understanding that there would be no parallel meetings of the Assembly, the General Assembly entitlement would be utilized to cover the cost of the special session. It was estimated that two pre-session documents of 4,290 words would be required in 2021 in all six languages. That would add to the workload of the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management and would need to be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for 2021. Accordingly, the draft resolution had no programme budget implications for the biennium 2018–2019.

61. **Mr. Fernández de Soto Valderrama** (Colombia), introducing the draft resolution, said that the United Nations Convention against Corruption was the cornerstone of international efforts to combat corruption. Corruption, accountability and transparency had also been referred to in specific targets of Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda. The General Assembly, as the most appropriate forum for defining policies on the eradication of corruption, should encourage Member States to show their citizens that they were committed to fighting corruption through international cooperation.

62. **Mr. Meza-Cuadra** (Peru), also introducing the draft resolution, said that the Assembly should be actively involved in strengthening international cooperation to prevent and combat corruption. Corruption was a transnational phenomenon that undermined the legitimacy of the international rules-based system, threatened development, undermined institutions, the rule of law and good governance, drained resources that could be used to eradicate poverty and increased inequality. During the eighth Summit of the Americas held in Lima in April 2018, States in the region had adopted the Lima Commitment, which included over 50 specific measures related to preventing and combating corruption.

63. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, Botswana, Chile, El Salvador, Georgia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Namibia,

Niger, Qatar, Senegal, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

64. *Draft resolution A/C.3/73/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.*

65. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to emphasize the leading role of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption in global efforts to prevent and combat corruption. Almost all Members States were party to the Convention, which was an effective framework for preventing and criminalizing corruption. It provided a legal basis for international cooperation in the prosecution of crimes under the Convention, including with regard to extradition, mutual legal assistance, confiscation and asset recovery, and provided for various useful mechanisms for implementing the Convention. The forthcoming General Assembly special session on corruption should focus on strengthening implementation of the Convention. The United States would assist with preparations for the special session through the Conference of the States Parties.

66. **Mr. Nakagome** (Japan) said that corruption posed a serious threat to economic growth and sustainable development all over the world. Member States should continue their collective efforts to combat corruption through existing international frameworks, including the United Nations Convention against Corruption and the working groups established by the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, and prevent duplication of their work. The secretariat of the Conference should be consulted during preparations for the special session in order to prevent any overlap of discussions or inconsistency with existing frameworks.

67. **The Chair** suggested that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption on its seventh session, held in Vienna from 6 to 10 November 2017 (A/73/132); the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (A/73/134); and the report of the Secretary-General on technical assistance in implementing the international conventions and protocols related to terrorism (A/73/136).

68. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 123: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.3/73/L.67)

Draft proposal A/C.3/73/L.67

69. **The Chair** drew attention to the tentative programme of work of the Third Committee for the seventy-fourth session of the General Assembly, submitted by the Chair of the Committee, as contained in document A/C.3/73/L.67.

70. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that in agenda item 1, sub-item (b), of the tentative programme of work, the words “disabled persons” should be replaced by “persons with disabilities”.

71. **The Chair** took it that the Committee wished to adopt the tentative programme of work of the Committee for the seventy-fourth session and transmit it to the General Assembly for approval.

72. *It was so decided.*

Conclusion of the work of the Committee

73. **The Chair** declared that the Third Committee had completed its work for the main part of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.