



General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
25 January 2021

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 7th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 13 November 2020, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Ms. Bogyay (Hungary)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development

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

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women

Agenda item 63: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions

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>)

20-15194 (E)



Please recycle



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

Agenda item 27: Social development

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (A/C.3/75/L.2, A/C.3/75/L.3 and A/C.3/75/L.9/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.2: Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing

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

2. **Ms. Persaud** (Guyana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic had posed unprecedented challenges to the normal working methods of the Main Committees, especially the Third Committee, which usually considered a large number of draft resolutions. The Bureau had therefore recommended streamlining the number of proposals before the Committee to reduce the heavy workload and the number of overlapping consultations, which might prevent delegations with limited staff from participating in negotiations on an equal basis. On that basis, the Group of 77 and China had decided to propose a draft resolution that was a technical rollover of General Assembly resolution 74/125. That decision in no way signified that the theme was any less important, but was a middle-ground solution to avoid long negotiations on new text through virtual platforms, with less chance of reaching consensus.

3. The draft resolution had become even more relevant amid the COVID-19 pandemic, which had accentuated the existing inequalities, discrimination and challenges faced by certain social groups, in particular older persons. In his report on the impact of COVID-19 on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons (A/75/205), the Secretary-General had highlighted that the protection of the human rights of older persons had long been overlooked in national policies and programmes, which, together with the absence of a dedicated internationally agreed legal framework, contributed to the vulnerability of older persons and, potentially, to inadequate responses to COVID-19. The adoption of the draft resolution would serve as a testament to the commitment of the international community to age-inclusive implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

4. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution: Austria, Canada,

Croatia, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Malta, Mexico, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

5. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to join 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 voluntary. 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. His Government also wished to underscore the importance of promoting the fundamental principles and rights at work for all workers.

6. The remainder of his current statement applied to all agenda items considered by the Committee. General Assembly resolutions were non-binding documents that did not create rights or obligations under international law. The United States did not understand resolutions to imply that a State must implement obligations under international instruments to which the State was not a party. Moreover, the fact that the United States sponsored or joined a consensus on a resolution did not imply its endorsement of the views of special rapporteurs or other special procedure mandate holders regarding the content or application of international law.

7. The United States was leading the global response to COVID-19, having allocated \$20.5 billion for the development of vaccines and therapeutics, preparedness efforts and foreign assistance. As had been made clear in the political declaration of the high-level meeting on universal health coverage, held in 2019, each country should develop its own approach to universal health coverage.

8. Consistent with the Geneva Consensus Declaration on Promoting Women's Health and Strengthening the Family, the United States was committed to promoting women's equality and to empowering women and girls. The outcome documents of the sixty-third session of the Commission on the Status of Women had not been the product of consensus.

9. His delegation did not support references to the International Criminal Court and the Rome Statute that did not distinguish sufficiently between parties and

non-parties to the Statute or were otherwise inconsistent with the position of his Government.

10. Consistent with the Geneva Consensus Declaration, there was no international right to abortion, and each nation had the sovereign right to legislate in accordance with its own position on the protection of life at all stages without any external pressure.

11. The United States maintained the sovereign right to facilitate or restrict access to its territory in accordance with its national laws and policies. The United States did not endorse or affirm the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration or the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. The 2030 Agenda was a non-binding document that did not create rights or obligations under international law.

12. His country's withdrawal from the Paris Agreement had taken effect on 4 November 2020. References to the Paris Agreement and climate change were without prejudice to the position of the United States.

13. Each State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries. The United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions.

14. The right to development did not have an agreed international meaning, and his country therefore continued to oppose references to that right. The United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the rights contained therein were not justiciable in the courts of the United States. The wording used in resolutions did not contribute to his country's understanding of its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

15. When resolutions included calls on States to strengthen aspects of education, including with respect to curricula, the United States would understand them in ways that were consistent with the approaches of the federal, State and local authorities.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.2 was adopted.*

17. **Ms. Squeff** (Argentina) said that the impact of COVID-19 had been devastating for older persons, who were not only at a greater risk of death and severe illness, but were also more vulnerable to discrimination, violence, abuse and neglect. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), 8 out of 10 persons who had died from the pandemic had been over 60 years of age.

18. In the draft resolution, emphasis was placed on the need to ensure that issues of relevance to older persons

were taken into account in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and recognized the essential contribution of older persons to the functioning of societies and to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Its provisions were intended to contribute to the work of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing.

19. The world was at a critical turning point and must listen to the voices of older persons in order to combat age discrimination and ensure the full enjoyment of their right to health and life on an equal basis with others.

20. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation) said that her 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. Her delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from the content of paragraph 52.

Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.3: Follow-up to the twentieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family and beyond

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

22. **Ms. Persaud** (Guyana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China reaffirmed the importance of the objectives of the International Year of the Family and its follow-up processes, which remained relevant and useful, especially during the challenging time of COVID-19. Adhering to the Bureau's recommendation to consider measures to reduce the workload owing to the exceptional circumstances, the Group of 77 and China had decided to propose a draft resolution that was a technical rollover of resolution [74/124](#), which had been adopted in 2019 with very few updates. That decision should not be regarded as setting a precedent for negotiations on future draft resolutions.

23. Owing to the technical rollover, it had not been possible to include the recommendations made by the Secretary General in his related report ([A/75/61-](#)

E/2020/4). Those recommendations would be included in the draft resolution to be considered at the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly, in addition to the recommendations from the 2021 report. The Group of 77 and China welcomed the efforts of Member States to support families in vulnerable situations, improve work-life balance for families with children and strengthen national institutions charged with the implementation of family policies. Member States should further invest in family-oriented policies and programmes as important tools for combating poverty, inequality and social exclusion. Member States should also actively participate in the preparations for the thirtieth anniversary of the International Year of the Family in 2024.

24. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution: Belarus, Russian Federation, Turkey and Uzbekistan.

25. *Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.3 was adopted.*

26. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because it strongly supported the irreplaceable 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. His delegation interpreted references in the draft resolution to violent disciplinary measures as punishment that constituted child abuse, as defined in domestic law.

27. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, education, and health-care services, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a statement delivered earlier in the meeting.

28. **Ms. Vasquez Muñoz** (Mexico) said that the multitude of different types of families was recognized and protected in her country. Full respect for sexual and gender diversity and the different types of families was included in national laws and public policy. All family members were protected by the State, and all forms of discrimination against them were rejected, in accordance with the Constitution. The lack of a specific reference in the draft resolution to the diverse types of families was disappointing. Her delegation had nevertheless joined the consensus, given the importance of strengthening the resilience of families and the human rights of family members, in particular in the context of the pandemic. Mexico understood the term “family” in the draft resolution to mean the diverse types of families and read all references thereto in

accordance with the *pro personae* principle established in its national legislation.

29. **Ms. Bukuru** (United Kingdom) said that her Government recognized the need to develop policies to support the valuable contribution of families to strengthening societies. For such policies to be successful, they must be inclusive and responsive to the changing needs and expectations of families. Across the world, the make-up of families had continued to change in response to economic and social developments, and the family unit had an endless variety of definitions, all deserving equal societal support and respect. Gender-responsive social protection systems were needed to tackle family poverty, and special attention should be given to families in vulnerable situations. Such efforts should be developed and implemented in cooperation with stakeholders. The United Kingdom would continue to engage constructively with partners to advance discussions on family-related matters.

Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.9/Rev.1: Inclusive development for and with persons with disabilities

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

31. **Mr. Manalo** (Philippines), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that the draft resolution contained new text concerning the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on persons with disabilities and recent developments in disability inclusion in the United Nations system. The draft resolution recognized that persons with disabilities were directly and indirectly disproportionately affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Member States and other stakeholders were therefore called upon to include persons with disabilities in all stages of policymaking and decision-making related to COVID-19 response and recovery, and to eliminate barriers against persons with disabilities in accessing support and health-care services. Given the importance of data in informing policies and programmes, the Secretary General was requested to report to the General Assembly at its seventy-sixth session on progress in the implementation of the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy and to provide an update on the 2018 *Disability and Development Report* at the seventy-eighth session.

32. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Lesotho, Libya, Lithuania, Madagascar,

Mali, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

33. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Guinea, Mozambique, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Tajikistan, Togo and Zimbabwe.

34. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that persons with disabilities enjoyed the same legal rights as those without disabilities, and Governments should ensure their full inclusion in society on an equal basis with their peers without disabilities. His delegation therefore welcomed the fact that the importance of including persons with disabilities as key decision makers in all COVID-19 recovery and response efforts had been underlined in the draft resolution.

35. His delegation was concerned by the attempts of some delegations during the negotiations to revert to the charity and medical model. The progress made on the rights-based model must not be set back. His delegation welcomed the reference in the draft resolution to the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy and strongly encouraged the United Nations to implement the recommendations contained in the first report on the Strategy's implementation (A/75/314). His delegation also welcomed the fact that emphasis was no longer placed on the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons, since the rights of persons with disabilities should be promoted from a human rights perspective, rather than on the basis of the outdated charity and medical model. Any data collection should be streamlined and coordinated with the reporting under the United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy.

36. It was his delegation's understanding that the term "health-care services" did not include abortion, but rather referred to services for persons with disabilities that maximized their health, opportunities and equal participation in society. The full application and implementation of the international normative framework on persons with disabilities and human rights and development, mentioned in the sixteenth preambular paragraph, should be referred to as a "commitment", rather than a "duty." It was not implied in the draft resolution that a State must implement obligations under international instruments to which it was not a party, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and any reaffirmation of that Convention applied only to those States that were

parties to it. His delegation fully supported the call to guarantee access to education by ensuring that no individual, solely by reason of her or his disability, was subjected to discrimination in access to, participation in or benefits under applicable programmes and activities.

37. The term "internationally agreed development goals" was understood to refer to the 2030 Agenda. His delegation had expressed its concerns with regard to references to the 2030 Agenda and other issues in a statement delivered earlier in the meeting.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women

(A/C.3/75/L.6/Rev.1, A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1, A/C.3/75/L.55, A/C.3/75/L.56, A/C.3/75/L.57, A/C.3/75/L.58, A/C.3/75/L.66, A/C.3/75/L.67, A/C.3/75/L.72, A/C.3/75/L.75, A/C.3/75/L.76)

Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.6/Rev.1: Strengthening national and international rapid response to the impact of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) on women and girls

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

40. **Ms. Hassan** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of Algeria, China, Saudi Arabia and Zambia, said that the draft resolution sought to highlight the devastating impact of the COVID-19 crisis on women and girls and their important role in the global effort to tackle the pandemic. It also highlighted the role of developing countries in pursuing the shared goal of placing due focus on women's issues.

41. The draft resolution had originally been introduced in a General Assembly plenary meeting on 22 April 2020, and two rounds of consultations had subsequently been held. The main sponsors had voluntarily paused the negotiations to ensure adequate focus on General Assembly resolution 74/306, the omnibus resolution on COVID-19, at a time of tighter restrictions on meetings and negotiations. Since many elements of the draft resolution had not been covered by the omnibus resolution but remained relevant, the main sponsors had been eager to continue the discussion within the Third Committee, and a further six informal consultations had been held.

42. The majority of the comments received during the extensive and inclusive consultations had been accommodated in the text. The aim of the consultations had been to enrich the text and ensure that every delegation had some form of ownership over it. The final text sent a clear, strong and action-oriented

message regarding a rapid response to the impact of COVID-19 on women and girls.

43. It was deeply regrettable that the United States had proposed amendments to the draft resolution. Two of the amendments had never been proposed during the long negotiation process. In a spirit of openness and constructiveness, the main sponsors had decided to accept the proposed amendment to paragraph 5, since it was consistent with their national positions. Paragraph 5 should be revised by adding the words “with full respect for human rights” after the word “gender-sensitive”.

44. Defending human rights and the rights of women and girls was not an endeavour exclusive to one group of countries; all countries, especially developing countries, were entitled to contribute positively to the realization of that shared global endeavour.

45. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Madagascar, Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

46. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Rwanda and Tunisia.

47. **The Chair** drew attention to the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/C.3/75/L.72](#), [A/C.3/75/L.75](#) and [A/C.3/75/L.76](#) and noted that they had no programme budget implications.

48. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that, in the light of the oral revision to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to withdraw its draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.75](#).

49. The draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.76](#) consisted of deleting the reference to WHO and emphasizing the importance of a transparent multilateral response to COVID-19 in the twenty-second preambular paragraph.

50. The draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.72](#) consisted of deleting “including sexual and reproductive health-care services” in paragraph 6. The concerns of the United States on those issues were well known and had been shared during the negotiations. It was regrettable that the sponsors had been unable to address them in the interest of achieving consensus on the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

51. **Mr. Hawke** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay, said that it was regrettable that multiple amendments had been proposed to paragraphs that had been discussed at length in relation to a number of draft resolutions. Such an approach was contrary to the working methods of the Committee and the principles of multilateralism.

52. The proposal to remove any reference to “health-care services” was regrettable, given that it was long-standing agreed language, including from the 2030 Agenda, that struck a fine balance to accommodate the different views of delegations on the scope of health needs. The term “health-care services” went beyond the provision of medical care for immediate health needs to include medical tests, counselling and the provision of health-related information and education. Terminology such as “sexual and reproductive health” had been used since the mid-1990s to encompass a wide range of perspectives. In the 2030 Agenda, Member States had committed themselves to ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services. All delegations should support the rights of women and girls and vote against any amendments relating to those issues.

53. **Ms. Vasquez Muñoz** (Mexico) said that her country had endeavoured to put women and girls at the centre of its COVID-19 response efforts, in line with its feminist foreign policy. Her delegation was concerned by the proliferation of draft resolutions on the same topic and had expected greater coordination, which would have enabled the Committee to produce a single robust text. Furthermore, the negotiations had not been conducted with the expected level of transparency.

54. With regard to the proposed amendments, Mexico would vote in accordance with its consistent approach

of focusing on human rights and ensuring that all women, adolescents and girls had full access to health care and could exercise their sexual and reproductive rights. Multilateralism and international cooperation were the only ways to find long-lasting solutions to major challenges and global emergencies and to build a more just, inclusive and sustainable world.

55. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/75/L.72 to amend paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.6/Rev.1, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Belarus, Eritrea, Libya, Nauru, Qatar, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, United States of America, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Abstaining:

Angola, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Guyana, Haiti, Iraq, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sudan, Viet Nam.

56. *The proposal was rejected by 134 votes to 10, with 17 abstentions.*

57. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/75/L.76 to amend preambular paragraph 22 of draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.6/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Brazil, United States of America.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, 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, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic,

Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Honduras, Lesotho, Tonga.

58. *The proposal was rejected by 161 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.*

59. **Mr. Heusgen** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that it was regrettable that amendments had been proposed at such a late stage. The proposal of the United States to remove "sexual and reproductive health-care services" from paragraph 6 of the draft resolution was regrettable. As outlined by WHO, the disruption of access to those services owing to COVID-19 had had a significant impact on the lives of millions of women around the world. The lack of access to those services risked reversing decades of progress, exacerbating maternal mortality and morbidity and increasing rates of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases. The European Union had therefore voted against the proposed amendment.

60. It was also regrettable that the United States had proposed removing the reference to WHO in the twenty-second preambular paragraph. Removing the reference to the international organization dealing with health issues was counterproductive in terms of effectively responding to the pandemic. The European Union was a firm supporter of WHO and appreciated the critical role it had played in supporting the response to COVID-19. It had therefore voted against the proposed amendment.

61. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that his delegation opposed the proliferation of resolutions on COVID-19, as the omnibus resolution on COVID-19 made multiple resolutions on the topic unnecessary. It was regrettable that a stronger human rights focus had not been incorporated in the draft resolution, despite the requests of many delegations, including his own. The promotion and protection of the human rights of women and girls in the context of COVID-19 response and recovery could not be omitted, especially in the light of the increased challenges and the increased rates of domestic violence faced by women and girls during the pandemic.

62. It was disappointing that the amendments proposed by his delegation had been rejected and that health-related wording that was problematic for the United States remained in the draft resolution. The United States therefore dissociated itself from the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. The United States had notified the United Nations of its intention to withdraw from WHO. It was inappropriate to single out specific partners in the response to COVID-19. "Sexual and reproductive health" and "health-care services" were controversial terms that detracted from the recommendations in the draft resolution to address female genital mutilation. Those terms had connotations that suggested the promotion of abortion or a right to abortion, which was unacceptable to his Administration. While the United States was committed to improving women's health throughout their lives, it could not accept references to "sexual and reproductive health", "sexual and reproductive health-care services", "safe termination of pregnancy" or any similar wording that would promote abortion or inaccurately suggest a right to abortion. As affirmed in the Geneva Consensus Declaration, each nation had the sovereign right to implement related programmes and activities in accordance with its laws and policies, without external pressure or interference. Consistent with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and its report, the United States did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning, and there was no international right to abortion. The United States fully supported the provision of quality health care to women and girls around the world without promoting abortion.

63. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a statement delivered earlier in the meeting.

64. **Ms. Alnesf** (Qatar) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, reflecting her country's belief that it was vital to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on women and girls. Qatar had exerted significant efforts in the area of sexual and reproductive health, taking the lead in providing health care to mothers and infants; however, it interpreted paragraph 6, which addressed the subject, in a manner consistent with its national legislation and the religious and cultural values of Qatari society.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.6/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

66. **Mr. Almanzlawiy** (Saudi Arabia) said that the sponsors had sought to take into account the differing

views of Member States and produce a draft that addressed the concerns of every delegation. He thanked delegations for their efforts to reach a consensus, in view of the need for countries to set aside their narrow interests and cooperate in order to overcome the pandemic.

67. **Ms. Barahona Figueroa** (El Salvador) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and supported its content. However, during the negotiations, it had stressed the importance of focusing on human rights and addressing the collection of quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographical location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts. The list in the nineteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 14 was not consistent with target 17.18 and paragraph 74 (g) of the 2030 Agenda or with paragraph 17 of General Assembly resolution [74/306](#) on a comprehensive and coordinated response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Her delegation therefore dissociated itself from the nineteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 14.

68. **Ms. Feldman** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, said that, given the importance of addressing the profound impact of COVID-19 on women and girls, the oral revision to the draft resolution was welcome. Approaches were truly people-centred only if the human rights of all individuals were protected, respected and fulfilled. Human rights were at the core of the Sustainable Development Goals and must be at the forefront of COVID-19 responses. Those issues should be given appropriate recognition in the draft resolutions of the Committee.

69. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation) said that the draft resolution would fill the gap in the provision of socioeconomic support to women and girls and their families during the pandemic. It was significant that Member States had agreed on a number of necessary response measures taking into account the particular needs of women and girls, including older women, women and girls with disabilities and those with health issues. Her delegation welcomed the fact that the key leadership role of WHO within the broader United Nations response had been recognized in the draft resolution.

70. The term “women and girls” meant women and girls of all ages. The reference to “women and girls of all ages” in the first preambular paragraph was therefore redundant and brought no added value to the text. The term “gender-based violence” in the sixteenth and eighteenth preambular paragraphs meant violence

against women and girls on the basis of sex. Her delegation dissociated itself from those terms.

71. **Ms. Jacobs** (United Kingdom) said that, while her delegation supported the strengthening of national and international responses to the impact of COVID-19 on women and girls, the draft resolution failed to reinforce and recognize the importance of sexual and reproductive health and rights for all women and girls. Paragraph 6 misrepresented and weakened agreed language on sexual and reproductive health and rights from the Sustainable Development Goals, failing to acknowledge that sexual and reproductive health-care services included information and education and the integration of reproductive health into national strategies and programmes. Such language had been agreed by Member States as recently as September 2020, in the omnibus resolution on COVID-19. It was deeply regrettable that there was no reference to reproductive rights given the critical importance of that issue to the subject of the draft resolution.

72. Her delegation was disappointed that the commitment to the outcome documents of the review conferences of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development had not been reaffirmed in the fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. Such a reference had been included in several General Assembly resolutions. At a moment of increased challenges for women and girls, it was essential to reaffirm the resolve to uphold and implement gender equality commitments.

73. The United Kingdom was committed to gender equality and sexual and reproductive health and rights and was concerned by the attempts to push back against those rights. Despite its disappointment at the shortcomings in the text, her delegation recognized the need to address the impact of COVID-19 on women and girls and had therefore joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

74. **Mr. Rivera Roldan** (Peru) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls were priorities for his country, especially in the context of the pandemic. The protection of the life and health of all individuals was key to a rapid and effective COVID-19 response, and the enjoyment of the right of access to health care was vital for the well-being of women and girls and their ability to participate in all areas of public and private life, as agreed in the Beijing Declaration.

75. Unless the virus itself was addressed as the core problem, all other measures would merely be palliative.

With regard to paragraph 5 (a) of the draft resolution, “extensive immunization against COVID-19”, which had been recognized as a global public good, could be achieved only if the vaccine too were a global public good. His delegation would therefore have preferred a more explicit reference in the draft resolution to the vaccine as a global public good, as suggested by the Secretary-General and the Director General of WHO, whose leadership Peru supported. The 2030 Agenda, resolutions of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council and WHO, and the political declaration of the high-level meeting on universal health coverage referred to “vaccines” and not “immunizations”.

76. **Mr. Heusgen** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that it was deeply regrettable that open consultations on the draft resolution had not been held beyond the discussion of the first revision. It was through open and transparent negotiations with all Member States that the Committee could thoroughly address issues and achieve consensual approaches.

77. The European Union was committed to promoting gender equality, the empowerment of all women and girls and their enjoyment of human rights in its response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Some of the proposals of the European Union concerning the participation of women and girls in decision-making, gender-based violence and additional references to human rights had been incorporated in the text. Those issues must be comprehensively addressed in order to do justice to all women and girls who had been affected by the pandemic.

78. It was regrettable that a reference to the outcome documents of the review conferences of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development had not been included in the final text, given that such a reference had been included in many resolutions adopted by the Committee. The European Union reaffirmed its commitment to recognizing the advances made by all Member States in all regions to implement the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development.

79. It was also regrettable that the right to safe drinking water and sanitation had not been included in the final text, despite the progressive realization of that right being critical to addressing the COVID-19

pandemic. The draft resolution highlighted the need to allocate resources to the continuation of access to health-care services, including sexual and reproductive health-care services. Such services were essential and life-saving and must be fully and adequately reflected in the work of the Committee, especially given that COVID-19 had disrupted the enjoyment by millions of women and girls around the world of their rights to sexual and reproductive health care in line with the Beijing Declaration, the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the outcome documents of the review conferences thereof. The omnibus resolution on COVID-19 had highlighted the importance of addressing that issue comprehensively for the realization of the human rights of all women. For the above reasons, the European Union had not been able to sponsor the draft resolution.

80. **Ms. Charikhi** (Algeria) said that, eight months since it had first been introduced in the General Assembly, the draft resolution had gained even more importance, given that women and girls, especially those in developing countries, were bearing a disproportionate share of the economic and social fallout from the pandemic. The draft resolution built upon the recognition that women continued to play an important role in the response to COVID-19, representing nearly 70 per cent of front-line health and social workers worldwide. The focus of the draft resolution on the social development impact of the pandemic on women and girls, its objective and the language used therein made it relevant to the work of the Committee. The protection and promotion of the rights of women and girls and the advancement of women were shared efforts of all countries, especially developing countries. The draft resolution, as orally revised, and having accommodated the majority of the concerns expressed during the negotiations, sent a strong message regarding a rapid response to the impact of COVID-19 on women and girls.

81. **Mr. Xing** Jisheng (China) said that the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic had posed serious challenges to the advancement of women, and the international community should unite to help women to escape the impact of the pandemic. For that reason, his delegation had been one of the main sponsors of the draft resolution and believed that it would play a positive role in strengthening cooperation in promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women. The main sponsors had listened to the views of Member States in an open, transparent and inclusive manner during multiple rounds of consultations and had endeavoured to forge consensus.

82. **Ms. Elmansouri** (Tunisia) said that her delegation expressed appreciation for the main sponsors' efforts, which had yielded a text that would equip the international community to address the impact of COVID-19 on women and girls. Tunisia attached priority to promoting the rights of women and advocated an approach rooted in gender equality and based on obligations under such international instruments as the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Human rights and fundamental freedoms must be upheld. Measures taken to combat the pandemic must be legal, non-discriminatory, appropriate and temporary, while individual and collective rights should be upheld in line with international obligations, the principle of equality and the rule of law.

83. **Monsignor Hansen** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation commended all endeavours aimed at protecting the dignity of women, including in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, and at promoting their integral development and advancement. However, it was disappointed at the proliferation of draft resolutions on COVID-19. Now was not the time for diplomatic competition, but to show the world that countries could work together.

84. The Holy See considered the term "sexual and reproductive health-care services" to apply to a holistic concept of health. It did not consider abortion, access to abortion or access to abortifacients to be covered by that term. The Holy See understood the term "gender" to be grounded in biological sexual identity and difference.

Draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1: Women and girls and the response to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)

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

86. **Mr. Santos Maraver** (Spain), introducing the draft resolution, said that the negotiations on the draft resolution had been guided by his delegation's commitment to transparency and inclusion, and the majority of proposals by Member States had been taken into account. As a result, the draft resolution had received strong support, with 85 Member States from all regional groups sponsoring it.

87. The General Assembly should address the differentiated impact of COVID-19 on women and girls and their critical participation in prevention and response efforts. The draft resolution was being introduced in the Third Committee because it addressed

the human rights of women and girls and served as a guide for urgent gender-related measures that had not been addressed comprehensively within the United Nations. Not introducing a draft resolution on that issue, withdrawing it or watering it down for fear of amendments could hinder progress towards gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls. The pandemic should not be an excuse for setbacks to such progress.

88. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Australia, Canada, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Panama, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

89. **The Chair** drew attention to the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/C.3/75/L.55](#), [A/C.3/75/L.56](#), [A/C.3/75/L.57](#), [A/C.3/75/L.58](#), [A/C.3/75/L.66](#) and [A/C.3/75/L.67](#) and noted that they had no programme budget implications.

90. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation), introducing the amendments proposed by her delegation, said that the aim of the draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.55](#) was to improve the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution from a legal standpoint by drawing a distinction between the legal obligations addressed in the beginning of the paragraph and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which did not contain such obligations. A reference to the Declaration on the Right to Development should also be added, given its relevance to the draft resolution.

91. The draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.56](#), concerning the thirteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, was aimed at expanding the scope of the draft resolution by making general references to discrimination and violence, rather than narrowing them down to "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination" and "sexual and gender-based violence". The draft amendment also sought to harmonize the last part of the paragraph with previously agreed language from paragraph 28 of General Assembly resolution [74/306](#).

92. The draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.57](#) was aimed at correcting paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, in which the political obligations set out in outcome documents and reviews of relevant international conferences had been wrongly equated with those assumed by Member States upon adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the

International Conference on Population and Development. Given that those documents had been added to the previously agreed language upon which the paragraph was based, it was not clear which other outcome documents and reviews of conferences were meant and whether those conferences had been held pursuant to a mandate from the States Members of the United Nations. A number of reviews had been controversial, and not all delegations had been able to participate fully in them.

93. The draft amendment contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.58](#), concerning paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, was intended to avoid giving priority to women and girls who faced multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and violence at the expense of those who faced only one form of discrimination or violence by replacing “especially” with “including”. Given that the draft resolution was not a legally binding document, it was also proposed that “must” be replaced with the softer verb “should”. Since it was not clear what was meant by a “gender-responsive” economic response, it was proposed that it be explicitly stated that economic response measures should “take into account the specific needs of women and girls”.

94. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America), introducing the amendments contained in documents [A/C.3/75/L.66](#) and [A/C.3/75/L.67](#), said that, in addition to raising its concerns during the negotiations, his delegation had submitted its amendments within the deadline for written submissions. Any claims that they were last-minute amendments were therefore inaccurate.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

95. **Mr. Heusgen** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that the delegations of the Russian Federation and the United States had had ample time to promote their positions. During the fair and transparent negotiations, the delegation of Spain had made visible efforts to accommodate the diverse views expressed, including those of the Russian Federation and the United States, and 80 per cent of the text had been agreed by a referendum. The last-minute attempt by those delegations to reopen the discussions by putting forward multiple amendments was therefore surprising.

96. With regard to the proposed amendment to the second preambular paragraph, the European Union had

no objection to recalling the Declaration on the Right to Development. However, there was a lack of consistency on the part of the Russian Federation, as it had not made similar proposals with respect to other draft resolutions.

97. The proposed amendments to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 1 and 3 were aimed at rewriting long-standing agreed language on which Member States had been able to find consensus on multiple occasions. No delegation had questioned that language in the omnibus resolution on COVID-19, which had been adopted by the overwhelming majority of Member States less than two months earlier.

98. The proposed amendments to paragraphs 7 and 8 sought to undermine the consensus on the important issue of access to essential health services during the pandemic. Member States, many of which held divergent views on those issues, had been able to agree on that language in the past, including in the 2030 Agenda and, most recently, in General Assembly resolution [73/147](#) on the intensification of efforts to end obstetric fistula and the omnibus resolution on COVID-19. No delegation had challenged the call to designate health services as essential services in the omnibus resolution, and the amendment against the paragraph on sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights had been largely defeated.

99. Such amendments went against the working methods of the Committee. Multilateralism required all Member States to act in good faith and make compromises to accommodate all sides. Undermining the consensus on such an important issue could only send a negative signal to the women and girls affected by the social, economic and sanitary impacts of the pandemic. The States members of the European Union would therefore vote against all the proposed amendments.

100. **Ms. Zoghbi** (Lebanon), speaking also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and

Zambia, said that it was regrettable that multiple amendments had been proposed to paragraphs that had been discussed at length in a number of draft resolutions. Such an approach was contrary to the working methods of the Committee and the principles of multilateralism.

101. The proposal to remove any reference to “health-care services” was disappointing, given that it was long-standing agreed language, including from the 2030 Agenda, that struck a fine balance to accommodate the different views of delegations on the scope of health needs. The term “health-care services” went beyond the provision of medical care for immediate health needs to include medical tests, counselling and the provision of health-related information and education. Terminology such as “sexual and reproductive health” had been used since the mid-1990s to encompass a wide range of perspectives. In the 2030 Agenda, Member States had committed themselves to ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services. The attempt to upset the consensus on those issues and undermine the normative framework underpinning the Committee’s work was deeply unfortunate and must not be accepted.

102. The Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action continued to set the international framework for the achievement of gender equality within broader policies and programmes. The proposed insertion of “as adopted by the General Assembly” would leave out regionally agreed outcome documents and discussions, which were an important expression of the way in which each region translated the international frameworks into reality, thus ensuring greater impact on the ground. The text did not seek to transpose the commitments from those regions onto others. All delegations should support the rights of women and girls and vote against any amendments relating to those issues.

103. **Mr. Santos Maraver** (Spain) said that the amendments proposed by the Russian Federation and the United States sought to weaken text in the draft resolution that enjoyed broad support in the General Assembly, and were contrary to the working methods of the Committee, threatening to undermine the consensus and demonstrating a lack of flexibility.

104. With regard to the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation to the second preambular paragraph, the reference to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Persons was intended to place emphasis on indigenous women and girls, who were disproportionately affected by the COVID-19

pandemic. The attempt to add the Declaration on the Right to Development therefore undermined the point of the paragraph and brought no added value, since the Declaration did not refer to any vulnerable groups, nor was it specifically applicable to women and girls.

105. The amendment proposed by the Russian Federation to the thirteenth preambular paragraph to change text that had already been used in numerous General Assembly resolutions constituted an attempt to weaken the draft resolution.

106. The amendment proposed by the United States to paragraph 7 to remove the reference to protection and health-care services for women and girls as “essential services” undermined the consensus reached in the 2030 Agenda and the omnibus resolution on COVID-19. It was simply unacceptable to suggest removing such a reference during a global pandemic, given that those services saved lives and contributed to full gender equality.

107. Paragraph 8 was based on long-standing agreed language from the 2030 Agenda, the biennial resolution on the intensification of efforts to end obstetric fistula and the omnibus resolution on COVID-19. It could not be rewritten on the basis of a last-minute amendment, given the huge amount of work and effort that had gone into drafting it over the years. All Member States should vote against the amendments.

108. **Ms. Jacobs** (United Kingdom) said that her delegation supported the inclusion of references to sexual and reproductive health and rights and health-care services, given their heightened importance for all women and girls during the crisis. The decision to put forward last-minute amendments to such an important draft resolution was regrettable. The proposed amendments to the second preambular paragraph and paragraphs 1 and 8 were part of a concerted effort to modify previously agreed language, including from the recently adopted omnibus resolution on COVID-19, and disregarded essential progress made in regional conferences and subsequent outcome documents. Her delegation also rejected the proposed amendments to the thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3, which put the vulnerable, the marginalized and those suffering intersectional discrimination at greater risk and narrowed the scope of the language on gender-based violence. At a moment of increased challenges for women and girls, her delegation could not accept the removal from paragraph 7 of the reference to essential health-care services, which were vital and often life-saving. Her delegation would therefore vote against the amendments.

109. **Ms. González** (Argentina) said that her delegation welcomed the transparency and constructive spirit with which Spain had conducted the large number of informal consultations on the draft resolution. It was regrettable that last-minute amendments had been proposed that sought to undermine agreed language from key international instruments on the rights of women and girls. Setbacks to the work of the international community to guarantee basic rights could not be accepted, and the consensus reached must be maintained to effectively guarantee the empowerment of women and girls in all aspects of their lives. It was also regrettable that amendments had been proposed to paragraphs that had been discussed at length during the informal consultations, setting a bad precedent for the working methods of the Committee. Her delegation would vote against all the amendments.

110. Argentina was fully committed to upholding human rights and achieving gender equality. The agenda that had been agreed 25 years previously in Beijing had been translated into its foreign policy and formed the basis for its strong support for the draft resolution.

111. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/75/L.55 to amend preambular paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of

Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chad, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

112. *The proposal was rejected by 85 votes to 33, with 37 abstentions.*

113. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/75/L.56 to amend paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Libya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao

Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Chad, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Suriname, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

114. *The proposal was rejected by 93 votes to 28, with 37 abstentions.*

115. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/75/L.57 to amend paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Libya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nauru, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia,

South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Chad, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

116. *The proposal was rejected by 96 votes to 29, with 32 abstentions.*

117. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/75/L.58 to amend paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Belarus, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Libya, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

118. *The proposal was rejected by 96 votes to 24, with 33 abstentions.*

119. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.66](#) to amend paragraph 7 of draft resolution [A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1](#).*

In favour:

Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Jamaica, Libya, Nicaragua, Palau, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, United States of America.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, China, 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, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen.

120. *The proposal was rejected by 111 votes to 13, with 29 abstentions.*

121. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document [A/C.3/75/L.67](#) to amend paragraph 8 of draft resolution [A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1](#).*

In favour:

Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Eritrea, Guyana, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Libya, Malaysia, Nauru, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, 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, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Chad, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

122. *The proposal was rejected by 103 votes to 24, with 29 abstentions.*

123. **Mr. Rivera Roldan** (Peru) said that his delegation welcomed the draft resolution, as the advancement of women was a priority for Peru. It was therefore concerned by the setbacks caused by the COVID-19 pandemic to the progress made in that regard and to sustainable development in general. Setbacks to advances for women and girls could not be allowed, especially in the year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Beijing Declaration.

124. His delegation had voted against the proposed amendment to the second preambular paragraph because it made substantive changes to the reference to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Persons, which was of importance to Peru, since many of its citizens belonged to indigenous communities and their culture was a part of the national identity. The Declaration contained relevant references to the issue of discrimination, which the paragraph sought to highlight as a practice that hindered the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The proposed addition of “recalling” would have downplayed the importance ascribed to the Declaration in the draft resolution, rendering it only part of a list together with the Declaration on the Right to Development.

125. **Ms. Elmansouri** (Tunisia) said that her delegation had abstained from the vote on the proposed amendment to draft resolution [A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1](#), contained in [A/C.3/75/L.55](#). Tunisia fully supported the draft resolution itself and appreciated the efforts by the delegation of Spain to deliver a balanced text, which would enable the international community to address the fallout from the global health crisis in accordance with international standards on human rights and gender equality.

126. The right to development was all the more important because the growing economic inequality and development gap between countries, a result of the pandemic, might imperil some of the gains made in efforts to achieve sustainable development and protect human rights, including social and economic rights. Her delegation was also committed to multilateralism and retaining consensus language in General Assembly

resolutions, reaching consensus among delegations with differing views through negotiation and constructive dialogue. Consequently, the decision to abstain should not be construed as opposition to the contents of the draft resolution concerning the right to development, which right her delegation supported; her delegation had instead based its decision on objective procedural grounds.

127. **Ms. Alnesf** (Qatar) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, reflecting her country’s belief that it was important to address the pandemic-related challenges faced by women and girls. While Qatar had exerted significant efforts in the area of sexual and reproductive health, it interpreted paragraphs 7 and 8, which addressed the subject, in a manner consistent with its national legislation and the religious and cultural values of Qatari society.

128. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

129. **Mr. Mack** (United States of America) said that his delegation opposed the proliferation of resolutions on COVID-19, as the omnibus resolution on COVID-19 made multiple resolutions on the topic unnecessary.

130. His delegation welcomed the inclusion of strong human rights language in the text, which was missing in the other draft resolution on the topic. The draft resolution included references to Security Council resolution [1325 \(2000\)](#) and the four pillars of the women and peace and security agenda. It emphasized the need to combat various forms of violence against women, which was especially important in a text on COVID-19, given the increase in violence and domestic violence experienced by women and girls in quarantine. The draft resolution also referred to countering disinformation, bearing in mind the importance of promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression.

131. It was regrettable that the amendments proposed by his delegation had not been adopted and that health-related wording that was problematic for the United States remained in the draft resolution. The United States therefore dissociated itself from paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft resolution. “Sexual and reproductive health” and “health-care services” were controversial terms that detracted from the recommendations in the draft resolution to address female genital mutilation. Those terms had connotations that suggested the promotion of abortion or a right to abortion, which was unacceptable to his Administration. While the United States was committed to improving women’s health throughout their lives, it could not accept references to “sexual and reproductive health”, “sexual and

reproductive health-care services”, “safe termination of pregnancy” or any similar wording that would promote abortion or inaccurately suggest a right to abortion. As affirmed in the Geneva Consensus Declaration, each nation had the sovereign right to implement related programmes and activities in accordance with its laws and policies, without external pressure or interference. Consistent with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and its report, the United States did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning, and there was no international right to abortion. The United States fully supported the provision of quality health care to women and girls around the world without promoting abortion.

132. It would have been preferable for the phrase “the outcome documents of their review conferences” in paragraph 8 and similar wording in paragraph 1 to end with “as adopted by the General Assembly”, as that would make it clear that documents adopted by consensus carried more weight than those that did not enjoy such consensus and would emphasize the need for consensus on any United Nations policy decisions.

133. The United States had notified the United Nations of its intention to withdraw from WHO and thus dissociated itself from the eighth preambular paragraph. It was inappropriate to single out specific partners in the global response to COVID-19.

134. With regard to the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda, his delegation had addressed its concerns in a statement delivered earlier in the meeting.

135. **Mr. Heusgen** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova, said that the draft resolution sent a powerful message of the collective commitment of Member States to the promotion and protection of the rights of women and girls, including during the COVID-19 pandemic. The European Union welcomed the reaffirmation of the principle of non-discrimination and the commitment to combating violence, racism, stigmatization and xenophobia. The current situation was an opportunity to join forces to put an end to all forms of discrimination and to build more just and equal societies. The European Union reaffirmed its commitment to the full and effective implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action, the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the

outcome documents of their review conferences, and remained committed to upholding sexual and reproductive health and rights in that context. Recognizing the need to address the specific challenges facing women and girls in crisis situations, the European Union welcomed the commitment expressed in the draft resolution to the full implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and subsequent resolutions on women and peace and security. Civil society, including non-governmental organizations and women human rights defenders, played a crucial role in the promotion of gender equality and the human rights of all women and girls, but had been seriously affected by the economic impact of the pandemic. The European Union reaffirmed its commitment to defending the role of civil society organizations at the United Nations and beyond.

136. **Ms. Bonilla Alarcón** (Guatemala) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which sought to address the contribution of women to the COVID-19 response and the need for countries to include women and girls in their recovery plans. However, her delegation had reservations about paragraph 8. The term “reproductive rights” could be misinterpreted, given that her country’s national laws provided only for sexual and reproductive health policies and not sexual and reproductive rights. Such rights could be interpreted as a right to abortion or abortion practices, which contravened the laws of Guatemala.

137. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation) said that her delegation had participated actively in the negotiations on the draft resolution. As noted earlier, 80 per cent of the draft resolution had been agreed by a referendum. Her delegation had proposed amendments to problematic passages in the remaining 20 per cent of the text. The amendments were based exclusively on previously agreed language and would have replaced wording that had been modified by the authors at their discretion on the basis of national priorities. The unwillingness of the coordinators of the negotiations to take into consideration the positions of Member States on key issues was contrary to the working methods of the General Assembly. The amendments proposed by her delegation and the delegation of the United States, which had been put forward not at the last minute but at the very beginning of the negotiations, were a manifestation of multilateralism.

138. The inconsistency on the part of a number of delegations was astounding. While they supported passages of the draft resolution that clearly duplicated the omnibus resolution on COVID-19 and other draft resolutions, for some reason other parts of the omnibus

resolution and the 2030 Agenda did not enjoy the same unconditional support of those delegations.

139. It was disappointing that the amendments proposed by her delegation, which were intended to make the text more balanced, had not been adopted. Her delegation must therefore dissociate itself from the second and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 1 and 3.

140. The granting of special status to so-called “women peacebuilders in situations of armed conflict and post-conflict” was puzzling. All stakeholders played an important role in the common efforts to respond to the pandemic, and it was hardly fair to single out one particular group. Her delegation therefore dissociated itself from that wording in the nineteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4.

141. The first preambular paragraph did not imply that documents that had not been adopted by consensus or agreed upon in an intergovernmental format from regional reviews of the International Conference on Population and Development or meetings on that topic outside the United Nations should be considered as guides for action by Member States.

142. Her delegation did not consider itself bound by the provisions from which it had dissociated itself or for which it had provided its interpretation. It did not consider such wording to be agreed language for future negotiations.

143. **Monsignor Hansen** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation commended all endeavours aimed at protecting the dignity of women and promoting their integral development and advancement, including in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, his delegation was concerned by the proliferation of draft resolutions on COVID-19. Together with other delegations, the Holy See had invited the main sponsors of draft resolutions [A/C.3/75/L.6/Rev.1](#) and [A/C.3/75/L.13/Rev.1](#) to put forward a joint draft resolution. Virtual negotiations could not replace in-person negotiations. It was unfortunate that the recommendations of the Bureau for the main sponsors of draft resolutions to consider streamlining the number of proposals before the Committee, including by making draft resolutions biennial or by implementing technical or procedural rollovers, were not consistently taken into consideration.

144. The Holy See considered the concepts “sexual and reproductive health” and “reproductive rights” to apply to a holistic concept of health. It did not consider abortion, access to abortion or access to abortifacients to be covered by those concepts. The Holy See

understood the term “gender” to be grounded in biological sexual identity and difference.

Agenda item 63: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions ([A/C.3/75/L.21](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.3/75/L.21](#): Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

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

146. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/75/L.21](#) was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.