



General Assembly

Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
17 January 2008

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 32nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 7 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Lintonen (Finland)

Contents

Agenda item 52: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

- (a) International trade and development (*continued*)
- (b) Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

Agenda item 54: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (h) Sustainable mountain development (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

- (a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 58: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*)
- (b) Women in development (*continued*)

Agenda item 60: Training and research: United Nations Institute for Training and Research (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

- (c) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*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.



The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

Agenda item 52: Macroeconomic policy questions

(continued)

(a) International trade and development

(continued) (A/C.2/62/L.10)

Draft resolution on international trade and development

1. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.10, which had no programme budget implications. She informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

2. **Ms. Ayesha** (Pakistan) asked who had requested the recorded vote.

3. **The Chairperson** said that the representative of the United States had requested a vote.

4. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.10.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, 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, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Mexico, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Serbia.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.10 was adopted by 109 votes to 47, with 5 abstentions.*

6. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that the United States was a leading advocate of trade liberalization. A successful Doha Round would have a positive impact on development, poverty eradication and the further integration of developing countries into the multilateral trading system. His delegation had hoped that the resolution would encourage progress on the Doha Development Agenda. Unfortunately, the resolution ignored that all countries had a shared interest and responsibility in the success of the Round. Furthermore, it did not offer constructive approaches to mobilizing trade for economic development and growth as a means to realizing the common commitment set forth in the United Nations Millennium Declaration to reduce poverty.

7. His delegation was especially disappointed that there had been little interest in engaging constructively in a dialogue to find common ground, which did not bode well for the forthcoming Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus. At the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey, participants, in a spirit of mutual cooperation and understanding, had concluded that a vibrant, open and global trading system could provide an essential source of development financing. The international community must recapture the Monterrey spirit if it was to engage

in a substantive review. While his delegation shared many of the elements contained in the resolution, regrettably, it found that it had been unbalanced, prejudged the outcome of the Doha Round and made the General Assembly a vehicle for shadow negotiations on issues which were under negotiation or review in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other specialized agencies. Those circumstances had compelled his Government to vote against the resolution.

8. **Ms. Gomes** (Portugal), 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, in addition, Georgia, Iceland, Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union had been particularly disappointed at the outcome of the consultation process and, contrary to previous years when it had abstained, considered that it could not be associated with the language and spirit of some essential parts of the draft resolution.

9. The failure to reach an agreement on the draft resolution and send a consensual message on the value that all Member States, including developing countries, derived from open trade and the rules-based international trading system, and on the potential benefits of a successful conclusion of the Doha Round, was regrettable. Unfortunately, despite some constructive suggestions during the consultations aimed at drafting a fresh text, the Group of 77 and China had knowingly chosen a strategy which would result in a lack of consensus.

10. The draft resolution repeated the unbalanced language used in the previous year's resolution concerning the Doha Round and thus did not take into account the progress made to date on negotiations over non-agricultural market access, anti-dumping and subsidies and countervailing measures. It failed to recognize the progress made towards a conclusion of the Round which would benefit all countries. In addition, the draft resolution made no reference to the need for a round of negotiations under a single undertaking, which was a key to the success of the Round. Equally, the reference to the role of the United Nations in the negotiations on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights made the text unacceptable for the European Union.

11. The European Union was also concerned that the long passages on the role of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) could prejudice a full and open discussion at its twelfth session. The Union would approach that session in a positive and constructive spirit, as it provided an important opportunity for dialogue and debate on issues of globalization and interdependence. On other issues of interest to developing countries, such as aid for trade and duty-free, quota-free market access for products from the least developed countries, the draft resolution did not reflect all the efforts to reach consensual language made during the consultations.

12. The European Union firmly opposed the suggestion made in paragraph 25 that the draft resolution should be sent to WTO and circulated as a WTO document. The different membership of the two organizations would make it impossible for the Director-General to circulate it as an official WTO document if the Secretary-General were to accede to the request. The failure to reach consensus threatened to make the draft resolution irrelevant. The Union strongly urged the negotiators in the coming year to start with a fresh text in order to achieve a more constructive result.

13. **Mr. Bialek** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand (CANZ), said that his delegation joined others in expressing disappointment that no consensus had emerged from discussions on the draft resolution, especially at such an important juncture in the Doha Round. Regrettably, the draft resolution as initially proposed had not made a significant contribution to moving the Doha negotiations forward and did not reflect changes on the ground in Geneva 2007, inter alia, the release of Chairpersons' texts on agriculture and non-agricultural market access, on which delegations had engaged constructively, and on rules, including anti-dumping, subsidies and fisheries subsidies. The Canada, Australia and New Zealand delegations had proposed a number of new, constructive and balanced proposals aimed at bridging past differences and regretted that none of them had been given adequate consideration.

14. The text submitted at the current meeting understated the important role of the global rules-based trading system as a fillip to economic growth and development. The rules-based multilateral trading regime contributed greatly to global prosperity, poverty elimination and sustainable development. The

development dividend that the proponents of the draft resolution were seeking was most likely to come from reduced protection in the core Doha areas of agriculture, non-agricultural market access and services. An ambitious outcome was critical if the Doha Round was to deliver on its development promises. The draft resolution did not support such an outcome.

15. The CANZ delegations also had strong concerns about paragraph 25 of the draft resolution. Circulating the text of the draft resolution as an official WTO document would only serve to bring into stark light the inability of the General Assembly to agree on the strong and incisive political message that the Doha Round currently needed to send. He drew attention to the strongly worded statement on the WTO negotiations delivered at the fifteenth Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC) Economic Leaders' Meeting in September 2007, which reflected the political imperative of both developed and developing countries alike to ensure that the Doha Round produced a better trading environment, lower barriers to trade and a freer, fairer and more secure global market.

16. **Mr. Gass** (Switzerland) said that unlike in previous years, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. The Committee should adopt a development and system-wide perspective in addressing trade issues. It must take into account the various interests of all Member States. Such interests could not be reduced to a simple North-South scheme. The Committee's role was to provide a forum to analyze those issues in a spirit of compromise and to strive towards a balanced outcome. Only a consensual outcome could make a meaningful contribution to the complex negotiations currently taking place in Geneva.

17. **Mr. Murakami** (Japan) said that his delegation had constructively participated in the discussion of the draft resolution in the belief that it was important to send a positive message for an early successful conclusion of the Doha Round. It was therefore regrettable that members had been unable to reach consensus and that the original text, which did not reflect the result of any negotiations, had been submitted. Japan would continue to support the promotion of trade and economic growth of developing countries through its comprehensive Aid for Trade programme and actively contribute to the early successful conclusion of the Doha Round.

18. **Ms. Hounghbedji** (Benin) said that once a draft resolution was adopted, it must be implemented in its entirety. Therefore, paragraph 25 of the draft resolution must be implemented. All votes were equal at the General Assembly. The fact that a draft resolution was not adopted by consensus should not diminish its force once it was put to a vote and adopted. She wished to ensure that that was what had been achieved with the adoption of the draft resolution.

19. **Ms. Ayesha** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, stressed the importance of agreed resolutions on international trade and development which could provide policy guidance to the negotiators in Geneva and WTO. In submitting the resolution, the Group of 77 and China had confined themselves to agreed language which allowed for considerable flexibility. The Group of 77 and China was disappointed at the failure of the General Assembly to achieve consensus. It had submitted the draft resolution using agreed language for negotiations in the expectation that there would be reciprocity. That had not been the case. Negotiating partners had ignored the language agreed by the General Assembly and chosen to introduce unacceptable amendments in critical paragraphs related to the development mandate of the Doha Round. They had attempted to change the focus of all development-related aspects of the resolution which had been agreed at the Doha Round and in the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration. Her delegation therefore found the partners to be lacking in political will, despite the rhetoric on aid for trade and support for the Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries.

(b) Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)
(A/C.2/62/L.4)

20. **The Chairperson** said that an extension of the work of the Second Committee had been authorized by the General Assembly in order to allow additional time for the ongoing negotiations on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.4.

21. **Mr. Gass** (Switzerland), speaking as facilitator of the informal consultations on the draft resolution, urged delegations to consider the text on its merits and recognize that many of the broader political issues were being dealt with in other resolutions. Therefore,

there was no need to try to use the time remaining for negotiations on the draft to tackle more political, substantive issues not directly related to operational activities.

Agenda item 54: Sustainable development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/62/L.21/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the oil slick on Lebanese shores

22. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.21/Rev.1, which was being submitted by Ms. Ayesha (Pakistan), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

23. **Mr. Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) wished to know which delegation had requested a recorded vote.

24. **The Chairperson** replied that the recorded vote had been requested by the delegations of Israel and the United States of America.

25. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.21/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, 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, Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted by 153 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.*

27. **Mr. Heidt** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation could not support the resolution, which used one-sided and unbalanced language and placed demands on one party to the conflict while failing to acknowledge the role of those responsible for initiating the hostilities in Lebanon in July 2006. The resolution did not recognize the well-known fact that the Hizbollah incursion into Israel had provoked the conflict. The United States acknowledged the serious pollution resulting from the destruction of oil storage tanks in the vicinity of the Lebanese El-Jiyeh electric power plant. However, the Committee had important responsibilities and should not be used to advance one-sided and unbalanced views. In particular, it was inappropriate for the Committee to take a position on Israel's responsibilities to compensate Lebanon for damage caused during the course of an armed conflict.

28. **Mr. Fluss** (Israel) said that the draft resolution was a blatant attempt to politicize an issue of environmental concern and paint Israel, once again, as the unjust aggressor. It joined the litany of one-sided resolutions that flowed out of the General Assembly each year. The Committee must not allow politicization to infiltrate its work, as it distracted attention from issues of substance and relevance.

29. The draft resolution omitted a crucial detail relating to the context of the events described. It did not mention the entire reason for the conflict — namely, that on 12 July 2006, Hizbollah terrorists had crossed an internationally recognized border into Israel and kidnapped and killed Israeli soldiers. Had the Government of Lebanon exercised its sovereignty and fulfilled the conditions demanded of it by Security Council resolution 1559 (2004), the conflict would not have occurred. But the Government of Lebanon had been derelict in its duty and irresponsibly allowed the growth of a “State within a State”, and now the peoples and land of Lebanon and Israel were paying the price.

30. The United Nations Development Programme report commissioned after the Second Lebanon War concluded that the aggravated effects on environment and loss of income were by-products of the conflict. The conflict prevented the implementation of conventions relating to oil pollution as they were inapplicable during armed hostilities. Additionally, the agreements relating to spill compensation pertained only to oil spills from tanker vessels at sea, and not land-based incidents.

31. That was not to say that there was no reason for concern regarding the environmental health and vitality of Lebanon’s coast. Professional agencies — including United Nations bodies such as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) — were assessing and addressing the situation on the ground, in ways that would accomplish far more than the draft resolution. Israel supported those efforts and worked with international agencies and NGOs to allow access to the sea and assist in any way it could. Predictably, the resolution failed to mention that cooperation. Moreover, if the sponsors were earnest in their desire to address the development ramifications of the conflict, they would have mentioned the more than half a million trees and 52,000 dunams of forest that had burnt down in Israel as a result of fires caused by Hizbollah rockets and other damage and pollution of Israeli land, air and water. The failure to mention those environmental catastrophes in Israel proved that the draft resolution was an act of political demonization. Many recent environmental accidents and oil slicks had caused far greater damage to the environment than the one in Lebanon in 2006; yet, none of those catastrophes had warranted a United Nations resolution.

32. Such overt politicization and bias against Israel was unacceptable. Israel had called for a vote on the draft resolution in the hope that Member States that believed in authentically addressing the challenges and responsibilities of the Committee would distance themselves from yet another shameful act of partisan politicking.

33. **Mr. Saleh** (Lebanon) said that the destruction of oil storage tanks by the Israeli air force had caused immense damage to the Lebanese environment and economy, some of which was irreversible. Miles of coastline had been contaminated, causing the death of numerous marine animals, including various endangered or critically endangered species. The farming, fishing and tourism sectors had been severely effected, and, in some areas, the groundwater had been polluted. In addition, the burning oil had produced an atmospheric plume which might have caused some short-term respiratory symptoms among exposed population living in the vicinity of the El-Jiyeh electric power plant and might have contributed to adverse climate change. The World Bank conservatively estimated that the direct damage caused by the oil slick amounted to US\$ 203 million or 1 per cent of Lebanon’s 2006 GDP. That estimate did not take into account indirect damage such as health-related impacts, losses to ecosystem services and the cost of clean-up operations and the safe disposal of oily waste.

34. The destruction of the oil tanks near the El-Jiyeh power plant was a deliberate act committed in full knowledge of the harmful effects on the environment. It was a blatant violation of international law and articles 35 and 55 of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions in particular. In compliance with the principles of “no harm”, “preventive action” and “the polluter pays”, Israel was legally bound to refrain from actions that could cause environmental harm.

35. The draft resolution repudiated the polluter’s aggressive attack on the environment and clearly indicated the international community’s commitment to the environment. The Lebanese delegation was deeply grateful to all the delegations that had supported the resolution.

36. **Ms. Dinevska** (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) said that her delegation would have voted in favour of the resolution if it had been present.

37. **Mr. Saleh** (Lebanon), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that a certain delegation would have

the Committee believe that diplomacy meant deception rather than truthfulness and principles and that democracy meant that one was free to express an opinion as long as it was not different.

38. In the view of that same delegation, the conflict in the summer of 2006 would not have occurred if Security Council resolution 1559 (2004) had been implemented. However, that delegation's political attitude had prevented the implementation of scores of resolutions, including, inter alia, resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1373 (2001).

39. The UNDP report mentioned in that delegation's intervention clearly stated that Israel's attack on the El-Jiyeh power plant was deliberate. Furthermore, the Winograd report prepared by the Israelis stated that the Israeli attack had been prepared months in advance.

40. The fact that oil slicks had occurred in other regions of the world did not mean that no action should be taken in respect of the Lebanese oil spill, which was an environmental catastrophe that affected all the countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea.

(h) Sustainable development: sustainable mountain development (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.18/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on sustainable mountain development

41. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.18/Rev.1, which was being submitted by Mr. Bachmann (Switzerland) on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

42. **Mr. Bachmann** (Switzerland) drew attention to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution and noted that, in the informal consultations, it had been agreed that "the report of the Secretary-General" would be followed by the actual name of the report. In paragraph 18, "including" should be inserted after "inter alia" and in paragraph 28, "its Declaration" should replace "the Declaration".

43. **The Chairperson** said that Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Israel, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Serbia, Sierra Leone, and Slovakia wished to join the list of sponsors.

44. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.18/Rev.1 was adopted, as orally corrected.*

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.25 and L.60)

Draft resolutions on the role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence

45. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.60, which was being submitted by Mr. Saleh (Lebanon), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.25. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

46. **Mr. Saleh** (Lebanon), Vice-Chairperson, said that the draft resolution duly reflected the agreement reached during the informal consultations. He expressed his appreciation to the facilitator for the efforts made to achieve consensus and suggested that he might be given the floor in order for him to present a few changes that had been made to the text already circulated.

47. **Mr. Meñez** (Philippines) said that, in the fifth preambular paragraph, "its" should be inserted before "economic" and "the United Nations" should be replaced by "United Nations activities", in order to accurately reflect the wording in the sixth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 60/265. In the fourteenth preambular paragraph, ", among others," should be inserted between "phenomenon" and "accompanying". "Further recognizes" should replace "Underlines" at the beginning of paragraph 4; "Underlines" should replace "Also underlines" at the beginning of paragraph 5; and "Also underlines" should replace "Further underlines" at the beginning of paragraph 6.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.60 was adopted, as orally corrected.*

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.25 was withdrawn.*

50. **Mr. Heidt** (United States of America) said that his country did not understand the basis for the yearly inclusion of an agenda item on globalization and interdependence, a theme which generally informed all issues taken up in the General Assembly and whose specific aspects were already addressed in other resolutions. As in past years, his delegation urged Member States to streamline the work of the General

Assembly by biennializing that agenda item; it would make the same request at the Assembly's next session.

51. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.25 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 58: Eradication of poverty and other development issues *(continued)*

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) *(continued)* (A/C.2/62/L.30 and A/C.2/62/L.55)

Draft resolutions on the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017)

52. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.55, which was being submitted by Ms. Tchitanava (Georgia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.30. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

53. **Ms. Gomes** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate country the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro; and, in addition, Moldova, said that the eradication of poverty, a necessary condition for sustainable development, was one of the greatest challenges facing the world.

54. In that connection, the Millennium Development Goals ought to remain the rallying point for the Organization in the fight against poverty. In order for the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty to contribute to the achievement of those goals, poverty eradication efforts should be strengthened by marshalling all available resources in an efficient and coordinated manner.

55. **Mr. Ishize** (Japan) said that his country welcomed the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty and hoped that it would catalyse new efforts to achieve that goal. However, numerous other initiatives on the eradication of poverty were already under way and those should also be pursued in an efficient and coordinated manner.

56. **Ms. Romano** (Croatia) said that her country aligned itself with the statement made by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.55 was adopted.*

58. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.30 was withdrawn.*

(b) Women in development *(continued)*
(A/C.2/62/L.31 and A/C.2/62/L.50)

Draft resolutions on women in development

59. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.50, which was being submitted by Ms. Tchitanava (Georgia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.31. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.50 was adopted.*

61. **Mr. Heidt** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation understood that there was international consensus that none of the wording in the resolution either created or recognized a right to abortion, nor could the wording be interpreted to constitute support, endorsement, or promotion of abortion or the use of abortifacients.

62. His delegation further understood that the eleventh preambular paragraph did not imply that States should implement obligations under human rights instruments to which they were not a party. That notwithstanding, his country joined in the call for full and urgent implementation by States of obligations under instruments to which they were parties.

63. His delegation also understood that the words "right to development" meant that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her own intellectual or other capacities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

64. Recalling that paragraph 21 reiterated the language of paragraph 57 (g) of the World Summit Outcome (A/RES/60/1), he said that it was unfortunate that the Secretariat had sometimes attempted to define implementation of that and other such commitments without the agreement of all Member States.

65. Nonetheless, his delegation understood that there was an international consensus that paragraph 21 did not create, recognize, or support a new goal, target, or indicator within the Millennium Development Goals. Given that the language of paragraph 21 was identical to language used in the Outcome, it was important to reaffirm that the objective set forth in paragraph 57 (g) of the Outcome was a means of achieving the goal of

reducing maternal mortality and other Millennium Development Goals, rather than being a goal in and of itself.

66. In order to achieve the goals of reducing maternal and child mortality, increasing maternal health, promoting gender equality, combating HIV/AIDS and eradicating poverty, increased attention should be given to preventable or treatable conditions such as malaria, tuberculosis, upper respiratory infections and immunizable diseases.

67. While neither those goals nor the health objective in paragraph 21 constituted a goal, target, or indicator in the context of the Millennium Development Goals, they were important to reducing maternal and child mortality, increasing maternal health, promoting gender equality, combating HIV/AIDS and eradicating poverty.

68. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.31 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 60: Training and research: United Nations Institute for Training and Research
(*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.34 and A/C.2/62/L.53)

Draft resolutions on the United Nations Institute for Training and Research

69. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.53, which was being submitted by Ms. Tchitanava (Georgia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.34. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

70. **Mr. Ishize** (Japan) said that the activities of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), including core training activities, should continue to be financed strictly through voluntary contributions. The draft resolution reflected that and its adoption should not open the way for any subsidy for the Institute in the regular United Nations budget. He called on all Member States to continue making voluntary contributions to UNITAR and to continue supporting its activities.

71. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.53 was adopted.*

72. *Draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.34 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 56: Globalization and interdependence
(*continued*)

(c) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption
(*continued*) (A/C.2/62/L.27 and A/C.2/62/L.61)

Draft resolution on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

73. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.61, which was being submitted by Mr. Saleh (Lebanon), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.27. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

74. **Mr. Siregar** (Indonesia), speaking in his capacity as facilitator of the informal consultations on the draft resolution, drew Committee members' attention to drafting changes in paragraphs 5 and 7. He also suggested that paragraph 9 should be deleted as it had not met with the support of all delegations that had negotiated the text of the draft resolution.

75. **The Chairperson** said that, in view of the lack of agreement on draft resolution A/C.2/62/L.61, delegations might need additional time for consultations. Therefore, consideration of the draft resolution would be deferred to the Committee's next meeting.

76. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.