



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2015

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 37th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 5 December 2014, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Cardi..... (Italy)

Contents

Agenda item 19: 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 and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

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

- (c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

- (b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)
- (h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

- (a) International migration and development (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

14-66490 (E)



Please recycle The recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 19: 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 and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on International Decade for Action, "Water for Life", 2005-2015, and further efforts to achieve the sustainable development of water resources (A/C.2/69/L.12/Rev.1)

1. **Mr. Isomatov** (Tajikistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.12/Rev.1, proposed several minor drafting changes.
2. **The Chair** said that Burkina Faso, Chile, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Serbia and the United Arab Emirates had joined the list of sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.
3. *It was so decided.*
4. **Mr. Shigabuddinov** (Uzbekistan) said that the draft resolution was based on a previous draft resolution containing provisions with which his delegation did not agree. Should the draft resolution be put to a vote, his delegation would abstain, in the interests of consensus.
5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted with minor drafting changes.*

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

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.4/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on modalities for the implementation of resolution 68/304, entitled "Towards the establishment of a multilateral legal framework for sovereign debt restructuring processes" (A/C.2/69/L.4/Rev.1)

6. **The Chair** drew the Committee's attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/69/L.59 and submitted by the

Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

7. **Ms. Vilaseca Chumacero** (Plurinational Republic of Bolivia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the international community had, in its overwhelming majority, supported the adoption of General Assembly resolution 68/304, which recognized the need to create a legal framework facilitating the orderly restructuring of sovereign debts. Debt restructuring processes and debt sustainability were at serious risk as a result of the actions of speculators endeavouring to gain profits from countries with excessive debt obligations and repayment processes. The present draft resolution fulfilled the mandate of resolution 68/304 and established clear modalities for its implementation.

8. The central role and legitimacy of the United Nations made it the appropriate venue for discussing economic and financial matters concerning development and related issues. In the light of the systemic problems still facing the global economy, all Member States and interested stakeholders were invited to participate constructively and in a spirit of compromise in the substantive process to begin following the adoption of the draft resolution.

9. **Ms. Perceval** (Argentina) said that three months after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 68/304, the Second Committee was fulfilling the first part of the mandate contained therein, to consider modalities for intergovernmental negotiations on sovereign debt restructuring. It had been said that vulture funds had the effect of a bomb thrown at the world economic system. Indeed, while some might see the actions of vulture funds as marginal acts by a small group of financial extortionists, they could in fact represent a new trend in capitalism that condemned the international financial architecture to anarchy.

10. The suffering caused by economic disparity and financial speculation was unacceptable. Laissez-faire capitalism was said to be the root cause of the economic chaos of 2008. Whereas 30 years earlier, the relation between gross national product and financial assets had been nearly 1 to 1, it was currently 1 to 4. If States and the international community could not respond appropriately to sovereign debt crises, social and political crises, which were far more destructive, might result. It was not merely the economy, but democracy itself that was at risk.

11. The challenge was global, from the standpoint of both international financial architecture, and the principles and rules of civilized life. It was a question of sovereignty for States.

12. The draft resolution, which focused on modalities, was procedural rather than substantive. However, it also represented an enormous step by the international community in responding to the acute need for a multilateral legal framework for discussion of the sovereign debt restructuring process in the General Assembly. It was clear that indifference to the anarchy and voraciousness of the financial markets would not lead to justice and equality.

13. In 2015, there would be an opportunity to hear different points of view through deliberative and respectful processes. Clear, predictable and just rules for both debtors and creditors were universally desired. The draft resolution brought the international community one step closer to such a system and would allow the Member States to discuss related questions openly, with broad participation by financial institutions, intergovernmental organizations, academia and civil society.

14. **Mr. Narang** (India) said that while the international community had long recognized the significance of sovereign debt issues, especially in the context of development, it had struggled to find a structured solution. The Monterrey Consensus encouraged the consideration of ways to resolve the issue in a timely and efficient manner. The issue had also been under consideration in the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Paris Club and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing had also noted the importance of addressing sovereign debt, including by enhancing the existing architecture.

15. In the light of the post-2015 development agenda, the opportunity provided by General Assembly resolution 68/304 was a timely one. It mandated the elaboration of a multilateral legal sovereign debt restructuring framework. The exact contours of that framework would be determined during the substantive negotiations. The draft resolution was procedural, aiming to put in place organizational modalities for the negotiation process to fulfil the mandate of resolution 68/304, which focused on the substantive issues.

16. The General Assembly had long called for a more structured framework for international cooperation on sovereign debt restructuring. With its unique legitimacy, it should make use of the upcoming negotiations to contribute meaningfully to strengthening such international cooperation.

17. **Mr. Mahmoud** (Egypt) said that the issue of sovereign debt restructuring must be addressed to ensure the realization of the post-2015 development framework. The international community should examine options for an effective, equitable, durable, independent and development-oriented debt restructuring mechanism. Through General Assembly resolution 68/304, Member States had mandated the General Assembly to create a multilateral legal framework for sovereign debt restructuring, committing it to agree on modalities for open intergovernmental negotiations on a sovereign debt restructuring framework by the end of 2014. Broad support for the resolution had reflected widespread dissatisfaction with the current financial architecture. The issue was of major concern to countries at all levels of development.

18. The draft resolution would change the way future debt crises were managed, bridging a significant gap in the international financial architecture. The General Assembly was the most inclusive forum and hence the right place for such decision-making. The draft resolution was in the interest of all countries.

19. **Mr. Elnor** (Sudan) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution out of a belief that it would provide the opportunity for developing countries to enhance financing for development and increase predictability in the financial system. It would also lead to a preventive framework to avert financial crises and decrease legal disputes around commercial debts, a problem for many developing countries.

20. The legal framework should be adopted through the United Nations. Other institutions, especially those whose policies had in the past exacerbated the economic situation in developing countries, should not be involved. The United Nations was the proper forum for such consultations to put an end to speculation and enable countries to safely resolve the problem of debts.

21. Addressing the issue within the context of the United Nations would help to prevent political considerations and interests from coming into play. It would provide strong support by the international

community for developing countries, which had struggled to achieve the Millennium Development Goals because of debt, high rates of poverty and economic deterioration.

22. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

23. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her Government remained committed to the stability of the international financial system as well as the development of its partners around the world, for which financing was crucial. Access to functioning debt markets enabled developing countries to make the infrastructure investments needed to diversify their economies and expand productive capacity. In that context, her delegation regretted that it was obliged to vote against the draft resolution on both substantive and procedural grounds, as it had a number of objections to it.

24. Her Government could not support the creation of a multilateral legal framework for sovereign debt restructuring as set out in the draft resolution, since work on that technically complex issue was already ongoing in other, more appropriate forums, including at IMF or within non-governmental bodies like the International Capital Market Association. The draft resolution would also entail the deployment of significant United Nations system resources for matters already being dealt with effectively in other international institutions. It was regrettable that time and money were being spent on a duplicative process, when there were other urgent priorities on the shared agenda.

25. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.4/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana,

Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.4/Rev.1 was adopted by 128 votes to 16, with 34 abstentions.*

27. **Mr. Lasso Mendoza** (Ecuador) said that the lack of regulation of the financial system continued to enable a limited number of ill-intentioned investors to strangle countries' economies, affecting not only their development, but also the well-being of the vast majority of their population. All States were sovereign and had the right to decide how to restructure their own debt in an orderly and sustainable way, and the

obligation to defend their population's interests and well-being.

28. General Assembly resolution 68/304 was an important step forward in setting out a clear mandate for modalities for intergovernmental negotiations to be elaborated by the end of 2014.

29. While it was regrettable that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus, Member States had voiced their positions, demonstrating the need for thorough reflection and continued constructive work on the matter. He urged Member States to establish a multilateral regulatory framework for sovereign debt restructuring processes.

30. **Ms. Piccioni** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that sovereign debt restructuring was an important matter which affected all countries, and creditors and debtors alike. Nevertheless, the European Union and its member States had not been in a position to support the draft resolution. Although they had made significant efforts and engaged in the consultation process in good faith, regrettably all the substantive proposals they had made to help move the process forward had been rejected, and action had been taken on a draft text which closely resembled the original draft submitted at the outset of the Committee's discussions on the matter.

31. IMF was the primary forum for discussing sovereign debt restructuring issues, as its work enjoyed widespread support and involved extensive consultation with both issuers and creditors. In that connection, the market-based voluntary contractual approach undertaken in discussions within the IMF Executive Board had recently been endorsed and the use of collective action clauses in sovereign bond contracts had become the market norm.

32. Any participation by the European Union and its member States in discussions relating to General Assembly resolution 68/304 would be dependent on a number of conditions. The ad hoc committee must be limited to the elaboration of a non-binding set of principles that built on a market-based, voluntary contractual approach to sovereign debt restructuring and aimed at furthering its implementation and use. Neither the European Union nor its member States would participate in discussions aiming at the establishment of a binding multilateral legal framework for sovereign debt restructuring processes.

33. Further, the ad hoc committee should reflect the recent and ongoing work on sovereign debt restructuring undertaken by IMF, in close coordination with and with technical support from IMF. Discussions should also make reference to the work in other forums on those issues, such as the Paris Club, which had a history of discussing sovereign debt restructuring issues. IMF, the Paris Club and its forum meeting of sovereign creditors and debtors to discuss debt restructuring were the appropriate place to identify multilateral solutions and reach consensus.

34. **Ms. Miyano** (Japan) said that her delegation had voted against the draft resolution because other forums, including IMF, were better suited to tackling the technical aspects of sovereign debt restructuring and involved the participation of all relevant stakeholders, and also because of the significant cost burden involved.

35. **Mr. Olguín Cigarroa** (Chile) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which would contribute to the stability of the international financial system. Regional and international efforts must be made to advance the restructuring of sovereign debt, which was intrinsically linked to sustainable development. Adoption of the draft resolution was a step in the right direction and paved the way for the third International Conference on Financing for Development, to be held in Addis Ababa, in July 2015, and in the elaboration of the post-2015 development agenda. It also demonstrated solidarity with developing countries, whose development had been impeded inter alia by the lack of a multilateral framework on debt restructuring.

36. **Mr. De Lara Rangel** (Mexico) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution, which was procedural in nature, did not affect its position on the substance of General Assembly resolution 68/304.

37. **Mr. Neelam** (Australia) said that despite his delegation's efforts to find common ground on the crucial issue of sovereign debt management, the resulting draft had not reflected a multilateral compromise: his delegation had therefore voted against the draft resolution. The international community must continue to find ways to restructure debt, including through existing mechanisms such as through IMF and the Paris Club. His delegation would continue to work in that context and to encourage relevant outreach with

all relevant stakeholders, including creditors and debtors.

38. **Mr. Neo** (Singapore) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution, in line with its support for General Assembly 68/304. Nevertheless, it remained concerned that the United Nations might not be the best venue to address such matters; financial institutions such as IMF were much more so, owing to their mandates and expertise, and because they were already addressing sovereign debt restructuring. It was hoped that an amicable and durable solution could be found, with the active participation of the financial centres of all countries, including the United States, and on the basis of consensus, including within the General Assembly.

Draft resolution on external debt sustainability and development (A/C.2/69/L.3)

39. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.3 had no programme budget implications.

40. **Mr. Llorenty Solíz** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said it was regrettable that consensus had not been reached on the draft resolution, which emphasized the particular importance of a timely, effective, comprehensive and durable solution to the debt problems of developing countries in order to promote their economic growth and development. During the negotiations and four informal meetings on the draft resolution, the Group of 77 and China had been available for constructive discussion on issues covered by the draft resolution, and had presented a straightforward, procedural text, which had always garnered consensus in the past.

41. External debt was one of the main obstacles to development, economic growth and poverty eradication. The adoption of General Assembly resolution 68/304, which set out modalities for intergovernmental negotiations and the adoption of a multilateral regulatory framework for sovereign debt restructuring processes, had been crucial for that reason. External debt sustainability and development was an area in which the role of the United Nations must continue to be strengthened. In that respect, he urged Member States to continue to participate constructively and resolutely in all matters related to the draft resolution.

42. **The Chair** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

43. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation was unable to support a draft resolution that defied longstanding practice in the Committee by including a reference to a different voted resolution. She recalled that a voted resolution should only be noted in its successor resolution. Such a deviation from procedural norms could undermine trust between delegations and risked undercutting the Committee's ability to reach consensus on other resolutions in the future. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution. She hoped that all delegations would respect the usual practice in future resolutions on debt sustainability, and that future draft resolutions would be restored to the traditional consensus text.

44. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.3.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab

Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, 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, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

45. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.3 was adopted by 128 votes to 4, with 46 abstentions.*

46. **Ms. Miyano** (Japan) said that her Government was committed to working constructively on the substantive matter of debt sustainability and development, and respected the Committee's established practices and rules of procedure. It was thus regrettable that the draft resolution referred to a voted resolution of a different nature, a procedural issue over which her delegation had raised its concern during informal consultations. Her delegation had voted against the draft resolution, and hoped that consensus could be reached on the draft resolution the following year.

47. **Ms. Mejía Vélez** (Colombia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as the matter of debt sustainability and development continued to be crucial to countries such as Colombia, and should also be part the effective support provided towards implementing a renewed global partnership for development in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. She recalled that the subject would be discussed at the third International Conference on Financing for Development in 2015. The Group of 77 and China had shown significant flexibility in facilitating discussions on the draft

resolution, and it was regrettable that it had not been approved by consensus.

Agenda Item 19: Sustainable development
(*continued*) (A/69/314)

(b) Follow-up to and Implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*) (A/C.2/69/L.24 and A/C.2/69/L.53)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to and Implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (A/C.2/69/L.24 and A/C.2/69/L.53)

48. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.53, submitted by Ms. Francis (Bahamas), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.24.

49. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.53 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, drew attention to paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, pursuant to which the request for an addendum to the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its seventieth session, to be entitled "Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States", would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of one pre-session document, to be issued in all six languages in 2016. That would entail additional requirements in the amount of \$50,900 for documentation services in 2016. Accordingly, should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly, that additional requirement under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, would be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.53 was adopted.*

51. **Ms. Strickland-Simonet** (Samoa) said she hoped that the collaborative spirit shown by Member States during negotiations would continue as the Committee embarked upon the next crucial step, which was implementation of the outcome document of the third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS), held in Samoa in September 2014. She requested the Secretariat to ensure that any reference made to that outcome document, entitled the “SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway”, whether in the present resolution or any other relevant resolution, should be made consistent with the title that had been adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 69/15.

52. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus demonstrated the importance that all attached to issues affecting small island States and to implementation of the SAMOA Pathway. As to the budget implications, in the light of the timing and relatively low cost of the report mandated in the draft resolution, she wondered whether that cost might not be absorbed in the 2016-2017 biennium, without a request for additional resources.

53. **Mr. Mikami** (Japan) said that his delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, but noted that the statement of programme budget implications was not binding since the costs associated with the draft resolution should be considered under the budget of the subsequent biennium.

54. **Ms. Kolozetti** (Canada) said that her delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, but underlined that the figures presented by the Secretariat were only estimates and would still require input from the Fifth Committee.

55. **Ms. Klaus** (Observer for the European Union) said that the estimates presented in the oral statement drafted by the Programme Planning and Budget Division did not prejudice the Secretary-General’s submission to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee of the proposed budget for the 2016-2017 biennium, nor could they be considered as requirements under the draft resolution just adopted. The estimates presented should thus not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States. In addition, in the light of the sum involved for the

document entailing budget implications and the fact that said document would not be issued until 2016, it was expected that the Secretariat should be able to absorb the costs of issuing the addendum to an existing report.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.24 was withdrawn.*

57. **The Chair** took it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Secretary-General entitled “Towards the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations” (A/69/314).

58. *It was so decided.*

(h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)
(A/C.2/69/L.34 and A/C.2/69/L.63)

Draft resolutions on harmony with nature
(A/C.2/69/L.34 and A/C.2/69/L.63)

59. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.63, submitted by Ms. Francis (Bahamas), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.34. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.63 was adopted.*

61. **Mr. Lasso Mendoza** (Ecuador) said that it was only through an open, proactive discussion and exchange of national experiences that the international community could gradually develop a model for sustainable development that was in harmony with nature and with Mother Earth. In that respect, all stakeholders, including civil society and academia, were invited to participate in an interactive dialogue scheduled to take place in April 2015 to commemorate International Mother Earth Day.

62. **Ms. Vilaseca Chumacero** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), speaking in her national capacity, recalled that sustainable development in harmony with nature was one of the basic pillars of her country’s sustainable development policy. The model of harmony with nature should be part of the elaboration of the post-2015 development agenda. Only holistic and integrated approaches to sustainable development could guide humanity towards a good life in harmony with nature.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/69/L.34 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence *(continued)*

(a) International migration and development *(continued)* (A/C.2/69/L.32 and A/C.2/69/L.61)

Draft resolutions on international migration and development (A/C.2/69/L.32 and A/C.2/69/L.61)

64. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.61](#), submitted by Ms. Francis (Bahamas), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.32](#).

65. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.61](#) in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, drew attention to paragraph 32 of the text, in which the General Assembly decided to hold a High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development no later than 2019 at United Nations Headquarters in New York to review the follow-up to the outcome of the second High-level Dialogue and advance the discussion on the multidimensional aspects of international migration, decided that the date and modalities of the Dialogue would be decided upon at its seventy-first session, and also decided to hold such dialogues to continue reviewing the follow-up to previous high-level dialogues on international migration and development at regular intervals. The General Assembly would decide on the periodicity of the high-level dialogues at its seventy-first session, taking into account alignment with all relevant United Nations Development review processes.

66. Pursuant to the decisions contained in paragraph 32, it was understood that all issues pertaining to the high-level dialogues, including the date, format, organization and scope, were yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the High-level Dialogue and the periodicity of subsequent dialogues, it was not possible at the present time to estimate the potential costs implications of the requirements for meetings, documentation and substantive support. Upon the decision on the modalities, format and organization of the dialogues, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs of such requirements in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Furthermore, the dates of the high-level dialogues would have to be determined in consultation with the

Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

67. Accordingly, adoption of draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.61](#) would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget.

68. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.61](#) was adopted.*

69. **Mr. Lasso Mendoza** (Ecuador) said that countries of origin and destination should guarantee rights and freedom of human mobility and residence and incorporate in their policies the potential of migration for human development, well-being, interculturality, inclusion and coexistence. The establishment of universal citizenship would be a step forward in that regard. Furthermore, the resolution of differences on migration could be achieved only through open, frank dialogue. Adoption of the draft resolution was an important step towards inclusion of migration in the multilateral agenda. Regular high-level dialogues would improve the situation and quality of life of all migrants. The international community was beginning to pay off a debt to migrants that had been outstanding for years.

70. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that the United States had a long history of welcoming immigrants and refugees and highly valued orderly, legal and humane migration. Her country was profoundly committed to ending racism and racial discrimination and remained fully committed to upholding the human rights of all people and combating racial discrimination, xenophobia, intolerance and bigotry. Paragraph 22, which was intended to urge States to take measures to prevent violent hate crimes against migrants or other criminal acts of hostility, such as threats or intimidation, should not in any way be misinterpreted to inhibit freedom to express policy views or even hateful, repugnant attitudes or philosophies. It must be interpreted in the light of robust international legal protections for freedom of expression.

71. **Ms. Moya** (Colombia) said that adoption of the draft resolution on international migration and development represented a coherent, comprehensive and balanced approach that placed importance on respect for the human rights of migrants, regardless of their migration situation. Migration was a global phenomenon, and it was necessary to overcome the fragmented, partial approach that had characterized it thus far.

72. Her delegation welcomed the mandate contained in the draft resolution for a third High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development to be held no later than 2019 and the decision to hold high-level dialogues at regular intervals. Human mobility was key to sustainable development, and freedom of movement was needed. Migration should therefore receive the necessary focus in the post-2015 development agenda.

73. *Draft resolution [A/C.2/69/L.32](#) was withdrawn.*

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.