

**General Assembly**

Seventy-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 April 2020

Original: English

Third Committee**Summary record of the 51st meeting**

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 19 November 2019, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Braun (Luxembourg)**Contents**Agenda item 25: Social development (*continued*)

- (b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (*continued*)
- (a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)
- (b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 26: Advancement of women (*continued*)

- (a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 25: Social development (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 26: Advancement of women (*continued*)

- (b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents 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>)



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 25: Social development

(A/C.3/74/L.9/Rev.1) (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.9/Rev.1: Persons with albinism

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

2. **Mr. Ligoya** (Malawi), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that the document focused on the environmental, structural and attitudinal barriers faced by persons with albinism in their access to health, education and employment as well as in their political, social, civil and cultural life. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus as had been the case in previous years.

3. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Comoros, France, Germany, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, Morocco, Poland, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

4. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Mali, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan and Viet Nam.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted.*

6. **Ms. Arndt** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and particularly appreciated the references therein to women and girls with albinism and the multiple forms of discrimination that they faced. Her delegation wished to disassociate itself, however, from references in the second preambular paragraph to the Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development, the Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development and the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons. By referring to outdated instruments that did not reflect current positions on the human rights of persons with disabilities, the Committee was undermining efforts to achieve their full and effective participation in all aspects of society.

7. Her delegation did not understand the draft resolution to imply that States must become parties to

instruments to which they were not parties or implement obligations under those instruments. In addition, references to the obligations of States were interpreted in the light of article 2, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Her delegation considered that certain international instruments, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, were relevant to addressing issues of stigma and violence against persons with albinism. Future discussions on how to address the various social and developmental challenges faced by persons with albinism could be greatly informed by examining the root causes of discrimination against persons with disabilities.

8. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development, the delegation had addressed its concerns in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting.

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/74/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.3/74/L.66 and A/C.3/74/L.67)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.8/Rev.1: Policies and programmes involving youth

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

10. **Mr. Duarte Lopes** (Portugal), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of Cabo Verde and Kazakhstan, said that since youth issues affected all Member States, the draft resolution was relevant for youth development policies worldwide, not solely in a specific region. The final text included stronger language on youth participation and a reference to the fact that the well-being of young people was critical to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda. With the aim of achieving consensus, new paragraphs had also been added on mental health, the role of young people in preserving cultural heritage and the prevention of cyberstalking and cyberbullying. The participation of youth delegates in negotiations on the draft resolution had brought added value to the process.

11. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, India, Ireland, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan and Zambia.

12. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

13. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to introduce two documents containing amendments to the draft resolution. Her delegation had put forward each amendment during negotiations but wished to reaffirm its preference for specific language. It would be inaccurate for any delegation to claim that the proposals were being made at the last minute, since the documents containing the amendments had been submitted before the deadline. If a delegation called for votes on any of the amendments, she encouraged all Member States to vote in favour of them.

14. Introducing her delegation's first proposed amendment, she proposed replacing paragraph 10 of the draft resolution in its entirety with the paragraph contained in document [A/C.3/74/L.66](#).

15. **Mr. De La Mora Salcedo** (Mexico), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay, said that it was regrettable that a Member State had chosen to depart from the consensus, especially given the importance of the topic under discussion. The submission of amendments a few days prior to action being taken on the draft resolution, when there had been weeks of informal consultations and ample opportunities to put forward such proposals, showed a lack of regard for the Committee's procedures.

16. The amendments would modify consensus language that had a long history in intergovernmental documents, having originated in the 1994 Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. The suggestion to remove references to health-care services was particularly worrying, since the existing language, which had been used in the 2030 Agenda, was a delicate balance that recognized delegations' differing views on the scope of health needs. Health-care services should extend beyond medical care for immediate health needs to aspects such as the provision of medical tests, counselling and health education. Only by investing in health services for women, girls, adolescents and vulnerable populations would it be possible to meet the health needs of all.

17. Regrettably, it would be necessary to vote on both amendments. He urged all delegations to support policies and programmes for young people by voting against the amendments.

18. **Mr. Bjordal** (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic and Baltic countries (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), said that the Nordic and Baltic countries would vote against the proposed amendment. The draft resolution, which had resulted from open, transparent and constructive consultations, was a genuine cross-regional initiative on the involvement of young people in programmes and policies that affected their lives and futures. Young people should be heard and involved because they would inherit the problems that the current generation was unable to resolve. The draft resolution was a prime example both of multilateralism and of what the Committee was capable of achieving.

19. The draft resolution had for many years been adopted by consensus, with broad cross-regional sponsorship. The amendment proposed by the United States would alter the compromise language of paragraph 10 and introduce wording that would be inconsistent with the wording used in the draft resolution on the rights of the child ([A/C.3/74/L.21/Rev.1](#)) which had recently been adopted at the Committee's 49th meeting. During that meeting, Member States had resoundingly rejected a very similar amendment proposed by the same delegation.

20. **Ms. Byrne Nason** (Ireland) said that exemplary and exhaustive consultations had been conducted on the draft resolution in a fair process. Ireland attached great importance to the draft resolution and was disappointed by the decision of the United States to depart from the consensus. Her delegation appreciated the reference in the draft resolution to the Youth Climate Summit, held

in New York in September 2019, and the Kwon-Gesh Youth Pledge, in which Member States made a commitment to involving young people in the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

21. The existential crisis of climate change should help the international community to understand better than ever the importance of empowering young people to participate in policymaking and decision-making processes. Young people should be equipped with the skills necessary to exert agency and control over their lives and their bodies, and comprehensive and quality sexuality education was critical to that empowerment, if provided in line with their evolving capacities. Comprehensive education centred on self-esteem and respect for others also contributed significantly to gender equality. The text of the draft resolution provided the best possible wording for achieving those goals.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

22. **Mr. Umarov** (Kazakhstan), speaking also on behalf of Cabo Verde and Portugal, said that more than 25 hours of negotiation had been conducted on the draft resolution, during which all delegations had had the opportunity to express their concerns. Whenever the views of delegations had differed and it had been impossible to reach a common understanding, agreed language had been retained. Sponsors had used all means available to achieve a consensus, and the fact that over 90 Member States had joined as sponsors suggested that common ground had been found.

23. If adopted, the proposed amendment to paragraph 10 would entirely change the meaning of that paragraph, since the replacement text addressed education whereas the existing paragraph centred on health issues. The amendment would also nullify the main operative paragraph of the entire draft resolution, and wording that was particularly important to many Member States, especially developing countries. Kazakhstan, Cabo Verde and Portugal would vote against the proposed amendment.

24. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; and the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia, said that the United States delegation was proposing amendments using language that had already been massively rejected at the 49th meeting following their late submission. The European Union did not support the practice of questioning the Committee's decisions and methods of work in that way. Cabo Verde, Kazakhstan and Portugal had conducted negotiations in a diligent, fair and transparent manner and participants had made genuine

efforts to maintain a consensus and achieve a satisfactory resolution for all. There had been broad agreement to revert to previously agreed language after it had become clear that agreement could not be found on alternative wording for paragraph 10 that would be acceptable to all parties.

25. It did not make sense to propose language from the 2015 resolution on the rights of the child (A/C.3/70/L.28/Rev.1). First, the 2015 resolution concerned young people, not only children. Second, the content of the proposed amendment was entirely different to that of the original paragraph 10 and would not achieve the purpose of promoting affordable, safe, effective, sustainable and appropriate youth-friendly health-care services and social services for all young people. Third, at its 49th meeting the Committee had adopted a resolution on the girl child with more up-to-date language than the version adopted at the seventieth session.

26. Weakening the language of the draft resolution would set a negative precedent and undermine commitments made by all Member States, not least with regard to the 2030 Agenda. Undermining consensus on the draft resolution would send the wrong message to young people, particularly to those most in need. For those reasons, the European Union would vote against the hostile amendments.

27. **Mr. Verdier** (Argentina) said that his delegation regretted the attempts to weaken consensus language that had been agreed in intergovernmental documents many years earlier. The amendment omitted various elements referred to in paragraph 10, such as access to sexual and reproductive health care, access to sanitation and hygiene services and the prevention of adolescent pregnancies. The amendments were also striking because they called into question commitments that had been made during the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, even though Member States had taken those documents into account in the 2030 Agenda when adopting a target for ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health care services. The amendment would also limit the extent to which young people could enjoy the right to the highest level of sexual and reproductive health and make decisions freely, independently and without being subject to discrimination or violence. It was the international community's responsibility to safeguard agreements already made to empower young people and not to reverse them. He encouraged delegations to vote against the proposed amendment.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.3/74/L.66.*

In favour:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Guatemala, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Libya, Malawi, Maldives, Nauru, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Yemen.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Brazil, Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Haiti, Indonesia, Liberia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

29. *The proposal was rejected by 103 votes to 26, with 25 abstentions.*

30. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), introducing her delegation's second amendment contained in document [A/C.3/74/L.67](#), proposed deleting the word "comprehensive" in paragraph 12 and

the words "including sexual and reproductive health care" in paragraph 13. She wished to make one oral revision to the amendment: the inclusion in the document of an additional proposal to delete the words "with information on sexual and reproductive health" in paragraph 12 of the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

31. **Mr. Fialho Rocha** (Cabo Verde), speaking also on behalf of Kazakhstan and Portugal, said that paragraphs 12 and 13 of the draft resolution contained language agreed on 25 years earlier in the 1994 Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the 1995 World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond, and repeated in the 2016 Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS: Intensifying Our Efforts to Eliminate HIV and AIDS. Moreover, paragraph 12 was identical to paragraph 13 of the draft resolution adopted by the Committee during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly ([A/C.3/72/L.15/Rev.1](#)).

32. If young people were not provided with education consistent with their evolving capacities and with scientifically accurate answers, they would find their own, often wrong, ways to learn about sexual and reproductive behaviour. The word "comprehensive" in paragraph 12 underlined the fact that parents, legal guardians, caregivers, educators and health-care providers must be full partners in those educational decisions.

33. With regard to the deletion of the words "sexual and reproductive health" in paragraphs 12 and 13, he recalled that the World Programme of Action for Youth recognized that many countries provided insufficient information and services to protect youth from unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. In 2019, adolescents represented a growing share of the population living with HIV, while young women and girls between 15 and 24 years of age had infection rates two to three times higher than those of young men. Since it would be impossible to curb the transmission of sexually transmitted diseases without ensuring access to sexual and reproductive health care, there was clearly a need for comprehensive information and high-quality youth-friendly health-care services. Failure to recognize that urgent need would represent a setback to the progress made by countries over the previous 25 years. For those reasons, he called on all delegations to vote against the proposed amendments to paragraphs 12 and 13.

34. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; and the

candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia, said that it was disappointing that the United States had submitted another hostile amendment on an important resolution that was usually adopted by consensus. The presentation of conflicting written and oral amendments to long-standing language created confusion and was highly detrimental to the functioning of the Third Committee and the principle of multilateralism. Other Member States had divergent views on the issue but had been able to agree on the language during previous sessions of the General Assembly, which demonstrated the careful balance achieved in the draft resolution.

35. It was not clear why the word “comprehensive” should be deleted in paragraph 12: ensuring inclusive and equitable high-quality education was not only a standalone Goal of the Sustainable Development Goals, but one of the overarching objectives of the 2030 Agenda. The attempts to weaken the language in paragraph 13 on the specific needs of young people in the response to HIV/AIDS were also troubling. Over 30 per cent of all new cases of HIV infection globally were estimated to occur among young people between 15 and 25 years of age. It was imperative that they had access to relevant health-care services to improve both prevention and early intervention. His delegation would vote against the proposed amendments.

36. **Dame Karen Pierce** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation supported the revised version of the draft resolution and would vote against the proposed amendments set out in document [A/C.3/74/L.67](#). The draft resolution was of critical importance as it addressed issues facing adolescents, an overlooked segment of society, and recognized their potential to become agents of change if provided with the necessary opportunities, health care and support. The proposed amendments would roll back advances in the right to health of young people, who were critical to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Amending paragraphs 12 and 13, which enshrined a collective understanding by the international community about the importance of young people’s rights, would unjustly erase years of thoughtful work by the Committee.

37. **Mr. Bjordal** (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic and Baltic countries (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), said that the amendments contained in document [A/C.3/74/L.67](#) would undermine the safety and well-being of all young people. Universal access to education and health, including sexual and reproductive health education and health care, was life-saving, since many young girls died each year from preventable

complications arising from pregnancy or childbirth. Comprehensive sexual education allowed young people to make informed choices based on scientifically accurate information. The usual practice when new elements could not be agreed upon was to return to previously agreed language. Amending the language would set a negative precedent for the General Assembly and have an adverse impact on the enjoyment of human rights by all young women and girls, as well as boys and young men. He encouraged Member States to vote against the amendments.

38. **Mr. Verdier** (Argentina), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay, said that it was regrettable that the consensus on the draft resolution had been broken at a late stage in the process, particularly given the importance of the topic.

39. With regard to the proposal to delete the word “comprehensive” in paragraph 12, the delegations that he represented believed that equal access to comprehensive sex education was instrumental to helping people grow up safely and in good health. Evidence-based programmes based on gender equality were more effective as they enabled people to make informed decisions on sexual and reproductive health. Paragraph 12 contained carefully developed compromise language used in other resolutions or declarations and included qualifications to address potential sensitivities, such as that measures should be age-appropriate and refer to adolescent girls and boys and young women and men.

40. The wording “including sexual and reproductive health care” in paragraph 13 had enjoyed consensus for many years and had a long history in intergovernmental documents, originating in the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Sexual and reproductive health encompassed physical, mental and social well-being in all matters related to the reproductive system, including skilled birth attendance, emergency obstetric care and access to medicines and medical equipment. As those issues were

sensitive, the term “sexual and reproductive health” covered a wide range of perspectives. Since the mid-1990s, the international community had agreed on the importance of sexual and reproductive health and had committed in the 2030 Agenda to ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services. It was unfortunate that a delegation was attempting to upset the consensus and balance on those issues.

41. Member States should not turn back on their shared commitments by allowing attempts to be made to undermine the normative framework of their work. The compromise language on sexual and reproductive health care was long-standing agreed language and should be recognized as a fine balance of the different views of delegations on the scope of health-care needs. He urged all delegations to support the rights of young women and girls by voting against the amendments.

42. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.3/74/L.67, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Guatemala, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libya, Mauritania, Nauru, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Yemen.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden,

Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bahamas, Brazil, Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mauritius, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

43. *The proposed amendments contained in document A/C.3/74/L.67, as orally revised, were rejected by 108 votes to 24, with 26 abstentions.*

44. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the retention of paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of the draft resolution.

45. **Mr. Duarte Lopes** (Portugal), speaking also on behalf of Cabo Verde and Kazakhstan, said that he was disappointed that a third vote had been requested. Paragraph 10 focused on the access of young people to health care and social services and the importance of raising awareness of sports and physical activity, in line with priorities of the 2030 Agenda. The paragraph was of paramount importance to many countries with high rates of poverty and unemployment and its deletion would clearly hinder the well-being and empowerment of young people. Paragraphs 12 and 13 incorporated agreed language from the draft resolution on policies and programmes involving youth adopted during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly. Its deletion would amount to a rejection of the rights of young people to education and health, including sexual and reproductive health, that had been recognized 25 years earlier in the World Programme of Action for Youth. Failure to recognize the urgent need for young people to have access to those services would also constitute a setback in relation to the commitments that States had already made. He encouraged all delegations to vote to retain the three paragraphs.

46. *At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal to retain paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.8/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia

(Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, Egypt, Guatemala, Iraq, Libya, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United States of America, Yemen.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Myanmar, Pakistan, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates.

47. *The proposal to retain paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted by 134 votes to 17, with 10 abstentions.*

48. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

49. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda; the Addis Ababa Action Agenda; economic, social and cultural rights; the agreed conclusions of sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women; migration and the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, the United States delegation had

addressed its concerns in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting. It also understood the reaffirmation in the draft resolution of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and their review conferences to refer also to the relevant conference reports.

50. Following the rejection of the proposals to amend paragraphs 10, 12 and 13, her delegation had been left with no choice but to call for a vote on the retention of those paragraphs because of its strong position on the matter. It wished to dissociate itself from paragraphs 10, 12 and 13, which it did not consider to be agreed or consensus text.

51. The United States defended human dignity and access to high-quality health care for women and girls throughout their lifespan and believed in legal protections for the unborn. It did not accept references to “sexual and reproductive health”, “sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights”, “safe termination of pregnancy” or other wording implying or explicitly stating that access to legal abortion was an element of health-care services. It also rejected interpretations of international human rights requiring States to provide safe, legal and effective access to abortion, such as general comment No. 36 (2018) on the right to life of the Human Rights Committee. Each nation had the sovereign right to implement programmes and activities consistent with its laws and policies, but there was no international right to abortion, nor any duty for States to finance or facilitate such a right. Moreover, in line with the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action and the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and their reports, the United States did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning or support abortion as part of global health assistance.

52. The United States favoured locally driven, family-centred sex education provided in a context that increased the opportunities for young people to thrive and empowered them to avoid all forms of sexual risk. It was unacceptable, on the other hand, to include the words “comprehensive education” in the draft resolution in relation to sexual and reproductive health. That phrasing often resulted in a normalization of adolescent sexual experimentation and in a failure to incorporate family, faith and community values, while also being inconsistent with public health messages promoting the highest attainable standard of health.

53. The United States dissociated itself from the fourth preambular paragraph because it referred to the

New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. With regard to paragraph 19, her delegation noted that harassment, while condemnable, was not necessarily violent. In the legal system of the United States, the word “violence” referred to physical force or the threat of physical force. Her delegation also interpreted references in the draft resolution to school-related punishment, in accordance with its domestic law, as punishment that rose above the level of child abuse. Owing to factors outside of Government control, Member States could not guarantee the provision of or equal access to services, resources and opportunities, but should seek to ensure that young persons had access to them.

54. **Ms. Bonilla Alarcón** (Guatemala) said that her country welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. With regard to references in the text to sexual and reproductive health, sexual and reproductive health care and reproductive rights, her country’s Constitution stipulated that the State must guarantee and protect human life and the integrity and security of the person from conception onwards. As enjoyment of health was a fundamental right for all individuals, sexual and reproductive health-care measures should not include abortive measures.

55. **Ms. Al Sulaiti** (Qatar) said that her delegation reaffirmed its intention to continue supporting youth and sustainable development and that her Government had taken a number of legislative and executive measures to ensure the full implementation of an international youth programme. In all matters related to young people, the role of the parents was paramount. Sex education must therefore be age-appropriate and provided in conformity with parents’ preferences.

56. **Monsignor Hansen** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation appreciated the focus in the draft resolution on the dangers of the digital age, including cyberstalking and cyberbullying. The Holy See wished to explain its understanding of three concepts referred to in the text: first, it understood sexual and reproductive health care and reproductive rights to refer to a holistic concept of health that was unrelated to the topic of abortion, access to abortion and abortifacients. Second, with regard to education on sexual and reproductive health, parents had the primary responsibility in decisions on their children’s upbringing and were free to exercise their right to religious freedom, as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Third, the Holy See understood gender as being grounded in biological sexual identity and difference.

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.3/74/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.12/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

57. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that under the terms of paragraph 64 of the draft resolution, the Assembly would, within existing resources, devote one high-level plenary meeting at its seventy-fifth session to the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the World Summit for Social Development, to celebrate progress made thus far and strengthen the role of social development beyond 2020. It would also request the President of the General Assembly to conduct consultations with Member States to determine the modalities of that meeting.

58. Since modalities, such as the date, format and scope, had not yet been determined, it was not possible to estimate any potential cost implications of documentation requirements. Once a decision on the modalities had been taken, the Secretary-General would provide information on the relevant costs, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure. Accordingly, the adoption of the draft resolution would not at present entail any programme budget implications.

59. Attention was also drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which was resolution 72/261, in which the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and had reaffirmed the role of the Fifth Committee in carrying out a thorough analysis and approving human and financial resources and policies, with a view to ensuring full, effective and efficient implementation of all mandated programmes and activities and the implementation of policies in that regard.

60. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the text submitted at the current session focused on universal and equitable access to education and health care. In the draft resolution, text had been added to indicate that the General Assembly welcomed the adoption of the

political declaration at the high-level meeting on universal health coverage, held in New York on 23 September 2019; called on the international community to provide universal access to inclusive, equal and non-discriminatory high-quality education at all levels; and emphasized the importance of commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the World Summit for Social Development.

61. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that his delegation was disappointed by the inclusion in the draft resolution of references to issues that were not linked to social development or the work of the Third Committee. He therefore called for a vote on the draft resolution and encouraged other Member States to vote against it.

62. It was inappropriate to call upon international financial institutions and other non-United Nations organizations to take action that went beyond the scope of the draft resolution. The reference to the Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development was also inappropriate, since that document referred to the European Court of Human Rights, which had no jurisdiction outside Europe; was not binding; did not change customary international law; and could not be normative or provide a framework for social development.

63. The eighteenth preambular paragraph contained an unacceptable reference to foreign occupation, following an attempt by certain Member States to politicize development issues at the United Nations.

64. With regard to economic and trade issues, his delegation welcomed the wording in paragraph 12, since the United States valued efforts to increase economic cooperation and boost prosperity through free, fair and reciprocal trade. The United States would act in its own sovereign interest, including on trade matters. The United Nations should respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums, including the World Trade Organization. The United States would under no circumstances consider recommendations on such matters by the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council to be binding. Given that the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development was no longer relevant as a basis for work and negotiations on trade because of events that had occurred since July 2015, the draft resolution should not contain references to its outcome document.

65. The United States had concerns about paragraph 17 on the right to food. Food security depended on domestic action taken by Governments, including

regulatory and market reforms consistent with international commitments. His Government would therefore not accept any reading of the draft resolution that implied that Member States had extraterritorial obligations arising from the notion of the right to food.

66. The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights provided an important universal framework for addressing a wide range of challenges. The United States therefore understood the concept of corporate responsibility, referred to in paragraph 28, as not artificially limited to transnational or private corporations but to apply to all kinds and forms of business enterprises, regardless of their size, sector, location, ownership and structure.

67. Demands in paragraph 55 that the international community “shall” increase market access were totally unacceptable. Words such as “shall” in reference to action by Member States should appear only in binding texts, not in General Assembly resolutions. Such language had no standing in the Third Committee or similar forums, including in future negotiated documents. In addition, Member States must collectively avoid any unintended interpretation of the term “equitable”, which was used in multiple contexts in the draft resolution, to imply a subjective assessment of fairness that might lead to discriminatory practices.

68. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to topics such as the 2030 Agenda and the right to education, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting.

69. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.12/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras,

Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

70. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted by 183 votes to 2.*

71. **Ms. Pongor** (Hungary) said that her delegation welcomed the focus of the draft resolution on achieving the highest attainable standards of health and the right to education, but regretted that consensus had not been reached on its adoption. In the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 37, more neutral references to the political declaration reached during the high-level meeting on universal health coverage in September 2019 would have been preferable. Moreover, paragraph 29 did not accurately reflect her country's policies on ensuring the affordability and price transparency of health products.

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (continued) (A/C.3/74/L.13/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.13/Rev.1: Follow-up to the twentieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family and beyond

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

73. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the objectives of the International Year of the Family and its follow-up processes remained relevant and useful. The text of the draft resolution contained various changes to the text submitted during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly, in particular, paragraph 6 on the provision of affordable, accessible and good-quality childcare and care facilities and the promotion of equal sharing of household responsibilities between women and men; paragraph 10 on investment in parenting education to prevent violence against children; and paragraph 11 on the collection and use of relevant data for the formulation and evaluation of family-oriented policies.

74. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belarus and Turkey had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

75. He then noted that Uzbekistan also wished to become a sponsor.

76. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted.*

77. **Mr. Tanner** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union attached great importance to family-related issues. Its member States shared the view that families made a valuable contribution to strengthening society and that policies must be developed to support their role. For policies to be successful, however, they must also be inclusive and responsive to the changing needs of families. Across the European Union and in the rest of the world, families had changed and would continue to evolve in response to socioeconomic developments. The text was a considerable improvement in that regard, in reflecting recognition of the fact that every situation required tailored and responsive policies. Her delegation particularly welcomed new text on the importance of sharing household responsibilities, reducing and redistributing unpaid care and engaging men and boys, as well as on legal identity and support for parenting education.

78. In all discussions on family policies, it must be recognized that various forms of the family existed in different cultural, social and political systems. The States members of the European Union understood all references to “family” in the draft resolution to reflect that fact.

79. **Ms. Korac** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it strongly supported the primacy of parents and families as a foundational institution of society. Strengthening of the capacities of children and their families was one of the best investments a society could make to eliminate extreme poverty, boost economic growth, and promote peace. Her delegation interpreted references in the draft resolution to violent disciplinary measures as punishment that reached the level of child abuse, in accordance with domestic law.

80. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, education and health-care services, her delegation had addressed its concerns in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting.

Agenda item 26: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

(A/C.3/74/L.22/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.22/Rev.1: Violence against women migrant workers

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

82. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Palau, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Uruguay.

83. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Argentina, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Guinea, Lebanon, Mali, Sao Tome and Principe, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

84. **Mr. Khashaan** (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution because it was committed to joint action on the issue at hand and appreciated the need to take on board all points of view. However, in keeping with its long-standing position, it wished to dissociate itself from the reference in the fifteenth preambular paragraph

to the agreed conclusions of the Commission on the Status of Women at its sixty-third session.

85. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that, with regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda; the Addis Ababa Action Agenda; the New Urban Agenda; economic, social, and cultural rights; the 1995 United Nations World Conference on Women; the International Conference on Population and Development and their five-year follow-ups; the outcome documents of the Commission on the Status of Women; the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration; and the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, his delegation had addressed its concerns in previous statements, and in particular in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting.

86. It was the understanding of his delegation that the draft resolution was non-binding and that it changed neither the state of conventional and customary international law nor the territorial scope established in the relevant conventions. It did not imply that States must implement obligations under human rights instruments to which they were not a party, nor did it establish new human rights, particularly in paragraphs 12 and 20.

87. With regard to the thirteenth preambular paragraph, his delegation noted that harassment, while deplorable, was not necessarily violent. In the United States legal system, the word “violence” referred to physical force or the threat of physical force. With regard to paragraph 32, individuals did not have the right to consular notification or access, but States had the right to grant it.

88. It was regrettable that the draft resolution included a reference to the agreed conclusions of the Commission on the Status of Women at its sixty-third session. Two delegations had unequivocally objected to the adoption of those conclusions, and the United States shared some of their substantive concerns. Many of its objections were endemic to Third Committee resolutions, including problematic references to abortion, the use of poorly defined jargon about gender and the inclusion of language that undermined the role of the family. The United States did not consider the outcome documents from the Commission’s sixty-third session to be the result of consensus.

89. **Ms. Elmarmuri** (Libya) said that her country attached considerable importance to the issue of violence against migrant women and had adopted a range of laws on the subject, with due regard for gender and for the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women and the International Convention on the

Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, to which Libya was a party. Moreover, her delegation believed that adopting the draft resolution by consensus would increase its profile and strengthen its effectiveness. Accordingly, it would join the consensus on the draft resolution. However, it had abstained on General Assembly resolution 73/195 endorsing the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and was convinced that States had the right, under international law, to distinguish between legal and illegal migration and to take into consideration national priorities with regard to entry, work and residence. Libya reserved the sovereign right, in the light of its current domestic situation, to determine its own national policies and exercise its jurisdiction with regard to migration. Her delegation therefore dissociated itself from the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, adoption of which should not be construed as a change in her Government's position. Similarly, her delegation dissociated itself from the reference, in the fifteenth preambular paragraph, to the agreed conclusions of the Commission on the Status of Women at its sixty-third session.

90. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted.*

91. **Mr. de Souza Monteiro** (Brazil) said that the draft resolution addressed numerous issues relevant to his country, including the promotion of the rights of women, the protection of children and adolescents, the specific situation of women migrant workers, the importance of the increased participation of women in the formal labour market and the fight against trafficking in persons. For Brazil, all discussions about migration should be subordinated to the principle of national sovereignty, which was why it had chosen to withdraw from the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and to not participate in follow-up forums. Brazil had comprehensive national legislation that set out the rights of migrant workers and ensured that they had access to basic services, such as health care and education. In view of the relevance of the topic of women migrant workers to Brazil, his Government wished to join the consensus on the draft resolution but to disassociate itself from the eighth, ninth and eighteenth preambular paragraphs.

92. **Mr. Tanner** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that the European Union was fully committed to promoting and protecting the rights of women migrant workers and appreciated the continuous efforts of

Indonesia and the Philippines to champion such rights. It welcomed the inclusion in the draft resolution of references to the agreed conclusions of the fifty-seventh and sixty-third sessions of the Commission on the Status of Women. The agreed conclusions from the sixty-third session, in particular, represented the most recent international consensus on the full enjoyment of human rights by women and girls and included forward-looking recommendations on the rights of migrant women. The member States of the European Union were fully committed to implementing all of the agreed conclusions.

93. The draft resolution reaffirmed the importance of crucial conventions of the International Labour Organization (ILO), particularly the recently adopted Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190), which he encouraged all Member States to ratify. The draft text should, however, have included a reference to the ILO Violence and Harassment Recommendation, 2019 (No. 206), which, in combination with the Violence and Harassment Convention, helped to fill a gap in the provision of protection to millions of workers.

94. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation) said that it was regrettable that the twentieth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution referred to instruments that did not enjoy broad support, such as the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189), which very few States had ratified; the Violence and Harassment Convention, which Russia had been unable to support earlier in 2019; and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families, which many States had not ratified. The paragraph also included references to a general recommendation and a general comment that reflected the personal opinion of experts serving on individual committees. For those reasons, the Russian Federation wished to disassociate itself from the twentieth preambular paragraph.

95. Her delegation was also disappointed by politicization of the discussion on the important topic of combating violence against women migrant workers. It was puzzling that certain delegations were keen to refer to the agreed conclusions of the Commission on the Status of Women at its sixty-third session, given that the process of finalizing that document had been extremely drawn out. Her delegation had shown flexibility by agreeing to mention the conclusions but was opposed to attempts to raise the status of the document or equate it to those adopted by the General Assembly or other United Nations organs. Agreed conclusions were only one element of the report that the Commission on the Status of Women submitted to the Economic and Social Council.

96. **Mr. Skoknic Tapia** (Chile) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, but since his Government had not endorsed the Global Compact and its content was not enforceable in Chile, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the eighth, ninth and eighteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 10.

97. **Ms. Ní Chonchúir** (Ireland), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay, said that the Commission on the Status of Women remained the main intergovernmental body exclusively dedicated to women's rights. The outcome documents of its meetings were important and reflected weeks of negotiations among Member State. The conclusions of the sixty-third session, which had been adopted without a vote by the Commission and then again by the Economic and Social Council, should be considered no differently.

98. **Ms. de Martino** (Italy) said that her delegation attached great importance to the protection and promotion of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of migrants, especially women migrant workers. Italy was committed to incorporating a human rights-based and gender-responsive perspective into its legislation and policies on migration and employment, with the aim of protecting migrant women workers from violence, discrimination, trafficking, exploitation and abuse. Although Italy had joined the consensus on the draft resolution in a spirit of shared responsibility, its position with respect to the Global Compact had not changed since the previous session of the General Assembly.

99. **Ms. Pongor** (Hungary) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and reaffirmed its commitment to international human rights instruments, including those on migration. Migration did not qualify as a basic human right, and all Member States had the right to define their migration policies, protect their borders from criminal networks involved in trafficking in persons and smuggling and prevent irregular migration that could create further opportunities for traffickers. Instead of promoting migration as a solution to socioeconomic and

environmental challenges, the international community should do more to address the root causes of those problems, including through conflict prevention, sustainable development and the upholding of human rights. Hungary had not voted in favour of the Global Compact and disassociated itself from paragraphs of the draft resolution that referred to that instrument or to the International Migration Review Forum.

100. **Ms. Charikhi** (Algeria) said that her country was committed to the protection of women, including migrant women. Algeria had made several amendments to its Criminal Code in 2015 to cover prosecution of perpetrators of violence against women and was firmly committed to protecting and promoting the human rights of women migrant workers in accordance with relevant international treaties, especially the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

101. Although her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it did not agree with the eighth, ninth and eighteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 10, which all referred to the Global Compact. Algeria had not endorsed the Global Compact, although it supported its global, multi-dimensional and cooperative basis and its aim to promote the humanitarian aspect of migration and the sovereign right of States to define their own national policies in that respect. His delegation wished to clarify its position: the text of the draft resolution did not distinguish between regular migrants and those in an irregular situation; it disregarded the root causes of migration and did too little to curb irregular migration, for which global solutions were required; the measures under the Compact to manage migratory flows would be ineffective without the introduction of a global strategy to eradicate the underlying causes of migration; and participation in the implementation of the Compact and its follow-up mechanism should be voluntary, gradual and approved by Member States in advance.

102. **Mr. Molina Linares** (Guatemala) said that the draft resolution offered the Committee a valuable opportunity to acknowledge the contribution that women migrant workers made to the development of society. Responses to migration must be comprehensive and coordinated and involve shared responsibility and respect for the rights of all migrants, regardless of their migratory status. Migrants should be guaranteed protection in their countries of origin, transit and destination, as well as during their potential return, with

priority given to protecting vulnerable groups from violence and exploitation.

103. Migration was not a problem to be solved, but a natural social process that had existed in every culture throughout history. It was a human rights issue, not a security issue, and migrants and irregular migration should therefore not be criminalized. Current waves of migration offered the international community development opportunities rather than inflicting harm on them. Guatemala recognized the Global Compact as one of the first processes centred on migrants and hoped that the measures taken under the Compact would be comprehensive, humane and sustained by cooperation among all countries.

Agenda item 25: Social development (continued)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (continued) (A/C.3/74/L.14/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.14/Rev.1: Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing

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

105. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the text of the draft resolution included new references to fundamental international human rights instruments that promoted that rights of older persons, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It also incorporated inputs from the report of the Secretary-General on follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (A/74/170) on the increasing number of humanitarian emergencies worldwide, the importance of taking into account the needs and potential contributions of older persons during emergencies. In addition, it included information on the human rights protection of older persons in humanitarian emergencies from the report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons (A/HRC/39/50). Member States were encouraged to address the situation of older persons in their voluntary national reviews presented at the high-level political forum on sustainable development.

106. Paragraph 52 of the text included information on discussions that had been held during the previous session of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing. Member States were encouraged to consider adopting, at each of the Group's annual sessions,

intergovernmentally negotiated recommendations to be presented for consideration to the General Assembly. The establishment of recommendations would ensure more fruitful interaction among Member States and would allow them to decide on the outcomes of each session in a consensual manner.

107. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Austria, Canada, Croatia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Malta, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

108. He then noted that Albania also wished to become a sponsor.

109. **Mr. Gennady Kuzmin** (Russian Federation) said that his country recognized the importance of improving the situation of older persons and finding the best way possible for the international community to protect the rights and interests of those persons. The Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing provided a solid foundation for further progress, while the contributions of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing were valuable in the international context. It was, however, premature to change the format of the Working Group to a model that included the adoption of intergovernmentally negotiated recommendations. There was no consensus on even the most basic aspects of the format proposed in paragraph 52 of the draft resolution, and the new approach risked paralysing discussions and creating obstacles to the adoption of the Working Group's outcome documents. His delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from the content of paragraph 52.

110. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.14/Rev.1 was adopted.*

111. **Mr. Leuprecht** (Canada) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, a text that should help to achieve the goals set out in the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing and the 2030 Agenda. Canada was committed to addressing issues relevant to older persons and had taken various actions at the national and international level to support their unique skills and challenges. Members of the international community must work collaboratively to improve the living conditions and protect the rights of older persons, and the General Assembly could contribute to that goal through the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing. Canada remained committed to working with Member States and civil society partners in the context of the Working Group and trusted that the measures proposed in paragraph 52 of the draft resolution would further enhance that body's work.

112. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, in which Member States were called on to protect and assist older persons in emergency situations in accordance with the Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. His delegation noted that both of those documents were non-binding. Other documents were also relevant to the protection and assistance of persons, including older persons, in humanitarian crisis situations, such as the Guidelines to Protect Migrants in Countries Experiencing Conflict or Natural Disaster and the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

113. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda; the world financial and economic crisis; the New Urban Agenda; health care; and economic, social and cultural rights, his delegation had addressed its concerns in previous statements, and in particular in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting. His Government also wished to underscore the importance of promoting the fundamental principles and rights at work for all workers, including care workers.

114. The terms “migration” and “migrants”, referred to in paragraph 18 of the draft resolution, were not well defined in international law. The United States maintained the sovereign right to facilitate or restrict access to its territory, in accordance with its national laws, policies and interests, subject to its existing international obligations. He drew participants’ attention in that regard to the national statement of the United States of America issued on 7 December 2018 concerning the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration. He also pointed out that the United States was not a party to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

Agenda item 26: Advancement of women (continued)

(b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.3/74/L.65)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.65: 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

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

116. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.65 was adopted.*

117. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, the United Nations World Conference on Women and the follow-up conference in 2000, the negotiated outcome documents of the Commission on the Status of Women and treaties that the United States had not ratified, including the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a detailed statement delivered at the 44th meeting. It interpreted paragraph 2 of the draft resolution to imply that the General Assembly reaffirmed not only the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, but also the report of the Fourth World Conference on Women (A/CONF.177/20/Rev.1). Lastly, his delegation dissociated itself from paragraph 8, because it did not accept that the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights or any other instrument entailed broad obligations for States to exercise due diligence to prevent all forms of violence committed against women and girls by non-State actors.

Agenda item 68: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (continued)

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (continued) (A/C.3/74/L.60/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.60/Rev.1: A global call for concrete action 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

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

119. **Ms. Barghouti** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in the context of an alarming resurgence of racism and deepening of inequalities worldwide, Member States should emphasize the urgency of fighting against and eliminating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The draft resolution included, in particular, text in which the General Assembly welcomed recent developments in Geneva regarding the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action and called for the finalization of

the establishment of the Permanent Forum on People of African Descent to be finalized at the current session.

120. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Russian Federation had joined the sponsors.

121. **Mr. Tanner** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that his delegation shared the concern of the main sponsors of the draft resolution that the objective of eradicating racism had not yet been attained. Racism in all its forms should be tackled in a comprehensive way by implementing effective measures mainly at the national level, but also at the regional and international levels, in particular by ratifying and implementing the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The European Union remained firmly committed to the primary objectives and commitments undertaken at the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance.

122. While the European Union appreciated the efforts made by the delegation of South Africa on behalf of the Group of 77 and China to hold constructive informal consultations on the draft resolution, it would have preferred to have seen a process directed towards finding compromise, as had occurred at the previous session of the General Assembly. In Geneva, the adoption without a vote of a draft resolution on racism had demonstrated that it was feasible for the international community to work together to reach a compromise on the topic. The European Union had engaged constructively in discussions in the belief that consensus would provide a solid basis for Member States to focus on fighting racism.

123. One proposal made by his delegation had been to reaffirm that the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was and should remain the basis for all efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate racism and that additional instruments, such as a protocol to the Convention or a declaration on the rights of people of African descent, were unnecessary. In the light of discussions in Geneva on the modalities of the Permanent Forum on People of African Descent, his delegation had also proposed more neutral language: draft resolutions on the topic had been adopted by the General Assembly both by consensus and following a vote, but the consensual approach improved the chances of success for the Permanent Forum. The programme of activities for the implementation of the International Decade for People of African Descent must continue to guide the Committee's work. The European Union had also proposed avoiding the proliferation and duplication of Durban follow-up mechanisms and processes, since

resources should be devoted primarily to supporting concrete measures to combat racism and all forms of discrimination on the ground. The European Union had also made proposals that correctly reflected the language of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.

124. It was regrettable that while some of his delegation's suggestions to update the text had been included in the draft resolution, none of its substantive proposals had been accepted. It was the common duty of Member States to combat the scourge of racism, particularly by overcoming the divisions regarding the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The draft resolution did not move the international community closer to that goal and the States members of the European Union would therefore not support the draft resolution.

125. **Mr. Baror** (Israel) said that Israel had joined other States at the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in September 2001 to combat the scourge of racism. It had withdrawn from the conference, however, after a small group of States had turned the conference into a platform for defaming, demonizing and delegitimizing the State of Israel. His country had also been among those to refuse to take part in the Durban Review Conference in 2009, at which the then President of Iran, who had repeatedly called for the annihilation of the State of Israel, had been invited to speak.

126. His delegation reiterated that it could not support outcomes or reports that were based on false foundations. His delegation followed that principle all the more staunchly in the case of racism and therefore could not accept the current draft resolution, which was founded on the racist and anti-Semitic foundations of the 2001 Durban Conference.

127. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States, recognizing its special obligation to combat racism and racial discrimination because of historical injustices perpetrated in past eras, pledged to work with civil society, international mechanisms and all nations of goodwill to combat such evils. It continued to implement the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which provided comprehensive protections in that regard and was the most relevant international framework for addressing all forms of racial discrimination. The United States also sought to raise the profile of the International Decade for People of African Descent. The best antidote to offensive speech was not a ban or a punishment, but a combination of

robust legal protections against discrimination and hate crimes, proactive Government outreach to communities and vigorous protection of freedom of expression, both offline and online.

128. His delegation, as in the previous year, was unable to support the current version of the draft resolution because the text was not genuinely focused on combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Among his delegation's concerns were the endorsements of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action and of the outcome of the Durban Review Conference and the latter's overly broad restrictions on freedom of speech and expression. His delegation rejected any efforts to advance the "full implementation" of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Rather than providing a comprehensive and inclusive way forward to combat the scourge of racism and racial discrimination, the draft resolution perpetuated the divisions caused by the World Conference and its follow-up. Furthermore, the United States could not accept the urgent appeal in the draft resolution for Member States to withdraw reservations to article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, or its implication that such reservations could be contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty. His delegation noted that the draft resolution had no bearing on international law and categorically rejected the call for "former colonial Powers" to provide reparations "consistent with" the Durban Programme of Action.

129. Lastly, the United States expressed its concerns about the additional costs under the regular budget for the reactivation of the group of independent eminent experts on the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. In view of the significant constraints on the regular budget and the limited ability of Member States to provide increasing amounts of resources, the United States stressed the need to consider carefully the resource implications of such requests. For those reasons, the United States would vote against the draft resolution.

130. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.60/Rev.1.*

In favour:

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

Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Czechia, France, Germany, Israel, Marshall Islands, Nauru, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine.

131. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.60/Rev.1 was adopted by 131 votes to 10, with 44 abstentions.*

132. **Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that it was not surprising that Israel, the last remaining apartheid regime of the twenty-first century, was displeased with the draft resolution, given that its

current Prime Minister had once said: “the weak crumble, are slaughtered and are erased from history, while the strong, for good or for ill, survive. The strong are respected, and alliances are made with the strong, and in the end, peace is made with the strong.”

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/74/L.58)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.58: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

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

134. **Mr. Moussa** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, had suffered for more than half a century as a result of the Israeli occupation and the denial of their natural and inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination. The text of the draft resolution was largely the same as the one submitted to the Committee during the seventy-third session of the General Assembly, except for some editorial changes.

135. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

136. He then noted that the Syrian Arab Republic also wished to become a sponsor.

137. **Mr. Baror** (Israel) said that his delegation wished to call for a recorded vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it. Israel did not oppose the rights of the Palestinians, but the text of the draft resolution was not focused on such rights. It was part of a broader effort to create a narrative in which the Palestinians were depicted as virtuous, while Israel was in the wrong. In

all the 20 or more General Assembly resolutions adopted each year on the issue, that narrative was unquestioningly accepted, and the rights of the Palestinian people were reaffirmed, while the narrative of the Jewish people, including its history and legal foundation, was disregarded. Israel believed that the Jewish people had the right to self-determination in a single Jewish state, the homeland of the Jewish people. Although delegations often expressed their opposition to country-specific resolutions and to the politicization of the work of the Committee and of the human rights framework, almost all of them had consistently voted in favour of resolutions that singled out Israel and politicized virtually every United Nations committee.

138. The draft resolution before the Committee implied support for the Palestinians’ long-standing refusal to negotiate with Israel and placed absolutely no responsibility on them. Consequently, it reinforced his country’s view that the United Nations was incapable of playing a constructive role in resolving the conflict. Lastly, it served as justification for tyrannical regimes, such as those in Damascus and Tehran, since their representatives could pose as defenders of Palestinian rights while violating the same rights of their own population.

139. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.58.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique,

Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Guatemala, Honduras, Kiribati, Rwanda, Togo, Tonga, Vanuatu.

140. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.58 was adopted by 164 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.**

141. **Ms. Eugenio** (Argentina) said that her delegation recognized the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to establish an independent and viable State. It had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflected her country's official recognition of the State of Palestine as a free and independent State, within the 1967 borders, and in accordance with whatever was agreed by the parties during the negotiation process. That recognition was consistent with the desire of the Government of Argentina to favour negotiations for the end of the conflict and its deep belief in the peaceful coexistence of all peoples. He confirmed the unwavering support of Argentina for the right of Israel to be recognized by all and to live in peace and security within its borders.

142. Exercise of the right to self-determination presupposed that there was an active subject in the form of a people subject to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, as defined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), paragraph 1. Without such a subject, there was no right to self-determination. Argentina welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and hoped that it

could contribute to the prompt realization of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent Palestinian State.

143. **Ms. Blais** (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it addressed the core issue in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Canada was strongly committed to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including the creation of a Palestinian State side by side with Israel, and strongly supported the international consensus on a two-State solution that would allow both sides to have a secure and prosperous future. There were at present, however, too many resolutions related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which resulted in Israel being unfairly singled out for criticism. The international community should focus on helping both sides to resume direct negotiations, in the interest of achieving a lasting peace for both peoples.

144. **Ms. Barghouti** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the overwhelming support for the draft resolution was a clear affirmation of States' continuing commitment to and support for the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, a right that had been violently withheld for more than half a century under Israeli occupation. Her delegation also acknowledged the change of position by Canada to voting in favour of the draft resolution. The draft resolution's reaffirmation of Palestinian rights in no way obstructed a just and peaceful solution. If anything, the adoption of the draft resolution by 164 Member States reflected the collective will to uphold international law and contribute to a just and lasting solution.

145. The vote cast by Israel against the draft resolution could only reinforce the idea among Palestinians that Israel rejected a real peace settlement based on the two-State solution. In order for a just peace to be achieved, the basic right of self-determination must be recognized by both parties. The State of Palestine had recognized the right of Israel to exist, but Israel had yet to recognize the Palestinian State or even recognize in any formal way the right of the Palestinians to live freely and independently in their own State.

146. As the years passed with scant progress in the peace process, the United Nations and international human rights organizations were finding that Israel was becoming more entrenched, violent and relentless in its subjugation of an entire people and its deprivation of their rights to life and self-determination. Peace was becoming more and more elusive as Israel persisted in

* The delegation of San Marino subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

tormenting and inflicting collective punishment on the Palestinian people through arrests, imprisonment, colonization and settlement activities. All Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestine, including East Jerusalem, were illegal and all settlements of civilians in occupied territory amounted to war crimes. The constant bombardment and military operations in the Gaza Strip, including airstrikes on civilian areas, and the 12-year siege imposed on the Palestinian people further reduced the chances of achieving peace. The right to self-determination was the inalienable right of all peoples, and the Palestinians were no exception. That right was not subject to negotiation and was not for Israel to grant.

147. The international community had a duty to insist on compliance with international law, and it had done so by voting in favour of the draft resolution. It must not accept the empty slogans and distorted pretexts used by the occupying Power.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.