



General Assembly

Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
17 March 2010

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 41st meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 9 December 2009, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Park In-kook (Republic of Korea)

Contents

Agenda item 50: Information communication technologies for development
(*continued*)

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

- (a) International trade and development (*continued*)
- (c) External debt and development: towards a durable solution to the debt problems of developing countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 52: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)
- (e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)
- (f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)
- (g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twenty-fifth session (*continued*)
- (i) Promotion of new and renewable sources of energy (*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.



Agenda item 54: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 57: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(b) Women in development (*continued*)

Agenda item 60: Agriculture development and food security (*continued*)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Agenda item 50: Information communication technologies for development *(continued)*
(A/C.2/64/L.26 and L.62)

Draft resolutions on information communication technologies for development

1. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.62, which was being submitted by Mr. Mohamed Chérif Diallo (Guinea), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.26. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Mohamed Chérif Diallo** (Guinea) announced that the seventh preambular paragraph should read “*Recognizing* the importance of the mandates of the Internet Governance Forum as a multi-stakeholder forum for dialogue to discuss various matters including, inter alia, public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet and reiterating that all Governments, on an equal footing, should carry out their roles and responsibilities for international Internet governance and for ensuring the stability, security and continuity of the Internet, but not in the day-to-day technical and operational matters that do not impact on international public policy issues”.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.62, as orally revised, was adopted.*

4. **Mr. Daoud** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the eighth preambular paragraph did not reflect paragraph 16 of the resolution adopted at the twelfth session of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. Note must be taken of that paragraph, which read:

“*Encourages* all stakeholders to contribute to the online consultations regarding the ‘desirability’ of the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum as envisaged in paragraph 76 of the Tunis Agenda and to take into consideration the stakeholders in developing areas that have been unable to get connected online and urged the Secretary-General to take all appropriate measures to have broad-based consultations”.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.26 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions
(continued)

(a) International trade and development
(continued) (A/C.2/64/L.50)

Draft resolution on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries

6. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.50, entitled “Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries”. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. He informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

7. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his country believed that each Member State had the sovereign right to decide how it conducted trade with other countries. In particular, it believed that promoting important nationally held values or protecting the national interest was a sovereign right that justified restricting trade when necessary. The Charter of the United Nations specifically provided for sanctions as part of a broader strategy of political and diplomatic measures that could help to promote or restore peace without the use of force. The United States considered its sanctions carefully and used them with specific objectives in mind. In many instances, it used sanctions as a means to promote a return to the rule of law or democratic existence. In others, it used them to prevent access to harmful materials like nuclear weaponry that could threaten global peace and stability. The United States was within its rights to pursue both of those goals through its trade and commercial policy. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, were often a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. The resolution, in effect, sought to limit the international community’s ability to respond by non-violent means to offensive acts, whether they were directed against democracy, human rights or global security. The United States had therefore requested a recorded vote on the resolution and would be voting against it.

8. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.50.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, 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, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

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

9. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.50 was adopted by 108 votes to 2, with 53 abstentions.*

10. **Mr. Fries** (Sweden), 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 and Montenegro; and, in addition, Georgia, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that they had abstained in the vote because they were of the view that unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, and where applicable the rules of the World Trade Organization. Such unilateral economic measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular in order to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or to uphold the respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union was committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated comprehensive policy approach which should include political dialogue, incentives and conditionalities, and could even involve, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

(c) **External debt and development: towards a durable solution to the debt problems of developing countries** (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.9 and L.69)

Draft resolution on external debt sustainability and development

11. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.69, which was being submitted by Mr. García González (El Salvador), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.9. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under the rules of procedure.

12. **Mr. García González** (El Salvador) indicated a revision to paragraph 20 of the draft resolution, inserting "economic growth, sustainable development and the achievement of the" between "sustained" and "internationally agreed".

13. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.69, as orally revised, was adopted.*

14. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.9 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 52: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (continued) (A/C.2/64/L.43 and L.66)

Draft resolution on the follow-up to and implementation of the Monterrey Consensus and the 2008 Review Conference (Doha Declaration on Financing for Development)

15. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.66, which was being submitted by Mr. García González (El Salvador), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.43. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under the rules of procedure.

16. **Ms. Loza** (Nicaragua), expressed dissatisfaction at the lack of a reference in the final text of draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.66 to a clear mandate for discussion of the concrete measures to follow up the financing for development process, including the creation of an intergovernmental body. Financing for development was the only major United Nations process not to have a suitable review mechanism, and one must be established. The situation was of particular concern given the current situation of multiple crises from which, through no fault of their own, the developing countries suffered the most.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.66 was adopted.*

18. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that the United States was pleased to join the consensus in support of the resolution. However, he wished to make a few points to clarify his Government's position. The modalities of the financing for development follow-up process had been reviewed only 12 months previously as part of the Doha negotiations, and the Economic and Social Council had negotiated a refinement of the follow-up process in July 2009. In the view of the United States, the existing modalities of financing for development had not had enough time to be put into action, and it was therefore premature to review them once more.

19. Enhancing economic cooperation in the area of double taxation was a very important issue forming part of a much broader, more detailed discussion of

taxation, and it was difficult to treat the subject fairly as just one small part of the resolution just adopted. The United States believed that the issue was relevant only when there were significant risks of double taxation between jurisdictions and where a double taxation agreement would therefore be appropriate.

20. **Mr. Fries** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Monterrey Consensus was the most comprehensive reference in terms of development funding and its related policy issues. That framework set Member States on the path of the collaborative partnership needed to achieve, among other important objectives, the Millennium Development Goals. The Doha Review Conference in 2008 had allowed further reflection upon the important and interrelated themes of the Monterrey Consensus and its implementation, while taking into account the profound changes in the global context, accelerated by globalization.

21. It was in that context that the European Union welcomed the substantive resolution on financing for development in 2009, and reaffirmed its strong commitment to the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus, as the seminal document providing the foundation for the global partnership to promote sustainable development and achieve the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals.

22. The European Union also welcomed the fact that the resolution endorsed the Economic and Social Council's recommendations on a strengthened and more inclusive financing for development follow-up process. The year 2010 would be crucial as Member States would have to implement the new process for the first time and to further strengthen the global partnership for development.

23. **Mr. Gálvez** (Chile) welcomed the adoption of the resolution and stressed the need for the follow-up process to be strengthened; in that connection, he endorsed the comments of the representative of Nicaragua. His delegation attached great importance to paragraph 13 of the resolution, in which the Secretariat was requested to organize an event early in 2010 to assess and consider innovative financing and how it could contribute to achieving the goals of the Monterrey Consensus. Chile was prepared to collaborate to make that event a success, and to show

that the Monterrey Consensus was a mechanism that delivered.

24. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.43 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

25. **The Chairperson** said he took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under the rules of procedure in considering the draft resolutions submitted under sub-items (e), (g) and (i).

(a) 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.2/64/L.22/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the midterm comprehensive review of the implementation of the International Decade for Action, "Water for Life", 2005-2015

26. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on the financial implications of the draft resolution and referring to its paragraphs 5 and 6, said that the host Government would cover all the costs of the High-level International Conference on the midterm comprehensive review of the implementation of the International Decade for Action, "Water for Life", 2005-2015. The High-level Dialogue of the General Assembly to be held on 22 March 2010 would require meetings services for four meetings, two of which could use the resources allotted to the General Assembly provided that the General Assembly itself did not meet in parallel. The other two meetings would constitute an addition to the calendar of conferences and meetings and would give rise to additional requirements of US\$ 28,700 in the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, including requirements of US\$ 24,700 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management and US\$ 4,000 under section 28D, Office of Central Support Services for other support services.

27. The in-house cost of processing the documentation for the High-level Dialogue would be US\$ 302,000, which was expected would be absorbed, given timely planning and submission of documentation through close coordination with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, with the use of in-house or contractual translation.

28. Although conference services for the High-level Dialogue of the General Assembly had not been included by the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in its draft calendar of conferences and meetings for 2010-2011, the Secretariat would seek to use most effectively and efficiently the provisions to be made under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management and section 28D, Office of Central Support Services, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, in order to fully service the High-level Dialogue.

29. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.22/Rev.1, no financial implications would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

30. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, informed the Committee that the main sponsor of the draft resolution, Tajikistan, had made a minor revision to paragraph 6, deleting the word "also".

31. **Mr. Aslov** (Tajikistan) said that Canada, Germany, France, Mongolia and Slovenia should be added to the list of sponsors. He expressed his Government's commitment to ensuring the success of the events provided for in the draft resolution.

32. **Mr. Alimov** (Russian Federation) asked for the Russian Federation to be included in the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

33. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Israel, Italy, Monaco, the Republic of Moldova and Solomon Islands also wished to be added to the list of sponsors.

34. **Mr. Seth** (Director of the Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination) explained, in response to a request for a clarification from the representative of Cuba, that action on the draft resolution did not imply action on the financial implications, a statement on which would proceed through normal channels.

35. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa
(continued) (A/C.2/64/L.31 and L.67)

Draft resolution on the United Nations Decade for Deserts and the Fight against Desertification (2010-2020)

36. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.67, which was being submitted by Ms. McQuade (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.31. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.67 was adopted.*

38. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.31 was withdrawn.*

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity
(A/C.2/64/L.29 and L.57)

Draft resolution on the Convention on Biological Diversity

39. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) brought to the attention of the Committee the fact that three high-level meetings of the General Assembly had been scheduled for September 2010. Since they would be plenary meetings, they could not overlap. Therefore, should all three events take place between the adoption of the agenda and the start of the general debate, all available days, including the weekend, would need to be scheduled.

40. Under the terms of paragraph 23 of the draft resolution, the one-day high-level meeting convened would be counted as two meetings in total which could be accommodated by using resources allotted for servicing the General Assembly, provided that the General Assembly did not meet in parallel on the same date. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.57, no financial implications would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

41. With regard to the use of the words “within existing resources” in subparagraph 23(d) of the draft resolution, attention was drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the General Assembly

had reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and had reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The attention of the Committee was also drawn to paragraph 67 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (A/54/7), which had indicated that the use of the phrase “within existing resources” or similar language in resolutions had a negative impact on the implementation of activities; therefore, efforts should be made to avoid the use of that phrase in resolutions and decisions.

42. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, indicated minor revisions to the text communicated to her by the facilitator.

43. **Ms. Sánchez Lorenzo** (Cuba) asked, given the importance of adequate resources being available to hold the events properly, whether the phrase “within existing resources” had been the subject of negotiation.

44. **Ms. Greenaway** (Antigua and Barbuda), speaking in her capacity as facilitator of the negotiations, clarified that the language in subparagraph 23(d), specifically the phrase “within existing resources”, was exactly what had been negotiated by delegations. The facilitator and the delegations had been aware of the report by the Advisory Committee on the use of the phrase. Nonetheless, it reflected the language as negotiated during the course of the negotiations and discussions on the draft resolution.

45. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.57, as orally revised, was adopted.*

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twenty-fifth session (continued) (A/C.2/64/L.30 and L.65)

Draft resolution on the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twenty-fifth session

46. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.65, which was being submitted by Ms. McQuade (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.30.

47. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution and referring to its paragraph 13 and 14, said that since provisions for implementation of the resolution had already been made in the budget for the biennium 2010-2011, adoption of the resolution would not have any additional programme budget implications.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.65 was adopted.*

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.30 was withdrawn.*

(i) Promotion of new and renewable sources of energy (continued) (A/C.2/64/L.33 and L.60)

Draft resolution on the promotion of new and renewable sources of energy

50. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.60, which was being submitted by Ms. McQuade (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.33. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

51. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, said that the twenty-first and twenty-second preambular paragraphs should be combined. The twenty-first preambular paragraph would then read: “*Noting with concern* that millions of poor people are unable to pay for modern energy services, even when those services are available, and *emphasizing* the need to promote an enabling environment for the promotion and use of new and renewable energy.”

52. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.60, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

53. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.33 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 54: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (continued) (A/C.2/64/L.32 and L.70)

Draft resolution on implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)

54. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.70, which was being submitted by Ms. McQuade (Ireland), Rapporteur

of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.32. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

55. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

56. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland), Rapporteur of the Committee, said that in paragraph 3, the words “economic and financial” should be deleted. Paragraph 3 would then read: “*Stresses the need* for Member States, taking into consideration, inter alia, the current global crises ...”.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.70, as orally revised, was adopted.*

58. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.32 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (continued)

(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (continued) (A/C.2/64/L.13, L.63, L.41 and L.61)

Draft resolution on development cooperation with middle-income countries

59. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.63, which was being submitted by Mr. Mohamed Chérif Diallo (Guinea), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.13. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

60. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

61. **Mr. Mohamed Chérif Diallo** (Vice-Chairperson) (Guinea) said that in paragraph 6, a comma and the word “and” should be inserted after “programmes”; paragraph 6 would then read: “*Invites* the United Nations development system, in particular the funds and programmes, and at the regional level ...”. In paragraph 9 of the English version, the words “undertake” and “further” should be reversed. Paragraph 9 would then read: “*Calls on* the international community to continue to further undertake ...”.

62. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.63, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.13 was withdrawn.*

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

64. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.61, which was being submitted by Mr. Mohamed Chérif Diallo (Guinea), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.41. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

65. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

66. **Mr. Mohamed Chérif Diallo** (Vice-Chairperson) (Guinea) said that in paragraph 7 of the French version, the words “vers les pays en développement” should be placed after the word “accord”. Paragraph 7 would then read: “... insiste sur la nécessité de prendre des mesures concrètes pour faciliter le transfert de technologie à des conditions équitables, transparentes et convenues d’un commun accord vers les pays en développement ...”.

67. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.61, as orally revised, was adopted.*

68. **Ms. Loza** (Nicaragua), speaking in explanation of position, said that the joint crisis initiative referred to in paragraph 4 of the resolution was outside the mandate of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, and that it was Member States who should be responsible for coordinating social protection floors.

69. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.41 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 57: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (continued) (A/C.2/64/L.4/Rev.2, L.44 and L.58)

Draft resolution on legal empowerment of the poor and eradication of poverty

70. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.4/Rev.2, which had no programme budget implications.

71. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

72. **Ms. Sánchez Lorenzo** (Cuba) said that her delegation would not obstruct consideration of the draft resolution, but nevertheless believed that waiving rule 120 of the rules of procedure must not become a precedent. The Committee must follow the rules, and her delegation was concerned by the waiving of rule 120 when the draft resolution on trade and development that the Group of 77 had wanted to submit in plenary had not been proceeded with.

73. **Mr. Briz Gutiérrez** (Guatemala) said that Cyprus, Djibouti, Eritrea, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland, Seychelles and Slovakia had joined the list of sponsors.

74. **Ms. Loza** (Nicaragua) said that after a process from which the majority had been excluded and whereby the views of a small group had been imposed on the international community, a weak consensus had been reached on the draft resolution. The legal empowerment of the poor had not been defined intergovernmentally and the process was barely beginning. The concept must be defined broadly within the framework of poverty eradication, acknowledging that lack of legal empowerment was not a cause of poverty but an aggravating factor. In the absence of agreement on the concept, any contributions to reports or requests for assistance were voluntary and not part of any mandate of the Organization. In her delegation’s view, the concept must be applied to all, especially the most vulnerable: migrant workers and indigenous peoples.

75. In the preparation of the following year’s report on legal empowerment of the poor and eradication of poverty, draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.47 should be taken into consideration because the concept must be understood in a broader context, in both developed and developing countries, and the root causes of poverty must be part of the examination.

76. **Ms. Sánchez Lorenzo** (Cuba) said that the solution reached was delicately balanced. Her country supported the resolution because, 60 years after adoption of the Charter, more than two thirds of the world’s population lived in poverty. The resolution could contribute to give the poor legal powers and rights, access to justice and true opportunities. Only social and legal protection and opportunities would end poverty, in societies founded on solidarity and not

selfishness. Governments must allocate resources to that goal as a priority, and protect the poor from the corporations that preyed on them.

77. While her delegation supported the draft resolution, the text and the report that had informed Member States reflected a limited and incomplete view. There was no universally agreed idea of what legal empowerment of the poor was.

78. **Ms. Espósito Guevara** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said her delegation was deeply concerned at the form negotiations had taken. Given the sensitivity of the subject, especially for developing countries, there should have been broader discussion. Her delegation totally disagreed with the exclusion of migrants and indigenous peoples from the text, because they often faced a lack of legal protection and, indeed, formed the majority in certain developing countries.

79. It was unjust that while mechanisms for protecting rights were strengthened, economic systems were promoted that worsened the poverty endured by so many. Workers' rights meant nothing if they had no jobs, and in the light of the crisis, the private sector alone could not overcome the problems created by the economic model.

80. Legal empowerment must not be isolated from political and economic empowerment. Workers and social movements must have legal empowerment so they could demand resources, services, benefits and participation. The eradication of poverty required a multidimensional approach that addressed root causes, including inequity and unequal land distribution and unfair trade. The issue had an international facet, tied to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and the right to development.

81. **Mr. Valero Briceño** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) expressed concern that certain developing countries that were sponsors of the draft resolution, with large indigenous and migrant populations, had not accepted the proposals of Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela aimed at mitigating the impact of poverty and inequality. Moreover, developed countries must meet their official development aid commitments to fight poverty.

82. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Afghanistan, Albania, the Czech Republic, Lesotho, Macedonia, Malta, the Republic of Moldova

and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the list of sponsors.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.4/Rev.2 was adopted.*

84. **Mr. Gálvez** (Chile) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the statement by the representative of Guatemala. The consideration by the Second Committee of the subject of the legal empowerment of the poor was important. His delegation believed firmly in the links between legal empowerment of the poor, development, the promotion of and respect for human rights and democratic values. He must reject emphatically the comments made by some delegations regarding the process of negotiations, which had been inclusive, transparent, open and democratic.

85. **Mr. Rengifo** (Colombia) said that his delegation recognized the effort made during the negotiating process to take different viewpoints into account. Since the theme had been discussed previously in forums other than the Second Committee, the appropriate venue and mechanisms for its consideration must be the subject of further intergovernmental discussion. A joint effort was needed to define more clearly its scope and implications. His delegation hoped that future discussions on the subject would allow all States to contribute their own interpretations and positive experiences, and understood that the legal empowerment of the poor referred to in the draft resolution must be interpreted on the basis of domestic legislation.

86. **Ms. Ornbrant** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the resolution represented a foundation on which to further elaborate the concept of legal empowerment of the poor. She urged coordination on the issue within the United Nations system, including through the Rule of Law Coordination and Resource Group, and stressed that learning about national experiences would be crucial in that regard. Access to justice and exercise of rights were essential components of the effort to eradicate poverty.

87. **Mr. Hassaninejad Pirkohi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation was concerned about the tendency to insert into United Nations documents concepts that had not been the subject of intergovernmental negotiation. Moreover, the already overloaded agenda of the Second Committee was not necessarily the proper place for the issue of legal empowerment of the poor to be considered. The provisions of the resolution should be interpreted in a

manner consistent with the national legislation of each individual State.

(b) Women in development (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.44 and L.58)

Draft resolution on women in development

88. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.58, which was being submitted by Mr. Mičić (Serbia), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.44. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

89. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.58 was adopted.*

90. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.44 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 60: Agriculture development and food security (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.27 and L.68)

Draft resolution on agriculture development and food security

91. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.68, which was being submitted by Mr. García González (El Salvador), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.27. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

92. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

93. **Mr. García González** (Vice-Chairperson) (El Salvador) said that paragraph 27 had been changed to read: "... challenges faced by the indigenous peoples in the context of food security and in this regard calls upon States to take special actions to combat the root causes of the disproportionately high level of hunger and malnutrition among indigenous peoples;"

94. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.68, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

95. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the resolution would contribute to food security by helping to correct policies that had given unfair advantages to exports from developed countries and discouraged agriculture in developing countries.

96. **Ms. Pessôa** (Brazil) said that she regretted that an earlier consensus on a preambular paragraph on the right to food had been reversed. The right to food had been affirmed in the Rome Declaration on World Food Security and the resolution on the right to food just adopted by the Third Committee. Her delegation would continue to work to have the right to food introduced into future resolutions of the Second Committee.

97. **Ms. Sánchez Lorenzo** (Cuba) said that consideration of agricultural development and food security must not duplicate or limit the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Her delegation would have welcomed a clearer reflection of the right to food in the draft resolution, in the light of the adoption in the Third Committee of the draft resolution on the right to development. Cuba would work in the future to ensure that that right was reflected broadly, without limitations.

98. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.44 was withdrawn.*

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.