



General Assembly

Seventy-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
23 November 2016

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 57th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 23 November 2016, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Ms. Mejía Vélez. (Colombia)

Contents

Agenda item 26: Social development

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

Agenda item 27: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 107: International drug control (*continued*)

Agenda item 60: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*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 Control Unit (srcorrections@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/>).

16-20782 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 26: Social development (continued)

(a) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (continued) (A/C.3/71/L.8/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.8/Rev.1: Inclusive development for persons with disabilities

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

2. **Ms. Yparraguirre** (Philippines), speaking also on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that she wished to make oral revisions to the draft resolution. In the twenty-second preambular paragraph, after the phrase, “following existing guidelines on disability statistics,” the words, “and their updates” should be added. In paragraph 21, after the phrase, “for the collection and compilation of nation,” the words “and regional” should be deleted.

3. Paragraph 22 should be revised to read: “Encourages the Statistical Commission, within existing resources, to update guidelines for the collection and analysis of data on persons with disabilities, taking into consideration relevant recommendations of the Washington Group on Disability Statistics, and also encourages the United Nations system, including the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, within the scope of her mandate, to strengthen coherence and coordination across the United Nations system in order to promote the availability of internationally comparable data on the situation of persons with disabilities and to regularly include relevant data on disability or relevant qualitative facts, as appropriate, in relevant United Nations publications in the field of economic and social development”.

4. Lastly, a paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 23 would read: “*Takes note* of the multi-stakeholder panel discussion on the ‘Implementation of the Post-2015 development agenda in light of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities’ held on 5 February 2016, during the fifty-fourth session of the Commission for Social Development and recognizes the importance of similar initiatives in the future and the continued inclusion of persons with disabilities and their representative organizations;”.

5. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of),

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jamaica, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted as orally revised.*

7. **Ms. Connell** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, said that the rights and participation of persons with disabilities were central to the achievement of inclusive development. The draft resolution had an important message to send, namely that the international community no longer viewed persons with disabilities as in need of charity or care, and that the contributions persons with disabilities made to society were recognized. Three areas of the draft resolution were of particular importance. First, women and girls with disabilities were usually the most vulnerable in society and the draft resolution recognized the need for national development strategies in order to empower women and girls with disabilities. Second, there was a lack of reliable data and statistics on persons with disabilities. That problem presented a challenge for development planning and the draft resolution took steps to remedy it, outlining some principles for data collection and analysis. Third, the draft resolution recognized the contributions made by persons with disabilities and their representative organizations to development efforts at, for example, the high-level political forum on sustainable development and the Commission for Social Development.

8. **Ms. Korać** (United States of America) said that the draft resolution was instrumental for moving towards a rights-based perspective on persons with disabilities and away from the outdated medical model. However, the thirteenth preambular paragraph should

refer to a commitment on the part of Member States to implement the international normative framework on persons with disabilities, human rights and development, as opposed to a duty.

9. **Mr. Haque** (Bangladesh) said that the rights and freedoms of persons with disabilities was one of the priorities of his Government. Disability was the consequence and the cause of inequality. Ensuring funding for basic amenities and services had been found to be critical for the reduction of poverty and the promotion of equality of opportunity for persons with disabilities. Successful policies in that regard tended to address structural barriers in economic, political and environmental domains. Bangladesh was known for its pioneering role in promoting the rights of those living with autism, and had played an active role in tabling a resolution at the General Assembly to designate 2 April as World Autism Awareness Day ([A/RES/62/139](#)).

10. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretariat on the World Social Situation 2016: Leaving No One Behind — the Imperative of Inclusive Development ([A/71/188](#)).

11. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 27: Advancement of women (continued)
([A/C.3/71/L.14/Rev.1](#), [A/C.3/71/L.55](#))

Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.14/Rev.1: Trafficking in women and girls

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

13. **Ms. Yparraguirre** (Philippines) said that the draft resolution recognized the importance of a revitalized global partnership to ensure implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including goals and targets related to ending violence against women and girls and human trafficking. It also recognized the heightened vulnerability to trafficking of women and girls in humanitarian crisis situations such as armed conflicts and natural disasters. Further work was required to better understand the link between migration and trafficking to develop more effective responses to the issue, and the draft resolution strongly urged Governments to ensure coherence between laws on migration, labour and trafficking.

14. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea,

Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

15. **The Chair** drew the attention of the Committee to the amendment to draft resolution [A/C.3/71/L.14/Rev.1](#) contained in document [A/C.3/71/L.55](#), which contained no programme budget implications.

16. **Mr. Mohamed** (Sudan), introducing the proposed amendment, said that throughout the informal discussions on the draft resolution, his delegation had argued for the rejection of the fifteenth preambular paragraph, as it sought to depict the International Criminal Court as the only body authorized to address gender-based crimes and ignored the fact that not all States were parties to the Rome Statute. There were in fact numerous national, regional and international mechanisms aside from the Court that were able to address such crimes. Sudan had therefore put forward amendments to the paragraph in order to achieve the necessary balance and had proposed other language and options in the hope of reaching a consensus on the draft resolution, but its appeals had fallen on deaf ears.

17. Fighting impunity had always been a key principle of the United Nations, and of the Government of Sudan, as an outgrowth of the principle of respect for international law, but the Sudan was deeply concerned by the attempt to impose the Court as a key term of reference for all. Sudan held a firm, clear and unchanging position on the Court and would not allow the Committee to be used as platform for advocacy for the Court. The poor performance of the Court over the span of its existence should also be pondered, given that it had spent billions of Euros to adjudicate a few cases from one particular region of the world, namely Africa.

18. **Ms. Yparraguirre** (Philippines) said that references in the draft resolution that recognized instruments such as the Rome Statute, as well as measures and activities that would end trafficking of women and girls should be welcomed, and the inclusion of gender-related crimes in the Rome Statute emphasized the seriousness of such crimes. Several of those gender-related crimes were considered trafficking in persons by the United Nations

Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. In June 2016, the Court had convicted and sentenced a military officer and the soldiers under his command for mass murder, rape and pillaging, sending a strong message that gender-based crimes must not go unpunished. The text of the fifteenth preambular paragraph had appeared in the draft resolution unchanged since the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly in 2002, and its inclusion was more important than ever before. Although membership in the Court was fluid, with some States parties to the Rome Statute withdrawing and others acceding, the draft resolution did not require action from Member States. The text merely acknowledged the inclusion of gender-based crimes in the Rome Statute.

19. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the proposed amendment to draft resolution [A/C.3/71/L.14.Rev.1](#) contained in document [A/C.3/71/L.55](#) as orally corrected.

20. **Ms. Nescher-Stuetzel** (Liechtenstein), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that human trafficking was not only one of the worst human rights scandals of modern times but also a lucrative business model, generating billions of dollars in revenue every year despite the fact that the prohibition of slavery belonged to *jus cogens*, and was thus recognized as a norm from which no derogation was permitted. Given that the fifteenth preambular paragraph did not deal with the practical work of the International Criminal Court, nor express a view on the Court's performance, the proposed amendment was an attempt to undermine consensus within the Committee on a topic of high importance.

21. **Mr. Kollár** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that nothing in the language of the fifteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution suggested or compelled States to interact or cooperate with the Court. Other international legal instruments that did not enjoy universal support were also referenced in the text, so it was incorrect to say that the Court was given special attention in the draft resolution. The Court was a key institution that worked to ensure accountability for perpetrators of gender-based crimes and gave victims hope that justice would be done.

22. **Mr. Coloma Grimberg** (Chile), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus for many years. His delegation would vote against the proposed amendment, since the fifteenth preambular paragraph was merely stating a fact and happened to

mention the International Criminal Court. That paragraph had been included in the resolution for 13 years and had never been subjected to a vote.

23. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment to draft resolution [A/C.3/71/L.14.Rev.1](#) contained in document [A/C.3/71/L.55](#) as orally corrected.*

In favour:

Algeria, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahrain, Belize, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Ethiopia, Guyana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United

Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia.

24. *The proposed amended to draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.14/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.3/71/L.55 was rejected by 106 votes to 19, with 32 abstentions.*

25. **Mr. Ustinov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposed amendment. As the Russian Federation was not a party to the Rome Statute, it could not therefore agree to the reference to the Statute in the resolution.

26. **Ms. Abdelkawy** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote after the voting, said that her country had voted for the amendment because Egypt rejected the promotion of the International Criminal Court and expanded references thereto in Committee resolutions. Egypt believed that inclusion of the fifteenth preambular paragraph in the draft resolution was inappropriate, given that the crime of human trafficking addressed by the resolution was not among the crimes cited in the Rome Statute. Although the fifteenth preambular paragraph also appeared in General Assembly resolution 69/149, which had been adopted by consensus, that did not mean that Egypt accepted it. In fact, that was one of the reasons that Egypt had not joined the sponsors.

27. **Ms. Moutchou** (Morocco) said that her delegation had voted for the proposed amendment because the paragraph in question did not enjoy consensus, as demonstrated by the request for and the result of the vote. Nonetheless, her delegation underscored that if a vote had been requested on the draft resolution as a whole, Morocco would have voted in favour of it, consistent with its international commitments on the subject of human trafficking.

28. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.3/71/L.14/Rev.1](#).

29. **Mr. Mohamed** (Sudan) said that gender-related crimes were included in a myriad of international instruments and mechanisms enforcing those norms, and thus the Sudan had repeatedly asked why the International Criminal Court was being singled out in the draft resolution to the exclusion of other instruments.

30. The Sudan had played a leading role in international efforts to combat trafficking in persons, particularly women and girls. In 2014, the Sudanese capital, Khartoum, had hosted a regional conference on combating trafficking in Africa. At the national level, the Sudan had begun efforts to enact a law on human trafficking, particularly of women and girls, and the

Sudanese refugee law had been amended in line with regional and international developments. The Sudan was a major transit point for migrants and refugees and therefore the country coordinated with regional and international partners with concerns about that issue.

31. The Sudan believed that the insertion of a paragraph that was utterly irrelevant to the subject of the draft resolution did not further the objective of preventing trafficking in persons, but rather served to promote the Court, which the world increasingly saw as merely a political instrument. Inclusion of that paragraph would cause a rift internationally and create real difficulties for States in the fight against trafficking in persons. Therefore, and given that the Sudan was not a party to the Rome Statute, the Sudan wished to have its reservations on the fifteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution noted.

32. **Ms. Sammut** (Malta) said that her delegation would like to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

33. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/71/L.14/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

34. **Mr. Ustinov** (Russian Federation) said that certain provisions of the draft resolution presented difficulties. For example, his delegation could not agree with the emphasis in the resolution on the Rome Statute in the fifteenth preambular paragraph and therefore dissociated itself from that reference.

35. **Ms. Ndayishimiye** (Burundi) said that the issue under consideration was a priority for her country. Burundi had chosen to support the proposed amendment, not because it objected to the content of the draft resolution as a whole, but rather to recall the position of Burundi that the International Criminal Court had proven to be ineffective.

36. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, should take note of the following documents: the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women on its sixty-first, sixty-second, and sixty-third sessions ([A/71/38](#)), the report of the Secretary-General on intensification of efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls ([A/71/219](#)), the report of the Secretary-General on intensifying global efforts for the elimination of female genital mutilations ([A/71/209](#)) and the note by the Secretary-General on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the intensification of efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women ([A/71/398](#)). She took it that the Committee wished to take note of the aforementioned documents.

37. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 107: International drug control
(continued) (A/C.3/71/L.10/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.10/Rev.1: International cooperation to address and counter the world drug problem

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

39. **Mr. Ríos Sánchez** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was an omnibus resolution that incorporated the commitments made at the special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem. While the resolution had remained broadly similar for decades, it had been necessary to completely revise and update the text to enable Governments to take a more modern approach to the problem. The agreements reached at the special session in the seven thematic areas represented a road map for the implementation of international drug policy, and the emphasis on prevention, health and human rights was particularly welcome.

40. There was a need for greater cooperation between the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly in a way that maximized the opportunities for all Member States to participate. Mexico urged Member States to put their commitments into action and called on all United Nations agencies to contribute to implementation of the recommendations of the special session.

41. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United States of America and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.*

43. **Ms. Gonzalez Tolosa** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation would not be joining the consensus on the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph and paragraph 24. With regard to the twenty-fifth preambular paragraph, the new psychoactive substances were not subject to international drug control and the initiatives developed by the International Narcotics Control Board and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) were based on voluntary reporting. Therefore, while cooperation was desirable, it was not mandatory. The

call to report those substances and any incidents involving them should not be considered as an obligation, as appeared to be the case in the draft resolution.

44. Turning to paragraph 24, she said that her country's reservation was based on the fact that the paragraph as formulated was not consistent with the meaning of article 3, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, which established that alternative punishments to imprisonment were optional for States and not a requirement. Close alignment with the Convention was crucial for international drug control.

45. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that those countries strongly supported a response to the world drug problem that struck a balance between public health and law enforcement, and the outcome document of the special session had represented a significant step forward in that regard. There had been scope for more balance in the draft resolution, but they had been pleased to see that paragraph 1 had welcomed and reaffirmed the outcome document in its entirety.

46. They would continue to promote criminal justice policies in which the severity of the punishment was proportionate to the gravity of the crime. With that in mind, they remained disappointed that the draft resolution had not included a call for the abolition of the death penalty for drug-related offences on the grounds that they did not meet the threshold of most serious crimes. The death penalty was clearly an important issue for many delegations, as had been seen during the negotiations on the outcome document of the special session and on draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.27. The death penalty was an inhumane form of punishment and there was no conclusive evidence that it deterred crime. It was therefore not an answer to the world drug problem.

47. **Ms. Rolle** (Bahamas), speaking on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and said that CARICOM was joining the consensus. The world drug problem affected all sectors of society and was a common and shared responsibility, and all Member States must be involved in the follow-up to the special session. Although the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had primary responsibility for drug policy, the General Assembly should continue to be an important forum for sharing experiences and assessing progress and challenges. The States members of CARICOM were

disappointed that there had been insufficient support for the incorporation of their concerns regarding participation into the draft resolution, and hoped that future consultations on the resolution would take their valid concerns into greater account in a more inclusive process.

48. **Mr. Ruiz Blanco** (Colombia) said that his delegation had supported the proposal to completely update the text of the resolution, which incorporated the seven areas of recommendations made in the outcome document of the special session. However, it was regrettable that the necessary political decisions had not been taken on how to address the world drug problem during the period 2016-2019. A great deal of work remained to be done, and the United Nations needed to take action and make the necessary preparations to ensure an inclusive and broad process leading up to 2019 and beyond. Colombia hoped to be able to continue working with all delegations to fulfil that commitment.

49. **Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that a balanced and comprehensive strategy would need to be adopted at all levels in order to achieve international cooperation on the world drug problem. Such a strategy must be free from political considerations and must ensure the expansion of regional and international cooperation in order to make the principle of common and shared responsibility a reality. Owing to their comprehensive and flexible nature, the three international drug control conventions were the bedrocks of the international drug control system. UNODC and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should continue to play a leading role, and the General Assembly should concentrate on providing specialized agencies and technical bodies with policy guidance and refrain from micromanaging them. With that in mind, UNODC and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs should be granted the necessary space in the follow-up to the implementation of the recommendations set out in the Political Declaration and Plan of Action on International Cooperation towards an Integrated and Balanced Strategy to Counter the World Drug Problem of 2009 and the outcome document of the special session.

50. *The meeting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. and resumed at 12.05 p.m.*

Agenda item 60: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)
(A/C.3/71/L.51/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.51/Rev.1: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

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

52. **Mr. Aliu** (Ghana) introduced a number of oral revisions to the text of the draft resolution. The fifteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 2, 4, 5, 16 and 19 should be deleted; the language used in A/C.3/71/L.51 should be restored in the twelfth preambular paragraph and paragraph 25; and the twentieth preambular paragraph had been revised to read: "Taking note of the World Humanitarian Summit held in Istanbul, Turkey, on 23 and 24 May 2016, while recognizing that it did not have an intergovernmentally agreed outcome, and welcomes the commitment of the African Heads of State and Government adopted by the African Union on a theme 'One Africa, One Voice' at the World Humanitarian Summit".

53. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China and Timor-Leste had joined the sponsors.

54. *Draft resolution A/C.3/71/L.51/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

55. **Mr. Kollár** (Slovakia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, although the situation of refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa was of concern to the European Union and its member States, they had not been given the opportunity to contribute to the resolution or engage with it. A truly transparent and consultative negotiation process at the seventy-second session would result in a stronger resolution.

56. **Mr. Tsutsumi** (Japan) said that his delegation had traditionally sponsored the draft resolution on the refugee situation in Africa, which was of international concern. However, as Member States had regrettably not had the opportunity to have consultations on the draft resolution, it had not become a sponsor at the current session.

57. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking on behalf of Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, said that it was regrettable that oral revisions had been proposed from the floor without giving Member States the opportunity to consider their merits. Such actions were not in line with the practices of the Third Committee or the constructive spirit in

which it conducted its work. Her delegation had not been able to engage with the draft resolution as no informal meetings had been held, although it would join the consensus.

58. **Mr. de la Mora Salcedo** (Mexico) said that his delegation supported the consensus on the draft resolution. However, it was crucial to ensure that the draft resolution was the product of constructive dialogue among the delegations involved. His delegation wished to be able to participate in preparing future draft resolutions to ensure that the Third Committee made progress on international humanitarian issues relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa.

59. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that his delegation supported the position expressed in the twentieth preambular paragraph on the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. While delegations, countries and groups had been entitled to undertake binding commitments at that Summit, it had not produced an outcome which had been agreed upon at the intergovernmental level.

60. **Ms. Brooke** (United States of America) said that her delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution to reflect its support for efforts to address the needs of refugees and displaced persons in Africa. However, the lack of transparency in discussions on the draft resolution and the last-minute introduction of oral revisions were of concern. Her delegation did not support all aspects of the common African position on humanitarian effectiveness, which had been presented by the African Union at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016.

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

Draft proposal A/C.3/71/L.56

61. **The Chair** drew attention to the Committee's tentative programme of work for the seventy-second session of the General Assembly as contained in document [A/C.3/71/L.56](#). She took it that the Committee wished to adopt the tentative programme of work for the seventy-second session and transmit it to the General Assembly for approval.

62. *It was so decided.*

Conclusion of the work of the Committee

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

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.