



General Assembly

Sixty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
19 January 2011

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 29th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 18 November 2010, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Ochir (Mongolia)

Contents

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

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

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its eleventh special session (*continued*)

(h) United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 60: 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.

10-64232 (E)



Please recycle The recycling symbol, a triangle of arrows forming a circle.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development
(*continued*) (A/C.2/65/L.44)

Draft resolution on international trade and development (A/C.2/65/L.44)

1. **Mr. Alyemany** (Yemen), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.44 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the draft resolution recognized the positive role of trade in fostering development and thereby contributing to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). At the same time, it highlighted the profoundly negative impact on trade flows of the ongoing world economic and financial crisis; reaffirmed the importance of an equitable multilateral trade system, reiterating the call to resist all protectionist tendencies and to rectify any such measures already taken, while recognizing the right of developing countries to make full use of the flexibilities under the World Trade Organization (WTO); and stressed the importance of a balanced, ambitious and development-oriented outcome of the Doha Round, calling on all Member States to show the necessary flexibility and political will to break the current impasse and ensure the early conclusion of the negotiations.

2. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.44, which had no programme budget implications. She informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

3. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that opening markets to trade across the globe could play a key role in reducing poverty and hunger and sharing the benefits of economic growth worldwide. In 2010, the United Nations should send a unified, positive message from all Member States encouraging an ambitious and balanced conclusion to the Doha Round. Sadly, rather than learning from the previous year's near-success, Member States remained divided on fundamental issues that had blocked consensus for many years. Since the United States could not accept the text of draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.44, as it did not provide a constructive basis on which to build a fair and inclusive trade dialogue, her delegation would

regrettably have to call for a vote and would vote against it.

4. **Mr. de Bassompierre** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Montenegro; and, in addition, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that international trade and investment were instrumental for sustainable development. While the case for open trade was more difficult amid sluggish growth and rising unemployment, history showed that protectionism yielded even worse results, which the interdependence of the current world economy would amplify. Carefully designed and gradual trade integration into world markets, as part of a comprehensive development strategy, remained essential to providing sustained, inclusive and equitable growth. Trade was part of the solution and would facilitate recovery from the crisis and the achievement of the MDGs. That approach was widely shared by the international community and by careful analysts. The International Labour Organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the World Bank and WTO had all agreed in their recent joint report to the Group of Twenty (G-20) that open markets were pivotal to supporting growth and job creation but that trade opening must be complemented by properly designed domestic policies, including employment and social protection, to ensure that benefits from trade were widely shared.

5. The incremental steps pursued in Geneva by small groups of ambassadors, negotiating groups and WTO as a whole showed the international trade community's tenacity in seeking an agreement beneficial in the first place to the smallest economies and least developed countries while restoring international and domestic investors' confidence. In concluding the Doha Round, the goal in months to come should be to narrow differences and finalize negotiations. A strong political message from the G-20 in Seoul would be instrumental. The European Union would have welcomed a General Assembly resolution building on common ground and enhancing the collective resolve to work constructively in difficult areas, rather than a text restating well-known positions and dwelling on disagreements.

6. In conclusion, the European Union could not agree with a draft resolution which in many ways

portrayed trade as part of the problem instead of the solution and therefore, regrettably, felt compelled to vote against it. A different approach should be chosen the following year, with a view to putting forward a shared message from the international community on the contribution that international trade could make towards poverty reduction, the MDGs and sustainable development.

7. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.44.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, 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, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy,

Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, 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:

Marshall Islands, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia, Turkey.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.44 was adopted by 114 votes to 48, with 6 abstentions.**

9. **Mr. Weisleder** (Costa Rica) said that the draft resolution emphasized two new elements that were very important for the present discussion. The first was the need for all WTO members to demonstrate the flexibility and political will necessary to break the current impasse in the Doha Round. If the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities was applied consistently to the Round, progress and even a mutually beneficial final agreement would be more likely for all countries. The second aspect was the need to make substantial progress in all areas of the mandate of the Doha Development Agenda as well as in the negotiations on the Dispute Settlement Understanding. That procedure was vital to guarantee compliance with WTO rules.

10. While the world was still suffering from the effects of the 2008 economic and financial crisis that had originated in developed countries, there were some signs of recovery in global production and trade that could be partially attributed to the recent dismantling of restrictive measures applied by Governments in response to the crisis, and to the greater regulation and stabilization of financial markets.

11. **Mr. Aguirre** (Chile), reiterating his Government's call on all negotiating parties to bring the WTO Doha Round to a successful conclusion, emphasized the need for greater flexibility and political will to that end. His Government condemned protectionist barriers to trade, including tariff and non-tariff barriers, which impeded market access for goods and services, and thus, free trade.

* The delegations of Mauritania and Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

12. Rules and policies on free competition were key to achieving equitable and balanced development. Moreover, signs of global economic recovery, such as the increase in trade flows, demonstrated that effective measures could be taken to stimulate growth and development. Further reforms were needed to ensure a lasting recovery that would be felt by all members of the international community.

13. He hoped that the next draft resolution on international trade and development could be adopted by consensus, in order to send a stronger and more resolute political message on the fundamental role that international trade played in the development of all peoples.

14. **Mr. Goledzinowski** (Australia), speaking on behalf of Canada, Australia and New Zealand (CANZ), said that the draft resolution contained some elements that it did not support. Nevertheless, CANZ was fully convinced of the importance of the issue under consideration and looked forward to supporting a modified draft the following year. CANZ was committed to the multilateral trading system and to the prompt conclusion of the Doha Round, the level of ambition of which must be bolstered, and all countries must be prepared to contribute more to that end. It shared the same desire as many developing countries to reform agricultural markets, including through the elimination of export subsidies, reductions in domestic support and improved market access. Removing impediments to trade would benefit all countries, importing or exporting, developed or developing alike. He looked forward to negotiations on the draft resolution the following year.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development

(continued) (A/C.2/65/L.42)

Draft resolution entitled "International Year for Sustainable Energy for All" (A/C.2/65/L.42)

15. **Mr. Alyemany** (Yemen) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.42 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

Draft resolution on the oil slick on Lebanese shores (A/C.2/65/L.17/Rev.1)

16. **Mr. Alyemany** (Yemen) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.17/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

17. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.17/Rev.1, which had no programme budget implications. She informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

18. **Ms. Davidovich** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, expressed Israel's disappointment with the draft resolution, which sought to advance the political agenda of specific parties. Rather than addressing the many pressing economic and social development issues, the Committee's time was being misused by a politically motivated draft resolution that sought to institutionalize an anti-Israel narrative within the United Nations, disregarding the Committee's fundamental obligation to remain impartial. The draft resolution omitted any reference to the context of the conflict, namely the armed attack launched by the Hezbollah terrorist organization across an internationally recognized border, and failed to acknowledge that if Lebanon exercised control over its territory, Hezbollah would not operate as a terrorist entity drawing people of the region into its ill-conceived wars against Israel.

19. While the draft resolution was ostensibly concerned with environmental damage from the 2006 war, it made no reference to the significant environmental damage sustained by Israel. The damage caused by Hezbollah rocket attacks included significant harm to ancient historic sites; more than 800 forest fires that had devastated over 52,000 dunams of forests; and the intentional destruction of endangered species along with many other types of fauna and flora. Furthermore, the draft resolution failed to recognize Israel's extensive cooperation with the United Nations Environment Programme and other United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations working to address the environmental situation along the coast of Lebanon, or to acknowledge that Israel was an active participant in the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution. Such a prejudiced and misleading draft resolution undermined the Committee's credibility and stood in the way of its otherwise important work. Israel had therefore called for a vote on the draft resolution, would vote against it, and urged other delegations to do the same.

20. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.17/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, 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, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, 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:

Colombia, Congo, Panama.

21. *Draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted by 159 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.**

22. **Ms. Boerma** (Netherlands) said that her Government, which deeply regretted the pollution of the Lebanese shores, had voted in favour of the draft resolution and commended all the parties that were involved in relevant clean-up operations. Nevertheless, her Government had misgivings about the recommendation that further consideration should be given to the option of examining the potential role of the Compensation Commission in securing the relevant compensation from the Government of Israel. That recommendation prejudged the outcome of negotiations among the parties concerned. The settlement of outstanding claims resulting from the conflict between Israel and its neighbours was a matter to be addressed through negotiations between the parties concerned, which she hoped would reach an agreement. The Committee's deliberations should support bringing the conflict to an end; however, some of the wording and proposed actions in the draft resolution did not entirely contribute towards that goal.

23. **Mr. Jaber** (Lebanon) said that the overwhelming number of votes in favour of the draft resolution showed once again the international community's support for Lebanon's just cause. The draft resolution just adopted followed up on the report of the Secretary-General on the oil slick on Lebanese shores (A/65/278) of 11 August 2010, in which the Secretary-General had reiterated his deep concern about the adverse implications of the destruction by the Israeli Air Force of oil storage tanks in the vicinity of an electric power plant.

24. The Secretary-General had refuted Israeli allegations and had asserted that the Second Committee was the correct forum in which to address the issue. The destruction of a civilian facility by Israel was classified under international law as a wrongful act. Therefore, Israel was responsible for the damages caused by its attack and must provide due compensation. The current draft resolution reiterated the request for Israel to assume its responsibilities.

* The delegations of Mauritania and Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

25. Time and again, Israel had chosen to remain outside the circle of international consensus and legality, and had not complied with many resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. He quoted from an article published recently in the *Haaretz* newspaper, which summarized Israel's abuse of power, reflecting the arrogance of the powerful and a lack of respect for inalienable human rights.

26. Lebanon continued to attach great importance to the international community's support for Lebanon's efforts in addressing the devastating consequences of the oil slick on its shores, its economy and its people. Lebanon called upon its friends to intensify their assistance, as the country was still engaged in the treatment of wastes, the monitoring of the recovery, the rehabilitation of its shores, and the restoration of its ecosystem to its previous condition.

Draft resolution on protection of coral reefs for sustainable livelihoods and development
(A/C.2/65/L.28)

27. **Mr. Goledzinowski** (Australia), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.28 on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document, said that protection of coral reefs was an issue at the heart of the Committee's work on sustainable livelihoods, food security, economic development and climate change. It cut across regions, as evidenced by the diverse list of sponsors of the draft resolution. The extreme heat of 2010 was putting the world's coral reefs under such severe stress that there were predictions of widespread die-offs endangering ecosystems that fed millions of people. The coral reef ecosystems along the coasts of over 100 States provided food and resources with a value estimated at \$172 billion annually for some 500 million people worldwide. However, according to some estimates, coral ecosystems would largely disappear by 2050. A leading indicator of climate change, coral reefs were integral to sustainable development for small island developing States and must be protected in order to achieve the goals recently reaffirmed at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

28. The draft resolution's main objective was to place protection of coral reefs in a sustainable development framework, linking protection to issues such as economic vulnerability, food security and adaptation to climate change. It urgently called for action to protect

coral reefs and related ecosystems, requiring the Secretary-General to submit a report on the issue, including analysis of the economic, social and environmental benefits of such protection. That report would be an important input in the preparatory process for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012.

29. **The Chairperson** noted that the Comoros, Costa Rica, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mozambique, Oman, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Republic of Tanzania had also joined the list of sponsors.

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its eleventh special session (*continued*)
(A/C.2/65/L.43)

Draft resolution on the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its eleventh special session (A/C.2/65/L.43)

30. **Mr. Alyemany** (Yemen) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.43 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

(h) United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/65/L.13 and L.41)

Draft resolutions on the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (A/C.2/65/L.13 and L.41)

31. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.41, which was being submitted by Ms. Würtz (Hungary), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.13. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

32. **Ms. Würtz** (Hungary), Vice-Chairperson, said that the title of the draft resolution should be corrected to include the time period as follows: "United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014)". She made another minor drafting change.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.41, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.13 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence
(continued) (A/C.2/65/L.20)

Draft resolution entitled "Towards a New International Economic Order" (A/C.2/65/L.20)

35. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20, which was being submitted by Yemen on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. She informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

36. **Ms. Nemroff** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that much had changed in the three and a half decades since the adoption of the principles of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, and the language of the draft resolution was not only unnecessarily divisive but increasingly out of date. While her delegation agreed that the international community should come together to develop a more effective and inclusive global economic system, the current draft resolution was counterproductive to that effort. The United States had therefore requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution.

37. **Mr. de Bassompierre** (Belgium) speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20. In the light of globalization, technological innovation and the emergence of new economic actors, General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) of 1974 no longer provided a useful framework for addressing multiple global challenges. Reverting to the concepts of the mid-1970s might send an inaccurate message about the ability of the United Nations to contribute to solving the problems of the contemporary world and risked marginalizing the Organization in global economic governance. Many substantive issues raised in the draft resolution were in fact covered in a more constructive, effective and forward-looking way by other resolutions. Moreover, the recent High-level Plenary Meeting on the MDGs had approved an outcome document (A/65/L.1) which covered all the

issues mentioned in the draft resolution in a balanced and realistic manner.

38. The European Union reaffirmed its commitment to promoting multilateral solutions to common problems, particularly in the United Nations, especially with regard to constructive international cooperation towards achieving the MDGs and the promotion of sustained, inclusive and equitable growth as a basis for sustainable development.

39. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, 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, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, 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, United States of America.

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20 was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 52 abstentions.**

41. **Ms. Gervasi** (Peru) said that while her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20, it maintained the reservations expressed in previous years regarding the advisability of focusing in General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) adopted in 1974, at a time when the levels of trade and investment flows, technological development and migration that characterized the current economic context did not exist. These features had allowed many countries to achieve economic development or to place themselves firmly on the right track and to substantially reduce poverty. An international economic architecture favouring trade must foster open markets, avoid protectionist measures and promote sustainable investment, so that development and sustainable, inclusive and equitable growth would benefit the large majority. In examining the current international economic situation and its repercussions on development, it was particularly important to bear in mind the Monterrey Consensus and the outcome document of the High-level Plenary Meeting on the MDGs, as well as the principles contained in the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

42. **Mr. Aguirre** (Chile) said that draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20 differed from those adopted in 2008 and 2009 in salient ways. It expressly recognized the importance of the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha

* The delegations of Mauritania and Nigeria subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Declaration on Financing for Development, and for the first time recognized that the principles set out therein made it possible to bolster the achievement of a more just, inclusive and equitable system leading to economic growth and sustainable development. Despite those advances, and although several principles contained in the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and its Programme of Action adopted in 1974 continued to have validity, they corresponded to an economic and political context that did not necessarily reflect the current situation. The various high-level meetings held on economic and financial issues over the previous 20 years had provided a sufficient, adequate and updated framework of principles and actions to improve the current international economic system. Accordingly, Chile firmly believed that by fulfilling the commitments assumed by the whole international community over that period it was possible to achieve an inclusive development based on principles of equity, sovereign equality, independence, common interests and solidarity among all States, the aim aspired to by the resolutions adopted in 1974.

43. **Mr. Rengifo** (Colombia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20 in the search for an international economic order that brought about equity and cooperation. The references in the text of the draft resolution to the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and to the respective Programme of Action were limited to the scope of the general principles contained in those documents. Likewise, the draft resolution should be interpreted in the light of the constant evolution of the United Nations agenda in the area of macroeconomics and in other development-related matters. In that regard, the new text rightly referred more fully to the results of the major United Nations summits and conferences in that field.

44. The relevant report submitted at the next session should reflect current realities and future prospects. Colombia did not consider it desirable for that report to limit its analysis to perspectives and criteria derived from a programme adopted in 1974 or for it to concentrate exclusively on the macroeconomics of the international order. It was also important to consider the Secretary-General's comments regarding advances achieved and common goals, with a view to making the most of the benefits and opportunities that an increasingly globalized, interdependent world offered,

especially in order to give impetus to joint solutions fostering development, prosperity and economic growth.

45. Actions promoting a more just and equitable economic order conducive to development must be based on consensus and a spirit of cooperation; they must also be guided by the various existing international commitments. In that regard, in the context of the United Nations, Colombia reaffirmed the primary importance of the MDGs as well as the intergovernmental process on financing for development begun in Monterrey.

46. **Ms. Rabkin** (Canada) said that Canada was disappointed that the draft resolution largely reiterated the content of General Assembly resolutions 63/224 and 64/209, which had been adopted by a vote. The current draft resolution echoed the 1970s, recalling the principles of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and its Programme of Action. However, rather than taking note that those principles had not been fully realized, the United Nations should focus efforts on more relevant recent outcomes and principles. It was also regrettable that the draft resolution did not take account of or complement ongoing multilateral efforts or build on the renewed political impetus to achieve the MDGs following the recent High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly. Instead, by calling for Member States to work towards a “new international economic order”, the draft resolution confused those efforts, sending conflicting messages about the level of commitment by the Organization to address the various global challenges it faced and the more recent and relevant work accomplished over the previous year.

47. In addressing the challenges of an uneven and fragile recovery, the Committee’s priority should be to redouble efforts to address the impact of the financial and economic crisis on development, with a forward-looking and supportive approach. Canada fully supported the United Nations development agenda, including the role that it should play in addressing the impact of the financial and economic crisis on development. To that end, the full support of Member States working together in a focused and effective manner was required. The draft resolution, unfortunately, worked against those efforts and Canada had therefore abstained from the vote.

48. **Ms. Navarro Barro** (Cuba) said that despite the constructive spirit in which the Group of 77 and China had presented draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.20, enhanced by language that updated and improved it, there had once again been stubborn resistance from the developed countries. Their participation in the discussions had been conditional on the removal from the text of all references to the concept that gave life to the draft resolution: “The New International Economic Order”. Against that concept, they had again rolled out their thin arguments about its supposed obsolescence. Nonetheless, faced with evidence of the validity of the fundamental principles brought together in the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, and many of the endeavours contained in its Programme of Action, those arguments could not prevail. It was obvious that no world order that ran counter to their interests of economic domination would be deemed acceptable by the powerful.

49. Although the need for immediate, radical change was widely acknowledged, as was the inevitability of the in-depth reform of the discredited international financial institutions, which had devised wild theories of sole reliance on the market, the developed countries were trying by every means to avoid addressing those fundamental issues within the United Nations, particularly within its most democratic organ, the General Assembly. Nevertheless, arduous work continued in pursuit of the unrealized aims endorsed by the vast majority of the international community. As had been stated on many occasions, the need for a New International Economic Order was undeniable, and the Organization must play a central role in managing the changes necessary to achieve it. That was the hope cherished by the world’s peoples.

Agenda item 60: 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.2/65/L.31)

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.2/65/L.31)

50. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.31, which had

been submitted by the delegation of Egypt on behalf of the original sponsors listed in the document and Ecuador, Namibia and Pakistan. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications; a recorded vote had been requested.

51. **Ms. Davidovich** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Committee was once again engaged in an annual ritual unbecoming a professional body. Rather than dealing with important global issues, the Committee was using its valuable time to discuss a yearly politicized draft resolution that deliberately omitted key facts, preferring instead to advance a political agenda. In reality, Israel shared the vital interests of its neighbours to preserve and protect the natural environment and addressed those concerns through a variety of existing mechanisms, working groups and joint capacity-building programmes, which focused on agriculture, food security, forestry, desalination and water management efforts that would be greatly enhanced if the Palestinian Authority were to proceed with the numerous projects that had already been approved. The draft resolution's supporters conveniently ignored numerous agreements between Israel and the Palestinian Authority that had already conferred on it jurisdiction over those issues. Such an annual exercise did not improve the lives of Palestinians or help to create a better understanding or improved regional partnerships. It merely promulgated hate speech.

52. The issues at stake could be effectively dealt with only through joint ventures with an approach based on facts and reality. Wasting the Committee's time perpetuating discriminatory and biased draft resolutions embedded in falsehoods would undermine real efforts towards peace and prosperity. Fallacious draft resolutions such as A/C.2/65/L.31 should be replaced by genuine partnerships. For those reasons, Israel had called for a vote on the resolution, would vote against it, and encouraged other delegations devoted to advancing the true vision and purpose of the Committee to do likewise.

53. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.31.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize,

Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, 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, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, 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:

Côte d'Ivoire, Panama, Papua New Guinea.

54. *Draft resolution A/C.2/65/L.31 was adopted by 162 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.*

55. **Mr. AlHantouli** (Observer for Palestine) said that it was fitting that the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee on multilateral cooperation for development included one calling on Israel to cease its exploitation of resources belonging to the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan. While Palestinians continued to desire a just and lasting peace, they would never accept the confiscation of their land, Israeli settlement-building and the destruction of Palestinian infrastructure.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.