



General Assembly

Seventy-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
6 December 2017

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 25th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 17 November 2017, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Jürgenson (Estonia)

Contents

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)(a) International trade and development (*continued*)Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*)Agenda item 63: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

17-20521 (E)



Please recycle



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

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Julian Simpson,
representative of Australia in the Second Committee*

1. *At the invitation of the Chair, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.*

Statement by the representative of the United States of America

2. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to make some clarifications regarding the interpretation of some of the language that was repeated in multiple draft resolutions. General Assembly resolutions, and many of the outcome documents referenced therein, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, were non-binding documents which did not create legal rights or obligations under international law, or bind States to any financial commitments, except when expressly agreed.

3. The United States recognized the 2030 Agenda as a global framework for sustainable development that could help countries to work towards peace and prosperity, and applauded its call for sharing of responsibility; all countries had a role to play in achieving its vision. The United States strongly supported its emphasis on national responsibility and believed that each country must implement the 2030 Agenda in accordance with its own policies and priorities.

4. In paragraph 58 of the 2030 Agenda, Member States had recognized that implementation of the Agenda must take place with respect for, and without prejudice to, the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including negotiations and could not prejudice or serve as a precedent for decisions or actions under way in other forums. For example, it did not represent a commitment to provide new market access for goods or services; and it was not an interpretation of, and did not alter in any way, any World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement or decision, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.

5. Much of the trade-related language in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda had been made irrelevant by events that had taken place since its adoption in July 2015 and therefore had no bearing on ongoing trade negotiations. In addition, with regard to middle-income countries' access to concessional financing, the multilateral development banks and bilateral assistance

providers should, to the extent possible, target their scarce concessional financing to the poorest and least creditworthy countries and rather than trying to preserve access to concessional finance, should aim to smooth the transition away from concessional assistance.

6. Noting that the President of the United States had announced his intention to withdraw from the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change unless he could identify terms that were more favourable to American businesses, workers and taxpayers, he said that while United States climate policy was under review, his delegation was concerned about the language related to the Paris Agreement contained in many draft resolutions. Climate change was a complex global challenge and the United States was strongly committed to an approach that would lower emissions while supporting economic growth and improving energy security.

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions *(continued)*

(a) International trade and development *(continued)* (A/C.2/72/L.7)

Draft resolution on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/72/L.7)

7. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.7 had no programme budget implications.

8. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan,

Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.7 was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 49 abstentions.*

10. **Ms. Angelova** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

11. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, which included restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, could be a means of achieving foreign policy objectives. When the United States had applied sanctions, it had been with specific objectives in mind, including to promote the rule of law, democracy, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to prevent threats to international security. The United States was within its rights to use its trade and commercial policy to achieve such objectives. By adopting draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.7](#), the Committee, in effect, was purporting to limit the international community's ability to respond effectively and by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or world security. Targeted economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force.

12. **Ms. Moldoisaeva** (Kyrgyzstan) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as Kyrgyzstan was committed to the principles of international law concerning good-neighbourly relations and cooperation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. No State could impose unilateral economic, political or other measures against another State in order to subordinate the exercise of its sovereign rights.

13. Unfortunately, since 10 October 2017, Kyrgyzstan had been subjected to an economic and transport blockade imposed by Kazakhstan that was intended to inflict economic damage on her country and undermine its investment and tourism attractiveness. Those measures were being applied by Kazakhstan despite mutually binding commitments on the free transit of persons under the Commonwealth of Independent States Agreement on the Creation of a Free-Trade Area, the Treaty on the Eurasian Economic Union and the WTO General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

14. The draft resolution would provide an important impetus to end the creation of artificial obstacles that not only undermined the spirit of brotherhood and cooperation among peoples, but also damaged the sustainable development of countries.

15. **Mr. Pinto Damiani** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. Unilateral economic measures were contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance

with the Charter of the United Nations; in particular, they ran counter to the principles of States' equality and non-intervention in domestic affairs, and the peoples' right of self-determination. The imposition of such measures constrained the political, economic, social and cultural development of the country targeted and infringed on the human rights of its nationals. The adoption of the draft resolution was a reaffirmation by the international community of its rejection of such illegal application of political and economic pressure, which was used as a means of subjugating countries, including Venezuela.

16. **Ms. Shurbaji** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation was disappointed that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus, especially since a consensus had been reached on the very same issue in the 2030 Agenda. Evidently, some States still thought of economic power as a weapon to be used against other States in the service of political hegemony. Her country had been subjected to unilateral sanctions ever since 1979. In recent years, coercive measures had been stepped up and had become a major obstacle to efforts by the Syrian Arab Republic to recover from the damage done to its infrastructure and vital facilities by years of terrorism.

17. As had been shown clearly by a recent Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) report on the impact of Syria-related unilateral restrictive measures, such measures were a major obstacle to the delivery of humanitarian assistance. They hindered the smooth functioning of virtually all vital sectors, caused massive inflation by weakening the national currency, created a climate of uncertainty that drove away investors, and prevented her Government and private Syrian companies from concluding contracts with their foreign counterparts.

18. It was hypocritical for certain Governments to impose unilateral coercive economic measures even as they promoted adherence to the letter and spirit of the 2030 Agenda. The United Nations needed to find a way to put an end to such measures so that the prosperity and dignity of weaker States would no longer be held hostage by the stronger States that monopolized most of the world's resources.

19. **Mr. Akhinzhanov** (Kazakhstan) said that his delegation had taken note of the statement made by the Kyrgyz Republic and, in the spirit of the traditionally friendly relations between their two nations, proposed to continue bilateral negotiations and dialogue with the objective of finding a mutually acceptable solution based on the WTO rules, as had been recommended by

the WTO members at the latest meeting of the Council for Trade in Goods.

20. Kazakhstan called upon the Kyrgyz Republic to fully meet the commitments it had made upon accession to WTO and the Eurasian Economic Union. The Kyrgyz Republic must also finally agree on and sign the road map which had been prepared during the visit of the Prime Minister of the Kyrgyz Republic to Kazakhstan.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (continued)

Draft resolution on strengthening the links between all modes of transport to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (A/C.2/72/L.2/Rev.1)

21. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.2/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

22. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Oman, Palau, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Serbia, Seychelles, South Sudan, the Sudan, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Zimbabwe had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

23. **Ms. Ataeva** (Turkmenistan), introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.2/Rev.1](#) on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that her delegation welcomed the broad international support for the draft resolution, which already included over 60 sponsors, and that it had made every effort during the consultations to maintain a constructive atmosphere and reach a consensus.

24. Transport development was a serious geopolitical factor that spurred integration, offered greater economic and political advantages to States and regions, and strengthened the compatibility of strategic interests by uniting common spaces, productive capacity and reciprocal flows of goods and services. It could also promote broad prosperity and enhance the quality of life for all while protecting the environment.

25. In that context, the draft resolution invited the Secretary-General to consider convening another Global Sustainable Transport Conference and encouraged Member States to indicate their interest in hosting that event. She called on all countries to support the draft resolution, which would provide additional impetus to

the efforts of the international community to promote all forms of reliable and safe transport — a key component of sustainable development.

26. **Mr. Ibragimov** (Uzbekistan) said that, as a doubly landlocked country, Uzbekistan had been making consistent efforts to contribute to enhancement of the capacity of the Central Asian region to deliver its goods to world markets. It had constructed a logistics hub at Termez, adjacent to the border with Afghanistan, which would benefit both countries. It had also built a railroad from Termez to the Afghan city Mazar-i-Sharif, and discussions were under way regarding an extension of the railway to the western Afghan city of Herat.

27. The previous week Uzbekistan had hosted the International Conference on Security and Sustainable Development in Central Asia under the auspices of the United Nations, at which delegates had unanimously expressed their readiness to support efforts to strengthen dialogue and cooperation between the countries of Central Asia and, in particular, to renew and expand its transport and communication linkages, including through opening new bridges, roads, railways and flights. Such cooperation brought tangible economic dividends to the countries of the region: new infrastructure not only increased trading capacity, but also provided employment opportunities for local populations.

28. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to register disagreement with the reference to WTO in the twenty-ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. It was not within the mandate of WTO to develop and operationalize international and regional transport and transit corridors, and it was disappointing that such a factual error had not been corrected. However, WTO members' full implementation of its rules and agreements, including the Agreement on Trade Facilitation, would make important and positive contributions to the draft resolution's underlying objective.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution entitled "Oil slick on Lebanese shores" (A/C.2/72/L.8)

30. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.8 had no programme budget implications.

31. **Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel) said that another year had gone by, yet the Committee was again performing the same absurd ritual of blaming Israel for all that was wrong in the world. Instead of focusing on the critical economic, social and environmental challenges around

the globe, the Committee's vital role was being cynically wasted on the current, irrelevant, draft resolution. The sponsors themselves knew that the draft resolution was ridiculous because they had not changed a single word of its text since previous years. The oil slick no longer existed, yet year after year the resolution called for a very expensive report — the latest of which stated that there were no further relevant findings available in relation to the environmental impact sustained by Lebanon and neighbouring countries beyond the assessments that had been presented in the previous reports. The draft resolution should be removed from the Committee's agenda to allow the international community to focus on important global issues. She urged delegations to vote against the draft resolution.

32. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Honduras, Mexico, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Tonga, Vanuatu.

33. Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.8](#) was adopted by 157 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

34. **Mr. Abbas** (Lebanon) said that 2017 was the twelfth consecutive year that the Committee had voted overwhelmingly in favour of the draft resolution entitled “Oil slick on Lebanese shores”, reaffirming the international community’s will to hold countries responsible for their intentionally wrongful acts, and sending a clear message that time was not a vehicle for impunity. The adoption of the draft resolution reaffirmed the commitment of the Committee to upholding international law, in particular the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules and principles of international environmental law.

35. The draft resolution acknowledged the environmental, economic and health-related damage in Lebanon caused by Israel’s 2006 bombing of the El Jiyeh electric power plant and once again requested Israel to assume responsibility for prompt and adequate compensation to his Government for the damage caused. Lebanon would continue to mobilize all resources and resort to all legal means to see that the resolution was implemented and that adequate compensation was paid fully and without delay.

Draft resolution on international cooperation and coordination for the human and ecological rehabilitation and economic development of the Semipalatinsk region of Kazakhstan
([A/C.2/72/L.28/Rev.1](#))

36. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.28/Rev.1](#) had no programme budget implications.

37. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Argentina, Azerbaijan, Ecuador, Honduras, the Republic of Korea, the Russian

Federation, Thailand, Togo and Turkey had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

38. **Mr. Akhinzhanov** (Kazakhstan), introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.28/Rev.1](#), said that the draft resolution and other previous resolutions on the same topic recognized that the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing ground inherited from the former Soviet Union and closed by a sovereign Kazakhstan in 1991 remained a matter of serious concern. His Government was making considerable efforts to tackle the health, environmental and social problems of the former nuclear test site and its surrounding areas, with assistance from donors and the direct involvement of United Nations agencies, but much remained to be done. Coordinated international attention was still required to sustain achievements in that regard. The Secretary-General had encouraged the international community to intensify its contributions towards the rehabilitation of the Semipalatinsk region in order to support the Government of Kazakhstan and increase the effectiveness of assistance to alleviate the tragic consequences of nuclear testing.

39. Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.28/Rev.1](#) was adopted.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development
(continued) ([A/C.2/72/L.32](#))

Draft resolution on World Bee Day ([A/C.2/72/L.32](#))

40. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.32](#) had no programme budget implications.

41. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, China, Cote d’Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Malawi, the Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Morocco, Myanmar, the Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, St. Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, South Africa, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island, and the United States of America had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

42. **Ms. Bavdaž Kuret** (Slovenia), introducing draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.32](#), said that bees and other pollinators should be protected because they were important for sustainable agriculture and livelihoods, food production and nutrition, human health, the

eradication of hunger and poverty reduction. The draft resolution sought to have May 20 declared as World Bee Day in order to raise awareness about the threats faced by bees and other pollinators and their key role in sustainable development and to promote global efforts and collective action to protect bees and other pollinators.

43. Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.32](#) was adopted.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development
(continued) ([A/C.2/72/L.44](#) and [A/C.2/72/L.29](#))

Draft resolutions on International Year of Camelids, 2024 ([A/C.2/72/L.44](#) and [A/C.2/72/L.29](#))

44. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.44](#) had no programme budget implications.

45. Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.44](#) was adopted.

46. Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.29](#) was withdrawn.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable Development
(continued) ([A/C.2/72/L.39](#))

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (continued) ([A/C.2/72/L.39](#))

Draft resolution entitled "Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development" ([A/C.2/72/L.39](#))

47. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.39](#) had no programme budget implications.

48. **Mr. Cadena** (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in the thirteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the word "and" should be inserted between the words "Conference" and "by" in the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.39](#). Without that word, the meaning of the paragraph was significantly altered. The change was consistent with the wording of paragraph 19 of the ministerial declaration of the 2017 high level political forum.

49. **Ms. Angelova** (Bulgaria), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate

countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the member States of the European Union would vote against draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.39](#), as their procedural and substantive concerns expressed at past sessions remained unaddressed.

50. The European Union and its member States did not believe that annual consideration by the Committee of a draft resolution on Agenda 21 was justified. Although Agenda 21 had been a milestone in the journey towards sustainable development, it had served its purpose by having helped shape the fundamental elements of the 2030 Agenda. The best way to fulfil the promise of Agenda 21 was through focused and effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which built on and incorporated Agenda 21 and the outcome documents of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

51. While there remained a divergence of views on a number of topics which had emanated from the Rio conferences and had traditionally been dealt with in Agenda 21 draft resolutions, and subsequently incorporated into the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, those topics were now an integral part of the implementation, follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda and should be discussed in that context. Those issues included the format, organizational arrangements and functioning of the high-level political forum on sustainable development; the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council and its relationship with the high-level political forum; the strengthening of the science-policy interface; preparation of the *Global Sustainable Development Report*; and arrangements concerning the Technology Facilitation Mechanism.

52. The Secretary-General's annual report on the implementation of Agenda 21 and related documents ([A/72/228](#)) did not respond to the request made in paragraph 14 of General Assembly resolution [71/223](#) to submit an analysis of the unfinished business of Agenda 21. The report provided a concise overview of issues relevant to the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda, including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, but contained no additional elements of value that were unique to the agenda item under consideration. It was clearly stated in paragraph 52 of the report that although Agenda 21 was a very comprehensive document, it reflected the realities of the 1990s. The report on mainstreaming of the three dimensions of sustainable development throughout the United Nations system ([A/72/75](#)), traditionally requested by Agenda 21

resolutions, also failed to add value. Furthermore, the preparation of both reports consumed resources which could be better used to implement the 2030 Agenda. The draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77 and China reflected the same weaknesses as the reports. Its added value was questionable as all of the topics tackled in the text were dealt with either in the context of the implementation, follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda or in separate, dedicated resolutions. The lifespan of the resolution had clearly come to an end.

53. The greatest task ahead was the full and effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Committee should concentrate efforts to that end; the draft resolution under consideration would not help further that objective.

54. **Mr. Favre** (Switzerland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of Iceland and of his own delegation, said that those countries strongly believed in a multilateral system and in the need for negotiated agreements between States Members of the United Nations; that was especially important in the Committee, whose mission was to discuss the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, among other topics. Consensus should be the rule, and voting the exception. With that in mind, Iceland and Switzerland remained committed to achieving consensus during negotiations on draft resolutions, and called on all Member States to adopt the same constructive approach. It was regrettable when a draft resolution required a vote.

55. Iceland and Switzerland also sought to enhance effectiveness and consistency within the United Nations system. The objectives of draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.39](#) had been included in other agreements, resolutions and decisions adopted at the United Nations, such as the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The integration of the objectives of the draft resolution into other universally adopted texts should be regarded as a great success. Consequently, there was no need for the item to be included in the agenda of the seventy-third session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution also contained cross-cutting language that had not yet been agreed between Member States, some of which Iceland and Switzerland did not support. Iceland and Switzerland had therefore decided to vote against the draft resolution.

56. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia

(Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

New Zealand, Norway, Turkey.

57. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.39](#), as orally revised, was adopted by 123 votes to 48, with 3 abstentions.*

58. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the limited time and resources available must be focused on draft resolutions that meaningfully addressed global priorities. Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.39](#) did not meet that standard and did

nothing to advance efforts to address economic, social and environmental challenges. Rather, it merely reiterated prior political commitments and previously agreed language. There was no credible reason to continue consideration of item 19 (a) and his delegation urged countries to agree to close the item. It was regrettable that Ecuador, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, had included cross-cutting language in the text which had not yet been agreed upon by all Member States.

59. **Ms. Boocock** (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of Norway and of her own delegation, said that both countries had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. The draft resolution had played an important role in the past, not least in operationalizing a number of decisions made at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012. In light of the job having been accomplished, and because time and resources must be focused on the most critical issues, there was no need for the continuation of the draft resolution. New Zealand and Norway remained fully committed to the implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the conferences on sustainable development referred to in the title of the draft resolution. However, turning all efforts and focus towards the successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda would be the best way to achieve the implementation of Agenda 21.

Agenda item 63: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.40)

Draft resolution entitled “Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources” (A/C.2/72/L.40)

60. **The Chair** informed the Committee that draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.40 had no programme budget implications and announced that Turkey had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

61. **Mr. Córdova** (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in paragraph 12 of the draft resolution, the words, “...in its resolution 2334 (2016)” should be added after the words “Security Council”.

62. **Ms. Fisher-tsin** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that she had hoped that partnership and professionalism would override politics within the Committee. It was shameful that yet another

one-sided attempt was being made by the Palestinians to exploit the United Nations, making that body into its own private theatre of the absurd. Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.40 did not belong in that forum; it distorted the facts and served as a means to demonize and delegitimize Israel. It diminished the quality of the Committee and undermined its credibility. Both the report prepared by the ESCWA entitled “Economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan” (A/72/90-E/2017/71) and the draft resolution were one-sided, economical with the truth, factually lacking and selective in data and analysis. The report and the draft resolution ignored the simple fact that Gaza was controlled by a terrorist organization, which divided its time and resources between attacking Israeli civilians, violating the human rights of its own population and misusing the financial and economic resources at its disposal.

63. Just three weeks previously, a tunnel belonging to Hamas had been discovered under a school in Gaza operated by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. That was the second tunnel discovered under a school in the preceding six months. Those tunnels constituted an attempt to use the children of Gaza and United Nations facilities as human shields. Once again, Palestinians were failing to take responsibility for their own actions and automatically blaming everyone else. Once again, the Palestinians were seeking to distract from fundamental issues by making false accusations against Israel. The problem with that tactic was that it did nothing to resolve the core challenges facing the region, instead only driving those involved further from a solution. Israel remained committed to working with other delegations to promote the work of the Committee and the 2030 Agenda. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution and urged other States that cared about the professional nature of the Committee to do the same.

64. **Mr. AlGhunim** (Saudi Arabia), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution reaffirmed the principle of the permanent sovereignty of peoples under foreign occupation over their natural resources; expressed concern about the exploitation by Israel of the natural resources of the Occupied Palestinian Territory and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967; expressed concern about the extensive destruction by Israel of agricultural land and orchards in the Occupied Palestinian Territory; stressed the urgency of achieving without delay an end

to the Israeli occupation that began in 1967 and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement on all tracks; and stressed the need for respect for the obligation upon Israel under the road map to freeze settlement activity, including so-called “natural growth”, and to dismantle all settlement outposts erected since March 2001. It was time to establish an independent Palestinian State with Jerusalem as its capital. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and he called on the other delegations to do the same.

65. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, South Sudan, Togo, Tonga, Vanuatu.

66. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/72/L.40](#), as orally revised, was adopted by 157 votes to 6, with 11 abstentions.*

67. **Mr. Angelov** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that while, as in the past, the European Union had supported the draft resolution under consideration, he wished to put on record that the use of the term “Palestine” in the draft resolution could not be construed as recognition of a State of Palestine and was without prejudice to the individual positions of the member States of the European Union on the issue and hence on the question of the validity of accession to the conventions and treaties mentioned therein.

68. **Mr. Shawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that his delegation was grateful to all those delegations that had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to their natural resources and recognized their right to claim restitution as a result of any exploitation, damage, loss or depletion or endangerment of their natural resources resulting from illegal measures taken by Israel, including the building of settlements and the construction of the wall. The resolution likewise called on Israel to comply with international law, including international humanitarian law; cease exploitation of the natural resources in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem; cease destruction of vital infrastructure; and halt actions harming the environment, including the dumping of waste.

69. He reminded the Committee that Security Council resolution [2334 \(2016\)](#) condemned all measures aimed at altering the demographic composition, character and status of the Palestinian Territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, including, inter alia, the construction and expansion of settlements, transfer of Israeli settlers, confiscation of land, demolition of homes and displacement of Palestinian civilians, in violation of international humanitarian law and relevant resolutions. That resolution also reaffirmed that the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem,

had no legal validity and constituted a major obstacle to peace; demanded that Israel immediately cease all settlement activities; and called upon States to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967.

70. His delegation called on all Member States to re-examine their dealings with Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. The international community could not condemn the settlements with one voice while some States left their markets open to goods produced in the settlements and allowed their companies to invest in businesses in those settlements.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.