United Nations A/60/PV.48

General Assembly

Sixtieth session

Official Records

48th plenary meeting
Thursday, 10 November 2005, 3 p.m.
New York

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

In the absence of the President, Mr. Diarra (Mali), Vice-President, 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. Le Luong Minh (Viet Nam): It is my great honour to participate on behalf of the Vietnamese delegation in the joint debate today on two important agenda items relating to the report of the Security Council and the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Council and other related matters.

The past year has been another year of hard work for the Council, as reflected in the great number of meetings and the wide range of complex and urgent issues it has had to tackle. We commend the members of the Council for their efforts.

As described in the Security Council's report to the General Assembly, about 50 per cent of the Council's work this year was dedicated to Africa, which continues to draw the special attention of the Council and of the international community as a whole. In this regard, we share the common view of Member States that the Council should continue to give African issues careful and particular attention, in order to make solid contributions to resolving African conflicts.

Terrorism is also a matter of top priority for the Council. The surge of terrorist attacks during the past year — the latest one taking place just last night in Jordan, resulting in more than 60 deaths and nearly 200 injuries — has proved that terrorism continues to be one of the most dangerous threats to international peace and security. We would like to convey to the Government and people of Jordan and the families of the victims our most profound sympathy.

We note with satisfaction the Council's continuous efforts to address this threat, and we welcome the strengthened cooperation among the Council's relevant subsidiary organs, including the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the 1267 Committee and the 1540 Committee. Viet Nam strongly condemns all acts of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, and we look forward to strengthening our cooperation with the Council in this connection.

With regard to the report's format, we appreciate efforts made with a view to providing a concise guide to the activities of the Council. Nevertheless, we share the view held by many Member States that the report is still far from substantive in content and lacks an assessment of the Council's work.

Turning to the issue of Security Council reform, my delegation acknowledges that there have been some positive changes in the working methods of the

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.

05-59953 (E)

0559953

Council, such as the increased use of public meetings, consultations with regional organizations and strengthened coordination among the Council's subsidiary bodies. We hope this momentum will continue, with a view to ensuring the genuine democracy, transparency and accountability of its work, thus turning the Council into a body able to effectively perform its functions of maintaining international peace and security.

In this regard, we take note of 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, contained in document A/59/47. While acknowledging certain progress, the report did point out that there were still varying views with regard to the six issues concerning the working methods of the Council and the transparency of its work that the Open-ended Working Group dealt with during the past year.

We also take note of the proposals on the working methods of the Council put forward just recently by the delegations of Costa Rica, Liechtenstein, Jordan, Singapore and Switzerland. These proposals deserve our careful examination. Though they are new, a quick review enables us to say that we can support many of them. Moreover, the interest of Member States in moving the process forward should be welcomed.

We share the view that the enlargement and working methods of the Council can be better served if they are dealt with in parallel and complementary processes. Over the past year, Member States have discussed intensively and substantially possibilities for the expansion of the Council. For our part, we wish to reiterate our position that the Council needs to be enlarged in both membership categories to ensure that it truly represents all United Nations Members, as stipulated in the Charter. We believe that developing States should be more adequately represented in this important organ of the Organization. We acknowledge that different views remain in this connection. We look forward to working with other delegations to arrive at a solution that enjoys the support of a broad majority of Member States.

Viet Nam attaches great importance to the work of the Security Council and has proposed its candidature for a non-permanent seat on the Council for the term 2008-2009. Not forgetting that reform of the Council is part of the United Nations reform process as a whole — in which revitalization of the work of the General Assembly and reform of other bodies of the United Nations, especially the Economic and Social Council, are of equal importance — we consider success in reforming the Council critical not only for the effectiveness of its work in maintaining international peace and security, but also for the success of the United Nations reform process as well. This approach will continue to guide our actions.

Mr. Wang Guangya (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): First of all, I wish on behalf of the Chinese Government and people to express our condolences to the victims of the terrorist attack in Jordan. We also strongly condemn this attack.

The Charter of the United Nations entrusts the Security Council with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of world peace and security. Since the beginning of this year, the Security Council, in its continuous commitment to respond to conventional and non-conventional security issues, has made great efforts in such areas as conflict prevention, dispute settlement, peace restoration, counter-terrorism and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. An effective, accountable and representative Security Council is in the common interests of all United Nations Member States. Adhering to multilateralism, strengthening the role of the United Nations and safeguarding the authority of the Security Council can help countries cope effectively with increasingly complex global threats and challenges.

At September's world summit, Chinese President Hu Jintao made a comprehensive enunciation of China's position on Security Council reform. I wish to reiterate here China's support for necessary and rational reform of the Council, including its expansion and improvement of its working methods, in order to maintain its authority, increase its efficiency and strengthen its role.

Democratization of international relations is a global trend, which should also be reflected in the Security Council. While developing countries account for more than two thirds of the entire United Nations membership, they are seriously underrepresented in the Security Council. China holds that expansion of the Council should give priority to augmenting the representation of developing countries in general and African countries in particular, and should increase the

opportunities for more countries, particularly small and medium-sized countries, to participate in the Council's decision-making process.

In expanding the Council, it is imperative to adhere to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and ensure the representation of different cultures and civilizations.

Necessary and appropriate improvement should be made to the Council's working methods so that the creative ideas and constructive proposals from non-Council members and regional organizations, as well as from civil society, can be fully reflected. In recent years, quite a number of countries have come up with many positive suggestions and options in this respect, and the Council has made headway in its actual work. China is ready to continue to work with other members of the Council to this end.

Security Council reform is an issue of great sensitivity and complexity, as it bears on the national interests of all Member States. Over the past few months, China has been vigorously advocating and urging Council reform in an appropriate and healthy direction. We stand by the following principles.

First, Council reform should be based on democratic discussion, with a view to reaching the broadest possible consensus. No artificial deadline should be set, nor should a vote be imposed. Only when this approach is followed can the relevant decisions command the widest possible trust and support and meet the common long-term interests of all Member States. A reform package that addresses the concerns of only a few States while disregarding those of the majority, and that treats African and other developing countries inequitably, will lead nowhere.

Secondly, reform should reflect the spirit of mutual compromise and maintain our solidarity. As a big family with 191 members, the United Nations derives its strength from unity. To date, Member States have yet to find a Council expansion formula that can meet the concerns of all parties and enjoy universal support. Naturally, all parties should, therefore, continue the dialogue and engage in full consultations in search of compromise. As long as all concerned take to heart the unity and long-term interests of the United Nations, accommodate each other's interests and concerns and display a pragmatic and flexible approach, a universally acceptable solution to reform will eventually be found.

Thirdly, the reform should be a gradual process in which the interests of overall United Nations reform should be kept in mind. Security Council reform is part and parcel of United Nations reform as a whole — reforms in other areas being of equal importance. Discussion over the Council's expansion in the run-up to the September summit consumed a great deal of the energy and time of all Member States. Consequently, consultations on comprehensive United Nations reform and on the outcome document were severely hampered. We must draw lessons from this and prevent its recurrence in the follow-up to the Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*) and in promoting United Nations reform.

This year marks the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. At the September summit, world leaders made solemn pledges and took important decisions on United Nations reform. The current General Assembly session should advance the reform process and strengthen the role of the United Nations. China is ready to actively support and cooperate with the work of the President of the General Assembly and contribute to the implementation of the summit outcome document.

Mr. Bolton (United States of America): I welcome the opportunity to participate in the discussion on reform and expansion of the Security Council. I hope our review of the issue today, as called for in paragraph 153 of the outcome document (*resolution 60/1*), contributes to an agreement on an approach that builds broad support among Member States.

The United States strongly believes in the Security Council. We will continue to ensure that the Council is able to carry out its mandate under the Charter. In discussing the Council's structure and methods, our foremost priority remains ensuring its effectiveness.

I would like to express my appreciation to President Eliasson for his outstanding leadership of this historic effort to implement the key reforms endorsed in the outcome document. I thank my friend and colleague from the Russian Federation, the current President of the Council, for his comments on the work of the Security Council over the past year. Ambassador Denisov's report highlights the need for a Council able to meet the challenges of a world in which conflict within borders, across borders and — too often —

without borders threatens the peace, security and freedom of people everywhere.

In recent weeks, the Council has acted on a number of critical issues affecting international peace and security, including Syria, Iraq and the Horn of Africa. I believe there is much for the Council to do to bring an end to long-running conflicts. As we have advocated in the Council, the collective efforts of this Organization need to focus on resolving the underlying disputes that fuel these conflicts, working closely with Member States, regional organizations, the private sector and other international bodies.

I mention a few of the vital issues before the Security Council today to emphasize a point. Discussions of reform and expansion of the Council must emphasize the need to strengthen — not weaken — the Council's ability to act.

The Security Council has under way a comprehensive review of its working methods and procedures and continues to take important steps to improve its efficiency. We believe that, as clearly stated in the Charter, the Security Council alone will determine its own working methods and procedures.

To that end, however, we fully welcome ideas and contributions from other Member States. The United States will continue to be a full participant in the Open-ended Working Group. Based on the work of this Group, the Council has already developed a series of procedures and practices to provide increased access and information on items being considered by the Council, including through briefings, *Journal* notices and the use of new information technology.

The Council will continue to engage with other Member States on issues such as conflict prevention and resolution, including through use of Arria-style meetings, contacts during Council missions and other activities.

The Council's sanctions committees will also continue their engagement with other Member States, including neighbouring countries, to inform the Council's work and support the full implementation of Council resolutions.

Just as the United States supports reform here in the General Assembly, we will lead by example by continuing reform in the Council, consistent with the powers and principles laid out in the United Nations Charter.

The United States supports an expansion of the Security Council that can contribute to its strength and effectiveness, and is open to various options to realize such a reform. Earlier this year, the United States made a specific proposal for a modest expansion of the Council by adding a combination of permanent and non-permanent members. We stand by that proposal and are open to suggestions of other countries.

As Secretary Rice has said, "We want that important body to reflect the world as it is in 2005, not as it was in 1945" (A/60/PV.9, p. 9). We must also ensure that new permanent members are supremely qualified to undertake the tremendous duties and responsibilities they will assume. In our view, qualified nations should meet criteria in the following areas: size of economy and population, military capacity, contributions to peacekeeping operations, commitment to democracy and human rights, financial contributions to the United Nations, non-proliferation and counter-terrorism records, and equitable geographic balance.

We have long supported a permanent seat for Japan. We hope very much that Japan will be able to take a permanent seat at the earliest possible opportunity. And we believe that developing countries deserve greater representation on this body. As I have already noted, particular emphasis should be placed on criteria for membership. And those Member States that most clearly meet those criteria should be allowed to serve on the Council, even where there is a disagreement over other candidates.

The United States is prepared to engage fully in an effort to find a proposal that allows for agreement on expansion of the Council. However, too large an expansion would risk making it unable to quickly address challenges to international peace and security. However, we will not support a return to any of the three proposals introduced at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Simply put, in those past attempts we bit off more than we could chew. The debate in the Hall in July only highlighted deep divisions among Member States and paralysed the overall reform effort. We believe it would be a mistake to return to that discussion.

Because Security Council expansion requires amendment of the Charter — which requires approval by two thirds of the membership and by the five current permanent members, in accordance with their own respective constitutional procedures — we need to

prepare the way carefully to ensure that whatever approach we adopt can and will gain the requisite support of Member States during the ratification process. It is important that any proposal contribute to the effectiveness of the Security Council. Proposals that do not command the breadth of support necessary to be put into practice should be reconsidered.

The United States takes its responsibilities as a permanent member of the Security Council very seriously. History has shown that the Council, working together and with the full cooperation of all Member States, can reverse aggression, contribute to the expansion of freedom and maintain peace and security for the benefit of us all.

Mr. Menon (Singapore): It is a pity that the process to reform the Security Council has stalled. On the Council's expansion, except on the question of the veto, Singapore supports the lapsed draft resolution of the G-4. The G-4 proposal to expand the number of both permanent and non-permanent seats, which should include developed and developing countries, was a missed opportunity, as that would have updated the Council's membership and made it more representative of current-day realities. However, the regrettable inability to make progress in the area of expansion should not inhibit progress in other areas of United Nations reform.

The rationale of the right of the veto was born of a different era. It was a privilege and a safety valve conferred on the five victorious Powers in the Second World War to secure their participation in the United Nations, and hence ensure its success and viability. Sixty years on, Singapore opposes granting the veto to any new permanent members. Extending the veto to more countries would be a mistake, because it will complicate decision-making in the Council and undermine the credibility, efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations. That would encourage the major Powers to bypass it and would undermine the Council, to the detriment of all.

It is unrealistic to expect the five permanent members to give up their right to the veto. At the same time, they are clearly conscious of that fact. They should be commended for sharply reducing their use of the veto in recent years. We should focus on feasible steps to improve the Security Council's transparency, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness. It is in all countries' interests, including the interests of the permanent members, that the Council's efficiency and effectiveness be enhanced. To that end, the open debates on the Council's work — for instance, on terrorism — Council meetings with troop-contributing countries and innovations such as Arria-formula meetings are useful and welcome. However, a lot more can be done. Greater transparency and accountability in the Council's working methods would accord Council decisions greater moral and political authority beyond what is legally conferred by virtue of the Charter of the United Nations.

With regard to transparency and accountability, this is usually the time of year when many corporations and organizations begin to do their stock-taking, not only of the state of their assets but also of their performances over the past year, as they think ahead about their plans for the next year and for the future beyond that. Most institutions take great pride in preparing their annual reports, which comes out of such stock-taking.

In that regard, we have before us the report of the Security Council (*A/60/2*), submitted in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter. However, in looking at the report, my delegation regrets that the Council has once again wasted an opportunity to do an analytical review of its own work and performance. This year's report has reverted to the old style of reporting and is bereft of analytical content. My delegation also notes that the Council, in adopting that report, no longer discusses its contents or the Council's work performance.

My delegation does not pretend that it is easy to assess the work and performance of the Security Council. The Council's work is, of necessity, highly political. Since the end of the cold war it has also become extremely complex. It ranges from dispatching military operations and deploying election monitors to mandating arms inspections, imposing various kinds of sanctions on recalcitrant States, entities and individuals, establishing international criminal tribunals and commissions of inquiry, and requiring States to take various measures to counter terrorism and to report on the implementation of such measures. The legitimacy of the Council's imposing on States and individuals such a broad range of measures and requirements is often questioned these days. Legitimacy is an intangible thing that is hard to define, but we all know how important it is, because if an institution is perceived to lack legitimacy, then it

would cease to enjoy the support or consent of those affected by it. The Security Council is no exception. It needs to uphold, and be seen to be upholding, standards of fairness and justice in all its decision-making and actions, which should be legally justifiable in the context of the Charter of the United Nations.

The decisions made by the Council also need to be acceptable to Member States and the international community at large, in order for the Council to retain its legitimacy. As former Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar once noted, "The greater the Power, the higher is [its] responsibility to act and to be seen to act with justice" (*A/45/1, p. 17*). The Council can make the best possible decisions, but if those decisions are taken in exclusivity or if the Council fails or is unable to explain the rationale behind them to the general membership of the United Nations, then, over time, the decisions of the Security Council risk not being taken seriously.

That is the same reason that public communications these days is so important for all Governments and organizations that want to succeed. Even with the best possible performance, it is not enough just to perform well and expect people to accept by faith that this is what is good for them. Any institution that eschews transparency risks raising suspicions that something is amiss. Unfortunately, the Security Council's communications are often limited to making known its decisions and actions, but not disclosing how it arrived at them. That shortcoming has spawned discussions at numerous seminars, as well as many articles and books, about the Council's work and role. In short, if the Security Council is unwilling or unable to be more transparent, including by putting out good reports, then that work will find itself being outsourced.

In that regard, there is now a new initiative outside the United Nations that is aptly named the "Security Council Report", a project affiliated with Columbia University and directed by Colin Keating, former Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations. The Report will be officially launched on 6 December. According to Ambassador Keating,

> "This initiative responds to a need for consistent, high quality, publicly available information ... about the Council's activities and those of its subsidiary bodies. It reflects the belief that the lack of such information is a consistent barrier to the effective performance of the Council and a major handicap for United Nations Member States at large and the wider public."

There is obviously much scope for improving the working methods of the Security Council. However, in response to such criticisms and proposals for improvement, we have heard an interesting argument, namely, that it is not for the General Assembly to advise the Security Council on how to conduct its work. In that connection, the General Assembly and Security Council have been compared to legislative bodies where lower and upper houses are mutually exclusive.

However, such a comparison misses the point that, unlike such bodies, all Security Council members are members of the General Assembly. Moreover, under Article 10 of the Charter, the Assembly has the authority to discuss any questions or matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the functions of any organ of the United Nations, as well as to make any recommendations to United Nations Members and to the Security Council.

It is in this spirit that some of us, the smaller countries in the United Nations, have informally circulated the text of a draft resolution containing some ideas for improving the working methods of the Security Council. The ideas contained in the draft text do not advocate abandoning the current system; rather, we hope to build on the existing system by proposing improvements to working methods that will align them more with the needs and norms of the current times. The result will benefit the Security Council, including its permanent members.

I would also like to make it clear that the ideas contained in the draft resolution are not cast in stone. My delegation, as well as others involved in the initiative, is ready and willing to engage in consultations and discussions with the rest of the membership of the United Nations — individually, in small groups and collectively with the entire membership — to improve the draft resolution. It is our hope that other Members of the United Nations will respond constructively to our suggestions for improving the working methods of the Security Council. We also hope that, through such dialogue, we will be able to arrive at a text that is broadly acceptable to the general membership of the United Nations.

Mr. Maurer (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Like many other delegations, I wish, on behalf of Switzerland, to extend my most sincere condolences to the Government of Jordan, as well as to all the families of victims who are today suffering the consequences of the terrorist attacks which yesterday struck Amman and all of Jordan.

At the outset, I would like to thank the Security Council for the submission of its annual report and welcome its presentation to the General Assembly today by the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation. The report contains much useful information, for which we are grateful. However, we also observe that the report is mainly a compilation of meetings held and documents issued by the Security Council during the reporting period. As a significant financial contributor to the United Nations budget, including to the peacekeeping operations and to special political missions approved by the Security Council, Switzerland would welcome a more analytical presentation of the challenges the Security Council faced over the past year.

At the recent Millennium + 5 Summit, the heads of State and Government of the Member States of the Organization acknowledged that reform of the Security Council was an essential element of the reform of the United Nations and that it was necessary to make progress both on the issue of Security Council enlargement and on the improvement of its working methods.

Switzerland strongly favours enlargement of the Security Council. We share the general view that the present composition of the Council no longer adequately reflects contemporary geopolitical realities. My country is in favour of an enlargement based on objective criteria. We are, moreover, of the opinion that enlargement should not mean that the right of veto should be extended to other countries, because this would complicate the decision-making process within the Council and would hinder its ability to take action.

In our view, it is also essential to continue to improve the working methods of the Security Council. The summit outcome document expressly invites the Council “to continue to adapt its working methods”.

Many countries have recently called on the United Nations Secretariat to be more transparent and responsible in its actions in order to strengthen its own effectiveness and the effectiveness of the Organization as a whole. Switzerland fully agrees with this and thinks that the same principle should also apply to the Security Council. Its decisions are more likely to be understood and implemented if the Council takes the opinions of the larger membership into account to a greater degree.

Following a presentation by Switzerland in May 2005 of a non-paper on Security Council working methods, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Costa Rica, Jordan and Singapore, as a contribution to the Summit follow-up, decided to synthesize the most important proposals on working methods of recent years in a draft resolution. On 4 November, the co-authors of this draft distributed the draft text to all the diplomatic missions, with a view to discussing it informally with all Member States. On 18 November, we will hold an information session open to all.

The draft allows for the General Assembly to call upon the Security Council to consider a series of measures described in the annex and to report back to the General Assembly during the 60th session on the action it has taken pursuant to this draft. It is an instrument that is flexible in form, but it makes a number of specific proposals in response to recognized problems.

Part of the proposed measures aim at strengthening relations between the Security Council, the General Assembly and other main bodies of the United Nations. In particular, we propose making the discussion of the Council’s annual report a platform for a more interactive exchange of views, and to encourage the Council to make use of the possibility, envisaged in the Charter, of presenting thematic reports, and in general, of favouring greater involvement of all Member States of the United Nations in the work of the Council.

Other measures proposed deal with the work of the subsidiary bodies of the Council. We propose greater transparency and we encourage the Council to invite, on a case-by-case basis, non-Member States to take part in the work of certain subsidiary bodies, when such States have a strong interest or relevant expertise. The draft resolution also stresses the importance of improving listing and delisting procedures, a point that was expressly acknowledged in the outcome document of the Millennium + 5 Summit.

This draft resolution also contains specific proposals on the use of the veto. The first of these

proposals invites a Permanent Member that has used its veto to explain publicly its reasons for doing so, in order to make its position better known to the entirety of Member States. The second proposal is designed to prevent — bearing in mind the responsibility to protect — the use of the veto in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity and serious violations of international humanitarian law. These proposals do not affect the substance of the veto.

This draft resolution has been formulated with care and in such a way as to take account of the respective roles and competencies of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, as defined in the Charter. This draft resolution is based on Article 10 of the Charter, which grants the General Assembly the competence to discuss the functions of other United Nations organs. We have chosen with care the terms of the draft resolution, so that it does not infringe upon the prerogatives and competencies of the Security Council, since it invites the Council to consider the measures described. It is up to the Security Council to decide on the action it wants to take in order to follow up on the proposals. The proposals are written in such a way as to offer an element of flexibility and a margin of interpretation. It aims at dialogue and at launching a discussion process, and does not seek to impose ready-made decisions.

The five co-authors of the draft resolution favour a comprehensive Security Council reform. We are strongly of the opinion that this draft resolution does not in any way affect the discussion on the enlargement of the Security Council. As a matter of fact, we hope that these complementary processes will be mutually reinforcing. The treatment of these two questions in parallel processes is justified by the differences in their nature and by differences in the decisions to be taken. Whatever model is chosen, enlargement of the Security Council will necessarily entail an amendment of the Charter of the United Nations. By contrast, improvements in the working methods of the Security Council primarily involve changes in the Council's practice, if necessary, through modifications of the rules of procedure. In our view, they do not require modifications of the Charter.

As has always been the case in the past, Switzerland and its partners wish to act constructively in pursuing this initiative. We are open to continuing the discussion of the contents of this draft resolution with the permanent members of the Security Council, as we have in the past, as well as to discussing the time of its tabling and the appropriate time to take action, in particular to avoid any interference with initiatives concerning the enlargement of the Council. In order not to interfere with the discussions on enlargement, this resolution could be tabled at the appropriate time under the item of the agenda relating to the follow-up to the Millennium Summit, and not under the one relating to the enlargement of the Security Council.

To sum up, our draft resolution on the working methods of the Security Council is of interest to all United Nations Members because it aims at increasing transparency and participation and will thus contribute to the effectiveness and legitimacy of the Security Council's action. The draft resolution should be acceptable to the five permanent members of the Security Council, as it respects the prerogatives of the Council. It should be acceptable to all proponents of enlargement, under whatever formula they choose, because it seeks mutually reinforcing reform and because it comes at an appropriate moment in the discussions on Security Council reform and in the follow-up to the 2005 High-level Plenary Meeting.

Switzerland believes that progress must be made where possible. We cannot allow ourselves to get caught up in tactical considerations, which threaten to paralyse the reform process at a time when changes are crucial to advancing the goals of the United Nations.

Mr. Jenie (Indonesia): At the outset, allow me to join the President and the representatives who have spoken before me to express our profound sorrow, condolences and sympathy to the delegation, the people and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as well as to the families who lost loved ones in the terrorist attacks in Amman. Indonesia condemns those barbaric terrorist acts.

My delegation is once again pleased to welcome the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, which is contained in document A/60/2. The objective of that annual report is to provide Member States a summary of the work of the Council during the reporting period pertaining to its mandate: the maintenance of international peace and security. In view of the importance of the report, the Assembly's meetings on this item continue to be a good opportunity for us to review the work of the Council. For this reason, we are grateful to the members of the Council for their report, and to the General Assembly

for this opportunity to make a contribution to the debate.

As we all know, this meeting is also considering 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*). On behalf of my delegation, I would like to express my appreciation to His Excellency Mr. Jean Ping of Gabon, President of the General Assembly at its fifty-ninth session, for his active role as Chairperson of the Working Group and for his determined efforts throughout the session to move these issues forward. We would also like to thank Ambassadors Paulette Bethel of the Bahamas and Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein, Vice-Chairpersons of the Working Group, for their diligence and hard work in the service of the Group.

The report of the Security Council provides a useful outline of its work throughout the period under consideration, clearly demonstrating an upward trend in the scope and volume of the Council's activities. Among the areas of focus were the conflicts in several areas of Africa, the situation in the Middle East and terrorism. We are grateful to the members of the Council for their attention to those and many other issues.

Unfortunately, we must observe that the report is still far too much an enumeration of facts and not enough of a report that explains how or why certain decisions or courses of action were preferred over others. For many years, delegations have called on the Security Council to ensure that its report provides an analysis that fulfils that need. Until that happens, the annual report can have only a rather limited value. We urge the Council to pay attention to that issue. Our suggestion is that it should set clear guidelines to guide each annual analysis of its work. Such guidelines will prevent the analysis from requiring protracted annual negotiations before it can be prepared for the benefit of Member States. On that question, it is instructive that the report of the Open-ended Working Group also reflects the concern of delegations that the Security Council report "should be factual, comprehensive, substantive and analytical" (*A/59/47, annex II, para. 5*). Despite those concerns, we commend the Council for its work on peace and security issues throughout the period, particularly on peacekeeping, conflict resolution and terrorism.

Let me now turn to the report of the Open-ended Working Group. It is significant to note that there is provisional agreement on items under cluster II, which deals with methods of work. It is a matter of concern that we have not made much concrete progress on the substantive issues since the Working Group began its assignment, 11 years ago.

My delegation would like to reiterate its position that enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations demands a strong and active relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly, and indeed among all the organs. The World Summit Outcome made that point when it stated that

> "in order to efficiently perform their respective mandates as provided under the Charter, United Nations bodies should develop good cooperation and coordination in the common endeavour of building a more effective United Nations". (*resolution 60/1, para. 147*)

The Security Council is further called upon to adapt its methods of work in order to increase non-members' involvement in its work.

On the issue of accountability, in particular the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly, my delegation is concerned about the Council's gradual encroachment on the powers and mandate of the General Assembly. The Council should refrain from addressing thematic issues, since those fall within the purview of the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Indeed, there should be a clear demarcation of the respective fields of competence of the Assembly and the Council. Consultations between the Presidents of those principal organs should be institutionalized as soon as possible. Furthermore, my delegation considers that the Security Council ought to convene more formal meetings on specific issues under its consideration, in order that it might learn of, and be enriched by, the views of interested parties.

The report of the Working Group also underlines the desire of troop-contributing countries to enjoy stronger involvement in the decision-making processes of the Council, including at the early stages of mission planning. We share that position, because it will enhance unity among the parties in a peacekeeping process.

With regard to the use of sanctions, we reiterate our position that they should be used only as a last

resort, and after other means available to the Council have been exhausted.

Turning now to the issue of subsidiary organs, our position is that their work should be more accessible to Member States in general. Overall, the use of such organs should also be curtailed.

Indonesia has always supported a comprehensive approach to United Nations reform and will continue to do so. That exercise is overdue. It is most welcome that at the world summit heads of State or Government offered their support for early reform of the Council as an essential element of the effort to reform the Organization to make it more broadly representative, efficient and transparent, and thus to further enhance its effectiveness and the legitimacy and implementation of its decisions. They also committed themselves to a process that would achieve a decision to that end by the end of 2005.

It is our expectation that reform of the Council will help to strengthen the body and address these concerns by providing accountability, transparency and representativeness. In that connection, my delegation takes note of the draft resolution proposed by the delegations of Costa Rica, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Singapore and Switzerland. It is our hope that the President will be able to conduct further consultations on this matter and to reach the widest acceptable compromise among Member States.

In the light of those issues, my delegation believes that there is an urgent need for the members of the Security Council — particularly the permanent members — to respond positively to the substantive input being provided by the majority of Member States by showing the political will to act. Such a response should lead to an improvement in the Council's working methods.

Finally, members will recall that a few months ago, this body was thrown into an unusual situation, involving contestants for positions in an expanded membership of the Security Council. That experience, in which the issue of expansion completely overshadowed other major priority issues demanding our attention, including other aspects of United Nations reform, jeopardized the unity of the Organization. It is Indonesia's conviction that the unity of Member States remains of the utmost importance at all times. In that regard, we must take care to address equitably all issues of common interest in order to avoid divisiveness in the future. Indonesia is fully supportive of efforts to find a fresh approach to this matter in the spirit of unity.

Mr. Choi Young-jin (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I would like to convey my delegation's deep condolences to the victims of the bomb attacks that occurred in Jordan yesterday. We condemn in the strongest terms those heinous acts of terrorism targeted against innocent civilians. Our sympathy is with the people and the Government of Jordan at this time of trial.

I should like to thank the President of the Security Council for this month, Ambassador Denisov of the Russian Federation, for introducing the annual report of the Council (*A/60/2*). According to the report, the volume and scope of the Council's activities continued to grow over the past year. We note with concern that Africa remains the context for the majority of issues before the Security Council, accounting for 60 percent of its agenda.

There have been some positive developments in Africa. Burundi, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia seem to be on track in their transition from conflict to stability, with the process of nation-building under way and bolstered by recent successful elections. In many other countries, however, instability continues. In particular, the humanitarian crisis in the Darfur region of western Sudan is still going on, and fresh reports of increasing violence indicate that the situation is not improving. Another area of serious concern is Côte d'Ivoire, where elections could not take place as scheduled and anxieties are increasing. In addition, we are deeply concerned about the recent escalation of the tensions between Ethiopia and Eritrea and the restrictions imposed unilaterally on the movement of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea. We urge both countries to exercise maximum restraint.

We appreciate the Security Council's active efforts to maintain peace and prevent further disputes in Africa through the recent establishment of United Nations missions in several countries on the continent. We also welcome the Council's efforts to find long-term solutions to African issues by holding a constructive open debate on the topic and by adopting resolution 1625 (2005), on the prevention of conflict, particularly in Africa, at a summit-level Council meeting.

During the past year, the Security Council continued to devote considerable attention to the situation in Iraq. The period saw the achievement of significant political benchmarks on Iraq's path towards democracy, including the parliamentary elections in January and the formation of the Transitional Government in May. The approval of the draft constitution by national referendum last month demonstrated the desire of the Iraqi people to determine their own political future. We look forward to the upcoming general elections on 15 December, which we hope can serve as a foundation on which lasting institutions and national reconciliation can be built.

For its part, the Republic of Korea is continuing to help the Iraqi people to rebuild their country. In the light of the Iraqi Government's recent request, we welcome the adoption of Security Council resolution 1637 (2005), which extends the mandate of the multinational force in Iraq. The Security Council must continue to play an important role in stabilizing and reconstructing Iraq and in facilitating its transition to a fully representative Government.

With regard to Lebanon, we support the Security Council's continuing efforts to take follow-up actions in response to the terrorist bombing that killed former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri and others. The Council's unanimous adoption of resolution 1636 (2005) at the ministerial-level meeting last week sent a strong and clear message. That resolution must be implemented scrupulously.

Elsewhere in Asia, it is encouraging that Afghanistan has made progress in security and nation-building, with constant and broad assistance from the international community. In particular, we commend the holding of parliamentary and provincial elections in September, which completed the Bonn process. We also note with appreciation that, in cooperation with the United Nations, Timor-Leste has been successfully building solid foundations for peace and development for the past several years. We are confident that, building upon the progress made so far, Timor-Leste will become a model case of successful transition from conflict to peace and long-term development.

The past year saw terrorist attacks in London, Egypt, Iraq, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, India, Lebanon and elsewhere around the world — most recently in Jordan yesterday — demonstrating once again that no country and no individual is safe from terrorist attack. The international community must therefore stand united against terrorism. In that regard, the Republic of Korea notes with satisfaction that the Security Council continues to play a leading role in combating terrorism, in particular through its three Committees on the matter. Coordination and cooperation among those Committees should be further enhanced to make the Council's counter-terrorism activities all the more effective.

Let me now briefly turn to reform of the Security Council. This year, we had a very intensive discussion on the issue of Council expansion, and various proposals were put forward. Unfortunately, those discussions did not lead to much progress. The Republic of Korea has made it clear that it supports the idea of a reformed Security Council that is more representative, accountable and effective. In the same vein, we have opposed any expansion of the permanent membership. I will refrain from reiterating in detail my country's position on Security Council reform. I only hope that, with our collective wisdom, we can reform the Council so that it can better fulfil its mandate in the future.

We appreciate the efforts of the Open-ended Working Group to improve the Council's working methods. We also acknowledge the steps taken thus far by the Council to increase the transparency of its work and the involvement of non-Council members. We believe that, building on that progress, we need to undertake further reform of the Council's working methods to make the Council more transparent, democratic and efficient.

Mr. Dolgov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): This meeting of the General Assembly is taking place in the context of the common understanding endorsed by world leaders at the 2005 High-level Plenary Meeting with regard to the need for comprehensive strengthening of the United Nations as the central multilateral institution to address international relations and ensure global security and stability. The summit outcome document (*resolution 60/1*) set out the generally acceptable bases for continuing the collective effort to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations on the basis of a comprehensive approach.

In addition, the run-up to the summit once again underscored serious differences on the approach to

Security Council reform. Attempts to force a decision on that important problem have threatened that the drastic polarization of the positions of Member States would cause a rift in the United Nations. In such a climate it was not possible to reach a mutually acceptable solution to the matter of the expansion of the membership of the Security Council by the holding of the summit in September. The Russian Federation is certain that the search for an effective common denominator on this problem must be continued, so that an increase in the membership of the Council does not have a negative impact on the efforts of either the United Nations or the international community to address pressing global policy problems.

We are prepared to lend our agreement to any reasonable option for an increase in Security Council membership, provided it enjoys the broadest consensus possible. As we understand it, such consensus presupposes far more robust political support for the anticipated final outcome than the legally required two-thirds vote in the General Assembly.

Russia has consistently believed that reform must lead to further enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council through a limited increase in its membership. The Council must be more representative and must reflect changing international realities. Those goals can be achieved above all by bringing influential developing countries into the Council, as well as developed countries. Russia's position with regard to specific candidatures for permanent membership in the Council is well known, and we have repeatedly reaffirmed it.

Enhancing the representative character of the Security Council should not erode its effectiveness. That is why Russia calls for maintaining the Security Council's compact character, and why we believe that the number of members of a reformed Council should not exceed a reasonable number. On a preliminary basis, we have already had an opportunity to define such a number as 20-plus.

Russia is certain that ideas intended to encroach upon the prerogatives and powers of the current permanent members of the Security Council, including the right to the veto, are counterproductive. Advancing such ideas, which have no possibility of implementation, simply serves to arouse emotions and do not make it any easier to achieve agreement on the parameters for Security Council reform.

Russia will continue to contribute to the Security Council's efforts to improve its methods of work, increase transparency and deepen its interaction with non-members of the Council, in particular with countries contributing troops to peacekeeping operations. That position is in line with the approach taken by our Security Council partners, as has been reaffirmed in particular by today's debate. With regard to that fundamental position, Russia will continue to contribute constructively to achieving the broadest possible consensus on all aspects of Security Council reform, in the interest of comprehensively strengthening the central role of the United Nations in world affairs.

Mr. Duclos (France) (*spoke in French*): As other colleagues have done before me, I would like at the outset to convey our heartfelt condolences to the people and the Government of Jordan on the recent attacks in that country.

The report on the activities of the Security Council (*A/60/2*), which was introduced to the General Assembly by the Russian presidency of the Council, outlines all the activities undertaken by the Council during the reporting period. I thank Ambassador Denisov for his introduction. I believe that this exercise contributes positively to ensuring transparency and dialogue in the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

I shall not retrace Ambassador Denisov's excellent presentation. I would simply like rather to underscore a number of what my country views as key points. I shall do so in an analytical manner, in response to concerns raised by a number of colleagues. In doing so, I shall highlight three themes.

With regard to the first theme, the Security Council has continued to shoulder its primary responsibilities with regard to crisis management, concerning in particular the African continent. I am pleased to underscore the fact that it has often done so in close cooperation with the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States and other African organizations. Allow me also to point out that, on the initiative of Benin, the 14 September Security Council summit adopted a particularly innovative resolution on the subject of the prevention of conflict, Security Council resolution 1625 (2005).

In addition to African issues, allow me also to highlight the matter of Lebanon. The Security Council

has been united in addressing this issue, so that that country may be able to regain its full sovereignty, including by shedding light on, and rendering justice in, the case of the assassination of former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri.

With regard to the second theme in the work of the Security Council, the Council is meeting its responsibilities in the context of combating new threats, especially with regard to terrorism and proliferation. In that connection, I would note the importance of resolution 1624 (2005), adopted at the 14 September summit, on the issue of combating terrorism. Let me also mention that the Security Council is taking action on other issues — for example, the protection of children in armed conflict.

With regard to the third theme, the Council has increasingly devoted attention to the fight against impunity. This year, the Council met with the Presidents of the International Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, as well as with the President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. For the first time, the Council also met with the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court on the issue of Darfur shortly after the Court took up the case. I would also note that the Council devoted a meeting to the fight against impunity in Burundi.

Beyond the record of activities, one of the important lessons of the past year is that the Security Council in practice is continuing to enhance what are called its working methods. We are seeing an ongoing adaptation of these methods and, specifically, an evolution towards greater transparency and openness.

For example, more than in the past, the Security Council in recent months has taken up the concerns of the troop-contributing countries. We witnessed this recently, thanks to the initiative of Japan, with respect to the crisis between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The Council has also given particular attention to better involving States not members of the Council. For example, it has made sure that, within the framework of the various sanctions committees, it takes better account of the concerns of neighbouring countries.

The thematic debates, which are sometimes criticized, have also been an opportunity for the Security Council to learn more about the views of other Member States that are not Council members. Lastly, in the same spirit, I would note that the Security Council has worked to further bring on board non-State actors in terms of its work. The Arria-formula meetings have been used more frequently in order to meet with civil society and non-governmental organizations.

Behind this progress of recent years, there is obviously the commitment to seek in a pragmatic way a balance between the fact that the Council does need to meet its responsibilities — all of its responsibilities — and its commitment to being more open and to listen to the sensibilities of States not members of the Council or other actors that might have a useful role in terms of issues or crises that are being dealt with by the Council.

This brings me to the issue of Security Council reform. The heads of State and Government reaffirmed two months ago that Security Council reform was a central element in the United Nations reform. They undertook to ensure that this reform would occur as soon as possible. Let me say that this reflects wisdom. It seems to us that, in this area, one needs to show a spirit of responsibility and, therefore, to do nothing that would weaken our organ, whose mandate is to ensure international peace and security. At the same time, we must refuse to remain paralysed, because that would be detrimental not just to this or that State but to our entire Organization.

A discussion has been under way for months. Some say it was an acrimonious debate that carried the seeds of division. We believe that this has been a healthy debate, useful to better clarify what is at stake and, perhaps, to reconcile points of view.

I would say that, for our country, the more the subject was discussed and the more our own views were corroborated, it appeared that a just, effective solution entailed expansion in the two categories of members, permanent and non-permanent. It also seemed to us essential that Africa have its full due place within a Security Council reformed accordingly. And we support, more than ever, the aspirations of Germany, Japan, India and Brazil.

The draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by 31 sponsors last July continues to be fully relevant and pertinent. We reiterate our support for this text and, more than ever, believe that it offers a good compromise, one that could be accepted by the broadest number. In addition, it has the added advantage of dealing with two inseparable elements of Council reform — that is, the continuing improvement

of its working methods and the expansion of its membership.

I would like to comment on this last point. We believe that if we are to deal exclusively with the issue of continuing to improve the working methods, that would be detrimental to the issue of expansion of the Security Council's membership. We all know that for months, or even years, there has been an urgent need to improve the functioning of our Organization.

To sum up, we express the hope that the General Assembly, which before the end of next month is to take stock of progress made towards reforming the Security Council, will be in a position to report that real progress has been made.

Mr. Stagno Ugarte (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me first to join previous speakers in expressing our most sincere and heartfelt condolences to the Kingdom of Jordan on the terrorist attacks that took place yesterday in Amman.

In compliance with the obligation contained in Article 24 of the Charter, the Security Council today presents its annual report to the General Assembly for consideration and adoption. The report follows the revised format adopted in 2002 that introduced a number of improvements aimed at facilitating its consideration. However, contrary to the practice begun in 2002, when the report was discussed in depth at an open meeting of the Security Council — the 4616th meeting, held on 26 September — on this occasion, unfortunately, that precedent has been discontinued. Indeed, the Council held only a short formal meeting, which lasted only five minutes.

I believe it appropriate to refer to the Council's 4616th meeting, given that the 23 pages of its procès-verbal (*S/PV.4616*), containing the statements by the Council members, offer much greater insight into the manner in which the Council really works than do the 302 pages of the 2001-2002 annual report. Therefore, in discontinuing the practice of holding open meetings of the Council to discuss the substance of its annual report — in this case the 258-page report for the 2004-2005 period — we are truly taking a step backwards in terms of the Council's working methods.

Costa Rica is particularly proud to be an integral part of the group of five small nations — the "Small Five" (S-5) — which has authored and sponsored the most comprehensive draft resolution in recent memory on the working methods of the Security Council. Allow me to pay tribute to Switzerland for having spearheaded this joint effort to improve the internal procedures of the United Nations organ of most limited composition. Since some of our "Small Five" partners have already presented in detail our proposal, which has been unofficially distributed, I would like to concentrate on other aspects related to the Council's working methods and to the initiative in question.

I do not wish here to reiterate once again our position on Security Council reform. Let me simply reaffirm our conviction that the Council requires a comprehensive reform that will enhance its transparency, democracy and effectiveness, as well as improve Council rotation, so as to enable it to act on behalf of all Member States and in strict compliance with the Charter.

In that regard, we believe it the time has come to tackle the other side of reform, that is, the Council's working methods. However, our interest in the Council's working methods should not be interpreted as a lack of interest in the Council's expansion. We simply believe that consideration of working methods always suffers if it is tackled simultaneously and jointly with the issue of expansion.

In fact, and much to our disappointment, the consultations on Security Council reform that have been held in recent months have concentrated on its expansion alone. We are convinced that this is not sufficient, as we have the opportunity to show greater ambition and to move beyond mere readjustments to work jointly to reach a new consensus on the way in which the Organization must confront current threats. The democracy, transparency and accountability that must necessarily accompany the process of taking decisions that at times are binding on us all are dependent primarily on the working methods used.

While in the past we have had concerns regarding the working methods of the Security Council, such concerns have only multiplied given what we know of the role played by the Council in the mismanagement of the oil-for-food programme. Costa Rica believes that reform of the working methods of the Council is an integral part of the broader management and oversight reform effort currently under way in the United Nations. We believe that this logical conclusion can be drawn from the final report of the Independent Inquiry Committee, dated 7 September 2005, which made it

abundantly clear that the lack of transparency in the proceedings of the Security Council and of its subsidiary organs, in particular the Committee established pursuant to resolution 661 (1990), aggravated problems related to the management of the oil-for-food programme. Costa Rica has taken due note of the many though scattered references made by the Volcker Committee to the Council's working methods.

Because of our commitment to a United Nations endowed with efficient and transparent management and oversight mechanisms, we believe that there is a need to tackle management and oversight reform in a cross-cutting fashion, covering every aspect of this Organization if required. In that context, we cannot but conclude, on the basis of the Volcker report, that the internal management and oversight of the Security Council must be an integral part of the further overall management and oversight reform efforts undertaken. For that reason, we believe that it is particularly pressing to initiate a joint discussion in the General Assembly on the working methods of the Council.

There truly has not been an effort of comparable scope to that of the "Small Five" proposal since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 267 (III), to which I will refer in more detail later. Paradoxically, although the Open-ended Working Group has dealt with both cluster I and cluster II issues every year since 1993 — with the sole exception of the Razali proposal, which included significant reforms to the working methods of the Security Council — efforts to reform the Council have always given short shrift to its working methods. Costa Rica believes that it is high time that the General Assembly send an unequivocal message to the Council that it cannot continue to function if its transparency and accountability are not enhanced.

Given that the S-5 initiative was drafted in a spirit of caution and respect, inviting the Security Council to consider a series of measures enumerated in the annex, it is surprising to us that some are seeking to evade the issue of improvements by questioning the authority of the General Assembly in such matters. Allow me briefly to address some of the arguments that some Member States have advanced to counter the initiative put forward by the S-5.

I think that it is particularly important to restate the broad prerogatives that Article 10 of the Charter confers on the General Assembly. While its "comprehensive jurisdiction" clause is not regularly cited, Article 10 is unequivocally clear as to the statutory right of the General Assembly to discuss any question relating to the powers and functions of any organ of the United Nations. The General Assembly is not exceeding its authority when it reviews the working procedures of the Security Council; on the contrary, it is complying fully with its mandate under the Charter.

While some may argue that Article 12 expressly limits the General Assembly's powers of consideration and discussion, this is a purely procedural and temporary restriction that aims to avoid any duplication of work between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as can be ascertained from the fact that the Security Council has primary but not sole responsibility on matters pertaining to the maintenance of international peace and security. Uniting for Peace — resolution 377 (V) — is concrete evidence of the role that the General Assembly can and at times must play if the Security Council is unable to shoulder and discharge its Charter-mandated responsibilities. However, that argument simply does not apply in this case, because the S-5 initiative is merely an invitation to the Council to consider a series of purely functional and operational proposals that do not address or prejudge any situation in particular.

Some also say that Article 30 of the Charter stipulates that the Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure. That is certainly true. But it is ironic that some Council members take refuge in that Article when we have been using provisional rules of procedure for 60 years now, in contravention of the same Charter. Others argue that it is not necessary to formally adopt the rules of procedure, because, in the best Anglo-American tradition, Article 30 permits the gradual development and alteration of practice. If that were so, we should wonder why the same tradition has not been followed with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, which have the same power to adopt their own rules of procedure under other Articles of the Charter that were written in exactly the same manner as Article 30. The Charter provides no mandate to interpret Article 30 in the Anglo-American tradition and the other Articles in the Continental tradition.

Moreover, with regard to the General Assembly's supposed interference in the internal affairs of the Security Council — which, as already demonstrated, is

totally consistent with the comprehensive jurisdiction clause of Article 10 — I wish to refer to practice. At its 197th meeting, on 27 August 1947, the Security Council considered General Assembly resolution 40 (I). In that resolution, the General Assembly

> "Recommends to the Security Council the early adoption of practices and procedures, consistent with the Charter, to assist in reducing the difficulties in the application of Article 27 and to ensure the prompt and effective exercise by the Security Council of its functions; and
>
> "Further recommends that, in developing such practices and procedures, the Security Council take into consideration the views expressed by Members of the United Nations during the second part of the first session of the General Assembly."

Likewise, at its 224th meeting, on 19 December 1947, the Security Council considered General Assembly resolution 117 (II). It should be stressed that the resolution's sole preambular paragraph specifically says,

> "The General Assembly, in the exercise of its power to make recommendations relating to the powers and functions of any organs of the United Nations (Article 10 of the Charter)".

Finally, I should like to invite all Members to study General Assembly resolution 267 (III), adopted on 14 April 1949 with the affirmative vote of four permanent members — only the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics voted against it — which has many formal and procedural similarities to the current initiative of the S-5. I have circulated a copy of that resolution so that members may arrive at their own conclusions.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): We welcome today's joint debate not only as a measure to revitalize the work of the General Assembly, but even more because we believe that the issues of the report of the Security Council and Council reform are closely linked in substance.

During the months leading up to the summit, we witnessed impressive and orchestrated efforts to bring about reform of the Security Council — reform that we agree is long overdue. Those concerted diplomatic efforts were successful in bringing the topic of Council reform to the forefront of our agenda, and they in fact dominated the discussions in this building throughout the summer. They did not result, however, in the achievement of the declared goal of Council reform. In September, our heads of State or Government committed themselves to early reform of the Council and mandated the General Assembly to review progress made on that topic by the end of this year. With no concrete proposal left on the table, we seem to be in a place similar to where we were a year ago. The task immediately before us thus consists of re-creating the momentum for Security Council reform.

As members are aware, we, together with four like-minded States, have circulated a draft resolution on the issue of the Security Council's working methods. The Assembly has heard presentations by several of our co-authors — including, immediately preceding, the representative of Costa Rica, and in particular the representative of Switzerland, who made an excellent presentation on the substance of our draft resolution. I will thus limit my comments to three aspects of the draft resolution: its relationship to enlargement, its foundation in the outcome document (*resolution 60/1*) and its non-confrontational nature. We are pleased that the draft resolution is receiving much attention in the corridors, in informal discussions and in today's debate, which we hope will contribute to an informed discussion of our initiative.

All five of the States that launched the initiative strongly support enlargement of the Security Council, although we do not agree among ourselves on the modalities of such enlargement. We concur, however, in the view that the Council's working methods deserve the same attention and the same careful the consideration as the politically charged topic of enlargement. For small States in particular — and, in fact, for a large majority of the membership — our daily interaction with the Council is at least as important as the question of who serves on it as a member.

The three draft resolutions submitted in the course of this year, which deal with both aspects of reform — expansion and working methods — illustrate clearly that combining the two aspects would inevitably be to the detriment of working methods. We therefore concluded some months ago that addressing the two closely interlinked topics in a complementary manner is the only way to achieve satisfactory results in both areas. Moreover, while the two aspects are clearly two sides of the same coin, we see a marked difference in substance that further justifies separate

resolutions. Enlargement will always lead to a Charter amendment and thus will be completed once the necessary ratifications are in place. On the other hand, adapting the working methods is an ongoing process — based on a dialogue among Member States — that does not lead to a Charter amendment.

Given the lack of momentum in favour of enlargement and the continued absence of a magic formula for it, we are of the view that this is a good time to establish a basis for such a dialogue between the Security Council and the membership at large on working methods with a view to enhancing transparency, legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness, in accordance with the outcome document. We firmly believe that effectively addressing the issue of working methods will help to build momentum for enlargement as well and will illustrate the need to address the second issue of Security Council reform.

As I have stated, the initiative on working methods is solidly grounded in the outcome document, specifically in its paragraphs 152 to 154. The summit has already addressed, at the level of the General Assembly, the issue of working methods in general but clear terms. Indeed, that is nothing new, as the Open-ended Working Group, a subsidiary body of the Assembly, of which I have the honour to be a Vice-Chairperson, has been dealing with the issue for more than a decade. The draft resolution circulated among the membership is thus but an extension of the outcome document, and indeed follows up on the relevant recommendation contained therein. The first heading of the 18 measures proposed for consideration in the annex to the draft resolution deals with the question of the relationship between the Security Council and other principal organs, in particular the General Assembly. In fact, the draft resolution itself is a reflection of that relationship, which we believe should be a mutually reinforcing and open one.

We agree with those who argue that the Security Council is the master of its own procedures and therefore has the sole competence to decide on all procedural aspects of its work, including its working methods. Our draft resolution is aimed at reconciling that undeniable fact with the provision of the Charter that states that the Security Council carries out its duties on behalf of all Members of the Organization. It is therefore crucial that the Council engage in a dialogue with the membership on how best to conduct its work.

The work of the Council has clearly entered a new era since the end of the cold war. Statistical figures regarding such things as the number of meetings and of resolutions adopted illustrate that point quite clearly. Moreover, the Council has significantly expanded its activities into areas that were previously the domain of other bodies of the United Nations, in particular the General Assembly, and the role of its subsidiary organs has increased dramatically. That increase in activities, including in the area of sanctions, leads to the need for stronger involvement of the membership at large in the design of the relevant decisions of the Council. The political will of Member States is the main tool at the disposal of the Council to ensure the effective implementation of such resolutions. More transparency and stronger involvement by States will make a significant contribution to the effective implementation of the Council's decisions, as well as to their legitimacy.

The overriding goal of the draft resolution is therefore to strengthen the standing of the Security Council and to enhance the implementation of its decisions, and thus its effectiveness.

We fully support the manner in which Mr. Eliasson is guiding us in the implementation of, and follow-up to, the September summit. The summit left more undecided than we had hoped. There is consequently more left to do than we had anticipated. We agree that, in the circumstances, 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. We have circulated our draft resolution in order to make a contribution to that end. We will continue to engage in open dialogue with everyone who has a genuine interest in this topic, and we hope that this initiative will find broad support among the membership.

Mr. Toro Jiménez (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to condemn the terrorist attacks that took place yesterday in Jordan. I

express our condolences to the people and the Government of Jordan, as well as to the families of the victims of those heinous acts.

The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to thank the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation for his introduction of the report of the Security Council on its activities for the period 1 August 2004 to 31 July 2005 (*A/60/2*). In that connection, I wish to take this opportunity to state our position with regard to the work of the Security Council.

The report before us today highlights the significant growth, in both scope and volume, in the activities of the Security Council. Africa once again had a prominent place on the Council's programme of work. The Council has also given Africa higher priority in the fight against terrorism. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela attaches great importance to threats to international peace and security caused by acts of terrorism.

However, we also adamantly condemn the occupation of Iraq and the acts carried out by foreign military forces in that country. We wish to underscore the importance of initiating an investigation into the recent allegation of the use of lethal chemical weapons against the Iraqi people during the occupation of Fallujah.

We are also concerned about conflicts in the Middle East, especially the ongoing non-recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination that has resulted from Israel's construction of the separation wall on Palestinian territory and the consequences of that undertaking for the human rights of the Palestinian people.

We also wish to condemn the siege on Iran and the consistent failure to recognize its legitimate right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

We are concerned as well about the situation in the fraternal country of Haiti, whose people continue to be overwhelmed by poverty, helplessness and violence despite the fact that there is a peacebuilding operation in that country — or is it a peacekeeping operation? We are not quite sure what kind of operation it is.

We are also concerned about the situation in Africa in general, where there seem to be subtle attempts to covertly impose a new form of neo-colonialism.

Venezuela agrees wholeheartedly with the importance placed on those matters. However, we note that the Security Council has increasingly resorted to Chapter VII of the Charter in addressing issues that are not necessarily threats to international peace and security. In fact, an effort is now being made to confer legitimacy on that practice through the proposed reform of the United Nations. Moreover, we believe that the Council should instead, as appropriate, be more scrupulous to act under other relevant chapters of the Charter — such as Chapter VI, pertaining to the pacific settlement of disputes. In addition, we would like to reaffirm the importance for the Council to clearly define its authority and to focus on the functions and responsibilities conferred upon it by the Charter, so as to avoid repeated encroachment upon functions that fall within the purview of the General Assembly.

In that context, the Security Council should, as we have said, deal solely with matters that represent a threat to international peace and security and should remove from its agenda questions that have lead the Council to intervene with increasing frequency in the internal affairs of States.

We disapprove of the framework that has been created with a new generation of peacekeeping operations, which in their latest incarnation are called "peacebuilding operations" and are intended as a response to post-conflict situations. These operations seek to take on, in addition to the often debatable extension of the presence of Blue Helmets in the territory of United Nations Member States, the civilian tasks of reconstructing or re-establishing States that have incorrectly and unjustifiably been categorized as failed States and States immersed in internal conflicts. Taking on such tasks directly infringes on the right of peoples to freely choose their own model of development and their own manner of restructuring their political institutions. The ideological basis for these so-called peacebuilding operations, as they are envisaged in the discussions under way in the Organization, is the idea of a powerless, failed State. Such concepts derive from an analysis that lacks historical perspective and seeks to conceal realities of the contemporary world that cannot be ignored.

First, there is a tacit attempt to blame the collapse of a State of the type mentioned on the presumed ineptitude of its Government and people, who are rather the victims of the situation than responsible for

the outcome that led to the establishment of a peacebuilding operation. We know that, on the contrary, in some cases, the weakness of States categorized as failed States is, in general, rooted in the State's origins, because, generally speaking, many States were created as dependent and subordinate political and economic entities, in other words, as foreign protectorates or semi-protectorates of a neo-colonial character. If one opens one's eyes to reality, it can be seen that those countries have been the victim of destabilizing processes created by the "empire" and its allies, which deliberately unleash internal crises and wars in such States with the aim of recreating those States in conformity with the standards imposed by the world's centres of power and contrary to the cardinal principle of the self-determination of peoples.

It is, therefore, a fundamental mistake to think that the international community has the right or the power to determine which institutions need to be restructured for a so-called non-functioning State to be able to carry out its basic functions. In our opinion, as stated in the Charter of the United Nations, only the people of the State concerned have the collective and inalienable right to decide the foundation and structure of their model of development and their future destiny. In addition, those operations clearly are, or end up being, by definition, acts of repression, intervention and intimidation, in contravention of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

United Nations peacekeeping operations must be a tool used for the strict fulfilment of the provisions of the Charter and must conform without reservation, with the principles of the consent of the parties involved, impartiality and the non-use of force except in the case of legitimate defence, as established in Chapter VII of the Charter. Moreover, the mandates of those missions must not be ambiguous, because that leaves the parties involved hostage to the Security Council. Decisions taken with regard to peacekeeping operations must conform to the fundamental principles of international law, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, that is, unconditional respect for State sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the self-determination of peoples. In addition, peacekeeping operations must have the financing necessary to attain the desired result of lasting and sustainable peace.

In any case, peacekeeping operations do not contribute any kind of solution with respect to the deep-rooted causes of the conflicts that affect numerous Member States. Those causes are often serious and chronic socio-economic problems resulting from policies imposed by illegitimate Governments that are subordinate to foreign policies that are guided by the interests of multinational corporations and imperialist States.

For that reason, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela favours the promotion of an economic development of peoples that is free of external pressures, obstacles or interventions, because that is the only effective approach for the peaceful prevention of conflicts. We do not accept the pretext that these are so-called humanitarian interventions, nor can we accept the manipulation of the issue of human rights as the reason for imposing on States coercive measures that are not in conformity with the Charter.

We cannot agree with the opinion that the so-called international community — a euphemism that is often used to present the opinion and the dominant will of the great Powers and their court of allies — holds a presumed natural right and responsibility to take direct actions to protect peoples, in disregard of the borders and the authority of States. Nor does it hold a direct international guardianship allowing it to take repressive action against States and persons presumed to be the authors of crimes of genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity or, simply, the so-called systematic violation of human rights. That novel false and pernicious institution of guardianship and international responsibility, whose establishment some propose, as can be inferred from statements we have heard, would seek to empower the Security Council to take coercive measures against States, which always turn out to be the same ones: developing States and the States of the South, which are continually accused of systematic violations of human rights. That is done — or is attempted — through the accumulation of successive condemnations couched in a series of resolutions. This then leads to the creation of dossiers on certain States so they can be punished using so-called humanitarian interventions. This all is done with the avowed purpose of seeking to ensure the protection of human security. Human security is another concept used as a pretext and a camouflage for unjustifiable interference in the internal affairs of States.

My delegation believes that sanctions against States should be considered only as a final measure of last resort in extreme situations. They must not be used

as a concealed means of overthrowing a State's legitimate authority and they must be employed in strict accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and international law.

The fight against terrorism is one of the pillars of the foreign policy of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. The Venezuelan people and Government — with one voice — condemn and reject terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, as a deadly political tool used to kill and intimidate innocent, weak and helpless people anywhere in the world. Terrorism includes the consequences for civilian populations — often justified as collateral damage — resulting from a foreign invasion.

At the same time, we wish to make our position clear. In our judgement, the legitimate resistance of a people against foreign occupation or invasion does not constitute terrorism. In our view, a significant, effective and undeniable component of terrorism can also be seen in the daily round of falsehoods, distortions and manipulations disseminated by the national and international press serving imperialism and its allies, which conceals, distorts and prevents clear understanding of the achievements of peoples who are exercising their right to self-determination and creating their own future by trying to make another world possible.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has described two instances of terrorism to the Security Council. The first involves the case of a terrorist of Venezuelan nationality, Luis Posada Carriles, who is now in the United States with what appears to be refugee status. Posada Carriles is a fugitive from Venezuelan justice. He escaped from a prison in Venezuela, where he was being detained and awaiting trial for the downing of a Cuban aeroplane that resulted in the death of 73 crew members and passengers in 1976. Our country has requested extradition from the Government of the United States of America, on the basis of the present extradition treaty in force between our Republic and the United States. To date, there has been no response at all to that request from the authorities of the Government of the United States. There has only been a prolonged silence, which appears suspicious.

Given that undefined situation, we join others in stating that a terrorist is not just someone who carries out terrorist acts through his own actions, but also someone who protects terrorists. Our Government hopes that the steps we have taken to obtain extradition will be duly responded to by the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with the extradition treaty in force and other applicable norms of international law.

The second case involves the Reverend Pat Robertson, who has ties at the highest level to the Republican Party, and who has publicly called for the assassination of our President Hugo Rafael Chávez Frías. Mr. Robertson has undoubtedly committed a terrorist act, according to current international law and resolution 1624 (2005) — recently adopted by the Security Council — which, in its preamble, strongly condemns incitement to commit acts of terrorism and expresses deep concern that

> "incitement of terrorist acts motivated by extremism and intolerance poses a serious and growing danger to the enjoyment of human rights, threatens the social and economic development of all States, undermines global stability and prosperity, and must be addressed urgently and proactively by the United Nations and all States".

Moreover, in paragraph 1 that resolution

> "Calls upon all States to adopt such measures as may be necessary and appropriate and in accordance with their obligations under international law to:
>
> (a) Prohibit by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts;
>
> (b) Prevent such conduct;
>
> (c) Deny safe haven to any persons with respect to whom there is credible and relevant information giving serious reasons for considering that they have been guilty of such conduct".

We do not understand how the Government of the United States of America can allow Mr. Robertson to continue with impunity to make absurd, insane and disrespectful comments against the President of a democratic State who has repeatedly been reaffirmed in his constitutional mandate by the Venezuelan people.

The Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has also taken steps aimed at having Mr. Robertson extradited for crimes committed against

the President of the Republic that are covered by the penal code of Venezuela and international law. Again, we hope that, after those steps have been taken, the formal request for extradition will be duly and diligently heeded by the United States authorities.

We reiterate that under international law it is prohibited to harbour known terrorists. Security Council resolution 1373 (2001), in its paragraphs 2 (c) and 3 (g), prohibits States from providing asylum to those who commit acts of terrorism, and disallows claims of political motivation as grounds for refusing requests for the extradition of terrorists.

Moving on to another matter, namely, the question of equitable representation in the Security Council and the increase in the membership and related matters, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela feels that the Security Council must enlarge its membership. However, there must also be an increase in the permanent as well as the non-permanent membership, with the inclusion of developing countries among the permanent members. That would reflect the new geopolitical realities in the world and the great need to have balance within the Security Council and within the Organization.

Moreover, Venezuela believes that the right of veto should be eliminated, so that we can move forward towards democratizing the Organization. Reform of the Council must be considered alongside other themes to be discussed in the General Assembly. Among such themes, national development is a priority matter for our country, a problem of crucial importance for the national security of our country and other countries as well.

Our delegation believes that improving the working methods of the Security Council will not provide a panacea or remedy for dealing with the objectionable activities of that body, nor will it ensure full transparency. Using the Arria formula, which has been referred to recently in this Hall, is only another way to hide or obscure the lack of transparency through a supposed consultation with representatives of civil society, where no one really knows who they are nor what interests they really represent.

To discuss working methods as a priority matter is simply a means of disregarding the main question, namely, the progressive erosion of the Council's credibility and its lack of legitimacy, as its present work shows. Thus, the great need to make that body more democratic again becomes apparent.

Finally, my Republic is not in favour of creating new United Nations bodies in which the presence and decisive pre-eminence of permanent members of the Security Council would be reaffirmed to the detriment of the rights of other Member States to participate on an equal footing in those bodies.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry (United Kingdom): May I, at the outset, express on behalf of the United Kingdom our deepest sympathy to the people and Governments of Jordan and Iraq and to the families and friends of the victims of the indiscriminate attacks, which we condemn in the strongest terms.

In his introduction of the annual report of the Security Council, Ambassador Denisov has highlighted several key achievements of the Council this year. I would like to add to those listed by him the adoption, in the margins of the United Nations summit, two important resolutions. The first of these calls on all United Nations Members to act to stop incitement to terrorism; the second provides the basis for a more comprehensive and coherent approach to the prevention of conflict, particularly in Africa.

I shall concentrate my remarks now on what more can and should be done to make the Security Council more broadly representative, efficient and transparent. The United Kingdom is an active member of the Open-ended Working Group on Security Council reform. We have long supported adding new permanent and non-permanent members, including Germany, Japan, India and Brazil as permanent members, as well as increased permanent representation for Africa.

We also want to see improvements in the Council's working methods, as recommended in the summit outcome document — that is, increased transparency and accountability. We recognize that other United Nations Members want this too, as is clear from this debate and the various contributions to it. The United Kingdom recognizes that it falls to the Security Council, as the summit agreed, to continue to adapt its own working methods, and we believe this process should indeed continue as part of our commitment to summit implementation.

So, let me set out three areas where the United Kingdom particularly wants to see continuing improvements. First of all is the issue of transparency.

The Council should involve non-members more, for example, through informal, Arria-style meetings, contacts with civil society, including during Council missions, and more dialogue with troop-contributing countries. A recent useful example, in our view, was the meeting of the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations with troop contributors to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea, which included a substantial and thoughtful debate about the immediate and underlying issues facing that Mission today.

Secondly, there is the area of consultation. The Council should engage more in dialogue with non-Council members and other experts, both to build up greater expertise and to respond to others' concerns. Ambassador Denisov has mentioned increased dialogue between sanctions committees and interested countries. We should build on this in other areas.

Another welcome development is increased coordination with regional and subregional organizations on conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and in the fight against terrorism. We see the Peacebuilding Commission as an opportunity to ensure that the Council gets coordinated advice, taking full account of the views of major donors, regional organizations, troop contributors and others, especially those interested in a particular country's situation. This should improve the Council's own decision-making in peacebuilding by enabling it to be informed by advice across the range of peacebuilding issues.

Thirdly, there is the matter of efficiency. The United Kingdom wants to find ways to simplify and rationalize the work of the Council, including the Council's growing number of subsidiary bodies, so it can avoid duplication and concentrate its efforts where they matter most.

We look forward, therefore, to the views of incoming Security Council members on these issues; their new ideas will be valued. Indeed, the Council owes many of its innovations, like Arria-formula meetings, to past members.

The Council has had a sad burden of responding to the continued number of terrorist attacks against Member States of the United Nations. Terrorism, therefore, remains at the centre of the Council's work. We are conscious of the summit's encouragement to the Council to consider reform in this area, too, in particular how to strengthen its monitoring and enforcement role in counter-terrorism, including by consolidating reporting requirements, while respecting the different mandates of the counter-terrorism subsidiary bodies. Recommendations were also made to improve the monitoring of the effects of sanctions and to ensure that fair and clear procedures exist for placing individuals and entities on sanctions lists and for removing them, as well as for granting humanitarian exemptions.

The Council has already begun to examine how it can respond to those and other suggestions. The United Kingdom hopes the coming year will see at least some of these proposals implemented, and the Council's working methods invigorated, in the interests of greater effectiveness and impact. We intend, therefore, to work closely with others, both Council members and non-Council members, in order to achieve this.

Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, I would like to thank the Bureau and the General Assembly members for the noble sentiments expressed to us as a result of the terrorist crimes that were committed yesterday in Amman. We will never forget how the members have stood by our side at this critical moment.

The United Nations reform process is established and continuous. This has been demonstrated through Member States' support of the conclusions of the outcome document (*resolution 60/1*) of the summit that opened the sixtieth session of the General Assembly. Today, before this General Assembly, we are trying to contribute to the implementation of the objectives of that document and to deal with one of the main issues of common interest, the working methods and machinery of the Security Council.

Despite the fact that I have already expressed Jordan's position on the question of Security Council reform, a matter without which the comprehensive reform of the United Nations cannot be completed, I would like to renew our commitment to the necessary expansion of Security Council membership in both the permanent and non-permanent categories and our support for the draft resolution that was submitted to the General Assembly last August on that reform and expansion.

However, we still believe that the said draft resolution does not comprehensively address the question of developing and strengthening the Council's working methods. Therefore, we are convinced today

that, owing to the importance of this issue, we have to deal with this question in a separate, specific and comprehensive resolution. Jordan therefore completely supports the draft resolution that has been distributed on the development of the working methods of the Security Council. We have contributed to it, and, together with Switzerland, Costa Rica, Liechtenstein and Singapore, we were among the original sponsors. We are fully convinced that the draft resolution on the development of the working methods of the Security Council represents a positive step in the right direction on the way to comprehensive reform within the framework of the United Nations.

We must contribute to improved implementation of practical and specific proposals to achieve our shared goals with respect to the need for the Security Council to consider questions in a comprehensive manner, with respect to the Council's accountability and legitimacy and with respect to the transparency of its work. All those factors contribute to strengthening the effectiveness of the Security Council. Improving the Council's working methods and mechanisms is not an end in itself but a means of contributing to the larger goal of reforming the United Nations.

Mr. Mra (Myanmar): First, I would like to convey the deepest sympathies of my delegation to the Government and the people of Jordan, as well as to the injured, in connection with the terrorist bombings in Amman. We cannot condone those heinous acts.

I express our deep appreciation to the President of the Security Council for the current month, Ambassador Andrey Denisov of the Russian Federation, for introducing the report of the Council covering the period from 1 August 2004 to 31 July 2005 (*A/60/2*). I should also like to commend the excellent work done by the President of the General Assembly at its previous session, Mr. Jean Ping, and his Vice-Chairpersons in guiding the work 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.

The Security Council is entrusted by Member States with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and with a mandate to act on their behalf. We are of the view that, by virtue of the Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Charter, the Security Council is accountable to the General Assembly. It is thus most appropriate that Member States are given this rightful opportunity to review the work undertaken by the Council during the reporting period. This is a time for reflection on the Security Council's performance. During our debate on the interrelated reports of the Security Council and of the Open-ended Working Group (*A/59/47*), we need to examine the way the Security Council has carried out its mandate and how we can make the Council more representative. We should also look at ways and means to improve its working methods.

We had high hopes that the 2005 world summit would bring significant improvements in our approach to the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council. However, we regret that no significant result was reached at the recent world summit in that important area of Security Council reform. However, at the summit, leaders agreed that the early reform of the Security Council is 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 further enhance its effectiveness and the legitimacy and implementation of its decisions. In accordance with the commitments made by our leaders, we must continue our efforts to that end.

My delegation has stated its position on reform of the Security Council on several occasions. We share the common view that the United Nations must be reformed in order to reflect the global realities of today, the increased membership of the United Nations and the need for broader representation based on equitable distribution, mutual benefit and cooperation. If the Security Council is to be more representative of contemporary political and economic realities, it should be expanded in both the permanent and the non-permanent categories.

If agreement can be reached, expansion of the Council's membership will make it more representative. However, expansion alone may not fully ensure the Council's effectiveness or transparency. We therefore believe that Security Council reform must also place special emphasis on further improvements to the Council's working methods and decision-making process in order to make its work more transparent and more democratic, so that it can better serve the interest of the entire membership of the Organization.

My delegation therefore welcomes paragraph 154 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*), which recommends that the Security Council adapt its working methods so as to increase the involvement of States not members of the Council in its work, enhance its accountability to the membership and increase the transparency of its work.

In that regard, my delegation is deeply appreciative of a number of initiatives taken by the Council in recent years to promote its transparency, such as the increase in the number of public meetings, the enhancement of communication and cooperation with troop-contributing countries, the delivery of press statements by the President of the Security Council and the regular holding of joint meetings among the Presidents of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

The Council's frequent convening of open debates is a step forward in enhancing the involvement of the larger membership, because it gives States not members of the Security Council a valuable opportunity to express their views on matters affecting them and the Organization. Such open debates would be more effective if the resolutions and decisions adopted by the Council took into account the views raised in those debates by States not members of the Council.

Because the non-permanent members of the Security Council represent their respective regional groups, they should keep their regional groups informed of developments in the Security Council. In that regard, my delegation welcomes the recent briefings given by Security Council members, in particular the briefings by Japan and the Philippines for the members of the Asian Group on the work done during their respective presidencies of the Council. Such briefings are extremely useful and valuable for States not members of the Security Council. It would be even more beneficial if Security Council members also held consultations with their respective regional groups before the Council adopted a draft resolution.

My delegation has also noted the gradual increase in both the volume and the scope of the work of the Security Council. My delegation shares the growing concern at the Security Council's gradual encroachment on the powers and the mandate of the General Assembly. Over the years, there has been a growing tendency to hold Security Council discussions on thematic issues that have traditionally been considered by other organs of the United Nations. Thematic discussions can be fruitful only when they are directly related to the Council's mandate.

More worrisome is the Security Council's tendency towards increasing involvement in work of a legislative nature, which has traditionally been under the domain of the international multilateral instruments adopted following a thorough negotiation process involving all States Members of the United Nations.

My delegation deeply appreciates the work done by the Security Council on issues that are directly related to the Council's mandate. At the same time, it is of paramount importance that members of the Council act strictly in accordance with the purposes and the principles of the Charter and that they resist any attempt to take up issues that do not pose a real threat to international or regional peace and security.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express its hope that, under the new chairmanship, the Working Group will continue to exert efforts to achieve further progress on the outstanding issues concerning the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and other matters related to the Security Council.

Mr. Hannesson (Iceland): Like colleagues who have preceded me, I condemn the terrorist attacks yesterday in Amman in the strongest terms. On behalf of the Government and the people of Iceland, I convey our profound condolences to the Government and the people of Jordan and, in particular, to those who lost family members and those who were injured.

At the outset, I would like to thank the President of the Security Council for the month of November for introducing the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly (*A/60/2*). The report reflects the continued increase in the volume and the scope of the activities of the Council. I will, however, limit my short statement to the issue of reform of the Security Council.

With respect to the working methods of the Security Council, Iceland has consistently supported calls for increased transparency in the work of the Security Council. That implies more openness, proactive communication and strengthened accountability. Some substantive steps have been made in that regard, such as the growing practice of open

briefings, meetings and debates of the Security Council, which we welcome. The open debates can serve as an important tool for communication among the Security Council, the wider United Nations membership and international civil society.

Iceland agrees with the Secretary-General that effective reform of the United Nations entails reform of the Security Council. Iceland has advocated a more representative and legitimate Council that better mirrors today's geopolitical realities. We are of the view that there should be an expansion of both the permanent and the non-permanent membership of the Council. Changes are long overdue. During the general debate in September, the Foreign Minister of Iceland expressed disappointment that the Group of Four proposal for reforming the Security Council seemed not to have the support it deserved: "While not perfect, it remains the most practical basis for reforming the Council. That approach therefore continues to have Iceland's firm support" (*A/60/PV.16, p.6*).

Indeed, Iceland was one of the sponsors of that proposal, draft resolution A/59/L.64, introduced last July at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly. In our view, that proposal continues to be pertinent and relevant. Consensus on the expansion of the Security Council is desirable, but, after more than 12 years of debate, we all know that it is not reachable. We should use the democratic decision-making power at the disposal of the General Assembly.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the establishment of Security Council Report, an independent not-for-profit organization affiliated with the Columbia University Center on International Organization, which aims to provide consistent, analytical information to the public on the activities of the Security Council. I believe that this initiative will be especially beneficial for smaller delegations.

Ms. Banks (New Zealand): First, I extend New Zealand's sincere sympathy to the people and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan following the tragic bombings yesterday in Amman.

I would like to join others in welcoming both the report of the Security Council (*A/60/2*) and the report of the Open-ended Working Group on Council reform (*A/59/47*). As Ambassador Denisov made clear this morning, the pressures on the Council are considerable. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of Council members in managing an ever more complex and demanding agenda.

The report of the Security Council highlights the continued increase in the volume and the scope of that agenda. That in itself makes it all the more important that we have transparency in the Council's proceedings. Given the far-reaching implications of Council decisions, the membership needs to understand what decisions are being taken in the Council and why. While there have been some improvements over the years, there are still too few practical and effective mechanisms for interacting with the Council on key issues. And even where discussions do take place, Member States often feel that their views are not taken into account.

Our challenge is to resolve those concerns in a way that allows the Council to do its work quickly and efficiently and at the same time gives Member States greater confidence in the Council's decisions.

Like others, New Zealand sees a need for some basic changes in the Council's working methods. First, while structured open debates provide a good opportunity to put views on record, we would like to see greater use made of smaller, informal meetings in which the Council and the membership can discuss particular issues. The regional meetings arranged during the negotiation of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) set a good precedent, as do the regular briefings that some Council members hold for their regional groups.

We would also like to see more extensive use made of drafting groups that include Member States not currently serving on the Council. That has been done successfully on issues such as Kosovo, Timor-Leste and Afghanistan. Similarly, we ask that the Security Council's subsidiary bodies consider involving non-Council members in their work. That would have the benefit of assisting the Council with its workload as well as enhancing transparency and adding to the Council's range of expertise. We ask too that the Council be made much more responsive to the interests and the views of troop-contributing countries with respect to the establishment, conduct and review of peacekeeping operations.

On the important issue of consultation, we would request the Council to look carefully at the capacity of Member States when considering new compulsory measures. As noted this morning by Barbados, on

behalf of the Caribbean Community, while there are often compelling reasons for placing urgent and far-reaching requirements on Member States, such as the counter-terrorism measures, due attention needs to be paid to the ability of Member States to meet those requirements. In our view, the Council needs to have an open and inclusive dialogue with all Member States to ensure that the compliance burdens are realistic and manageable. We have raised that concern previously with respect to the impact of those requirements, for instance, on our Pacific neighbours. We welcome the recent focus of the Al-Qaida and Taliban sanctions Committee, the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) on providing technical assistance to developing States, and we hope that creative ways can be found to address the challenging reporting requirements involved.

We remain concerned that Council action on some issues has not been possible because of the use of a single veto or a silent veto. There were several occasions in the past year when delays or complete inaction occurred despite overwhelming international support in favour of the Council taking action. We regret the situation and once again would like to put on record our unequivocal opposition to the veto, both with respect to current permanent members of the Council and any potential future members.

As a final point on working methods, I would particularly like to welcome the draft resolution circulated informally last week by Switzerland, Costa Rica, Jordan, Singapore and Liechtenstein. The draft touches on many of the points I have made and we very much hope that it will stimulate an open and constructive discussion among the membership on strengthening the work of the Council.

Finally, a word on Security Council expansion. At the world summit, leaders supported early reform of the Security Council. They committed themselves to continuing efforts to achieve a decision on the issue. New Zealand welcomes that commitment. We are of the view that the Security Council should be more broadly representative, effective and transparent. We believe that any expansion of the Council must include Japan.

Mr. Pleuger (Germany): Let me begin by condemning in the strongest terms the heinous terrorist acts committed in Amman, and expressing our heartfelt condolences to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and to the families of the victims.

We are grateful for the President's decision to schedule this debate on Security Council reform alongside our discussions on other pressing reform topics, such as management reform, the Human Rights Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. That clearly confirms the conviction expressed by our heads of State in the outcome document, that Security Council reform is an essential part of overall reform.

The recent general debate in the General Assembly also reflected that view, as did the Secretary-General when he stated that no United Nations reform can be complete without Security Council reform. Around 140 speakers made a point of stressing the need for Council reform in that debate. Obviously, the issue is going to stay on our agenda, because the need for action is so widely recognized. We will not make the problem go away just by waiting. Action is needed, and action there will be.

The G-4 have presented a comprehensive proposal that will basically do four things. First, it will increase the legitimacy, transparency and effectiveness of the Council. Secondly, it will ensure the participation of major contributors to the maintenance of international peace and security. Thirdly, it will ensure equitable representation of developing countries and of Southern Hemisphere nations in the Council, and fourthly, it will improve the Council's working methods.

We continue to believe — and we fully share what has just been stated by the Ambassador of Iceland — that our proposal is the one that most comprehensively addresses the reform needs of the Council. Naturally, and let me stress again, we remain open to discussing amendments and other proposals that could improve our proposal in its substance and that could broaden the basis of support for reform.

There are also other proposals being discussed, such as the African Union resolution and the proposal on working methods presented by five countries. They all demonstrate the continuing interest in reform and contribute to the dynamics of the reform process. The African Union model, in fact, is very close to the G-4 proposal. In the last General Assembly, the African Union could not put its resolution to the test or consider a compromise with the G-4 because it needed more time to consolidate its position. Now, we

understand that at its summit in Addis Ababa in October, the African Union decided to take action on this issue. We welcome that decision and hope it will pave the way for a decision on Security Council reform.

Let me now turn to a question which has come up recently: should we approach Security Council reform by stages, in a piecemeal manner? Our opinion is, clearly, no. Only a reform proposal addressing all major facets will be able to deliver satisfactory results.

We want neither an enlarged Council that does not change its ways, nor recommendations for working methods reform that look good on paper but will not be implemented in a Council that remains structurally the same. For 60 years the Council has worked with provisional rules of procedure. How could we expect it to modernize its working methods now if its composition remains the same?

In order to reform the Council's working methods, we need a structural change in the balance of power of the Council. To achieve that, we need to increase the numbers of both permanent and non-permanent members. New permanent members would be bound by political commitments they have made in the process of Security Council reform. They know from their experience as non-members and as elected members of the Council what the justifiable and legitimate needs of the membership outside of the Council are — in particular, more transparency, more inclusiveness and accountability. This group, therefore, constitutes the best instrument to bring about change. That is why we think it is neither useful nor realistic to separate cluster I from cluster II issues.

It has become clear to all of us that there is no consensus on Security Council reform and that there will be none in the future. A vote therefore is unavoidable. It is obvious that all those who oppose a vote in fact want to prevent Security Council reform from happening. I would like to ask all those who warn against a vote on this crucial issue how they reconcile their stand with the clear demand in the outcome document for results in reforming the Council.

There is another contradiction. Some members of the so-called Uniting for Consensus group, who always opposed a vote, now support a draft resolution on cluster II issues and eventually intend to put that to the vote. There is evidently no more consensus on working methods than on enlargement. If a vote on one is advocated, then we feel a vote on the other should be accepted as well.

Last week, our colleague and my friend, the Ambassador of Pakistan, compared the United Nations to an old and leaky sailboat that we are trying to repair in mid-voyage. He proposed that we do what we can on necessary repairs, but not rock and capsize the boat by tackling everything at once. I think the comparison with a boat at sea is very apt, only I draw a different conclusion from the metaphor: if we find ourselves sailing in a vessel that has a number of leaks, I would advise repairing all of those and not leaving one of the biggest leaks open to take in water. I would also advise using all the tools available for repairs. The vote is an effective tool, and we should use it.

There are those who worry that an increase in the membership of the Council might diminish its effectiveness. But effectiveness is not exclusively a function of the decision-making procedure, that is, how easily the necessary majority vote is obtained for a resolution. Effectiveness is determined also by the legitimacy of a body, just as much as by the number of its members. If the membership of a body adequately reflects today's political realities, if it incorporates the perspective of all world regions and if it includes those in its decision-making who will contribute the most to the implementation of resolutions — only then will you have a body that is efficient both in taking decisions and in implementing them.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.