Mr Chair,

1. This is a complex topic situated at the sensitive interface between a State’s sovereign right to expel aliens from its territory, that State’s obligations to comply with applicable international human rights laws, the rights and obligations of receiving States, and the rights of individuals.

2. Singapore has spoken on this topic many times over the years. We believe that our views are well known. These views have not changed. We continue to take the position that progressive development in respect of the laws and practices applicable to the expulsion of aliens must be approached with caution. We continue to have concerns over the lack of distinction, in the draft articles and its commentaries, between codification and progressive development. In this connection, we have consistently opposed the expanded principle of non-refoulement articulated in paragraph 2 of draft article 23. That paragraph is not reflective of customary international law. There is no customary international law obligation to the effect that a State that has abolished the death penalty is bound not to expel a person to another State where the death penalty may be imposed, and my delegation rejects the position articulated in the draft articles on this matter.

3. These concerns on the draft articles have also been expressed by other delegations in previous sessions and I believe they continue to be shared by other delegations today. On the question of the form to be given to the draft articles, Singapore does not support their status as draft articles. The General Assembly should simply take note of the draft articles as well as the concerns and reservations expressed by the delegations on them.
Thank you, Mr Chair.
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