

General Assembly

Official Records

Distr.: General 15 December 2003

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 36th meeting Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 9 December 2003, at 3 p.m. Chairman:

Contents

Agenda item 91: Macroeconomic policy questions (continued)

- (a) International trade and development (*continued*)
- Science and technology for development (continued) (b)

Agenda item 94: Environment and sustainable development (continued)

Agenda item 95: Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (continued)

Agenda item 99: Training and research (continued)

(b) United Nations System Staff College in Turin, Italy (continued)

Agenda item 101: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and of the twenty-fifth special session of the General Assembly (continued)

Agenda item 103: 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 under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

03-64643 (E) *0364643* The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda item 91: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*) (A/C.2/58/L.33)

(a) International trade and development (continued)

Draft resolution on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/58/L.33)

1. **The Chairman** said that consultations on the draft resolution which he had facilitated had not achieved consensus. The representative of the United States of America had requested a recorded vote.

2. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Argentina, Bahamas. Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran Republic (Islamic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia. Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Georgia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

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

3. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.33 was adopted by 105 votes to 2, with 43 abstentions.

Mr. Gilman (United States of America), 4. speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had requested the vote and had voted against the draft resolution because the text challenged the prerogative of sovereign States freely to conduct their commercial relations. It was also aimed at undermining the ability of the international community to respond effectively to acts which, by their very nature and enormity, were offensive to international norms. Unilateral and multilateral economic sanctions could be an effective means to achieve legitimate foreign policy objectives. The United States of America was not alone in holding that view or in following that practice. The Charter of the United Nations itself provided for the use of sanctions to change the behaviour of those who would challenge or would seek to undermine international norms.

5. Mr. Bernardini (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote, said that the members of the Union had abstained because they were of the view that economic measures should be compatible with the principles of international law both as contained in the Charter of the United Nations and also within a wider interpretation including the principles of the multilateral trading system and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union considered that unilateral coercive measures should not be taken against any member of the international community. Such measures were not admissible. The European Union regretted that the resolution was almost exclusively focused on the adoption of such measures against developing countries, and wished to express the hope that the discussion of the question by the General Assembly at

its sixtieth session would permit the inclusion of those elements in future texts.

6. **Mr. Abreha** (Ethiopia) said that, if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

(b) Science and technology for development (continued)

Draft resolution on science and technology for development (A/C.2/58/L.6)

7. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.6 was adopted.

Agenda item 94: Environment and sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/58/L.12 and L.48)

Draft resolutions on the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twenty-second session (A/C.2/58/L.12 and L.48)

8. **The Chairman** said that draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.48 had been submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, Mrs. Zubčević (Croatia), on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.12, and not by Ms. Cronenberg-Mossberg (Sweden) as erroneously stated in the document.

9. **Mrs. Zubčević** (Croatia) (Vice-Chairman), introducing the draft resolution, said that a consensus had been achieved during the informal consultations.

10. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.48 was adopted.

11. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.12 was withdrawn.

Agenda item 95: Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/58/L.8 and L.49)

Draft resolutions on the International Decade for Action, "Water for life", 2004-2015 (A/C.2/58/L.8 and L.49)

12. The Chairman announced that the following countries had joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.49, which was submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, Mrs. Zubčević (Croatia), on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.8: Angola, Antigua and

Barbuda, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

13. Mrs. Zubčević (Croatia) (Vice-Chairman), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.49, said that it had achieved a consensus during the informal consultations.

14. **Mr. Koudelka** (Czech Republic) drew attention to a typing error in paragraph 2: "goal" should read "goals".

15. **Ms. Pià Comella** (Andorra) asked for her country to be added to the list of sponsors.

- 16. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.49 was adopted.
- 17. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.8 was withdrawn.

Agenda item 99: Training and research (*continued*) (A/C.2/58/L.21 and L.47)

(b) United Nations System Staff College in Turin, Italy (continued)

Draft resolutions on the United Nations System Staff College in Turin, Italy (A/C.2/58/L.21 and L.47)

18. **The Chairman** said that draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.47 had been submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, Ms. Cronenberg-Mossberg (Sweden), on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.21.

19. **Ms. Cronenberg-Mossberg** (Sweden) (Vice-Chairman) introduced the draft resolution.

- 20. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.47 was adopted.
- 21. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.21 was withdrawn.

Agenda item 101: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and of the twenty-fifth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.2/58/L.35 and L.46)

Draft resolutions on the rules of procedure of the Governing Council of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (A/C.2/58/L.35 and L.46)

22. **Mrs. Zubčević** (Croatia) (Vice-Chairman), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.46, which she was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.35, said that she hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

23. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.46 was adopted.

24. **Mr. Ainchil** (Argentina) said it was understood that at all times the secretariat of Habitat and the Governing Council in question should comply with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) and other relevant provisions regarding the question of the Malvinas. As a consequence, the parties to the sovereignty dispute recognized in those resolutions should be consulted with regard to any work of the Governing Council or the participation of that body.

25. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.35 was withdrawn.

Agenda item 103: 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.2/58/L.36/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on 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.2/58/L.36/Rev.1)

26. **Ms. Cronenberg-Mossberg** (Sweden) (Vice-Chairman) said that during informal consultations on the draft resolution it had become clear that no consensus would be possible and that the text would have to be put to a vote.

27. **The Chairman** said that the representative of the United States of America had requested a recorded vote.

28. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain. Bangladesh, Bahamas. Barbados. Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Croatia. Cuba, Cyprus, Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, 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, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nauru, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Tuvalu.

29. Draft resolution A/C.2/58/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted by 142 to 4, with 9 abstentions.

30. Mr. Mizukami (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that Japan had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that the natural resources of any territory seized by force should not be used inappropriately or illegally by the occupying Power. The cycle of violence between Israelis and Palestinians which had begun more than two years ago was continuing. The situation in the Middle East had worsened. The Government of Japan once again expressed its deep concern regarding the construction of the separation wall and its negative repercussions on the daily lives of the Palestinians and prejudgement of the final status of negotiations, as the wall was to be extended inside the Green Line. The Government of Japan firmly expected Israel to exercise the maximum self-restraint to calm the situation, and at the same time hoped that the Palestinian Authority would immediately crack down on the extremists. The Japanese delegation did not believe that the Committee was a suitable forum in which to handle such a draft resolution, which was of a fundamentally political nature.

31. Mr. Bernardini (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union, the acceding countries, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, the associated countries Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey, and, in addition, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, said that the European Union countries had voted in favour of the draft resolution because they believed that the natural resources of any territory seized by force of arms should not be used inappropriately or illegally by the occupying Power. The European Union reaffirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the occupied territories and also reaffirmed that any infringement of the rights of the Palestinian people with regard to that Convention was illegal. However, the issues referred to in the resolution were matters which were to be dealt with in the framework of the permanent status negotiations of the Middle East peace process. The European Union remained committed, in close cooperation with its partners in the Quartet and in the Arab world, to assisting the parties in their efforts to find a final settlement to the Middle East conflict. The resolution just adopted must therefore not be considered as prejudicial to or preemptive of the outcome of those negotiations. Any actions or statement which might be seen as being so had to be avoided.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.