United Nations A/60/PV.50

General Assembly

Sixtieth session

Official Records

50th plenary meeting
Friday, 11 November 2005, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Eliasson . . . . . (Sweden)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Diarra (Mali) took the Chair.

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

Agenda items 9 and 117 *(continued)*

Report of the Security Council (A/60/2)

Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters

Mr. Oshima (Japan): We condemn terrorism in all its forms, whenever and wherever it occurs. Please allow me at the outset to express Japan's sympathy and deep condolences to the families of the victims and to the people and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in connection with the recent tragedy caused by the heinous terrorist attacks in Amman.

As we intensify our efforts on some critical issues in the implementation of the 2005 World Summit Outcome, such as the Peacebuilding Commission, the Human Rights Council, and management reform, under the strong and able leadership of Mr. Eliasson, my delegation looks forward to seeing him demonstrate the same leadership in guiding us on another major issue, that of reform of the Security Council, further building on what was achieved under his predecessor, Foreign Minister Jean Ping of Gabon, during the previous session.

My delegation wishes also to acknowledge with thanks the tireless efforts and important contributions made by Ambassadors Paulette Bethel of the Bahamas and Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein, as co-Vice-Chairpersons of the Open-ended Working Group.

My delegation attaches great importance to this joint debate on the two items under consideration — the annual report on the activities of the Security Council and reform of the Security Council — as it provides a timely and useful opportunity to reflect on the way forward on the key issues involved here, namely the Security Council's structural reform and improvement of its working methods.

First, I wish to touch briefly on the annual report that was presented by Ambassador Andrey Denisov of the Russian Federation, the President of the Council, to whom I wish to express our appreciation. Japan, as a serving member on the Council for this year and next, welcomes the report. The report covers the full range of the Council's activities, which have become increasingly diverse and complex, reflecting the new challenges facing today's world in the area of peace and security.

Since Japan has the honour to serve as the Chair of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations established within the Council, I wish to add a few words to supplement the section dealing with peacekeeping operations. As the report succinctly states, the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations has been trying to be more proactive in its work in order to ensure a more focused debate and closer

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-59974 (E)

0559974

attention to key issues through, first, more frequent meetings with troop-contributing countries, major financial contributors and other stakeholders to improve cooperation and understanding among key actors; secondly, timely and focused debates on certain thematic issues of major concern, such as sexual exploitation and abuse in the context of specific United Nations peacekeeping missions; and, thirdly, improved information-sharing and coordination of work between the Council's Working Group and the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to achieve the complementary relationship that should exist between the two bodies. This is very much a work in progress, and I intend to follow it through with the cooperation of all those actively involved in the work of peacekeeping operations.

I might mention in this connection that I have just concluded a field mission, in my capacity as Chairman of the Working Group and with the backing of the Council, to Ethiopia and Eritrea. I met with the representatives of the mission deployed there — the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) — and the troop-contributing countries, as well as military commanders, in order to be apprised firsthand of the worrisome situation that is developing along the border. I am reporting my findings back to the Council and its Working Group.

Reform of the Security Council, in terms of expanding its membership and improving its working methods, is long overdue. World leaders recognized that fact in their Millennium Declaration five years ago, and they have done so again this year in a clearer and more definitive way in the outcome document.

As we are repeatedly reminded, the challenges that today face the United Nations as a whole and the Security Council in particular are vastly different from those of 1945. The basic structure and composition of the Security Council, however, essentially continues to reflect the world as it was 60 years ago. To be effective, it must be changed to better reflect the realities of today's world. In recognition of this, our leaders affirmed, at the world summit in September, that early reform of the Security Council is an essential element of our overall efforts to reform the United Nations. The primordial task for Member States now is to act and deliver on that conviction in the form of concrete solutions.

First, we have advocated the expansion of the Security Council to reflect the realities of the twenty-first century, with the inclusion, on a permanent basis, of Member States that have the manifest will and real capacity to take on a major role in the maintenance of international peace and security. That position has come to be shared by a large number of Member States. This must happen if the Security Council is to remain effective and relevant. Few disagree with the logic and rationale for such action. In 1946, for example, approximately 70 per cent of the budget resources required by the Organization came from the Permanent Five members, which thus provided a solid power base for making decisions and ensuring that those decisions would be implemented effectively.

In 2005, by contrast, that percentage has declined to only about 37 per cent of the Organization's current regular budget and to about 45 per cent of its peacekeeping operations budget. This significant shift in the balance of power and resources — among other factors — calls for and justifies an expansion of the Council's membership that will truly enhance the effectiveness of its collective action. Expansion will also have to be carried out in ways that will maintain the efficiency of the Council's work.

Secondly, and no less important, improving the working methods of the Security Council has been an important concern for all Member States, small and large, and that too must be addressed. We acknowledge and welcome certain progress made in recent years in the Security Council, but more needs to be done. To that end, we believe that three things must go together.

First, the General Assembly has a legitimate role in seeking improvement of the Council's working methods, as it has indeed tried to do for more than a decade through the Open-ended Working Group that it established under resolution 48/26. Unfortunately, those deliberations have so far failed to produce tangible, agreed results. The time has come, however, to exert real effort to harvest what can now be harvested in that regard. At the same time, we must effect changes in the Council's composition, demonstrating our collective pragmatism and flexibility in the pursuit of our common commitment.

Another key factor related to achieving improvement in the Security Council's working methods is the direct responsibility of the Council itself. As master of its own rules and procedures under

the provisions of the Charter, the Council is responsible for any decision in that area. That being recognized, we believe that the Council is expected to act and to do more in response to the concerns of a large portion of the General Assembly membership. In that regard, reactivation of the Council's informal working group on documentation and other procedural questions should be considered, among other measures, as a step towards achieving improvement in its working methods. All members of the Council must be engaged on this matter, but we expect greater responsiveness and activism from the five permanent members because of their special role and the responsibility incumbent upon them by reason of their permanent status and the privileges and influence associated with it.

Thirdly, we believe that an expansion of the Council's membership, particularly of the permanent category, would also be a relevant and important — albeit indirect — factor in bringing about changes and improvements in the Council's working methods, including by breathing new life into its modus operandi, because its impact would no doubt be felt.

With regard to changing the structure and composition of the Security Council, we believe that we achieved quite significant progress during the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly, as partly reflected in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*). Particularly noteworthy is the fact that for the first time in the Organization's history, several draft resolutions were submitted to the Assembly calling for significant changes in the Council's composition.

The group of four countries — Brazil, Germany, India and Japan — supported by many other sponsors, submitted a draft resolution (*A/59/L.64*) on Security Council reform that includes expansion in the permanent and the non-permanent categories. That effort, together with other subsequent actions — including, notably, by the African States — has created a momentum in the General Assembly in New York and in world capitals for fundamental structural reform of the Security Council on a scale unprecedented in recent United Nations history.

The efforts made by the group of four and the other sponsors enjoyed the broad support of Member States, and we would like to take this opportunity to express once again Japan's heartfelt appreciation to those who have supported our efforts. I wish in particular to express, on behalf of my Government, our sincere thanks to all those countries that have expressed their support for a permanent seat for Japan.

The momentum thus created has not gone away; it has sustained itself and now demands a concrete outcome. That will be our new task in the next stage of the process in which we now find ourselves following the world summit. In this second stage, building on the momentum created at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly, we need to look beyond the fact that none of the draft resolutions submitted last session was put to a vote, and seek a solution that can command broader support than has been possible thus far.

There are those who want to conclude that Security Council reform is over. They are mistaken. Reform is a process, and it moves in a continuum, step by step. That is particularly true with regard to such a sensitive, challenging endeavour as reform of the Council that tries to address fundamental changes in its composition. No effort should be spared to move this arduous process forward.

Japan is determined to continue to work, on the basis of the building blocks already laid down and in cooperation with all interested States, to move the process forward and to arrive at a solution that is broadly acceptable to the membership. For the first time in United Nations history, there is a real prospect that bold action can result in a concrete solution during the present session of the General Assembly, along with agreement on other, larger United Nations reform issues. That will no doubt require greater activism, realism, innovation and imagination on the part of all individual States and groups of States interested in the matter. We call upon all Member States to take an early decision on Security Council reform within the current session of the General Assembly. As Prime Minister Koizumi stated at the 2005 world summit, "Let us all unite in an endeavour to make this session of the General Assembly a session for action: action to achieve the comprehensive renewal of the United Nations" (*A/60/PV.6, p. 36*).

In closing, we would like to reiterate that Japan will spare no effort to achieve the goal of overall United Nations reform. We look forward to working hard towards that goal, under the strong leadership of

the President, during this historic session of the General Assembly.

Mr. Faaborg-Andersen (Denmark): I thank the President for convening this meeting of the General Assembly. I would like to express my delegation's gratitude for his strong effort to push forward the United Nations reform agenda.

Denmark believes that the composition of the Security Council must reflect the world as it looks today. Facing the challenges of the twenty-first century requires the enhanced legitimacy, credibility and effectiveness for the Council's work.

The present composition of the Security Council is a reflection of a world that no longer exists. If the Council is to continue to play a decisive role in the promotion of peace, security, human rights and democracy, broader representation is needed. In recent months, a broad majority of Member States have demonstrated clear support for reform and expansion of the Security Council. Furthermore, the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*) sets out a specific task for us to carry out in that regard.

When it comes to Council reform, we are not starting from scratch. It is not a clean-slate situation: there are certain given facts. Among them is that the Council consists of both permanent and non-permanent members and that the permanent members have certain privileges, most notably the veto power.

In our view, it is not realistic — and perhaps not even desirable — to attempt to change those basic attributes of the Council. They are, after all, no small part of the reason why the Council has survived and played a significant role during the past 60 years. Instead, our efforts should be aimed at levelling the playing field in the Council by ensuring a better overall balance in both categories of membership among countries from various geographical regions having different levels of economic development.

There can be no denying that permanent membership confers considerable advantages: better institutional memory, greater mastery of the game, et cetera. As a current non-permanent member of the Security Council, Denmark can certainly testify to that. Adding additional permanent members, particularly from the developing countries, will thus ensure a more level playing field. That having been said, we see no reason why there should be an expansion in the number of veto-carrying permanent members.

It is for those reasons that Denmark has for many years been supporting a model of expansion according to which both the number of non-veto-carrying permanent members and the number of non-permanent seats in the Council would be increased, and both developing and developed countries would hold seats as permanent members. That basic approach was reflected in the proposal of the group of four countries, which we sponsored. We still believe that that proposal is the only one that will be able to gather broad support among the membership.

The reform of the Security Council goes far beyond the question of the expansion of the membership. It is also very much a matter of addressing issues concerning the working methods and operation of the Council. There is a need for more transparency and inclusiveness in the work of the Security Council vis-à-vis the general membership; a large measure of agreement on practical steps in that direction has already been achieved in the Open-ended Working Group.

Another aspect of reform relates to the need for change in the organization of work within the Council itself, including rationalization of the way in which the Council conducts its deliberations, et cetera. Such reform measures are long overdue and, simply put, are an imperative if an expanded Security Council is to be able to work efficiently.

A comprehensive reform approach that covers both enlargement and working methods is needed, and we should not attempt to deal with those issues sequentially or separately in a piecemeal manner. Much is at stake, and we all share the same goal: the need for a stronger and more efficient United Nations.

The issue of Security Council reform has been on the agenda for more than 12 years. The time for reflection is over and the time for action has arrived. It is our responsibility to send a clear message to the world saying that we want a stronger United Nations, capable of addressing the new threats and challenges that the world is facing today.

Ms. Hřebíčková (Czech Republic): I should like first of all to express sincere sympathy and condolences, on behalf of the Czech people and the Czech Government, to the people and the Government

of Jordan in connection with the terrorist attacks that took place the day before yesterday in Amman. We condemn terrorism in all its forms.

We probably all agree that the reform and expansion of the Security Council is long overdue. Such reform — which would make the Security Council a more representative, transparent and efficient body — has been rightly seen as a key element of overall United Nations reform; a wave of hope in that regard was generated in the course of the preparations for this year's United Nations summit.

However, the issue proved to be too difficult to be resolved as part of the summit outcome, despite the fact that we were closer than ever to finding a reasonable approach, one which would garner broad support in the General Assembly, an option second best to a — clearly elusive — consensus.

Our views on Security Council reform are well known. The Czech Republic has consistently supported enlargement of the Security Council in both categories of membership — that is, in the permanent member category as well as in the elected member category. That naturally places us in the camp of supporters of the draft resolution presented earlier this year by the group of four countries. There are a number of reasons for that. The key one for the Czech Republic is that the group seeks to substantively enhance the representation of developing countries. We continue to believe that that proposal offers a viable model for the Council's expansion — a model that still has the potential to gain the support of the required majority of Member States.

As we undertake efforts to expand the Council, we should not lose sight of reform in the area of working methods. In this context, we find the Swiss initiative and proposal to be very inspiring. However, owing to the complexity and sensitivity of these questions, including the possibility that they might interfere with other reform issues, it seems that further careful consideration of the proposal is necessary. The Czech Republic and the Czech delegation is ready to take part in that effort too.

Mr. Dabbashi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like at the outset to express our heartfelt condolences to the Government and the brotherly people of Jordan in connection with the terrorist attacks that took place in Amman two days ago.

I would like to express our support for the statement made by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the Group of African States.

Developing countries have understood for many decades that there is an imbalance in the Security Council membership, and have worked since the 1970s to redress the imbalance, including through the inclusion of this item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session, in 1979. However, the powers that be, which are interested in maintaining the status quo, did not allow the General Assembly to consider the item seriously until the forty-seventh session, in 1992. In 1993, the General Assembly adopted resolution 48/26, by which it established an Open-ended Working Group to consider the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council.

However, as we all know, the efforts of the Working Group came to a dead end as a result of privileged Council members' insistence on keeping their privileges. When we speak of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, we should seriously consider all the factors that affect the performance of the Security Council and prevent it from carrying out its mandate to maintain international peace and security, in particular the right of veto, which only the permanent Council members enjoy.

None of us can deny that the current situation in the Security Council is a result of the outcome of the Second World War. It is a situation that was imposed on the entire international community by the victors in that war. They controlled the Security Council and made it the predominant body, inequitable, imbalanced and lacking democracy, where the right of veto is abused and where international problems are dealt with selectively and in a discriminatory way. In most cases, aggressors are protected and granted impunity, while sanctions are unjustly imposed on countries that do nothing to deserve them, for no other reason than that their policies do not serve the interests of some of those privileged members of the Council. Because of the veto power, the United Nations has been unable to uphold justice among peoples. Reform of the Security Council has thus become more urgent than ever.

The African continent has suffered the most as a result of the arrangements put in place following the Second World War, including the establishment of the

Security Council, from which most of the countries of the continent, then under colonialist Powers and racism, were completely excluded. Now that African countries have attained their independence, having made incredible sacrifices and after long suffering, and since they constitute one fourth of the international community represented in the United Nations, they must have justice. They deserve recognition of their rights and they deserve redress of the historic injustice they have endured, through an opportunity for equitable representation in the Security Council. Equitable representation for the African continent means it must have permanent membership of the Council, just as other continents do. Even without comprehensive reform of the Security Council, the African continent should also be granted a number of non-permanent seats commensurate with its number of Members of the United Nations.

Libya, as a member of the African Union, holds firm in its support for the unified African position taken at the fifth ordinary session of the Assembly of the African Union, held in Sirte, Libya, on 4 and 5 July 2005, a position reiterated in the two extraordinary summits of the African Union, held in Addis Ababa on 4 August and 31 October 2005. That African position stipulates that two permanent seats, with all the privileges — including, I stress, veto power — and five non-permanent seats, should be granted to Africa. We in Libya would prefer Africa's permanent seats to be allocated to the African Union rather than to any specific country, and to be rotated, as was decided at the African summit held in Harare in 1997.

The African continent does not wish and will not accept to be the loser in whatever arrangements are made regarding the increase in Security Council membership. The African continent has a right to all the privileges enjoyed by other continents. The equation here is very simple: either all have privileges or no one has privileges, and by this I mean in particular the veto power. When veto power in the Security Council is abolished, that will be the beginning of genuine reform of the Security Council and of the United Nations as a whole.

Although we recognize that the Security Council has achieved some success in making peace and preventing conflicts, particularly in Africa, we are disappointed and frustrated by the Council's inability so far to adopt any measure to protect the Palestinian people from suffering at the hands of the occupying Power, or to assist the Palestinian people in regaining their territories and enable them to achieve their inalienable rights, particularly the right of return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State of their own throughout their territory.

Mr. Salgueiro (Portugal): I would like to extend my Government's and my own most sincere condolences to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and to its people on the loss of life and the casualties that resulted from the horrendous terrorist acts in Amman.

I would like to start by thanking the President for convening this very timely meeting. We are halfway between the September High-level Plenary Meeting and the end of the year, when we will have to review progress on the crucial issue of Security Council reform.

During the last session of the General Assembly, and for the first time since the establishment of the Open-ended Working Group more than 10 years ago, three draft resolutions were submitted on the question of Security Council reform. Besides that, a number of States have put forward concrete ideas on this issue. All this is an indication that the need for Security Council reform is widely acknowledged in this Assembly. This was confirmed at the September summit by our heads of State or Government, who considered "early reform of the Security Council [to be] an essential element of our overall effort to reform the United Nations" (*resolution 60/1, para. 153*).

As is well known to the Assembly, Portugal was a sponsor of draft resolution A/59/L.64, submitted earlier this year by the group of four countries and others. We continue to stand by the principles of that draft resolution and to consider that reform along the lines laid out in it provides the best answer for adapting the Security Council and the United Nations to the twenty-first century.

Allow me once again to reiterate briefly our guiding principles on this important issue of Security Council reform. First, reform, in our opinion, must comprise concrete and ambitious proposals, both on the matter of enlargement and on that of working methods. We fully understand and accept that in many circumstances the Security Council needs to work with discretion. But the Council acts on behalf of the international community, and we all have to feel that we have a stake in its deliberations. The fact is that a

working culture for which the Charter did not provide has developed over the years in the relationship between the Security Council and the membership at large, as well as with the Secretariat. This working culture has been an object of criticism. We believe that a decisive improvement in this situation demands action through joint structural and working-methods reforms. Expansion and working methods are two sides of the same coin.

Secondly, enlargement should take place in the existing two categories of permanent and non-permanent members, providing for more and better representativity of the wider membership in the Security Council. That would pave the way for an increased presence by developing countries in both categories and would allow Africa to accede to permanent membership. In addition, preserving the impediment to the immediate re-election of non-permanent members would guarantee a chance of accession to the Council for the vast majority of the United Nations membership, comprising more than 100 small and medium-sized States.

Concerning the question of the veto, our long-standing position is that the requirement for concurring votes — established in Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter — should not be expanded beyond the current permanent members of the Security Council.

Finally, Portugal believes that, whatever reforms we may carry out at present, a review exercise should be conducted at a specified time in the future — for example, within 15 years — in order to assess the merits of those reforms and their impact on the work of the Organization.

I would like to conclude by expressing the hope that by the end of the year, we will be in a position to report concrete progress on Security Council reform. It is my firm belief that reasonable, clear and democratic reform is likely to gather sufficient support in the General Assembly. A Security Council that reflects the realities of today's world would bring a new momentum to the work of the Organization.

Mrs. Papadopoulou (Greece): Please allow me at the outset to express my country's deep condolences to the people and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as well as to the families of the victims of the tragedy caused by the horrendous terrorist attacks in Amman. Greece condemns terrorism in all its forms, whenever and wherever it occurs.

Heads of State or Government, at their summit last September, agreed that there is a need for reform of the United Nations to make it reflect the realities of today's world. Reform has been discussed for the past 12 years in a Working Group specifically created for that purpose. In the past 12 months, further extensive debate has been under way within the United Nations as well as in academic and political circles, in non-governmental organizations and in the media.

With specific regard to Security Council reform, three draft resolutions have been submitted (A/59/L.64, L.67 and L.68), and it is clear that consensus — although highly desirable — is extremely difficult to achieve. That having been said, we believe that insisting at this stage on taking a decision by consensus on this particular issue would only perpetuate the current impasse. In our national parliaments, decisions are made every day on serious — indeed, crucial — issues without consensus.

In all our previous statements on this issue, we have clearly expressed our support for the principles set out in draft resolution A/59/L.64, which we joined in sponsoring. In our view, that approach to the problem is the most realistic one. Expanding the number of permanent and non-permanent members is essential to achieve balance in the Security Council. It would increase the Council's accountability and transparency, enhancing its multicultural and multidimensional character and making it more representative of the world we live in. It would strengthen the Council's credibility and legitimacy and therefore its effectiveness.

In order to effectively face today's serious global threats and challenges, the United Nations — in particular the Security Council — must be urgently reformed and modernized. If we want the Organization to continue to play a crucial and decisive role in the twenty-first century, decisions on these matters cannot be further delayed. This is a time for action, and we must not lose the current momentum.

Mr. Loizaga (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Permit me at the outset to express, on behalf of the people and the Government of Paraguay, our heartfelt condolences to the people and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on the criminal terrorist attacks committed on Wednesday in Amman, which claimed the lives of innocent civilians. We condemn

such cowardly criminal acts, which have no justification whatsoever.

This plenary meeting is devoted to considering agenda items 9 and 117, which refer both to the report of the Security Council (*A/60/2*) and to the report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters related to the Security Council (*A/59/47*).

With regard to the report of the Council, my delegation acknowledges that progress has been made in its presentation but believes that it should be improved further, given the substantial increase in the Council's agenda. That would enable Member States and international public opinion alike to analyse and substantively assess the Council's work and to understand the basis of the decisions taken. We also believe that an interactive General Assembly debate on the report between members and non-members of the Council would strengthen the Organization.

We make that observation because, in our view, Member States' consideration of the report should not be limited to a mere formality, but rather should be a reaffirmation of the Assembly's responsibility for issues of fundamental importance for the entire membership of the Organization. Member States have the right and the duty to be familiar with and fully analyse the Council's work, because the Council acts on behalf of everyone under the mandate entrusted to it in the Charter of the Organization.

Moreover, we should like to highlight the progress made in the open meetings held by the Security Council in recent years, which have enabled non-members to express to the Council their points of view on topics of general interest and great importance. However, Member States very often feel that their views are not taken into account when decisions are taken. In addition, we wish to express once again our delegation's concern at the legislative role being played by the Security Council, to the detriment of the General Assembly's authority.

In the outcome document of the recent world summit, our heads of State or Government devoted a special section to the Security Council, in which they expressed their support for

> "early reform of the Security Council — an essential element of our overall effort to reform the United Nations — in order to make it more broadly representative, efficient and transparent and thus to further enhance its effectiveness and the legitimacy and implementation of its decisions". (*resolution 60/1, para. 153*)

Paraguay has therefore been carefully following initiatives to reform the Security Council both with regard to its composition and to its working methods, because our Organization is an instrument of the international community which must evolve and adapt itself to the realities of the new century.

The Republic of Paraguay reiterates its position in favour of an increase in the number of Security Council members. It is essential that in effecting such an increase we take into account today's political reality and the increase in the number of States Members of the Organization.

In order to bring about a Security Council that is more democratic and representative, we must enlarge both categories of members — permanent and non-permanent — and must include both developed and developing countries, taking into consideration the fact that the latter are underrepresented in that important organ. The increase in the number of Council members will make that body more representative and will thus give it greater legitimacy.

Likewise, as a fundamental part of that reform, we should also study the right of veto. We should aspire to a gradual elimination of the veto until it disappears completely. As a first step, it should be strictly limited to matters under Chapter VII of the Charter. Likewise, we could also leave open the possibility of a periodic review of the reform, in order to analyse the functioning of the Security Council in the light of the needs and realities that arise.

My delegation also feels that due consideration should be given to any suggestion that will improve the working methods of the Security Council, make the Council more transparent and responsible and ensure greater participation by all Member States. For that reason, the proposal on the reform of the working methods of the Council circulated by the delegations of Costa Rica, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Singapore and Switzerland is an important contribution containing elements that will enhance the debate on that subject. Paraguay feels that enlargement of the Council and reform of its working methods must be addressed as one comprehensive package.

No reform of the United Nations will have the effect we all desire, without the long overdue reform of the Security Council. Until that occurs, we will not be able to speak of an Organization in step with the times in which we live and able to meet the aspirations and respond to the interests of the international community.

In conclusion, I would like to express the hope that this reform will not suffer the same fate as the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council. If those provisional rules of procedure were to be the measure of our hopes, we must ask ourselves whether it would be appropriate to wait another 60 years for reform.

Mrs. Silkalna (Latvia): May I begin by extending our deepest sympathies to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in connection with the horrific attacks on Amman two days ago.

My delegation welcomes this opportunity to revisit the question of Security Council reform. Over the past two months we have focused our efforts on those elements of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*) for which our leaders have set a time frame for concrete results. However, our heads of State and Government have also requested a stocktaking of progress towards Security Council reform before the end of this year. If we are to register any progress at all, our collective courage and will to act on this matter in the upcoming weeks will be of crucial importance.

As a sponsor of the Group of Four (G-4) proposal (*A/59/L.64*) that was submitted at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly, Latvia can reaffirm its support for the creation of both new permanent seats without right of veto, and non-permanent seats. We consider that the model of enlargement offered by the G-4 sufficiently meets the need for a more representative Security Council. It also widens the base of financial and other resources permanently available for the implementation and enforcement of Security Council decisions.

At the same time, we would encourage efforts by the Security Council to further adjust its working methods, in order to strengthen the relationship between the Security Council and the wider membership. Many delegations have already called for more transparency in the work of the Security Council, and we add our voice to that call. We also welcome the valuable contribution by Switzerland, Jordan, Singapore, Liechtenstein and Costa Rica in that direction. We see enlargement and working-method reform as complementary, equally important processes.

Security Council reform will clearly take time and patience, but substantial progress will never be made if we move at the current pace. Given that no consensus has been achieved in the past 12 years, how can we continue to delude ourselves and others that wide consensus will ever be possible on the question? We can debate for 12 more years and wait for miracles, or we can act decisively. We need not fear change if it is achieved with the tools of democracy. In a democratic organization such as the United Nations, a vote need not be divisive; it is a useful tool for reaching decisions and getting things done within a reasonable time span. The United Nations needs a modern, updated Security Council, the sooner the better.

Mr. Sen (India): First of all, let me begin by conveying our deepest condolences to Jordan on the tragic loss of life. It seems that the “heartache and the thousand natural shocks” have crossed all limits in our time. We shall certainly continue our stern and common struggle against terrorism.

I do not think that I will now rehash and repeat the old arguments and replay the old debates. I will begin by recalling a gentleman named Raymond Mikesell, who worked in the United States Treasury Department in the 1940s and who revealed in his memoir entitled *The Bretton Woods Debates* that he was asked — in fact instructed — to arrive at predetermined quotas by suitably adjusting statistics in order to ensure the overwhelming voting power and permanent presence of the big four: France, actually, was added later, after the antipathy to De Gaulle had been overcome. That was in fact also the process followed — he said in the book — in the creation of the United Nations which, together with the Bretton Woods institutions, was part of one plan. In fact, he notes that similarly the dominance and permanent presence of the big four in the United Nations was ensured. Incidentally, I would like to add that the quotas and the manner in which they were arrived at — were challenged by many delegations at that time, except of course for the delegation of Canada, which thought the mathematics was impeccable.

The point I am trying to make is that the political and economic order created in 1945 was a result of

those twin acts of gerrymandering. Therefore the concentration of political and economic power has to be transformed together to redress the balance in the interests of the developing countries.

Nobody wants to underestimate or to downplay the immense role that the victory of the big four played in the history of the world and for the world today. But at the same time it is very important to remember — or at least it would do no harm to sometimes remember — that soldiers from the colonies also contributed to that victory.

But for the post-Yalta and post-Potsdam world, Mahatama Gandhi's non-violent struggle against colonialism, involving hundreds of millions of people, played, I think, an equally important role, especially in terms of its impact, ranging from the anti-colonial and anti-apartheid struggles of Africa, through Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement in the United States, to Lech Walesa and the 10 million-strong Solidarity movement in Poland. And it is our contention that this struggle will not be completed until the defeated and the colonized of 1945 take their place as equal members in the decision-making councils of the United Nations, especially as permanent members of the Security Council.

The most powerful permanent member of the Security Council has talked of criteria. Another permanent member, in contradistinction to its own revolutionary tradition, has spoken of gradualism, the classical liberal doctrine. These remarks actually remind us of the old colonial argument — that you are not yet ready for independence, or that you should not enter this cricket club or that hospital because you do not belong to the ruling elite. Quite clearly, this is an argument that we cannot accept.

Similarly, the same most powerful permanent member has said that we should not revisit the old debates and has therefore opposed the reintroduction of the three proposals on reform introduced at the Assembly's fifty-ninth session. In fact it added, if I recall rightly, that we bit off more than we could chew. Unless one's reach exceeds one's grasp, how is one going to reform anything? Certainly we object to being either bitten or chewed. Ours is the old democratic objection to one country being chewed by another; it is based entirely on a regard for the discomfort of the country being so chewed.

Therefore, I am confident that the African Union will not be deterred — in terms of the decision taken at Addis Ababa and reiterated by South Africa yesterday — from introducing its draft resolution at the current session, as it has decided.

One of the leading lights of the Uniting for Consensus group claimed that the proposal of the African Union regarding the two "empowered seats", if I recall the words correctly, means that they could be filled either by two or by more Member States from among the African Union. In other words, Uniting for Consensus knows the African mind better than the Africans. Africa is being discovered afresh by the Uniting for Consensus group; the Ezulwini Consensus and the Addis Ababa decision mean exactly what that group says they mean. This is what Edward Said, a great Palestinian and one of the greatest figures of our time, called "orientalism". When practised by a representative of the Orient, it becomes a caricature of the original.

In the 1940s, the United States drafts for an international organization called the future United Nations Security Council "the executive committee", the implication being that the General Assembly was the legislature. If the executive committee usurps legislative and judicial powers, then we are on the road to dictatorship. As we all know, in the last decade-and-a-half, if not more, the Security Council has increasingly been exercising those functions. It has been delimiting boundaries, setting up tribunals, imposing reparations and making laws. It is worth remembering that in the Namibia case, one of the judges of the International Court of Justice said clearly that the Security Council was set up simply to keep the peace, not to change the world order, and not to do things which are better left to a peace treaty or a peace settlement.

It is quite clear to us that if the Charter can be flouted, no individual country can really do much about it because if it is under sanctions and it chooses to regard the sanctions as illegal, it would merely have more sanctions imposed on it. Therefore the remedy, according to some, is the International Court of Justice. And here I agree, in terms of the Aegean continental shelf case and the hostages in Iran case, that the Court, according to Article 41 of its Statute, does not recognize *litispendance*, that is, that it cannot take up matters which are before the Security Council. Also, as for the Namibia and Lockerbie cases, in peripheral

remarks, the Court is not bound not to carry out a judicial review, but the limitation quite clearly is that this can be done only in contentious proceedings or in the case of advisory opinions, which are only rarely sought. There is no other way of doing this.

What is more — and this is more important — the judgements of the Court cannot be enforced on the Security Council. There can be legal complications and contradictions, because there is no legal way of deciding, for instance, that if a certain Security Council decision violates *jus cogens* — as indeed was the case in the genocide case, according to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in reference to Council resolution 713 (1991) — or if a sanctions regime violates *jus cogens*, then those who are actually implementing the regime could always claim the protection of Article 25 of the Charter. There is no way of resolving this. The only way left that has not been tried earlier is through an enlargement, particularly of the permanent membership, of the Security Council and the transformation of its working methods. That is the only recourse logically, technically and legally remaining.

However, leaving this aside for the moment in order to get to the working methods themselves, one of the delegations mentioned, I believe it was yesterday, that the Group of Four (G-4) has been obsessed purely with the question of enlargement. Even a cursory glance at the G-4 draft resolution would show that that is not the case. It is a comprehensive proposal with detailed paragraphs on working methods, particularly on the representation of countries through participation in subsidiary organs and the like, and the manner in which work should be conducted. So even if it is an obsession, I think it is, to be fair, a comprehensive obsession. One of the delegations said yesterday that if the working methods are considered together with enlargement, then that would take the working methods hostage. What we are seeing, and as I have just demonstrated, is that the working methods are and would be taken hostage by the Security Council unless they are accompanied by enlargement. It is true, as the delegation said, that in the past, perhaps enlargement was sometimes privileged. But then, as I have just shown, there was good reason for that.

The prime mover of the draft resolution on working methods says that the General Assembly would invite the Security Council to consider these working methods. It would really break our heart if the Security Council were to decline this invitation. And in fact the Council did decline it even before it was made. The most powerful member of the Security Council has clearly said that the Council will determine its own working methods and procedures. Similarly, the same prime mover goes on to say that it is for the Council to decide the actions that it would take, or, in this case, not to take any action at all, which I suppose is also a kind of action.

In any case, it is quite clear to us that the most unacceptable part is to say, as did the statement of the prime mover, that the working methods do not require a modification of the Charter. If there is no modification of the Charter, there will certainly be no new working methods. The history of the last half century more than amply proves this. In fact, another mover of the draft resolution quite clearly stated that the report of the Security Council had once again gone back to the old style of mere facts, which, ultimately, are meaningless without any analytical content. In other words, the new style simply proved to be a brief Indian summer, followed again by the long winter of the old style. So it is clear that working methods cannot be improved unless there is either an enlargement of the Council, through the addition of new permanent members committed to improving those methods and that would be held accountable in a review if they do not, or, at least, a Charter amendment on some of those working methods.

One country to the north of us was extremely eloquent on the non-use of the veto in the case of the responsibility to protect, an area in which that country has in the recent past played a leading role in organizing several workshops. But I faintly recall that, during negotiations in the group of 30 and the group of 15, when we had argued in favour of including the non-use of the veto in the outcome document, that country's flag certainly did not go up in our support.

We have to be very clear on the fact that, unless there is a determination to move uninterruptedly to a Charter amendment on issues such as the non-use of the veto, there is no practical way that these new working methods can actually be implemented in or by the Security Council.

Having said that — I am speaking for India now, not on behalf of the group of four — we would certainly support this draft resolution on working methods if it were to come up for action. We would

support it, and we would support it in spite of the constraints that I have mentioned. Those constraints are obvious. From what I have said, it follows that we would actually be substituting words for action. We would be giving an impression of reform when, in fact, no reform was taking place.

But in spite of that, I say that we would support these working methods, because at least it would be some kind of a declaration in words that we are moving in the right direction — so we would still support it if it were to come up for action.

The most powerful country that I mentioned earlier has also — at least in some capitals — circulated a non-paper, entitled, I believe, "Defeating the Swiss resolution". It reminds me, actually, of the non-paper they had circulated earlier, on "Defeating the G-4 resolution". In other words, let us defeat everything that is reasonable and public-spirited in order to ensure the continued victory of unreason and to use again the Uniting for Consensus argument that this would cause division and be inflammatory. Obviously, anything that precedes a reform is bound to be inflammatory. All radicalism is inflammatory.

The same paper goes on to say, "We reject this because it would mean the imposition of General Assembly oversight". I thought that was the whole idea — that the General Assembly should have some oversight.

I would not really refute the arguments regarding Article 30 and so on, because my young friend the Permanent Representative of Costa Rica has already done this with great ability and skill — to borrow Lincoln's phrase, far above my power to add or detract. I will therefore not go into this, but, still, I would say that a step is good only if it leads to further decisive steps in the very near future, because without this fundamental change in the balance of forces we cannot really effect reform of any kind.

In that same paper, and even in other statements, they have said that — an argument, incidentally, used earlier by the Uniting for Consensus group — that the Swiss paper and earlier such draft resolutions would all lead to a draining out of concentration and energy from the reform process. At any rate, if those are not the exact words, certainly this is their meaning.

I would suggest that we all recall the period after July, because when the discussions on the comprehensive reform of the Security Council ended, much of the colour, energy and synergy had gone out of the debate on the larger reform process and gone out of the negotiations. That is perfectly natural, because, after all, the Security Council reform added synergy to the general reform process for the simple reason that it is the heart of the reform — so it is perfectly natural.

The report of the Security Council that has been presented — I will not go into it because I have spoken at length already, and I do want to take up too much of the Assembly's time — but it merely confirms what we have been saying, quite apart from the point made by the movers of the Swiss resolution. It is reminiscent of Charles Dickens's Mr. Gradgrind — facts, facts, facts; and we all know where Mr. Gradgrind ended up. Facts really get one nowhere without some analytical content.

But apart from that, there are many other issues — consider the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE), which we have had occasion to discuss. Although some progress has been made, the Charter is still not being followed in the case of the relationship between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries. The thing is that, even here, if it is not arbitrary strength, then it is indecisive weakness. In any case, it does not fulfil the essential criterion for reasonable action, which is what the ancient Greeks called sophrosyne — the golden mean.

Therefore, if we look at this issue or at other working methods, as distinguished from actions that have been taken — for instance, some of the thematic debates — I think we will find that they take up too much of the time and energy of the Security Council, besides encroaching on the prerogatives of the General Assembly, because all that means is that the Security Council has less time to do something well, and more time to do ill what needs to be done well.

I think that we need to take a fresh look at this gamut of issues. I am not suggesting for a moment that there have been no successes — not at all. There have been successes, but at the same time it is important to remember that there have been failures that could have been mitigated, mistakes that could have been corrected, and successes that could have been made more secure had there been an enlargement of the Security Council with the entry of new members, particularly from Africa — the continent to which 70 per cent of the Council's time is devoted. Such new

members would have brought new essence, added optimality, and added acceptance to decisions and thereby minimized the use of force.

It would therefore be incorrect to think — and would not really be conducive to a reasonable future if one continued to feel — that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds, because to say that the working methods of the Security Council are adequate would be tantamount to saying that the Spanish Inquisition was a time of objective judgment and transparency. I do not think that any of us could say that.

I believe, therefore, that we need to remember that there is a lot of room for improvement. We must also consider practical ways of adopting these new working methods and consider how the practical enlargement of the Security Council could take place, so that we can bring about a truly multilateral order in which justice reigns — not simply the capricious use of force. I am sure that one day that will happen. In the meantime, let us remember the Psalm in the Bible that states: "Ye weigh out the violence of your hands in the earth" (*The Holy Bible, Psalms 58:2*).

I have spoken at great length. I do not want to address all the arguments of the Uniting for Consensus group, which we have addressed in so many earlier debates. Briefly, to recapitulate, when one speaks of equity and equality, one should not forgot that this also applies within the permanent membership of the Security Council. And when one speaks of small countries, it is worth recalling that many small countries are, in fact, sponsors of the group of four's draft resolution. Nor should one forget that the arithmetic of the Uniting for Consensus proposal, in particular its emphasis on re-election and permanent presence applicable to all non-permanent seats, might in fact mean that there would be less chance of small countries being elected, whereas the G-4 proposal clearly increases those chances, even if not by a very large factor.

With that, I rest our case. I would only say in conclusion that I think it is a grave error for those who think that the issue of reform will go away to believe that the reform will be a bit like the Cheshire cat: that you will have a grin without a cat. They may well find that the cat has nine lives. In fact, in that sense, they may not only have caught the cat by the wrong tail but caught the wrong cat by the wrong tail.

It is now late. I would therefore conclude by saying that those who want to defend selfish privileges, prevent the empowerment of the developing countries and maintain the developing countries' role as the objects of history are, to our mind, forces already in dissolution. They have mistaken the hour of the day: it is evening.

Mr. Loayza Barea (Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me, on behalf of the Government and the people of Bolivia, to convey to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan our sincere condolences at the loss of human lives resulting from the unspeakable terrorist attacks that took place in Amman. We firmly denounce those attacks.

In its section on the Security Council, the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*) adopted by our heads of State or Government underlines that early reform of the Council is an essential element in making it more broadly representative, more efficient and more transparent.

In that context, commitment to achieving the goal of enhancing the Council's effectiveness and legitimacy in the implementation of its resolutions is particularly important. Such reform will respond to the expectations, which have existed since the reform process began, that the joint efforts of Member States can reap auspicious results.

My Government seeks to give the principal organs of the Organization the credibility and the effectiveness needed to tackle the vital issues on the international agenda. For the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to be representative, it must reflect the new twenty-first-century reality of the entire international community, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

As we noted last February at an informal meeting of the General Assembly, I must reaffirm that Bolivia shares the aspiration for, and interest in, a broader concept of collective security that, in an effective and equitable manner, reflects and ensures the inclusion of all States Members of the Organization.

Thus, the option of broader participation in the Council would be a recognition of those principles and would ensure that the Council's decisions embody the constructive action that should characterize its work. In that context, the Council's working methods are

particularly germane, in particular the Council's relations with the General Assembly. Proposals put forward in that respect have contributed interesting points for our consideration.

That line of action should be applied not only to the principal organs of the United Nations but also to the agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations system. That would lead to greater coordination and more dynamic participation. Those entities should have the operational capacity to achieve concrete results that reflect, and give expression to, the political will of our States.

The President took the Chair.

That the issue of Security Council reform has been under consideration for more than a decade demonstrates the complexity of achieving that goal. Although the various consultations and meetings have not produced the anticipated results, they have contributed to agreement on the various proposals for the Council's new structure, reflecting the spirit of the mandate of our heads of State or Government.

For that reason, we continue to believe that representation on the Security Council must be broadened. That expansion should have the primary goal of ensuring balanced geographical representation, not merely because that goal responds to a general principle but because, we are increasingly convinced, regional initiatives are decisive in the settlement of special problems.

If the Security Council possesses the legitimacy that a comprehensive participatory process would confer on it, the United Nations system will gain the capacity to find solutions to the situations in various regions of the world that have not been satisfactorily resolved and responses to potential threats to international peace and security.

It is our belief that we must redouble our efforts to find a solution that reflects the aspirations of our Governments and our peoples. No effort to that end would be in vain. We trust that under your open, transparent and measured leadership, Mr. President, we will establish the most appropriate modalities for dealing with this important issue, as well as with establishment of the Human Rights Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Cordovez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is a particular pleasure, Sir, to address the General Assembly under your presidency.

I would like to convey the condolences and the feelings of solidarity of the Government and the people of Ecuador to the Government and the people of Jordan for the recent unspeakable attacks against them.

Despite the enormous changes that the international system has undergone in the past 60 years, the concept of collective security enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations has maintained its full force. But the effective application of that concept requires an efficient institutional mechanism. In order for it to be effective, the structure and the working methods of the Security Council must be modernized: they have to catch up with the world.

The reform of the Security Council is absolutely essential to ensure the Council's authority and credibility. The composition of the Council has not reflected the current reality for many years, and it should be enlarged as soon as possible. In doing so, we must take into account the principle of equitable geographic distribution. There must, of course, be more representation of developing countries in the Council.

The Council's working methods must be made democratic, as should its procedures and the way in which it takes its decisions. The transparency of its procedures and those of its subsidiary bodies should be increased.

The Council must give a more frequent account of its proceedings to countries not members. Here I would endorse what the delegate of India said, that consideration of a report of the kind we are now discussing should not be an annual event, but part of a much more frequent and interactive relationship between the Council and the General Assembly.

The Council must also maintain a better dialogue with countries that are not Council members. It should coordinate better with regional and subregional organizations for conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. This is particularly important in the Latin American and Caribbean region.

The countries that are involved in issues that are dealt with in informal Council consultations should be heard directly in those meetings. General and public summaries of what is discussed and decided in

informal consultations should be produced and made available immediately to States not members of the Council. Also, an overlapping of functions with the Council's subsidiary bodies should be avoided.

The Government of Ecuador feels that we should consider restricting the right of veto of the permanent members to very specific subjects, with a view to eventually eliminating the veto. A first step towards that goal would be to limit the exercise of the right of veto exclusively to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

Ecuador feels that 12 years of negotiations on these matters is too much time and has already cost the Organization an enormous amount of money as well as untold efforts on the part of all delegations. We need to find a way to make progress in this area. We feel that the proposal of Brazil, India, Germany and Japan has aspects of great interest that we support and that merit the soonest possible attention.

I would suggest that we decide how and when we are going to adopt the most necessary decisions, including the increase in members, in order to modernize the Council, and that we then subsequently move forward with the necessary political will.

Mr. Butagira (Uganda): To begin, I would like, on behalf of the Ugandan Government, to extend our heartfelt condolences to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on the tragic loss of innocent lives. This tragic incident underscores the fact that the international community should, more than ever before, resolve to fight the cancer of terrorism. In this regard, this General Assembly should move quickly to conclude the convention on counter-terrorism.

Uganda congratulates Ambassador Andrey Denisov of the Russian Federation, for presenting, on behalf of the Security Council, the report of the Council. We congratulate also the two co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and other Matters related to the Security Council.

Uganda aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group.

The Security Council, as per its Charter mandate, is primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is a very heavy responsibility exercised on behalf of Member States, which must have full confidence in the Council's operations and be assured that their interests are protected.

Very often, however, we have witnessed instances when, for unexplained reasons, the Security Council has adopted a hands-off policy. Africa, for instance, has witnessed a number of devastating conflicts. Yet, beyond condemnation and statements of appeal, the Security Council has not done enough.

The volatile security situation in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo is a case in point. This region has become a haven for all manner of rebel groups, who are a threat to the security of neighbouring States. The Council has watched as the numbers of these rebel groups have multiplied and they have acquired considerable quantities of arms. For example, a Ugandan rebel group known as the People's Redemption Army has grown to over 2,000 in number, under the eyes of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). Uganda warned of the existence of this group, but its warnings were ignored until recently, when the MONUC Representative, Ambassador Swing, acknowledged the presence of this and other rebel groups.

Surely, the Security Council cannot allow the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo to be a conservation area for rebels. His Excellency President Museveni of Uganda has suggested a way forward — that is, to give MONUC a robust mandate to disarm these negative elements or invite a third party to do the job. Alternatively, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other neighbours could act jointly under Security Council authorization to wipe out these terrorists, or the Council could authorize the African Union to do so.

The Security Council should weigh these options as a matter of urgency. The leader of the Council delegation to the Great Lakes region, Ambassador Jean-Marc de La Sablière of France, is quoted as saying in Uganda on 9 November, when the Council mission was in Uganda, that the time for voluntary disarmament has come to an end. So let the Council act quickly to disarm the rebels for the sake of peace and security in the region.

With regard to the question of equitable representation on the Security Council, much has been

said by many delegations, all emphasizing the importance of Council membership reflecting the realities of the modern world. Suffice it to say that Africa has been in the unenviable position of being treated as a second class citizen. It is the only continent without permanent membership. Much of the Council's work concerns Africa. By asking for two permanent seats with all the prerogatives, including the veto, we are not begging for favours. We are demanding a correction of a historic wrong. The present arrangement of five permanent members with a monopoly on the power of veto cannot be rationally justified, but as long as it lasts, we demand that Africa be accorded the same privilege. It is in this connection that the African Union reaffirmed last month its previous position calling for two permanent seats, with all the privileges that go with that status, as well as five non-permanent seats.

We do not buy the argument that it may be difficult to ask for permanent seats with the power of veto because the present five permanent members have no wish to enlarge their club. We are fighting for a principle that should not be sacrificed at the altar of expediency. History is replete with examples where steadfast struggle, however longlasting, has resulted in victory.

With regard to its working methods, the Security Council should not function as an exclusive club. Greater involvement by non-member States in its work is essential. For example, if a matter under discussion affects a Member State, that State should be afforded an opportunity to make a statement, rather than merely being invited to listen to the statements of Council members. In addition, the veto should be used as a last resort, if used at all, and certainly not in cases involving genocide, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Mr. Spatafora (Italy): First of all, let me express, on behalf of the Government of Italy, the strongest possible condemnation of the criminal terrorist attacks against the civilian populations in Amman and Baghdad. Italy expresses its sincere solidarity to the Governments and the peoples of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and of Iraq and to the families of the innocent victims.

I would like to join my colleagues, Mr. President, in expressing my appreciation for the way in which you are leading the consultations on the various follow-ups to the outcome document (*resolution 60/1*). We feel your passion, the optimism of your heart and what I would call your "Mediterranean" enthusiasm, but at the same time we feel and appreciate your cool and calm presence. We are pleased to see that our President has a political vision, but that at the same time he is keen to avoid getting out of touch with the membership — that is, with the ground and its hard realities. Such a balance, I believe, is the Dag Hammarskjöld legacy at its best.

I would also like to join my colleagues in expressing strong support to and appreciation for the Vice-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group, Ambassador Bethel and Ambassador Wenaweser, for their efforts and determination in leading, with energy and commitment and in a very delicate and sensitive environment, the discussions on the fundamental issue of improving the Security Council's working methods.

I would like to recall, in that regard, that we must implement the decision taken by the General Assembly at the 117th meeting of the fifty-ninth session. By approving paragraph 19 of the report of the Open-ended Working Group (*A/59/47*), we have committed ourselves to continue to work through the Group, considering both the expansion of the Security Council and the improvement of its working methods, "drawing on the experience of its fifty-ninth session as well as the views to be expressed during its sixtieth session". There is now a proposal on the table — a very lucid, interesting and articulate document circulated by the group of five small nations (S-5) — which, because of its fresh approach, deserves our very careful attention and our constructive, result-oriented and non-divisive engagement. By "non-divisive", I mean that we will have to be consensus-led, avoiding a vote.

I now turn to today's consultations on Security Council reform. As I am taking the floor at this stage of the debate, I feel that I should just say that I fully agree with and strongly support the approaches, considerations and reflections already put forward by many like-minded colleagues. To mention only one of these, I recall the statement by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan. Full of substance, creativity and flexibility, that statement was an invitation addressed to the entire membership to become engaged, under the President's leadership, in constructive, result-oriented, comprehensive and non-divisive consultations and negotiations.

Indeed, today's consultations should offer to the membership an opportunity for a moment of reflection so that, standing on solid ground, taking a fresh approach and building upon lessons learned, we can start a new phase of a fruitful brick-building exercise, as you said earlier, Mr. President. The positions taken on this matter by Uniting for Consensus are well known, and it is not necessary for me to expand on them; Ambassador Akram and many others among my colleagues have been very eloquent on the matter. I should just like to recall that the main feature and the strength of our position is its flexibility, which allows breathing room for a fresh approach, if and when needed its inclusiveness and its capacity to accommodate the interests and concerns of ever-growing sectors of the membership.

As I recently recalled, the statements on Security Council reform made by our political leaders at the summit and at the ministerial segment of the General Assembly show, through the objectivity of the numbers, that a very clear relative majority — more than 42 per cent — of Member States now uphold positions, values and principles that are Uniting for Consensus positions, values and principles.

Uniting for Consensus is ready to engage, under the President's leadership, in brick-building consultations and negotiations with all sectors of the membership, in good faith and with strong good will and a constructive and result-oriented approach, aimed at comprehensive and non-divisive Security Council reform.

But let us bear in mind one of the most important lessons learned from the last session: we must not allow ourselves to become hostages to this issue, risking the derailment or mishandling of other issues that, in the follow-up to the summit, have more urgent priority. Such derailment or mishandling will occur if our approach to the Security Council issue is divisive instead of consensus-led. "Consensus" does not mean "unanimity"; rather, it means "quality consensus", a concept that I have borrowed from the President of the General Assembly and that has important political and geopolitical bearings. A quality consensus must be pursued with patience and determination, bearing in mind that the time has come for us — the entire membership — to try our best to address the issues at stake with a fresh approach, leaving behind the old divisive paths that have led us nowhere.

As stated in a very balanced way by Ambassador Wenaweser, Permanent Representative of Liechtenstein, at the 48th meeting,

> "Security Council reform cannot be at the top of our agenda for the time being. At the same time, of course, the agreement in the outcome document regarding early reform must not be ignored. It therefore seems advisable to gradually and cautiously build up the necessary political momentum that can result in effective change and real reform, with the strongest possible political support from the membership".

Ambassador Hannesson, Permanent Representative of Iceland, has expressed the view that the proposal of the Group of Four countries remains the most "practical" basis for reforming the Council. I do not believe that what we need is simply a "practical" way out. What is on the table?

We have heard strong requests for national permanent seats, strong requests for two regional — not national — permanent seats for Africa and requests for a permanent seat that would rotate among Arab States. Then we have the position of the 57 members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) — a sector representing nearly a third of this house — which is set out in the Final Communiqué of the Annual Coordination Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the OIC, issued in New York on 23 September 2005 (*A/60/440*). In paragraph 64, the Communiqué states that the Meeting

> "stressed an increased role of regional groups in nomination of their representatives to serve on the Council. The Meeting called for a comprehensive reform of the Security Council in all its aspects so as to make it more democratic, representative, transparent and accountable. It also recognized that there was a wide support for increasing the number of non-permanent members in the Security Council. It decided that any reform proposal which neglect the adequate representation of the Islamic Ummah in any category of membership in an extended Security Council will not be acceptable to the Islamic World."

Paragraph 68 states:

> "the Meeting stressed the initiation of constructive negotiation between all United

> Nations Member States, to refrain from pushing divisive votes, without imposing any time limits. It called for [and to build] upon the points of convergence such as the need to enlarge the Council, to increase the representation of developing countries, and to improve the working methods and transparency of the Council's work."

Is that the voice of a third of the membership calling for a "practical" solution, or is it a strong appeal by a third of the membership for a more advanced dialogue and for more flexible and inclusive "political" solutions? — a path, by the way, that is the same path for which Uniting for Consensus is striving.

We will trust your judgement and powers of analysis, Mr. President, when the time comes for you to assess where we stand on the path that must lead to the reform of the Security Council.

I would like to conclude by stressing a point that is of fundamental importance for all of us as far as Security Council reform is concerned, as it has a direct impact on our ownership of this House. In shaping the reform, we will have to be vigilant in order to preserve the "ownership rights" conferred on all of the Member States by the Charter on the basis of sovereign equality. We must prevent those rights from being gradually eroded. We will succeed if we do not compromise on one point: whichever Member State may have a seat in the Security Council, in whatever capacity, with or without a long renewable mandate, that Member State must be there only because we — the owners of the House — have decided to send it there with our votes. We may in future decide to keep that same Member State on the Council if, in our judgement, the time is not ripe for a rotation, on the basis of a scenario requiring our votes either in the General Assembly or, if necessary, in the regional group. A different scenario would imply — let us not fool ourselves — that we have given up our ownership.

Only if and when all Member States feel that they are not marginalized and that they will always be part of the process because they are owners of this House will we succeed in strengthening this Organization, because we will succeed in engaging all of its components. That is also the reason why we need non-divisive reform.

The President: I thank the Permanent Representative of Italy for his kind words with regard to how to combine Nordic and Mediterranean qualities as President of the General Assembly.

Ms. Rivero (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like first of all to express, on behalf of the Government and the people of Uruguay, our profound solidarity with the people of Jordan in connection with the heinous terrorist attacks that took place there.

As we have make clear on various occasions, Uruguay firmly believes in multilateralism. That is why, since the very creation of this Organization, we have contributed to the best of our ability to the many activities of the United Nations.

Uruguay has served in the Security Council for just one term. However, that was in 1965 and 1966 — many years ago. It was a very different time, and the work of the Council was very different from today.

That is why we welcome this opportunity to speak about the report of the Security Council. Thanks to the volume and comprehensiveness of the report, we can see that the work of that body has increased considerably in recent years, in terms of both its quantity and its scope. We would like to say that we appreciate the difficult work carried out by States members of the Council on a daily basis, as well as their efforts to make that work more accessible to other Member States.

Because we know that today's world is very different, we share the views of representatives who spoke earlier, that both the composition of the Council and its working methods must be adjusted to current political conditions, so as to make it a more effective instrument for dealing with current threats to international peace and security. Uruguay has expressed this view before: we want a more efficient, more democratic and more representative body.

With regard to expansion, we can support the model presented by the Group of Four countries, but we reiterate our firm opposition to the extension of the right of veto.

It is clear that today's urgent situations make a rapid response from the United Nations essential. But that does not imply that such response will be evaluated and decided upon without taking into account the considerations of Member States. We feel very optimistic in this regard, given the near-consensus among representatives concerning the need to devote a large part of the task of reforming the Security Council

to improving its working methods. In this respect, we view with particular interest the proposal introduced by the group of five small States — the "Small Five" — and we hope that it will provide a good basis for our future work in this field.

We consider it essential to increase the transparency of the Council's work as a way of increasing its credibility. We believe the practice of holding open debates in which all Member States can participate is quite suitable. However, there is room for improvement. It always surprises us when a draft resolution or declaration is produced immediately at the conclusion of such a debate. It seems to us that a certain amount of time should be set aside to allow Council members to consider the comments that have been made. They should not just listen to what is said but — more important — pay attention to it.

We are convinced that the enormous amount of time devoted to this subject will produce the desired results. We are confident that by bringing together all of the intelligent suggestions that have been made, we will be able to achieve, if not the perfect solution, at least the goal that we have set ourselves: to bring the Security Council's working methods up to date.

Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*spoke in French*): For 13 years now we have been engaged in this long and difficult debate on the reform of the Security Council — a subject that, as we are all keenly aware, is of overriding importance. Some — not without justification — have become frustrated and impatient, while others have counselled caution.

In this complex world in which threats to peace continue to loom, there can be no doubt that the Security Council has a significant role to play. To make that organ more effective, representative and democratic, it must be reformed so as to take account of current global realities.

The position of the Lao People's Democratic Republic on Security Council reform is well known and has been reaffirmed on many occasions. We favour an increase in the number of both permanent and non-permanent members, from developed and developing countries, in accordance with the principle of equitable geographic distribution and taking into account the relative importance of countries. We also believe that the reform should include measures that would make the working methods of the Council more transparent, particularly with regard to its decision-making process.

Africa is a large continent. The African people, like all other peoples, deserve our highest respect. The fact that Africa has no permanent seat on the Security Council in order to promote its rights is unjust. This injustice needs to be corrected, and Africa should, therefore, also have permanent seats in a future, enlarged Council.

Our world today is undergoing rapid and complex change. We are all encountering new, complex global realities. The Security Council, the principal body for the maintenance of international peace and security, must adapt to these realities. We must work together in a spirit of compromise to reform the Security Council in order to make it more effective, legitimate, democratic and transparent.

Mr. Suazo (Honduras) (*spoke in Spanish*): My first words are directed to the Government and people of the Kingdom of Jordan to express our feelings of solidarity and condolences with regard to the terrorist attacks in the capital of Amman and upon the occasion of the loss of precious human life. Honduras repeats its condemnation and rejection of all acts of terrorism.

We would also like to express our thanks to the representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Denisov, for his presentation of the report on the activities of the Security Council. This document has been discussed at length by others who have taken the floor before me. This makes it difficult for me not to be repetitive or redundant in my intervention. However, I do consider it important to reiterate and state that we agree with many of the ideas that have been expressed. With regard to the fact that we need a thoroughgoing and systematic analysis of the activities carried out by the Security Council in the promotion of international peace and security. A mere list of the activities of the Security Council, documents circulated and thematic accounts give us only a limited view of what is being done. Very often, we do not know how and why certain decisions have been taken and particularly why in certain urgent situations there sometimes seems to be paralysis. The format of the document is repeated every year, but it gives us no more than a limited and incomplete view of all that is being done in the Security Council. This debate in the General Assembly is also part of this ritual, when we discuss this report. What has been said yesterday and today is the same

thing that my delegation has been hearing for the past ten years.

We are not moving forward, neither with enough speed nor in the right direction. The recent summit and the broad discussions of the future of the United Nations and its main bodies gave rise to hopes that this year's report would be more substantive and systematic. We hope that after the current considerations raised in this discussion, the Security Council will take into account all of the contributions and inputs made, so that next year we will see a report that reflects provisions of the Charter and the expectations of this Assembly with regard to that document.

Now I would like to refer to the reform of the Security Council and its enlargement. My delegation would like to stress the need for the body that has a direct bearing on political decisions regarding international peace and security and matters of life and death for thousands of human beings to be more democratic, more transparent and more representative and, therefore, more universally legitimate. Discussions on these matters are well known and will strengthen the Council and this is why we have always supported the need for the Council's reform. We feel that this will give greater and universal legitimacy to its actions and to its consultative and decision-making processes. In this respect, Honduras feels that Germany and Japan are two Members of this Organization that meet the requirements to be part of this body. Their contribution in humanitarian, social and economic fields puts them in the vanguard as candidates for seats on the Council.

Honduras, which is a founding Member of this Organization, considers that reform and the strengthening of the United Nations are closely linked to the integrity and legitimacy of its bodies. Therefore, we feel that the document adopted by the heads of State and Government at the last Summit gives us a clear and precise mandate to carry out the reform and exhaust all possible avenues for enlargement of the Security Council, the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Human Rights Council. These bodies should work jointly and in unison within a new international architecture.

My delegation will continue contributing and following up all initiatives and proposals aimed at strengthening our Organization. For that reason we are very happy to see the document prepared by the delegations of Costa Rica, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Singapore and Switzerland on the importance of defining the working methods and procedures of the Security Council, and particularly — its rules of procedure.

Mr. Zinsou (Benin) (*spoke in French*): Allow me to express from this rostrum my solemn condolences and those of my delegation to the delegation of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan upon the terrorist attacks that took place in that country 9 November 2005. We repeat here our condemnation of terrorism in all its forms. My delegation aligns itself with the statement made here yesterday by the Permanent Representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group.

Mr. President, my country, Benin, thanks you for organizing this debate. The annual report covers a period of intense activity by the Council, which has been faced with events and unfolding crisis situations. Africa has been the main arena of its interventions. The Council has striven to make the best possible use of the tools at its disposal under the Charter in order to control very diverse situations characterized by great instability in the fields of operation where missions are deployed on the continent. My delegation has contributed as much as possible to ensuring consensus within the Council on the ways to implement appropriate responses to the various problems that the changing situations in the field has placed before the Council in the exercise of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We welcome, in particular, the synergy that the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union has been able to develop with the United Nations to put the peace process in Côte d'Ivoire into the proper perspective. Adoption of resolutions 1572 (2004) and 1584 (2005) gave the Council the means to put pressure on the parties in Côte d'Ivoire to avoid any worsening of the situation that could lead to an escalation of the crisis.

However, although the coordinated actions of the United Nations and regional African organizations have been effective, the phenomenon of local ethnic violence has seriously affected the civilian population and has presented a major challenge. The massacre in Gatumba in Burundi on 13 August 2004, and the broad condemnation that ensued, was a catalyst in favour of

the emergence of a consensus on the principle of including in peacekeeping operations the mandate to ensure, by all means, the effective protection of civilians who are threatened by violence.

We must not neglect to mention here an essential aspect of the protection of civilians — that of children in armed conflict. That question was given special attention by the Council in the period covered by the report. My country welcomes the opportunity that it had to play a leading role in that area, in particular through the organization of a public debate on the issue and the holding of negotiations on resolution 1612 (2005) which was adopted by the Council on 26 July 2005.

That resolution authorizes the implementation of an oversight mechanism and the dissemination of information on children affected by armed conflicts, as well as the creation of a working group to study the report produced by that mechanism. We welcome the fact that the working group is being lead by the Ambassador of France, His Excellency Mr. Jean-Marc de La Sablière, who will chair the group.

Another major problem facing the Council has been the non-respect of the arms embargoes imposed by the Council. The problem is very serious in Somalia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo where the flow of illegal arms continues to fuel endemic violence. It is necessary to ensure the political will of neighbouring countries and Member States in general in order to resolve that issue.

Among the progress that has been made with regard to the maintenance of peace in the period under consideration, specific reference should be made to the case of Sierra Leone, where the peacekeeping operation will soon be completely withdrawn and will be replaced by an integrated support office for peacebuilding. That office will have an important role to play in eliminating the underlying causes of the conflict. We could ask ourselves why it was not possible to address those issues during the period when the mission was fully operational. We hope that the mandates of peacekeeping operations in the future will take account of the underlying causes of conflict.

We welcome the fact that the question of land property rights in Burundi has been addressed in the framework of the international support mechanism designed to help that country after the restoration of constitutional order.

The Council is seen more often as a body responsible for managing crises and conflicts. But a closer reading of the Charter will bring to light some functions that a particular historical context has allowed us to ignore. Thus, the role of the Security Council in the area of conflict prevention has not been fully developed. Resolution 1625 (2005), which was negotiated by my delegation in close cooperation with other African countries that are Council members and which was adopted by the heads of State and Government on 14 September 2005, fills that gap to a certain extent.

Currently, the Secretary-General is looking at the modalities for its implementation. However, let us make no mistake here. These are not measures intended exclusively for Africa. They make up a framework of action that can be applied in any country throughout the world that is facing a situation that poses a risk for international peace and security.

We could not close without repeating, once again, our hope to see the reform of the Security Council soon attaining success and leading to an enlargement of its membership in a manner that respects the legitimate demands of the African continent.

Concerning the no less important issue of working methods, my delegation fully supports the principle of strengthened consultations with Member States and of enhanced transparency in the work of the Council. That transparency must allow for the discretion required when dealing with certain sensitive matters and must take account of the interests of Member States.

The Council will be dealing with the issue of its working methods shortly. However, that question should be examined in relationship with the new membership of an enlarged Council. The work methods of a Council with 25 or 26 members will differ considerably from those of a Council with 15 members. The question of work methods therefore can be dealt with in an integrated manner only when the issue of the membership of the Council has been fully defined. Nevertheless, all the improvements that can be introduced immediately should be introduced, taking into account the views of Member States.

The issue of thematic debates continues to be a sensitive issue. The thematic debates have a considerable usefulness for the work of the Council. They are necessary for the adoption of a proactive

approach in identifying and managing new threats and in the Council's exercise of its monitoring responsibilities. They also offer the possibility for broader consultation with Member States.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on the items of today and yesterday.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of the report of the Security Council contained in document A/60/2?

It was so decided.

The President: A representative has asked to speak in right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to 5 minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Kitaoka (Japan): Thank you, Sir for allowing us to exercise our right of reply, as the meeting comes to an end. My comments are related to the statement made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea this morning. I will keep my remarks brief and positive. First, we firmly believe that the qualifications of a given country for permanent membership in the Security Council should be judged based on that country's contributions to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Secondly, regarding the issues of the past, I wish to record that Prime Minister Koizumi has expressed on various occasions, including on 22 April of this year to more than 100 world leaders attending the Asia-Africa summit in Bandon, Indonesia, Japan's heartfelt apology for what Japan caused through its colonial rule and aggression, and stated its renewed resolve to contribute to the peace and prosperity of the world in the future. He again elaborated those thoughts on 15 August of this year. My delegation would like to remind the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the international community as a whole that the fifth meeting of the six-party talks was held in Beijing and bilateral talks between Japan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were reconvened last week after one year's suspension. The representatives of our two countries had an in-depth exchange of views on various matters, including the settlement of unfortunate past issues, as well as outstanding issues of concern. They considered the talks to be very useful and agreed that it would be desirable to reconvene the bilateral talks in the near future.

Mr. Ri Song Hyon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The reform of the Security Council involves the interests of all Member States, big and small. For that reason, the discussion of Council reform is very complicated. Today, my delegation presented our views on that matter, including on the Council's working methods. In particular, we mentioned Japan's bid for a permanent seat and the issue of past crimes. That issue is really a yardstick to estimate whether or not Japan is truly committed to peace. My delegation is consistent in its position as regards Security Council reform, particularly the issue of permanent seats.

As for what the representative of Japan has just said about its commitment to peace, we cannot really know what Japan's real intentions are. We need actions — actions and deeds that match those words, because it is saying one thing and actually doing another. One particular example to which I referred is the fact that they are still worshipping at the altar of past crimes. I do not need to go into detail about that. We therefore view the issue of the reform of the Security Council with the utmost seriousness.

The representative of Japan also touched somewhat on bilateral issues, but since this is not the appropriate forum in which to deal with them, I will not go into further detail.

The President: We have come to the end of the debate on Security Council reform. I would like to thank delegations for the serious, calm, constructive and, in some cases, even erudite, spirit in which they conducted the debate on the report of the Security Council and the issue of Security Council reform.

I think that I can say that, as a result of the debate, we have a clearer view and perspective on the positions of Member States on Security Council work and Security Council reform. Members will understand that it is not possible to make a fair and full summary of that rich and comprehensive debate, so I will just limit myself to a few comments.

Regarding the report of the Security Council, a number of delegations noted improvements in the depth, thrust and content of the report. The report by the President of the Security Council, Ambassador Denisov, was welcomed and was well received. Some

delegations underlined the need for the report to continue in that direction and become even more analytical so as to truly serve its intended purpose as a means of communication with the General Assembly.

As members may recall, the representatives of several Member States advocated strengthened exchanges between the Council and the Assembly, for instance in the areas of peacekeeping and sanctions regimes.

With regard to the reform of the Security Council itself, I am sure that we all followed with great interest the positions put forward by delegations over the past two days. There seems to be general support for making the Council broadly representative and continuously effective, of course, and also for improving its working methods in order to enhance the legitimacy of its decisions. However, it is obvious that views are still divergent — in some cases, strongly divergent — as to the modalities for reforming the Council, especially regarding enlargement. That issue clearly relates to the fundamental interests of Member States.

The improvement of the Council's working methods has been a recurring theme and an important subject of our discussions, and I understand that that issue will continue to be discussed among Member States. Intentions and interests have also been expressed by various delegations with a view to taking other concrete steps at a later stage. Concerning the process for the further consideration of Council reform, a number of States called for the continuation of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Related Matters. I would like to thank the co-Chairpersons for the work that they carried out in that regard.

I think that we all now need to fully analyse the comments made during the debate and consider what has been stated in this body. In my work, I will be guided by the outcome document and by the debate, as well as by possible further proposals and initiatives from members, in order to fulfil the requirement set out in the outcome document, namely, to review progress by the end of the year. The serious debate today, and the tone in which it was conducted, represent an important contribution by the General Assembly in the context of that review of progress. I will continue to listen to Member States on this very important issue.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 9?

It was so decided.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 117.

Agenda item 109

Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations

Note by the Secretary-General (A/60/352)

The President: As members are aware, in accordance with the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, and with the consent of the Security Council, the Secretary-General is mandated to notify the General Assembly on matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security that are being dealt with by the Security Council and on matters with which the Council has ceased to deal.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of document A/60/352?

It was so decided.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 109.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.