



General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 March 2020

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 52nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 19 November 2019, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Braun (Luxembourg)

Contents

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)Agenda item 70: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)Agenda item 108: International drug control (*continued*)

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Conclusion of the work of the Committee

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>)



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

Agenda item 69: Right of peoples to self-determination (continued) (A/C.3/74/L.61)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.61: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

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

2. **Mr. Akram** (Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that the right to self-determination had been enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. In General Assembly resolution 2649 (XXV), the acquisition and retention of territory in contravention of the right of the people of that territory to self-determination had been declared inadmissible and a gross violation of the Charter. Curfews, blackouts and lockdowns of civilian populations to suppress their ability to demand freedom and self-determination were obviously gross violations of human rights, including the right to self-determination. Attempts to unilaterally change the legal or demographic status of an occupied territory whose people had yet to exercise their right to self-determination had been declared ipso facto null and void in several resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In the decades after the Second World War, the right to self-determination had often been exercised peacefully through a free and fair referendum or a plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations, such as in East Timor and Namibia. While most dependent or occupied peoples had been able to exercise their right to self-determination, some had been denied that right and forced to struggle for it.

3. The year 2020 would mark the sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)) and the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)) and General Assembly resolution 2649 (XXV). In the draft resolution, the General Assembly sought to reaffirm the cardinal principle of self-determination as elaborated in those landmark resolutions, the provisions of which were equally applicable to contemporary situations of denial of freedom and self-determination by foreign occupation, alien domination, illegal annexation and military intervention.

4. Recent history showed that the suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination inevitably resulted in violence and conflict. Such suppression had often been justified by portraying struggles for self-determination and freedom as terrorism – a lie propagated by aggressors and occupiers that was being progressively exposed. In view of the universal nature of the right of self-determination and its continued applicability in situations of foreign occupation and intervention, the draft resolution had traditionally been adopted by consensus. His delegation urged the Committee to reaffirm the global commitment to the principle of self-determination by adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

5. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Comoros, Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gambia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Palau, Paraguay, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Suriname, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Uzbekistan and Yemen. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea, Lebanon, Maldives, Mozambique, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago and United Republic of Tanzania.

6. **Ms. Tripathi** (India) said that, while her country recognized the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, that principle must not be used as a pretext for violation of the territorial integrity of any Member State. Self-determination in the United Nations context referred to the rights of a people that had been colonized or continued to be under foreign domination. It clearly referred to the peoples of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories. Desperate attempts by any country to seek to legitimize their territorial ambitions by misusing the issue of the right to self-determination would not alter the commitment of India to upholding that right. Her delegation would join a consensus on the draft resolution with the firm understanding that the provisions applied only to the situations listed in the report of the Secretary-General on the right of peoples to self-determination (A/74/309) and that other documents not mentioned in the draft resolution should not be taken into consideration.

7. **Ms. Eugenio** (Argentina) said that her Government fully supported the right to self-determination of peoples subjected to colonial domination and foreign occupation, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The exercise of the right to self-determination required an active subject, namely a people under alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, as set out in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), without which the right to self-determination was not applicable. The draft resolution should be interpreted and implemented in keeping with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.61 was adopted.*

9. **Mr. Gutiérrez Segú Berdullas** (Spain) said that the existence of a colonial situation did not always involve suppression of the population's rights. In some cases, it constituted an attack on a State's right to territorial integrity, which was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the Organization's principles and doctrine. The right to self-determination should not be used to justify colonial situations that compromised the territorial integrity of States. Spain rejected situations in which the administering Power and the authorities of a colonized territory claimed that there was no longer a colonial link following supposed changes in the political relationship. That was a distortion of the Charter and the relevant resolutions and conventions.

10. The original population of Gibraltar had been forced to leave the territory, and the current inhabitants were descendants of those installed by the occupying Power for military purposes. In such circumstances, Spain denied the existence of a right to self-determination protected under international law, and its position was clearly supported by General Assembly resolution 2353 (XXII). The United Nations recognized that the situation in Gibraltar undermined the territorial integrity of Spain, and his country had repeatedly called for dialogue on the issue.

11. The continuing existence of the colony on Spanish territory was having a negative impact on Campo de Gibraltar, which was home to many of the descendants of the Spanish population expelled from Gibraltar. The negotiations between Spain and the United Kingdom that had been unilaterally suspended by the United Kingdom must be urgently resumed in order to find a solution that was in keeping with United Nations principles. At the same time, Spain was trying to reach an agreement with the United Kingdom for the implementation of a new cooperation arrangement that

would directly benefit all the region's inhabitants and address existing imbalances. Spain therefore reiterated its invitation to the United Kingdom to negotiate a solution that would put an end to an anachronistic situation.

12. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that the United States recognized the importance of the right of peoples to self-determination and had therefore joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, the text contained many misstatements of international law and was inconsistent with current State practices. She also recalled the general statement made by her delegation at the 44th meeting of the Committee.

Statements made in exercise of the right of reply

13. **Mr. Al Khalil** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that Israel, the occupying Power, continued to pursue repressive policies of apartheid and terrorism against Syrian citizens. Israel had been orchestrating sham prosecutions of Syrians and sentencing them to long terms of imprisonment, including the "Syrian Mandela", Sidqi al-Maqt, who had been arbitrarily arrested and sentenced to 14 years of imprisonment in addition to the 27 years he had already spent in detention centres of the occupation. The international community must work towards his release and that of other detainees in Israeli prisons.

14. His Government reiterated its condemnation of Israeli practices aimed at controlling the natural resources in the occupied Syrian Golan. Israel was systematically exploiting those resources in clear contravention of the sovereignty of people under foreign occupation over their natural resources and in violation of Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and of General Assembly resolution 72/240. Israel continued to deplete the natural resources of the occupied Syrian Golan and to prevent Syrians from benefiting from their natural resources, including water resources, by allowing only settlers to use them. It was also damaging lands and uprooting trees in the Golan, as well as draining the waters of the Mas'adah Lake and diverting them towards Israeli settlements, in contravention of international law and the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. The Syrian Arab Republic warned against the dangerous measures taken by Israel that would grant companies of the United States the rights to further exploit the natural resources of the Syrian Arab Republic, in violation of United Nations resolutions.

15. The Syrian Arab Republic continued to uphold the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination

and to establish their national State on their national territory, with Jerusalem as their capital. The State of Palestine should be given full membership in the United Nations.

16. **Mr. Baror** (Israel) said that the comment made by the Iranian delegation at the 51st meeting of the Committee showed how shallow and lacking the understanding of some Member States was of the facts and realities of the Holocaust, its horrors and atrocities, and the actions of those involved. The comment could perhaps prove useful in demonstrating, to representatives of every Member State, just how much still needed to be done in the field of education on and commemoration of the Holocaust.

17. **Mr. Sylvester** (United Kingdom) recalled that the United Kingdom had sovereignty over Gibraltar and the territorial waters surrounding it and that, as a separate Territory recognized by the United Nations and included since 1946 in its list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, Gibraltar enjoyed the rights accorded to it by the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation also recalled that the people of Gibraltar enjoyed the right to self-determination. The 2006 Gibraltar Constitution, which had been endorsed in a referendum by the people of Gibraltar, provided for a modern and mature relationship between Gibraltar and the United Kingdom. His Government would not enter into arrangements under which the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another State against their wishes and would not enter into sovereignty negotiations that they opposed. The United Kingdom was committed to safeguarding Gibraltar, its people and its economy.

18. The Governments of the United Kingdom and Gibraltar remained firmly committed to the Trilateral Forum for Dialogue on Gibraltar as the most credible means of strengthening United Kingdom-Gibraltar-Spain relations for the benefit of all parties. The United Kingdom regretted that the Government of Spain had withdrawn from those talks in 2011. The Governments of the United Kingdom and Gibraltar stood ready to engage with Spain to establish new and deeper forms of cooperation to address issues of mutual importance in the wider region, through dialogue that fully reflected the wishes, interests, rights and responsibilities of the people and Government of Gibraltar.

19. **Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that deceptive remarks could not conceal the fact that Israeli policies of intimidation, aggression and occupation continued to be the source of instability in the Middle East and beyond. Illegal settlements, an unlawful and inhumane blockade and abhorrent racism persisted while millions of civilians, including women,

children, persons with disabilities and elderly people, were being taken hostage by Israel, the last apartheid regime in the world. Such a level of human rights violations in the twenty-first century was appalling.

20. **Mr. Gutiérrez Segú Berdullas** (Spain) said that the territorial waters of Gibraltar had, de facto and de jure, belonged to Spain since time immemorial. The only waters ceded under article X of the Treaty of Utrecht were the waters of the port of Gibraltar.

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

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) ([A/C.3/74/L.31/Rev.1](#), [A/C.3/74/L.44/Rev.1](#), [A/C.3/74/L.45/Rev.1](#), [A/C.3/74/L.46/Rev.1](#), [A/C.3/74/L.48/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.3/74/L.63](#))

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.31/Rev.1: Implementing the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms through providing a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders and ensuring their protection

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

22. **Mr. Kvalheim** (Norway), introducing the draft resolution, said that the challenges facing human rights defenders had not diminished over the past two decades; at least 1,019 human rights defenders had been killed across the world from 2015 to 2017; and the Secretary-General had pointed to alarming trends of reprisals and intimidation against human rights defenders cooperating with the United Nations. The draft resolution was therefore important in calling upon States and all relevant stakeholders to intensify their efforts to implement the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and in urging the General Assembly to send a clear message of support to human rights defenders.

23. Introducing oral revisions to the draft resolution, he said that “genuine, free and full” should be replaced with “meaningful” in paragraph 9; and “by State and non-State actors against human rights defenders” should be replaced with “by State and non-State actors, including against human rights defenders” in paragraph 11. Paragraph 14 should read: “Calls on

States to develop and implement appropriate and effective protection initiatives for human rights defenders at risk or in vulnerable situations, including through meaningful consultation with them and based on comprehensive risk analysis, and also to ensure that these measures are holistic, respond to the protection needs of individuals and the communities in which they live and function as an early warning to ensure that human rights defenders, when threatened, have immediate access to authorities that are competent and adequately resourced to provide effective protective measures.” In paragraph 16, “impoverished communities, groups and communities in vulnerable situations” should be replaced with “impoverished communities and communities in vulnerable situations”.

24. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, North Macedonia, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe and Seychelles.

25. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union welcomed the focus of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. It also welcomed the removal of unnecessary qualifiers that had served only to restrict the common understanding of the important and legitimate role played by human rights defenders; the new reference to the need for States to take steps to protect women human rights defenders from violence and harassment both online and offline; and the inclusion of language on reprisals and cybercrime.

26. As a sponsor and firm supporter of the draft resolution, the European Union was disappointed that its priorities and sensitivities had not been better reflected in the text. It was concerned that subjectively defined concepts such as morality, public order and general welfare could be used to inappropriately limit and delegitimize the activities and positive contributions of

human rights defenders and to restrict the exercise of their rights and freedoms. The proposal of the European Union regarding the need to ensure that legislation on civil society registration could not be used to obstruct the work of human rights defenders and their right to defend human rights had unfortunately not been taken on board. Although the European Union would join the consensus on the draft resolution, it would do so without prejudice to the positions that it might take on those issues in future related resolutions.

27. **Mr. Zhang Zhe** (China) said that his delegation had decided to join the consensus on the draft resolution. China encouraged individuals to play an active role in the promotion and protection of human rights and supported the activities carried out by individuals to that end in accordance with the legal framework.

28. Given the lack of an internationally unified, universally recognized legal definition of “human rights defenders”, countries had different views as to who qualified as a human rights defender. The application of the term in the draft resolution should be consistent with the purposes, principles and provisions of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. Such defenders should not be considered a special group of people who enjoyed special rights and special legal status. Human rights defenders must carry out their activities in a peaceful and lawful manner. Human rights defenders who violated domestic laws must be held accountable in the same way as anyone else who broke the law.

29. The draft resolution should be interpreted within the framework of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders and should not contradict the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, or impose additional international obligations and commitments on Member States. China would interpret the draft resolution in accordance with its domestic laws and would not accept any content that contradicted Chinese laws, regulations and policies.

30. **Ms. Sánchez García** (Colombia) said that the draft resolution represented a commitment to defending human rights. The negotiation process had shown that, despite wide-ranging views among Member States, agreement could be reached through dialogue. Adoption of the draft resolution by consensus was key, and the international community must continue to take measures to protect human rights defenders.

31. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation) said that it was regrettable that a certain group of countries had prevented the inclusion in the draft resolution of the language from General Assembly resolution 72/247 that had enabled a compromise to be reached in 2017.

Although his delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution, it had some concerns from the perspective of international law and regarding the institutional framework of the international human rights system, as well as with respect to the inclusion of new approaches and concepts. The attempt to create some kind of special legal protections for a separate group of “human rights defenders”, the legal status of which was unclear, undermined the integrity of national legal and law enforcement systems and the principles of the rule of law, and contravened the obligations of States under international human rights agreements, in particular those concerning non-discrimination. The Russian Federation did not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of the draft resolution regarding special protection measures for human rights defenders or measures to exempt them from common rules and laws applicable to all citizens.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.31/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

33. **Ms. McDowell** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Switzerland, said that the draft resolution served as a reminder that all countries, regardless of their development status or political systems, had more to do to protect human rights defenders. The calls for States to strengthen the protection of women human rights defenders against violence and harassment, including online, and to consider adopting laws, policies and practices to protect women human rights defenders from defamation and hate speech were welcome. The recognition of the important and legitimate role played by environmental human rights defenders was also welcome. The fact that human rights defenders made a significant contribution to implementing internationally agreed human rights standards and strengthening the rule of law should be seen not as a threat but rather as a reflection of the social contract with citizens and the commitment made to them for the promotion and protection of human rights for all.

34. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that the work of human rights defenders was critical to safeguarding against threats from repressive powers, corrupt actors, autocratic regimes and backsliding democracies. To carry out their vital work, human rights defenders must be able to exercise their fundamental freedoms of expression and association and their rights to freedom of movement and freedom of peaceful assembly. Member States must redouble their efforts to counter threats, acts of intimidation and reprisals against human rights defenders and ensure that State and non-State actors were held accountable for violating or abusing fundamental freedoms.

35. It was the understanding of the United States that “environmental human rights defenders” meant individuals seeking to express their views on environmental issues; that laws protecting human rights defenders should be enacted and enforced in terms consistent with federal and State authorities; and that non-State actors, including transnational corporations and other business enterprises, should assume their responsibilities as set out in the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. She recalled the general statement made by her delegation at the 44th meeting of the Committee and emphasized that any measures to prevent intimidation or threats against human rights defenders or to protect them from defamation or hate speech must be consistent with international human rights obligations, including those regarding freedom of expression.

36. **Ms. Nguyen Lien Huong** (Viet Nam) said that her country reaffirmed the primary responsibility of States in the promotion and protection of human rights and recognized the important roles of individuals, non-governmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders in that regard. Given the lack of a universal definition of the term “human rights defenders”, the use of the term in the draft resolution should be understood in the context of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. Constructive engagement and close cooperation between the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and the States concerned were critical to guaranteeing the accuracy and credibility of the information contained in the reports of the Special Rapporteur. Under the Constitution of Viet Nam, and in line with its obligations under international human rights agreements, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, every person was entitled to legal rights and freedoms, but the exercise of those rights and freedoms must not violate the enjoyment of the legitimate rights and interests of others and of the community.

37. **Mr. Zavala Porras** (Costa Rica) said that his country was committed to protecting the human rights of human rights defenders, including those working on environmental issues, and was concerned at the risks they faced at home and in the countries in which they worked. The call issued by Member States must translate into concrete action to make such protection effective. His delegation hoped that it would also translate into more consolidated and transparent United Nations efforts to support the work of human rights defenders.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.48/Rev.1: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons*

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

40. **Ms. Juul** (Norway), introducing the draft resolution, said that, 21 years after the adoption of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, the number of conflict-induced internally displaced persons had roughly doubled to about 40 million people and the number of natural disaster-induced internally displaced persons continued to grow, standing at about 24 million on average each year. With the draft resolution, the General Assembly sought to set out the challenges and vulnerabilities of internally displaced persons and called upon States to take effective and practical steps to address their plight.

41. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Somalia, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United States of America and Uruguay. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Maldives, Sao Tome and Principe and Sierra Leone.

42. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation) said that, while his delegation did not wish to call into question the need for measures to hold to account those responsible for crimes against humanity, it did not share the optimistic view expressed regarding the activities of the International Criminal Court. The Russian Federation had repeatedly outlined in detail its perspective on the Court's activities, which had become even more pessimistic over the past year. His delegation therefore could not support the reference in the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and disassociated itself from the consensus on that paragraph.

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

44. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that her delegation's sponsorship of the draft resolution reflected the deep concern of the United States about the plight of the millions of internally displaced persons

across the globe, the continued high rates of internal displacement each year and the lack of a resolution to displacement for many. More must be done, within the United Nations and globally, to elevate the issues facing internally displaced persons, and the draft resolution represented a concrete effort to that end.

45. She recalled that, in its general statement made at the 44th meeting of the Committee, her delegation had noted that General Assembly resolutions were not binding and did not create or alter rights or obligations under international law, and it had addressed references to economic, social and cultural rights, the International Criminal Court, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and climate change and the Paris Agreement.

46. **Ms. Fangco** (Philippines) said that her delegation disassociated itself from the twenty-sixth preambular paragraph and its reference to "the relevant provisions of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court", as the Philippines did not recognize the jurisdiction of the Court. The Philippines had in place legislation, working judicial processes and domestic mechanisms that were sufficient for protecting and assisting internally displaced persons.

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.45/Rev.1: The safety of journalists and the issue of impunity

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

48. **Ms. Theofili** (Greece), introducing the draft resolution, said that, six years after the General Assembly had adopted by consensus resolution 68/163 and proclaimed 2 November as the International Day to End Impunity for Crimes against Journalists, much more needed to be done to put an end to the upward trend in the number of deaths of journalists in recent years and to the increased attempts to silence them. The authors of the draft resolution had highlighted the need to prevent violence, threats and attacks against journalists and to put an end to the vicious cycle of impunity. They had not only continued to take a gender-sensitive approach but had also addressed the digital aspects related to the protection of journalists. Two weeks after the commemoration of the sixth International Day to End Impunity for Crimes against Journalists, the introduction of the draft resolution served to highlight the international community's continued commitment to protect journalists from all human rights violations and abuses.

49. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bolivia (Plurinational State of),

Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, San Marino, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, United States of America and Zambia. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Guinea, Mauritania, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu and Yemen.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted.*

51. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that the United States was committed to investigating and, where appropriate, prosecuting crimes against journalists and media workers. With respect to paragraph 14, no forms of censorship were acceptable because censorship was, by definition, an undue restriction on freedom of expression. Her delegation understood the references to the right to privacy to refer to the protections set forth in article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. She also recalled the general statement made by her delegation at the 44th meeting of the Committee.

52. **Ms. Pritchard** (Canada) said that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus underscored the importance of the safety of journalists to both the freedom of the media and the freedom of expression worldwide. His country was firmly committed to that issue, as it had demonstrated by jointly hosting the Global Conference for Media Freedom in July 2019. Although expulsion from a country was not necessarily a human rights violation or an attack on journalists, Canada was concerned about attempts to silence journalists by taking measures such as expulsion.

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.44/Rev.1: National human rights institutions

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

54. **Mr. Rohland** (Germany), introducing the draft resolution, said that the broad cross-regional sponsorship of the draft resolution demonstrated the strong international commitment to the value and importance of national human rights institutions. The draft resolution should be seen in parallel with Human Rights Council resolution 39/17. The draft resolution highlighted the contribution made by national human rights institutions at the national and local levels to the promotion and protection of human rights, their valuable input to the work of the international human rights system, including the universal periodic review and the Commission on the Status of Women, and the

interplay between national human rights institutions and the 2030 Agenda.

55. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, Israel, Lebanon, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mongolia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America and Uruguay. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Libya, Mali, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and Zimbabwe.

56. **Ms. Feldman** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Norway, said that dialogue within the United Nations was enriched through the engagement of stakeholders such as civil society, human rights defenders, experts and, in particular, national human rights institutions. Established by Governments to promote and protect human rights, national human rights institutions were subject to an internationally recognized accreditation system to ensure their independence, pluralism, accountability and impartiality, and minimum international standards for their establishment, operations and functions had been set out in the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles). National human rights institutions had demonstrated their commitment to addressing human rights concerns through the United Nations by contributing to discussions, submitting papers and hosting side events. States should continue to work towards formalizing the engagement of national human rights institutions and the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in the United Nations.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted.*

58. **Ms. Simpson** (United States of America) said that the Paris Principles were not legally binding and did not necessarily reflect international law. She also recalled the general statement made by her delegation at the 44th meeting of the Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.46/Rev.1: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

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

60. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution, said that the draft

resolution focused on the threats arising from the spread of disinformation by State and non-State actors, which amounted to threats to international peace and security, in particular when they originated from State actors. The important role played by journalists in countering disinformation and the importance of an enabling environment for them to do their work were underscored. The importance of the participation of young people in decision-making at all levels of society was also highlighted, which was a valuable addition to the existing language on women and persons with disabilities as key decision makers in all stages of elections. Member States, civil society and other stakeholders were called upon to address those growing threats by increasing the resilience and security of institutions, economies and societies and by taking concerted action to identify and hold to account those who sought to undermine genuine, democratic elections.

61. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey and Uzbekistan. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Angola, Comoros, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Gambia, Hungary, Ireland, Kiribati, Malaysia, Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone and Sweden.

62. **The Chair** drew attention to the proposed amendment contained in document [A/C.3/74/L.63](#) and noted that it had no programme budget implications.

63. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation) said that the issues raised in the draft resolution were important for the strengthening of democratic institutions in Member States and the provision of assistance to those institutions by the international community. Although his delegation supported many elements of the draft resolution, the text required further improvement. His delegation had therefore been compelled to submit a draft amendment ([A/C.3/74/L.63](#)), which consisted of deleting the reference to the so-called “Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers” in paragraph 14, as those documents had not been the result of any intergovernmental expert

agreement. His delegation opposed the attempt to legitimize, through a General Assembly resolution, documents prepared by a group of non-governmental organizations when those documents had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. His delegation fully supported the idea of harmonizing the methods and standards of international electoral observation, as set out in the first part of paragraph 14.

64. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Cuba and Nicaragua had joined the sponsors of the proposed amendment.

65. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation had requested a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by the delegation of the Russian Federation, which sought to delete what had been consensus language for years, and her delegation would vote against it. Paragraph 14 called for the harmonizing of methods and standards on election observation and merely expressed appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which had been endorsed by the African Union, the European Commission, the Organization of American States and many other organizations. She urged delegations to vote against the amendment, as they had done in previous years.

66. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/74/L.63](#).*

In favour:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Oman, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico,

Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Kiribati, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Uganda.

67. *The amendment contained in document A/C.3/74/L.63 was rejected by 95 votes to 26, with 32 abstentions.*

68. **Ms. Pritchard** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, said that Canada and Australia supported the key messages of the draft resolution, including the importance of gender equality and the engagement of young people in electoral processes and the concerns regarding the spread of disinformation and the manipulation of election processes. Like many regional and intergovernmental organizations, Canada and Australia fully supported the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which provided critical guidance on improving credible international electoral observation missions. It was regrettable that an amendment to the draft resolution had been proposed.

69. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation) said that, while his delegation supported many elements of the draft resolution, it was disappointed by the reluctance of the authors to take into consideration its main objection. Given the importance of the theme of the draft resolution, his delegation would not request a recorded vote on it. Nevertheless, the Russian Federation reiterated its objection to the universalization, through a General Assembly resolution, of the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, as they had not been the result of an intergovernmental negotiations process.

70. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted.*

71. **Ms. Ali** (Singapore) said that her country recognized the importance of fair, periodic and genuine elections for effective, transparent and accountable governance. With reference to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, under the law of Singapore, persons with disabilities could, upon their request, be assisted in voting, but only by presiding officers, who were obliged to mark the ballot paper as directed by the voter and to keep the vote secret.

Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/74/L.18/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.18/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

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

73. **Mr. Marini** (Italy), introducing the draft resolution, said that effective crime prevention and criminal justice were fundamental to international peace and development, as was upholding the rights of persons, including those in contact with the criminal justice system. Policies to uphold human rights, especially the rights of the most vulnerable members of society, must also encompass the fight against crime.

74. The draft resolution effectively addressed sensitive issues, such as improving data collection and analysis to facilitate evidence-based policies, strengthening judicial capability and ethics to enhance fair and effective justice systems, encouraging the spread of a culture of lawfulness and updating and coordinating language relating to hate crimes, corruption, trafficking in persons, illicit financial flows and environmental crimes. Coordination and coherence had been ensured between the draft resolution and resolutions on related issues, including General Assembly resolutions relating to the use of narcotic drugs and the abuse of information and communications technology and relevant resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

75. In the draft resolution, the President of the General Assembly was invited to hold a high-level debate on urban crime, a phenomenon that affected all regions and was becoming more significant. Many benefits could be derived from greater cooperation in the sharing of analysis and best practices in that area.

76. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina,

Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Angola, Benin, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Lebanon, Mali, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia.

77. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 108: International drug control
(continued) (A/C.3/74/L.15/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.15/Rev.1: International cooperation to address and counter the world drug problem

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

79. **Mr. De la Mora Salcedo** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text maintained its cross-cutting vision based on the seven thematic areas of the outcome document of the thirtieth special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem of 2016. It contained technical updates and reflected the progress made by the international community over the past year.

80. To assist in reaching a consensus on the draft resolution, his delegation wished to introduce an oral revision to the text. The twenty-seventh preambular paragraph should be revised to read: "Taking note of the various contributions made by Member States, United Nations entities, United Nations inter-agency initiatives aimed at strengthening coordination within the United Nations system, intergovernmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders to the sixty-second session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs,".

81. Drug control policy covered many areas, and it was understandable that States might have different

views. No convention, provision or commitment should restrict a candid, transparent and respectful dialogue on the scope and limits of international drug control policy. Mexico had encouraged open, transparent and inclusive talks in pursuit of a comprehensive draft, and he wished to thank all delegations for their active participation in the negotiations.

82. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Turkey and United States of America. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, Bangladesh, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Djibouti, Guatemala, Jordan, Lebanon, Mali, Morocco, North Macedonia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Zimbabwe.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.3/74/L.15/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

84. **Ms. Jauhainen** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. The draft resolution provided key recommendations to address and counter the world drug problem and took note of the contributions made by intergovernmental organizations and the work of the United Nations system coordination task team.

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.3/74/L.69)

85. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft programme of work of the Third Committee for the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly, submitted by the Chair of the Committee, as contained in document A/C.3/74/L.69. Introducing an oral revision to that document, he said that the symbol for the draft provisional programme of work and timetable of the Committee, "A/C.3/74/CRP.1", should be replaced with "A/C.3/74/CRP.1/Rev.1". Following further discussions within the Bureau, it had been recommended that the first meeting of the Committee at the seventy-fifth session be postponed to Thursday, 1 October 2020. He took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft

programme of work of the Committee for the seventy-fifth session, as orally revised, and transmit it to the General Assembly for approval.

86. *It was so decided.*

Conclusion of the work of the Committee

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

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.