



# General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
16 December 2019

Original: English

---

## Second Committee

### Summary record of the 23rd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 21 November 2019, at 10 a.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Al-Kuwari (Vice-Chair) ..... (Qatar)

## Contents

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)Agenda item 20: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

- (a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (*continued*)
- (b) Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development (*continued*)
- (c) Culture and sustainable development (*continued*)
- (d) Development cooperation with middle-income countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 21: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

- (a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)
- (b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027) (*continued*)
- (b) Women in development (*continued*)
- (c) Human resources development (*continued*)
- (d) Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (*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](mailto: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/>).

Agenda item 23: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system  
(*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

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

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

*In the absence of Mr. Niang (Senegal), Mr. Al-Kuwari (Qatar), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.*

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

1. **The Chair** said that before beginning consideration of the draft resolutions under specific agenda items, the Committee would hear a statement by the representative of the United States of America.

*Statement by the representative of the United States of America*

2. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that said that her delegation wished to make some clarifications regarding United States policy with respect to multiple draft resolutions as 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 rights or obligations under international law.

3. The United States underscored that the 2030 Agenda did not created any new financial commitments. It recognized the 2030 Agenda as a framework for development that could help countries work towards global peace and prosperity. It applauded the call for shared responsibility, including national responsibility, in the 2030 Agenda, and emphasized that all countries had a role to play in achieving its vision and must work towards implementation in accordance with their own national policies and priorities. The United States understood any references to “internationally agreed development goals” to be referring to the 2030 Agenda. Her delegation underscored that paragraph 18 of the 2030 Agenda called for countries to implement the Agenda in a manner that was consistent with the rights and obligations of States under international law, and highlighted the recognition that the implementation of the Agenda must respect and be without prejudice to the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, and could not prejudice or serve as a precedent for decisions or actions under way in other forums. For example, the 2030 Agenda did not represent a commitment to provide new market access for goods or services, nor did it interpret or alter any World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement or decision, including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.

4. Much of the trade-related language in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda had been overtaken by events since July 2015 and was therefore immaterial and the

reaffirmation of its outcome document had no bearing on ongoing trade negotiations.

5. On 4 November 2019, her Government had submitted formal notification of its withdrawal from the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate. Therefore, references to the Paris Agreement and climate change were without prejudice to the positions of the United States. Similarly, references to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate special reports were without prejudice to the positions of the United States.

6. The United States reiterated its views on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 expressed in its explanation of position in 2015. The United States had been a strong supporter of disaster risk reduction initiatives, which helped recipients build a culture of preparedness, promote greater resilience and achieve self-reliance.

7. With respect to the New Urban Agenda, each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, including by restricting trade in certain circumstances. Unilateral or multilateral economic sanctions could be a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. In cases where the United States had applied sanctions, they had been used with specific objectives in mind, including as a means to promote a return to rule of law or democratic systems, to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, or to prevent threats to international security. The United States was within its rights to utilize its trade and commercial policy as tools to achieve its objectives. Targeted economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force.

8. The United States enjoyed strong and growing trade relationships across the globe and welcomed efforts to bolster those relationships, increase economic cooperation and drive prosperity to all peoples through free, fair and reciprocal trade. However, the United States would act in its sovereign interest, including on trade matters. The United States did not take its trade policy direction from the United Nations. Her Government was of the view that the United Nations must respect the independent mandates of other processes and institutions, including trade negotiations, and must not involve itself in decisions and actions in other forums, including at WTO. The United Nations was not the appropriate venue for those discussions and there should be no expectation or misconception that the United States would interpret recommendations made by the General Assembly of the Economic and Social Council on those issues as binding. That included calls that undermined incentives for innovation, such as

technology transfer that was not both voluntary and on mutually agreed terms.

9. The proper forums for discussing eligibility measures for official development assistance were the Boards of the Multilateral Development Banks and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Her Government did not accept the United Nations as the appropriate forum for determining eligibility for, and allocation of, those resources.

10. The United States also noted that the term “inclusive growth” appeared throughout many of the draft resolutions. Part of the problem with placing inclusive growth at the forefront of economic discussions was that the term itself was vaguely defined and was applied freely to economic discussions with little consideration for the trade-offs between higher levels of sustainable, supply-led economic growth and more equitable distribution of resources of that growth. The United States recognized the importance of studying inequality and improving the measurements of income and consumption across populations. However, her delegation wished to ensure that any work or goal related to inclusivity remained grounded in evidence and proven best practices.

**Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (continued)**  
(A/C.2/74/L.13)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.13: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development*

11. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that financing for development was key to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and should focus on channelling resources to poverty eradication. Uncertainties about the financing of the Sustainable Development Goals made the draft resolution especially pertinent.

**Agenda item 20: Globalization and interdependence (continued)**

**(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (continued)**  
(A/C.2/74/L.26)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.26: Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence*

12. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it reaffirmed the vital importance of an inclusive, transparent and effective multilateral system to address urgent global challenges.

**(b) Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development (continued)**  
(A/C.2/74/L.27)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.27: Science, technology and innovation for sustainable development*

13. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it recognized the crucial role of science, technology and innovation in implementing the 2030 Agenda.

**(c) Culture and sustainable development (continued)** (A/C.2/74/L.17)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.17: Culture and sustainable development*

14. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it highlighted the role of culture as an enabler and a driver of sustainable development.

**(d) Development cooperation with middle-income countries (continued)** (A/C.2/74/L.25)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.25: Development cooperation with middle-income countries*

15. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it highlighted the need for sustained efforts to address the special challenges faced by middle-income countries in achieving sustainable development.

## Agenda item 21: Groups of countries in special situations *(continued)*

### (a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.29)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.29: Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries*

16. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it reaffirmed that the least developed countries, as the most vulnerable group of countries, needed enhanced global support to overcome the structural challenges they faced in implementing the 2030 Agenda.

### (b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.30)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.30: Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries*

17. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in anticipation of the upcoming comprehensive high-level midterm review of implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action for landlocked developing countries for the Decade 2014–2024 in New York on 5 and 6 December 2019, the group had introduced a concise draft resolution focusing on the key priorities of landlocked developing countries.

## Agenda item 22: Eradication of poverty and other development issues *(continued)*

### (a) Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027) *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.19)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.19: Implementation of the Third United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2018–2027)*

18. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it called on the international community to adopt targeted and comprehensive measures to effectively eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions, especially in least developed countries, landlocked developing countries, small island developing States and African Countries, as well as middle-income countries.

### (b) Women in development *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.28)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.28: Women in development*

19. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it was based on General Assembly resolution 72/234 and the Secretary-General's reports A/74/279 and A/74/111. The comprehensive yet focused draft resolution underscored such key factors as equitable access to financial and productive resources, lifelong learning opportunities and accelerating the transition to formal employment as practical steps towards enhancing women's economic empowerment.

### (c) Human resources development *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.20)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.20: Human resources development*

20. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it highlighted that human resources development lay at the heart of sustainable development.

### (d) Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.22)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.22: Eradicating rural poverty to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*

21. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that given that nearly 80 percent of the extreme poor lived in rural areas and worked in agriculture, the draft resolution called for collective efforts and efficient solutions and means to address rural poverty.

## Agenda item 23: Operational activities for development *(continued)*

### (a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.38)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.38: Operational activities for development of the United Nations system*

22. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that in anticipation of the new quadrennial comprehensive policy review cycle

scheduled to begin in 2020, the draft resolution called on the Secretary-General and the United Nations system to provide all pertinent information on the progress made in implementing the mandates contained in General Assembly resolutions [71/243](#), [72/279](#) and [73/248](#).

**(b) South-South cooperation for development**

*(continued) (A/C.2/74/L.39)*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.39: South-South cooperation*

23. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it was a concise and mostly procedural draft resolution on South-South cooperation based on General Assembly resolutions [72/237](#) and [73/249](#).

**Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition** *(continued)* (A/C.2/74/L.6 and A/C.2/74/L.7)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.7: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition*

24. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that as hunger was rising to levels not seen in a decade, the draft resolution addressed current challenges and promoted initiatives on agriculture, food security and nutrition.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.6: International Tea Day*

25. **Ms. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that it was based on resolution [12/2019](#) of 28 June 2019, adopted by the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations at its forty-first session, and emphasized the economic and cultural significance of tea.

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

**(a) International trade and development**

*(continued) (A/C.2/74/L.5/Rev.1)*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.5/Rev.1: Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries*

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

27. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, 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 domestic or multilateral, could be a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. When the United States had applied sanctions, it had been with specific objectives in mind, including to promote a return to 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. If the draft resolution were adopted, the Committee would, in effect, be 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. Her delegation had therefore requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it.

28. **Mr. Jo Tong Hyon** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that unilateral economic sanctions against developing countries were an infringement on sovereignty, a crime against humanity and a violation of human rights in breach of the Charter of the United Nations. All anachronistic and unjust economic sanctions against developing countries, which hindered economic and social development and achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, should be ended. That included sanctions imposed by the United States against his country, Cuba, Iran, Syria and Venezuela. His delegation strongly supported the draft resolution and he urged all Member States to vote in favour of it.

29. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.5/Rev.1.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic,



Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, 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, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 52 abstentions.*

31. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova, said that the member States of the European Union had abstained in the vote. 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.

32. **Mr. Varganov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had consistently supported the draft resolution over the years. Unilateral economic measures ran counter to international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Unfortunately, such measures were becoming the norm for certain countries, which used them to punish countries for choosing their own paths to development and also to gain an unfair competitive advantage in global markets. That directly violated the principle of free and mutually beneficial economic cooperation that lay at the core of the 2030 Agenda, thereby undermining trust and the sustainability of international relations.

33. His delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution had been updated to reflect new trends, and in particular that it recognized that sanctions had effects beyond the developing countries they targeted. He hoped that the report of the Secretary-General would reflect the negative impact of unilateral economic measures on achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The report should also include recommendations on how to overcome the negative impact of sanctions on the achievement of the Goals, as well as analysis of the international norms and agreements violated by the imposition of such sanctions. No State had the right to impose its will on any other through the threat or use of political, economic, financial or trade restrictions in circumvention of international law.

34. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that unilateral coercive economic measures were a form of collective punishment that undermined the United Nations system, deprived States of their right to development, impeded international commerce and obstructed implementation of human rights instruments. The international community needed to go beyond simply condemning such measures and create a mechanism to compensate victims. An international registry should be kept of unilateral measures that affected human rights. His delegation supported the idea of the General Assembly issuing a declaration on unilateral measures and the rule of law. Governments that imposed illegal economic embargoes should be held politically, legally and financially responsible for their effects on the delivery of vital services that were crucial for the lives of citizens and achievement of the 2030 Agenda.

35. His country had for decades been suffering from unilateral measures that affected its economy, development, war against terrorism, reconstruction and recovery, and the return of refugees to their homes. He noted that the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights had expressed doubt that such measures were truly intended to protect Syrians or promote a democratic transition. The time had come to put an end to such measures. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

36. **Mr. Rupende** (Zimbabwe) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The ambitious poverty eradication target of the 2030 Agenda was premised on the ability of the international community to work together in harmony within the confines of international law. Regrettably, in total disregard of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, certain Western powers frequently resorted to the imposition of illegal unilateral coercive measures, economic blockades and financial sanctions against other countries, and even disrupted the normal economic exchanges between the targeted countries and third parties. As a consequence of its land reform programme, his country had been suffering for almost 20 years from illegal sanctions imposed by the European Union and the United States. Zimbabweans knew very well that it was impossible for such sanctions to be either “smart” or “targeted”. It was hypocritical for certain States to impose unilateral coercive economic measures while at the same time calling for implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

37. **Mr. Li Gen** (China) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. States should be focused on the 2030 Agenda and its goal of leaving no one behind. The imposition of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries undermined the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, the norms governing international relations and the efforts of the affected countries to advance social and economic development. All countries had the right to choose their own social systems and their own development paths. Globalization did not mean “some working against others”, but rather “all working for the benefit of all”.

38. **Mr. Bayley Angeleri** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Unilateral economic measures were a clear violation of the principles of international law as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, contravened the basic principles of the multilateral trading system and were prejudicial to the legitimate economic interests and aspirations of Member States,

particularly developing countries. No State had the right to employ coercive measures to subordinate the interests of any other State to its own. There was one particular Member State in the Organization that was not only resorting to such measures with increasing frequency, but was also calling on other States to similarly violate international law. More than 20 countries were affected by the illegal and arbitrary coercive measures imposed by that one single State, including his own country.

39. The July 2019 report of the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights ([A/HRC/42/46](#)) had indicated that the sanctions imposed on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela fit the definition of collective punishment of the civilian population as described both in the Geneva Conventions relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts of 1949 and the Hague Convention respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land of 1899. In addition to depriving people of their human rights, including the right to development, unilateral economic sanctions also cut off access to essential medicines and foodstuffs, and had far-reaching impacts on various sectors of the economy, thereby undermining not only development efforts, but also overall economic stability and by extension international peace and security. He called for an immediate end to such inhuman, unlawful and neo-colonial measures.

40. **Mr. Hajilari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the enforcement of national laws with extraterritorial effects was unlawful and violated the principle of equal sovereignty of United Nations Member States. Unilateral coercive measures were a form of indiscriminate collective punishment that amounted to economic terrorism. Such abuse of economic power had been illegitimately exercised against his country for more than four decades. Measures that deprived entire populations of access to medicine, education and food should be unanimously condemned as a crime against humanity. Such measures were war by a different name – a war being waged against women, children, hospital patients, older persons, the poor and refugees. There could be no justification for taking civilians hostage for the purposes of political rivalry.

41. **Ms. Leyva Regueira** (Cuba) said that multilateralism and international cooperation were being held hostage to the aggressive and unilateral conduct of a handful of countries with hegemonic ambitions. Unilateral coercive measures violated the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the affairs of other States, and hindered development efforts and the exercise of human rights. The brunt of their impact was borne by women, children and older



persons. Her delegation opposed the imposition of unilateral coercive measures irrespective of the country targeted, because they were incompatible with the principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the multilateral trading system.

42. Her country had been the victim of the harshest and most prolonged unilateral coercive measures ever imposed by one country on another. The economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States against Cuba for almost six decades was the main obstacle to sustainable development in Cuba. In recent months, the harm caused by the embargo had worsened with the activation of Title III of the Helms-Burton Act. The financial cost was in the hundreds of billions of dollars, and the human cost was immeasurable, with not a single family or part of the country left untouched. The 2030 Agenda could not be fully implemented as long as unilateral coercive measures were in place. Instead, fair and robust economic relations should be established that provided for special and differentiated treatment for developing countries.

43. **Mr. Hermida Castillo** (Nicaragua) said that said that powerful countries continued to target developing countries with unilateral measures that deprived entire peoples of their right to development. The brunt of such measures was borne by the most vulnerable members of the societies targeted. No State had the right to impose such damaging and inhumane measures, which were in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. The pretexts offered to justify them were lies. The draft resolution was a step towards eliminating such measures and promoting multilateralism as the proper approach to overcoming global challenges.

**Agenda item 24: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition** (*continued*)  
(A/C.2/74/L.2/Rev.1)

*Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.2/Rev.1: Natural plant fibres and sustainable development*

44. **Mr. Bin Momen** (Bangladesh), introducing the draft resolution, said that natural plant fibres were important source of income for farmers and could play an important role in eradicating poverty.

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

46. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Angola, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, China, Costa

Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eswatini, the Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Indonesia, Ireland, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam had joined the sponsors.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.2/74/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted.*

48. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America) said that her delegation was happy to join the consensus on the draft resolution and referred the Committee to the remarks she had made earlier concerning language on climate change.

49. **Mr. Oseguero Farias** (Mexico) said that said that his delegation was happy to join the consensus on the draft resolution. Natural plant fibres were vital to the economies of many developing countries and the livelihoods of millions of farmers around the world. However, the language of the draft resolution reflected the lack of alignment between the work of the Committee and the 2030 Agenda. In particular, the Committee had not directly addressed the issue of responsible consumption as highlighted by Sustainable Development Goal 12. It was the responsibility of the Member States to formulate guidelines for the reports of the Secretary-General. Resolutions would be more effective if the reports requested therein were action-oriented and identified which Goals were involved in order to help Governments formulate more effective public policies. Concrete recommendations on advancing the 2030 Agenda would have a greater impact on the ground and also support synergy between the work of the Committee and the high-level political forum on sustainable development.

*The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.*