



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

50th plenary meeting

Wednesday, 12 November 2014, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

President: Mr. Kutesa (Uganda)

In the absence of the President, Mrs. Baaro (Kiribati), Vice-President, took the Chair.

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

Agenda item 119 (continued)

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

Mr. Thoms (Germany): Let me begin by commending the President of the Assembly, Ambassador Kutesa, on the appointment of the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, as the new facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations. We are confident that his choice, a result of thorough consultations, will lead to substantial progress in the negotiation process. We assure Ambassador Rattray that we stand ready to collaborate closely with him, unified in our desire for a results-oriented process to bring about reform of the Security Council. At the same time, I would like to extend my gratitude to Ambassador Tanin, who has dedicated so much energy to bringing the intergovernmental negotiations to the point they have reached today.

I would like to align myself with the statement delivered by Ambassador Patriota of Brazil (see A/69/PV.49) on behalf of the Group of Four countries and would like to add the following remarks in my national capacity.

Speaking of the efforts and achievements so far, Germany considers the non-paper developed by

former President of the General Assembly John Ashe and his advisory group to be a crucial document, as it summarizes the various positions of the different groups on this issue and constitutes one possible text-based foundation for our negotiations in the intergovernmental negotiations.

After a lengthy exchange of positions, the time has come to finally translate rhetoric into actual negotiations and make real progress on Security Council reform. The necessity is evident. All of us acknowledge the need to overcome the deadlock that has caused us so much frustration and suffering for the people who turn to the Security Council for help. However, it is our responsibility not only to name the problem, but also to dissect it and solve it. Let me mention a few decisive points.

First of all, the demand for an ex-ante consensus text, before negotiations have even started, will not lead to any results. That is not in line with the usual United Nations working methods and has caused the continued stalemate in the reform process thus far. All transparent and output-orientated negotiations require a negotiation text. We are completely open regarding the content of such a text. We sincerely hope that the President will present such a text as a starting point for the next intergovernmental negotiations.

Directing our view beyond the deadlock on Syria and Ukraine, we feel that the necessity to reform the Security Council remains obvious and that reform is long overdue. The Council is far from representing the geopolitical realities of the twenty-first century.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in 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 U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

14-62341 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



The legitimate demand of a majority of nations for an equitable geographical distribution in the Security Council represents one major pillar of the Group of Four (G4) proposal. There have been various attempts by different groups to improve the work of the Council so far, and we welcome, for example, the constructive work by the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group to reform working methods. In addition, the French-Mexican proposal on limiting the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities received major support across regional groups and underlined the undeniable necessity to reform the Council. However, the attempt to overcome the current paralysis of the Security Council by merely reforming its working methods without a real, structural reform cannot succeed.

The President took the Chair.

The United Nations seventieth anniversary in 2015 will be an historic opportunity. The anniversary marks 50 years since the first and last Security Council reform, 20 years since the beginning of the reform debate and the establishment 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 and, most importantly, 10 years since the Heads of States and Government, at the 2005 World Summit, called for an early reform of the Security Council. It is our obligation to live up to those expectations.

Germany, together with its G4 partners, will give its utmost to reinvigorate the process in order to achieve a tangible outcome by the end of next year. We call upon all reform-oriented countries to join us in that endeavour.

Mr. Ja Song Nam (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): At the outset, let me begin by expressing our appreciation to you, Sir, for convening this meeting on such an important issue.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Iran (see A/69/PV.49) on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The task of reforming, without further delay, the Security Council, which has the primary mission of guaranteeing international peace and security, is pressing. Recently the high-handedness and arbitrariness of the super-Power in the Security Council has reached an extreme level, directly threatening the peace, security and independence of sovereign

States. The Security Council's wrong handling of the extremely dangerous situation on the Korean peninsula is a typical example.

Today, the Korean peninsula holds a crucial place in guaranteeing peace and security in Asia. There is now on the Korean peninsula a vicious cycle of aggravated tension, which is increasingly jeopardizing the peace. However, the Security Council has failed to even properly determine the cause of the tension, not to mention its failure to find an appropriate solution for the tense situation on the Korean peninsula. The fundamental causes of the vicious cycle of tension on the Korean peninsula are none other than the hostile policy of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as the United States-South Korea joint military exercises, which are aimed at provocations, such as the occupation of Pyongyang, the capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Nevertheless, the Security Council is intentionally turning a blind eye to the aggressive war games and nuclear threat of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and chooses to make an issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's unavoidable choice to cope with those threats. In particular, the Security Council is still avoiding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's demand for the consideration of the matter of the United States-South Korea joint military exercises as an agenda item of the Security Council. If the Security Council wants to fulfil its mission of maintaining international peace and security, it should make an issue of the United States-South Korea joint military exercises.

The impartiality of the Security Council and its competence — that is, whether it can contribute to global peace and security or not — will be judged by its attitude on the matter of the United States-South Korea joint military exercises. If the situation on the Korean peninsula becomes unexpectedly grave, the responsibility will lie fully with the United States, which has forced the inevitable choice upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as with the Security Council, which has taken the side of the United States.

Today's reality shows the urgency of Security Council reform. The international community unanimously demands reform of the Security Council so that it can serve as the United Nations organ that genuinely contributes to international peace and security. All Member States should demonstrate their political will by taking practical measures. First,

the Security Council should be reformed in order to maintain impartiality, objectivity and democracy in its activities. The Council should disapprove of the high-handedness and arbitrariness of a few specific countries and ensure openness, transparency and non-selectivity in all its activities. In particular, we should consider establishing a strict mechanism whereby the General Assembly would decide whether the Security Council's resolutions and decisions relating to international peace and security, such as sanctions and the use of force, should take effect. Secondly, the Security Council should be reformed in order to increase the representation of the Non-Aligned Movement member States and other developing countries in its membership.

Although nearly 70 years have passed since the foundation of the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement member States and other developing countries, which make up the majority of 193 Member States of the United Nations, are not adequately represented on the Security Council. At present, the prospect of increasing the permanent membership of the Security Council is not bright, owing to serious disagreements between individual countries and regional groups. Therefore, the only viable solution to address the unbalanced and unreasonable structure of the Security Council is to proceed with increasing the number of the non-permanent seats in the Security Council.

As far as the increase in the permanent membership of the Security Council is concerned, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea makes its principled position clear once again that Japan is totally unqualified to be a permanent member of the Security Council under any circumstances. Japan continues to deny its extraordinary war crimes against humanity, such as massacre, plundering and invasions of neighbouring countries in the past century, which placed Japan in the shameful category of enemy State in the Charter of the United Nations.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is convinced that the current session of the General Assembly will take practical measures for Security Council reform.

Mr. Haniff (Malaysia): At the outset, allow me to thank you, Sir, for convening this important debate on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters. My delegation also wishes to associate itself

with the statement made by the representative of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (see A/69/PV.49).

At this juncture, Malaysia would like to congratulate Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica on his recent appointment as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. We trust that his wise leadership and experience, as seen in his stewardship of the First Committee, will steer us forward in our negotiations towards a more equitable and representative Security Council.

My delegation also expresses our deepest appreciation to his predecessor, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, for his diligence and leadership in presiding over the intergovernmental negotiations since 2008.

As an incoming non-permanent member of the Security Council for the 2015-2016 term, Malaysia is deeply interested in efforts to shape a more efficient Security Council. We were elected by the overwhelming majority of Member States to that important body, and we take this opportunity to again thank all delegations for their support. At the same time, we recognize that their voices need to be heard and their interests recognized.

Based on the many views we heard during the tenth round of the intergovernmental negotiations, the abundant interest of Member States is clear. There is a serious demand for reform of the Security Council. That is not a new demand, nor is it unique. It has been reiterated time and again, yet it has remained unanswered.

In that regard, Sir, we are encouraged by your opening statement during this year's high-level debate in the General Assembly (see A/69/PV.6). You rightly called for more progress on Security Council reform, relating that to the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). Your letter dated 10 November further reaffirmed your commitment to the process, when you stated that an early resumption of the intergovernmental negotiations was necessary and appointed Ambassador Rattray as its new Chair.

We are therefore reminded of the efforts of one of your predecessors, Ambassador Razali Ismail of Malaysia, who was the President of the General Assembly at its fifty-first session. In 1997, he introduced the first-ever comprehensive proposal for Security Council reform, dubbed the "Razali proposal", as contained in document A/AC.247/1997/CRP.1. In the days before we had intergovernmental negotiations

and advisory groups, Ambassador Razali took it upon himself to come up with that formulation, after consultations with over 165 delegations and groupings.

While that attempt was ultimately unsuccessful, it has since been recognized by many as the attempt closest to achieving progress in the reform of the Security Council. The Razali proposal did manage to encapsulate the various aspects of Security Council reform, in particular the expansion in the membership and improved transparency in its working methods. It also succeeded in providing food for thought, which has, perhaps, influenced our current deliberations. That bold initiative continues to inspire Malaysia in our unrelenting pursuit of a more representative, democratic, legitimate and transparent Security Council. In that sense, Sir, we hope that you may be similarly inspired, and perhaps during your presidency we may be able to see equally noteworthy progress.

Malaysia's positions on the issue of Security Council reform have been consistent. Allow me to briefly summarize those positions, which we will expand further during the next round of the intergovernmental negotiations.

We firmly believe that there is a need for an expansion in the Council's membership and a better geographical representation, in particular for regional groupings underrepresented in the Council. The expansion of both categories, permanent and non-permanent, would be crucial in strengthening the role and representativeness of the Council. An increase in non-permanent seats would allow more Member States to be elected to the Council and would increase the frequency for Member States to serve in the Council, thus providing for more inclusiveness in the Council's decision-making process.

On the question of the veto held by the five permanent members, Malaysia reaffirms our principled position to disagree on its use based on the current structure. The veto should be regulated so as to prohibit it from being used unjustly and against the wishes of the majority. My delegation also joins those who propose restraint in the use of veto powers, especially in cases of international crimes such as genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. We believe that if all regions are represented by permanent members, then the new permanent members should also be accorded the right to veto, so as to contribute towards a more balanced and representational decision-making process. However, we may need to explore the option that a certain number of

veto would be required before a resolution is rejected by the Council.

Malaysia strongly supports the view that the overall work of the Security Council should be enhanced and improved. We have put forward several proposals in that regard, *inter alia*, to ensure that any expansion in membership will allow incoming Council members to continue to have the responsibility of presiding over the Council at least once during their term, to formalize the Council's provisional rules of procedure, to increase coordination between the Council and troop-contributing countries, and to have more structured interactions and regular consultations between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

With regard to the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council, Malaysia believes that there should be a clear delineation between the work of those two organs, based on their respective mandates. We should be mindful of the need to prevent encroachment on the part of the Council into matters that fall under the prerogative of the Assembly. My delegation also calls for the institutionalization of monthly consultations between the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council.

Going forward, Malaysia would also like to reiterate the importance of text-based negotiations on Security Council reform. We support the preparation of a working document by the Chair and the full participation of Member States. Only through such discussions, with the participation of Member States, can we identify areas for cooperation and move ahead on negotiations. In that regard, we are pleased with your encouragement of such an approach, Mr. President, as outlined in your 10 November letter.

Malaysia believes that all Member States have a responsibility to ensure that the United Nations, and by extension the Security Council, are capable of addressing the challenges prevailing today. In order for progress to be made, Member States must be willing to move beyond entrenched national and group positions. We have debated long and hard about compromise and flexibility, but we have yet to deliver on that. I wish to assure you, Sir, of my delegation's firm support and cooperation to work with you and with other Member States in that endeavour.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): I thank you, Sir, for convening this meeting. We appreciate the fact that you,

as President of the General Assembly, held extensive consultations before holding this meeting. We also welcome the important statement that you made this morning (see A/69/PV.49).

We thank Ambassador Zahir Tanin for his hard work over the past seven years to move the reform process forward. As an accomplished diplomat, he tried his best to bring all countries on board. We also congratulate Ambassador Courtenay Rattray on his appointment as the new Chair and facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations. We will give him all the support he needs to advance our common agenda. We congratulate Angola, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain and Venezuela on their election as new non-permanent members of the Security Council.

Let me first talk about the negotiating dynamics. Seven years ago, the United Nations membership embarked on the process of intergovernmental negotiations on the basis of decision 62/557. That decision mandated the Assembly to work to achieve a comprehensive reform on five key issues: categories of membership, the veto, size and working methods, regional representation, and the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly. The expansion of the Council is one of the elements of the overall reform agenda. The other four elements are equally important, and all five are closely linked.

Our experience over the past 20 years has shown that a quick fix will not work, though many abortive initiatives have been tried from time to time. Reform will be delivered on the basis of an agreement among States on the substance, not as a result of procedural short-cuts or manoeuvres. For such an agreement to emerge, we need a critical mass of political will and resolve. The intergovernmental negotiations process is a membership-driven process to be pursued in good faith, with mutual respect, in an open, inclusive and transparent manner, with the objective of seeking a solution that enjoys the widest possible political acceptance. On Security Council reform, the President of the General Assembly and the Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations draw their authority from decision 62/557.

A tenable and sustainable outcome for the membership cannot be devised by a small caucus or advisory group, because reform must be a product of negotiations among States, conducted in open settings. The United Nations is most skilled in conducting such

negotiations and producing results. Another fact is that the rigidity in positions has retarded progress in the past 20 years. We call for flexibility to explore common ground. For its part, the Uniting for Consensus group has twice revised its own proposal and is ready to enter into dialogue to refine it.

This year we should work energetically on Security Council reform, but there should be no artificial deadlines. The President of the General Assembly, in his letter of 10 November, has encouraged us to move the process to text-based negotiations. We agree. What I would like to point out is that the second revision of the negotiation text, which was compiled on Ambassador Tanin's watch, has all the text we need. It provides a good starting point.

Now let us talk about the substance. Pakistan opposes the creation of new permanent seats, not because of regional rivalries or realpolitik, but because of the principles that should drive the Council's reform in the twenty-first century. The Prime Minister of Pakistan, in his address to the General Assembly on 26 September, said: "We want the Council to become more representative, equitable, accountable and transparent" (*A/69/PV.12*, p. 39). Our opposition to the creation of permanent seats is rooted in those principles.

The existing permanent seats in the Council hark back to the Second World War, when decisions were taken by the victors, who also took the permanent seats. The world order is not static; it has moved on. There are no more victors and vanquished. The world is much more pluralist, much more diverse. The four countries that have presented their candidacies for permanent seats need to understand that many medium-sized countries, individually and collectively, compete with them in terms of size, population, economy, military capacity, contribution to United Nations peacekeeping and commitment to democracy and human rights.

Today we talk about emerging nations, and some cite that as a criterion and qualification for a permanent seat. The reality is that many more countries stand behind them and will play an even greater role in world politics and economics in the years to come. There are projections that power configurations will change in the coming decades. When States attain a higher level of competence, let us say in 10 years' time, should they also be inducted as permanent members in the Security Council? And will those losing their eminent status be asked to vacate permanent seats? No State is powerful

in perpetuity, so let us not invest membership with permanence, because the next revision of the Council's composition may take place 70 years from now.

The purpose of the reform is not to embed new centres of privilege within the Council, but to democratize it by aggregating and promoting the interests and aspirations of the entire family of small, medium-sized and large nations, which together constitute the United Nations. The United Nations belongs to all, not to a select few. We need to make the Council more inclusive. That is why the Uniting for Consensus group advocates an intermediate solution. If we want to break the impasse in the intergovernmental negotiations, we should start looking at that group's proposal, which provides for terms that are longer than that of the current non-permanent seats and renewable upon elections. That would make members, elected for a longer term, accountable to the General Assembly. On the other hand, by electing new permanent members, we will kill the very principle of accountability.

The Council also needs to expand its non-permanent seats. More than one third of the United Nations membership has never had the opportunity to sit on the Council even once. New rotating non-permanent seats will enable more countries to play their role in the maintenance of international peace and security. Periodic elections will ensure that States elected for longer terms or non-permanent seats remain responsive, accountable and transparent vis-à-vis the general membership.

Within the confines of those principles, Pakistan has always showed respect and empathy for the African common position, the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration as the collective demand of an entire continent. We see that common position as one based on consensus and legitimacy, which is quite different from the individual ambitions of a few countries.

Again I emphasize flexibility and compromise, without which there is no point in negotiating. The Uniting for Consensus group showed that spirit by revising its original proposal and introducing it as the Italy-Colombia paper. That paper is open to further negotiations. On the other hand, the Group of Four continues to stick to its demand for permanent seats. They lament the lack of progress, without acknowledging that their fixed position is the biggest barrier to progress. For them, the only measure of progress is the extent to which other groups adjust to their claim of entitlement. There has been no change

in their stance. That is not how intergovernmental negotiations ought to be conducted.

Most of my remarks have been devoted to the categories of expansion. I would like to briefly state the following on other elements. We have followed with keen interest the French proposal to restrict the use of the veto. We need to hold further discussions to examine the added value of the veto's general limitation, its use only under Chapter VII and its abolition. The size of the expanded Council should be large enough to make it representative but small enough to keep it efficient and effective. The Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions should open space for engagement with the general membership, so as to refine its working methods in order to make its decision-making more informed, accountable and transparent. Regional representation and regional ownership should be further enhanced.

Finally, the General Assembly asks for more say on issues of peace and security, and rightly so. However, it should make optimal use of the space that is already available to it — for instance, through more effective stewardship of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and more active use of the Uniting for Peace mechanism. The Council, for its part, should devise ways to deal with emerging thematic issues such as climate change, sexual violence in armed conflict and children and women's rights in close partnership with the relevant intergovernmental organizations and forums.

Mr. Körösi (Hungary): For years, Hungary has emphasized the need to move expeditiously towards a timely and comprehensive agreement on all aspects of Security Council reform. My country wishes to take decisive steps towards that goal by 2015, half a century after the Security Council was last reformed.

The year 2015, the seventieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, will also be the year when Member States finalize their preparations for more sustainable development and when they plan to enter into a legally binding agreement on climate change. Yet Security Council reform seems to be at a standstill, or even worse: we seem to be in a self-inflicted time loop.

Unfortunately, our situation is neither science fiction nor a bad movie; it is the lamentable reality. We have been reliving our intergovernmental-negotiations discussions on the five key issues time and time again.

We even force artificial amnesia on ourselves, since not even written records of new proposals or summaries can be made. Similarly, the non-paper of the advisory group and the document containing the third revision have been rejected by some who claim that Security Council reform must be a State-driven process. But how can a process be State-driven if it refuses to record any new proposal, including proposals by States, for over four years? Mind you, the document containing the second revision was issued in 2010.

Every political process needs shared institutional memory. We have a problem that we have created for ourselves, partially, by adopting the same decision on the reform process year after year and adhering to it as agreed language that commands consensus. Let me emphasize that Hungary is a great supporter of consensus. As we have said, we want to build consensus instead of building camps. But consensus has to emerge at the end, or as a result, of the process on the substantive issues of reform. Consensus cannot be a prerequisite for all elements of the process, including procedural issues. More precisely, it can be required, but only with the devastating consequences that we are all witnessing. By emphasizing the need for consensus, we cannot even start negotiations, thus losing any chance to achieve consensus.

Therefore the question: how to move forward with the intergovernmental negotiations process. How can we break out of the deadlock of self-repeating cycles?

First, we agree that the process should be Member-State-driven. Therefore, all new proposals should be compiled in written format. It is only logical that we put new proposals on an equal footing with proposals that have already been reflected in the document containing the second revision.

Secondly, the next logical step would be to produce a draft text that could become the basis for substantive negotiations, as many delegations before me have requested.

Thirdly, we must have meetings at regular intervals, producing newer and newer drafts, narrowing differences and reducing the number of outstanding issues. It is true that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, but to get there we have to start agreeing on something. I acknowledge that that logic might not be optimal for some delegations. There could be other ways to move forward, but the lack of complete agreement on

procedural issues can no longer be used as justification for doing nothing.

Therefore, if such proposals are not acceptable, our suggestion would be to have the first intergovernmental negotiation meetings dedicated solely to the intergovernmental negotiation procedures and their way forward.

We need to decide whether we want to make the process outcome-oriented, or whether the outcome is not our primary interest. Indeed, we should move forward and change the rigid rules of engagement that have shackled us and our previous Chair, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, for years. While we thank him for his diligence under difficult circumstances, we are ready to change gears under the guidance of our new Chair, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray.

Mrs. Namgyel (Bhutan): I thank you, Sir, for convening this very important meeting. The question of Security Council reform has been on the agenda for many years, and you have rightly recognized it as a priority. My delegation looks forward with optimism to making meaningful progress on that subject under your able leadership.

I welcome the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica as Chair of the eleventh round of intergovernmental negotiations and assure him of our full support and cooperation. I have no doubt that Ambassador Rattray will inject new momentum into the intergovernmental negotiations process during the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly. I would like to place on record our deep appreciation to the previous Chair, Ambassador Zahir Tanin of Afghanistan, for his steadfast commitment and stewardship of the intergovernmental negotiations process for the past few years.

Bhutan aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the L.69 Group by Ambassador Menissa Rambally, Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia (see A/69/PV.49).

The imperative to reform the Security Council so as to make it more representative, transparent and accountable cannot be overstated. It has been recognized since 1993, when the General Assembly first began debating Security Council reform. Our leaders in 2005 also called for an early reform of the Council as an essential element of our overall efforts to reform the United Nations. Many of our leaders reiterated that call

during the high-level segment of the Assembly's sixty-ninth session.

Since 2009, the 10 rounds of the intergovernmental negotiations have kept us engaged on this important subject. However, despite the overwhelming support for reform, we have not made much progress.

During the intergovernmental negotiations, a majority of delegations supported an expansion in both categories of membership. In his assessment, the Chair of the tenth round of the intergovernmental negotiations highlighted, among other issues, that there was a continued emphasis on the need for reform. While some progress has been made in improving the working methods of the Council, the lack of a working document has made it difficult to engage constructively in real negotiations and address all issues. We therefore look forward to your leadership, Sir, and to that of the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations, to take the process forward on the basis of a zero draft.

Bhutan supports the need to reform the Security Council in keeping with contemporary realities, on the basis of the principles of sovereign equality, equitable geographic distribution, transparency, accountability and democratization of the decision-making process. We believe that an expansion of the Security Council in both the permanent and non-permanent membership categories and an improvement in its working methods are necessary to further strengthen and enhance the Council's legitimacy and functioning.

For over 20 years, beginning with 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 and on through the recently concluded tenth round of the intergovernmental negotiations, we have heard and listened to various proposals. We have engaged extensively on all issues on the basis of decision 62/557. We now have the benefit of years of discussions and debate, and we understand each other's positions better. What we need now is a working document so that real negotiations can be pursued in earnest. Only then can we make meaningful progress in our common endeavour to reform the Security Council by building on areas of convergence and by finding common ground on areas in which we disagree.

The seventieth anniversary of the United Nations in 2015 presents an opportune occasion to make real progress on a subject that has remained on our agenda

for over two decades. Despite the seemingly intractable nature of this subject, it is now time for us to engage in text-based negotiations to take the reform process forward. While a decision taken by consensus is the most desirable way forward, we cannot allow its absence to obstruct progress indefinitely. In that regard, we are confident that you, Sir, will provide renewed momentum and impetus to the process and steer it towards a results-oriented and meaningful conclusion.

Mr. Hermida Castillo (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session. We appreciate the importance that you have given to today's agenda item, entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters".

We take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude to His Excellency Mr. Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for all his dedication and leadership throughout our rounds of negotiations, in which the various groups and States expressed their positions regarding urgent and necessary reforms.

We welcome the appointment of His Excellency Mr. Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as Chair of the intergovernmental process. We are confident that with Ambassador Rattray's signature dynamism and experience and your wisdom, Mr. President, we can move on to a more advanced stage in the negotiations.

Nicaragua aligns itself with the statement made by Ambassador Menissa Rambally, Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia, on behalf of the L.69 Group (see A/69/PV.49). Our Group has been sufficiently flexible and level-headed in our positions during the past 10 rounds of negotiations. We have also worked in a spirit of compromise and cooperation throughout the process to achieve the required comprehensive reforms in the Security Council.

Nicaragua also reiterates its full support for the African position as set out in the Ezulwini Consensus.

The tally of the progress made on reforms over the past 10 years leaves much to be desired. It is imperative that during the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly, on the eve of the seventieth anniversary of the Organization, we redouble our efforts and ensure that we are able to comply with the mandate conferred on us by our leaders in 2005. In order to achieve that, as

evidenced by the lessons learned in the past 10 rounds of negotiations, we must give one final push to the negotiating process and, united by our common cause, achieve lasting, comprehensive reforms in the Security Council.

It is therefore necessary that you, Mr. President, give a clear mandate to Ambassador Rattray, Chair of the intergovernmental process, to immediately conduct real negotiations, based on a text that is fully supported, in the next round of negotiations. Only in that way will the process move forward and will we be able to successfully reach the culmination of our efforts and present a concrete outcome when our leaders meet next year.

I must recall that over the past 10 rounds of discussions it has become absolutely clear that the vast majority of Members support and wish for an urgent expansion in the categories of both permanent and non-permanent members in the Security Council. Only thus can we reflect the realities of the contemporary world and achieve greater accountability in a Security Council that is more representative, transparent, credible and relevant.

Finally, at this crucial stage of the negotiations, Nicaragua reiterates its full support and pledges its cooperation to Ambassador Rattray and to you, Mr. President.

Mr. Aboulatta (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your statement (see A/69/PV.49), which reflects an insightful vision and a strong resolve to achieve reform in, and an expansion of, the Security Council.

My delegation would like to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, the representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group and the representative of Kuwait on behalf of the Arab Group (*ibid.*).

Egypt believes in the importance of a comprehensive reform of the United Nations, especially the Security Council, so as to better support the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to enable our universal Organization to respond to new and contemporary international challenges.

Egypt attaches major importance to the reform of the Council through a transparent process owned by all

Member States, aimed at achieving an agreed solution that is comprehensive and commands the widest possible political support, including on the major interrelated negotiating issues as set out in decision 62/557. We are confident that those clear guidelines will form a frame of reference for the work of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica and new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. We welcome him to his new functions and assure him of our ongoing support to continue the constructive efforts in the process of reforming and expanding the Council, as we did with his predecessor, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, to whom we express sincere appreciation for his efforts in that regard.

Egypt once again reiterates its full commitment to the common African position as set out in the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration, which provide a comprehensive vision of the reform of the Security Council, including the right of the veto. Egypt is pleased with the growing support for the common African position, which we view as evidence that the world recognizes the importance of righting the historic injustice visited upon the African continent. Africa still lacks the representation it deserves in the Security Council. Such representation would serve to promote how the Council is perceived when it comes to its work in general and the African questions on its agenda in particular. Given that African questions constitute the bulk of the agenda, redressing the historic injustice done to the continent is even more important to the effectiveness of the work of the Council. That requires that the demands of the African position be responded to.

Egypt is committed to continuing to work to expand the membership of the Council. That requires that we all make constructive efforts to achieve an acceptable solution to all aspects of the reform process. We should all continue to work together to preserve the basic values of the United Nations, namely, inclusiveness, democracy, accountability, transparency and equality. Those values should guarantee that the current negotiations culminate in a comprehensive reform and thus enable the Council to assume its role effectively in maintaining international peace and security.

There is no doubt that the challenges of the twenty-first century require enhanced multilateral action through a reform of the United Nations that reaffirms its central role and renders the Security Council more

effective, with a composition that is more equitable and more representative of the general membership of the Organization.

Our meeting today provides another chance to negotiate in order to complete the reform of the United Nations through a reform of its major organ concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security. This is an opportunity that we must take advantage of through commitment to the basic values of the Charter of the United Nations and by making the utmost efforts to bridge positions and to push forward a consensus position.

Mr. Khiari (Tunisia) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this debate on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, and for the special interest that you attach to the process of Security Council reform, as set out in your statement at the opening of the sixty-ninth session (see A/69/PV.1) and in your introductory statement today (see A/69/PV.49).

I would like to pay tribute to our colleague the Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, His Excellency Mr. Zahir Tanin, for his outstanding work and for the manner in which he led the intergovernmental negotiations over the past few years despite the difficulties and pitfalls he faced. I would also like to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, Mr. Courtenay Rattray, on his appointment as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations.

My delegation aligns itself with the statements made by the representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group and by the representative of Kuwait on behalf of the Arab Group (see A/69/PV.49).

I welcome your efforts, Mr. President, and those of the succeeding facilitators and the various countries and groups of countries aimed at overcoming the years-long stalemate in the intergovernmental negotiations process. In that regard, I express Tunisia's full readiness to continue to support this process, which must continue to be based on the proposals of Member States, transparency, inclusiveness and the search for consensus.

Mrs. Baaro (Kiribati), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The intergovernmental negotiations should continue to be the only appropriate institutional

framework for this process, as they are mandated by the General Assembly to address the issue of Security Council reform in an open and inclusive way with the goal of identifying the solution that garners the widest possible political acceptance among Member States, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant decisions of the General Assembly on the issue, in particular decision 62/557.

Tunisia expresses its full support for the desire shared by almost all Member States to break the current status quo and give new impetus to the negotiating process in order to achieve the concrete results that we have been awaiting for over 20 years. However, we believe that this goal should not be pursued in haste or to the detriment of the broad consensus needed among all Member States. In our view, imposing a fictional timeline or a negotiating text that does not reflect the positions of all countries would be inconsistent with the spirit of consensus and the principle of transparency, which have characterized the negotiations process to date.

The process of negotiations should have as its main objective a Security Council that reflects the political and economic realities of our world today. It should endow the Council with the legitimacy, credibility and effectiveness needed to act on behalf of the international community in fulfilling a mandate in line with the Charter of the United Nations. Strengthening the legitimacy of the Council, in particular by enhancing equitable representation within that principal organ of the United Nations, will undoubtedly result in more realistic mandates, more effective decisions and a more consistent implementation of Council decisions.

To achieve an expanded Security Council that ensures equitable representation and reflects current and ongoing sensitivities, we should focus on expanding the Council's membership, particularly when it comes to developing countries. In that context, Tunisia reiterates its support for the position of the African Union on the issue of Security Council reform as reflected in the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration. We believe it is time to remedy the current situation that deprives the African continent of a permanent presence in the Security Council, as well as to provide Africa with a better non-permanent presence.

We also support the legitimate demands of the Arab countries for permanent representation in the Security Council. The current situation in the region, which could very well persist, justifies that demand.

The reform of the Security Council should be comprehensive and inclusive. It must address all substantive issues relating, *inter alia*, to the Council's composition, regional representation, working methods, agenda and decision-making process, including the right of the veto, so as to achieve the broadest possible political agreement from Member States.

We cannot conclude without mentioning the option of considering, in any attempt to reform the Security Council, the relationship between the Council and the other principal organs of the United Nations, and full respect by the Council of the prerogatives and functions of each of those bodies, in particular the General Assembly.

Mr. Tuy (Cambodia): First of all, I would like to thank the President for convening this important meeting on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters. I would also like to congratulate His Excellency Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica on his appointment as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. My appreciation also goes to the former Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations, His Excellency Ambassador Zahir Tanin, for his tireless efforts in moving the negotiations forward.

Cambodia welcomes the adoption of the oral decision read by the President of the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters (decision 68/557) adopted in September 2014 (see A/68/PV.106), aimed at paving the way for further intergovernmental negotiations at the Assembly's sixty-ninth session. While rendering its full support for the continued ongoing intergovernmental negotiations this year, Cambodia is ready to work with all States Members of the United Nations to move forward with the process.

We have observed that over the years we have had quite a number of consultations on United Nations reform, and we have arrived at the consultations on today's theme. However, we have not yet found any common ground on a clear framework or any basic documents with which to start. That is largely due to our divergent views, and also partly because we have not positively responded and lived up to the commitment set out at the 2005 Summit.

While commending Ambassador Tanin's assessment of the tenth round of the the intergovernmental negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, my delegation firmly believes that we need to build the momentum from the last round of consultations on the issue.

At the annual general debate of the Assembly's sixty-ninth session, in September, we heard concerns over emerging challenges, ranging from communicable diseases to raging conflicts and instability, which may affect many regions and many parts of the world. We heard about the pressing need for the United Nations to change things within the United Nations system, since the Organization today is completely different from the entity created almost 70 years ago when only 51 countries were Members.

My delegation therefore believes that the year 2015 will be a crucial one, as the United Nations will celebrate the seventieth anniversary of its establishment and the tenth anniversary of the 2005 World Summit, where world leaders agreed to reform the United Nations to meet the need of today's geopolitical and global challenges.

It is certain that the Security Council, as the body mandated with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should reflect the global realities of today. In that regard, my delegation is of the view that the Security Council should be expanded to include both permanent and non-permanent members in an equitable manner to cope with the global challenges. More important, Council reform should be undertaken in a manner that provides for equitable geographical representation from all Member States, including developing countries.

My delegation believes that a set of guidelines is needed for the Security Councils's permanent seats to be extended to Member States that possess all the capacities and commitments to substantially contribute to maintaining international peace and security.

Mr. Khan (Indonesia): Let me begin by thanking the President for convening this important debate. I would also like to convey my delegation's deepest appreciation to Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for his very able stewardship of the intergovernmental negotiations over the past years, and to congratulate Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of

Jamaica, for his appointment as the Chair of the next round of the intergovernmental negotiations.

We meet here in the midst of heightened and complex security challenges in various regions. As the emerging, as well as old, challenges are confronted, the global expectations of the Security Council to act effectively are more pronounced. But the effective maintenance of international peace and security in the face of today's challenges requires a Council whose structure reflects the plurality and realities of today — a Council that can demonstrate unequivocally that it is representative, democratic, transparent, accountable and efficient and that serves the interests of the entire international community, and not a select few.

Indeed, when the Council leaves cases unaddressed, such as those of Palestine and Syria, for long periods, failing to resolve them in a meaningful manner, serious questions linger about its credibility. Since all States Members of the United Nations have entrusted the Security Council to act on their behalf, it is our collective responsibility to help ensure that the Council fully lives up to fulfilling the peace and security imperatives, as well as the norms set out in the Charter of the United Nations, international law and humanitarian law. Indonesia will therefore remain an active proponent of the efforts to achieve a comprehensive and intergovernmental-led reform of the Security Council.

As my delegation has elaborated its position on the five key reform issues on a number of occasions, I shall restrict myself to making a few observations on the rounds of negotiations so far in the informal intergovernmental negotiations, and on our view of the way forward.

As important as the tenth and preceding rounds of discussions have been, they have not led to a narrowing of differences on the Council's reform. The perspectives are vast and deep. Most notably, there are strong views on the issues of membership categories and the related expansion. But the veto and other key issues are also marked by divergence.

The reform of the Security Council, with its inherent geostrategic implications, clearly entails high stakes for many. Certainly, Member States have legitimate concerns and expectations. But encouragingly, all countries also agree that we must be constructively engaged in the reform process. To promote forward thinking that helps to advance the

process in a meaningful manner, we urge Member States to exercise greater political flexibility and to consider intermediate options that may lead to potential convergence, particularly on membership expansion and the veto, which have underlying ramifications on differences for other reform issues.

A number of countries have proposed models on the intermediate options for the categories of seats. Along with other reform issues, we are willing to discuss them further with an open mind in the new round of negotiation.

With regard to the veto, Indonesia advocates the abolition of the right to the veto. As a step towards that, we could support a mechanism for regulating or managing the veto. The renewed calls for the non-use of veto in cases concerning serious violations of international humanitarian law and genocide must be given due consideration. We support the view that the veto should not be exercised under Chapter VI of the Charter, and that two concurrent negative votes by permanent members to prevent the adoption of a Council decision should be required.

We note the suggestion to carry out a so-called high-level audit of efforts aimed at achieving an early reform of the Security Council, and that the audit should be undertaken by an independent political figure, to be selected. Despite the good intentions behind the proposal, we reiterate that the nature of the informal negotiations as a membership-driven process should be fully observed and preserved. All Member States must have an equal voice in a transparent reform process, which must involve them in any decisions taken on the way forward. We also underscore that all five key reform issues should be considered together, without piecemeal solutions, and that the integrity of decision 62/557 should be upheld.

Concrete gains on Council reform have been elusive. Nevertheless, we must be committed to relentlessly and constructively forging commonalities and building on them. For its part, Indonesia will continue to work with all interested delegations to help craft workable paths to meaningful reform.

Mr. Meza-Cuadra (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes the convening of this meeting of the General Assembly to continue discussing one of the core issues related to reform of the Organization: the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and

related matters. While acknowledging Ambassador Zahir Tanin's work during the 10 rounds of informal intergovernmental negotiations on the issue, we also welcome the appointment of the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, to chair the process during the Assembly's current session. I would like to assure him that he can count on my delegation's support.

If anything has become evident during the long process of negotiations on reforming the Security Council, it is Members' overwhelming agreement on the urgent need to adapt the Organization's structure so that it adequately reflects the changed international scene. Peru would like to stress how essential it is that we make progress towards our goal of achieving a renewed, reformed, expanded, more democratic and representative Security Council that is also effective and efficient and whose methods of work are more transparent. The Council's inability to halt the armed conflicts in Syria, Ukraine and the Gaza Strip, among other places, has shown us how urgently its comprehensive reform is needed.

We should remember that the Security Council's mandate to ensure international peace and security is granted to it by all States Members of the United Nations, which is why it is up to the Assembly to carry out the reforms required to ensure effective implementation of that mandate. It is therefore time to act. We cannot simply continue to limit ourselves to reasserting our well-known national positions; we must make the necessary concessions that will enable us to produce a negotiating text that has clear alternatives, that can rise above a mere description of positions and that can identify and process our options so that we can work for genuine negotiation. None of that will be possible if we do not abandon notions about artificial deadlines or delays and replace them with a real commitment to producing tangible, balanced results, firmly based on the principle that the process must be inclusive and transparent.

To quickly touch on the points made in decision 62/557, Peru once again reiterates its belief that for the Security Council to be able to deal appropriately with the new realities, it is essential to add new permanent and non-permanent members. That would promote a fair and equitable regional representation, altering the Council's currently unbalanced status quo. My delegation understands that such an expansion should

be enough to increase the Council's representativeness but not so great as to render it less effective.

With regard to the issue of the veto, Peru has consistently taken a principled position in favour of its eventual abolition. At the moment, however, my delegation takes the constructive attitude that the permanent members should commit to considering a first step that limits the use of the veto and eliminates the possibility of applying it in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity or successive acts that blatantly violate human rights or international humanitarian law. I welcome France's proposal in that regard and urge the other permanent members to seriously explore this possibility.

It is also important to strive for concrete reform of the Council's working methods so as to increase its legitimacy, the transparency it needs for multilateral relations, and the efficiency and effectiveness of its work. That will be achieved only by promoting greater interaction between non-member countries and the Council. It is therefore essential to hold more public than private meetings, schedule more open debates, consult troop-contributing countries in a timely way when the Council discusses the renewal of peacekeeping mandates, establish as a regular practice the wrap-up sessions on the Council's work at the end of each month, and explore other creative ways of increasing the Council's transparency.

The whole process should lead us to a decision. If, as we have unanimously said here, we want to reform the Security Council, we must turn that wish into concrete commitments. I would like to conclude by reaffirming my country's total willingness to continue to participate constructively in the intergovernmental negotiations in informal plenary on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters.

Mr. Waheed (Maldives): It is an honour for the Maldives to participate in the debate on this important agenda item. The question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council is an important matter that has been a top priority of Maldivian foreign policy for decades. My delegation welcomes the appointment of His Excellency Mr. Courtenay Rattray as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. We look forward to seeing real progress on the negotiations in the lead-up to the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations next year.

The question of Security Council reform is one that has gone unanswered for too long. At its core, the United Nations embodies the ideal that all States are equal. We are equally responsible for maintaining international order, furthering global development and advancing the just causes of all peoples. Regrettably, the Security Council has not mirrored those principles. Sixty-nine years ago, the United Nations was created by 51 countries in a world suffering from destitution, colonial oppression and the aftermath of global war. Today, although the world around us has changed dramatically and the membership of the United Nations has expanded to include 193 States, the Security Council has been reformed only once since the Organization's founding.

When the Council was reformed 50 years ago, it was expanded through the creation of four new non-permanent seats. The expansion did not compromise the Council's efficiency or make it less effective. Instead, it became more representative and legitimate. In today's world order, legitimacy is no longer derived from the will of the few, but rather from that of the overwhelming majority. If the Security Council is to maintain its legitimacy as an organ of the United Nations with the authority to make vital decisions on matters of peace and security on behalf of the entire international community, it must be open to change.

There were calls for reform even before the Council held its first meeting, and those calls have been repeated consistently over the decades. However, little progress has been made. The greatest impediment to progress has not been the apparent lack of consensus, but rather the lack of a fair and proper process to establish reform. In that light, we once again welcome the establishment of an advisory group on Security Council reform but regret that no real movement has occurred since its non-paper was published in December of last year. We hope that the advisory group will make progress over the course of the year and offer constructive proposals for establishing a streamlined reform process.

The membership of the Council is an increasingly flawed reflection of the world today. Half of the Members of the United Nations are small States, yet the vast majority of small States have never been elected. Small island developing States (SIDS) represent one fifth of the United Nations membership, yet 78 per cent have never gained a seat on the Security Council. We

can begin to correct this flawed picture with one simple step: establishing a SIDS-specific seat on the Council.

SIDS are an established, cohesive group that share unique challenges. We are nations that are small, isolated and particularly vulnerable to natural disasters and climate change. Yet climate change is fundamentally an issue of international security and stability that the Security Council must confront. The Maldives raised that issue during the Arria formula meeting of the Security Council on the subject of security dimensions of climate change, in 2013. The Maldives has great expectations for a day when the Security Council will formally address the long-term security threats that affect low-lying States, such as ours and many others, that are vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. That day may not come soon, and it may not come soon enough, unless the Security Council has equitable representation, inclusive of those States most affected by climate change, particularly SIDS.

The designation of a SIDS-specific seat is based on the principled position of the Maldives that an expanded membership should reflect the true nature of the United Nations. Because the Security Council lacks diverse perspectives, it is unable to meet the diverse needs of the international community, especially the developing world. But a change in membership is not possible without addressing the prohibitive cost of running a campaign that deters or prevents smaller States from securing a seat on the Council. Security Council seats must not be a prize won by the highest bidder. Instead, States must be elected on principles of equality and representation. All States Members of the United Nations must be able to compete on an equal footing and have an equal chance.

The current constitution of the Security Council reinforces the concentration of military power in the hands of a few. We call on all permanent members to rise above their national interests and act, as Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations duly requires, on behalf of the interests of all States Members of the United Nations. We urge the permanent members not to resist the call for urgent reform and to help bring that vital organ of the United Nations into the twenty-first century.

The Maldives maintains that the Security Council, both in its present form and in its final manifestation through the reform process, must become more accountable, coherent and transparent. It is imperative

that the functioning and working methods of the Council be revised to ensure greater efficiency and inclusiveness. As a member of the cross-regional Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group, the Maldives calls upon the current Council to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter by genuinely representing the will and interests of the larger membership.

The vast majority of States have spoken here today: the Security Council is in urgent need of reform. No small island developing State should be held back from its rightful place in the world order, for global security affects the small with the greatest measure. Nations should not be judged on the size of their populations, nor on the might of their armies, but on the strength of their resolve to further peace and security for all.

Mr. Dabbashi (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to commend Ambassador Zahir Tanin, facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform and on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, for the efforts he has made to achieve progress during the previous rounds of negotiations. I also wish to congratulate Mr. Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, for his appointment as the Chair of the new round. We look forward to reaching a consensus under his leadership that reflects the interests of all and produces the reforms that we all aspire to.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the Group of African States (see A/69/PV.49).

There is no doubt that Security Council reform is one of the priorities of the work of the United Nations, both because the process seeks to guarantee and secure the future of the United Nations and because of the central role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security. Maintaining that important role dictates that the work of the Council should be carried out in a way that enables it to address the realities of today's world and those of the future, because the times are different from when the Charter of the United Nations was signed.

Ten rounds of negotiations have been held to date, during which the delegations of all countries and groups expressed their positions. Regrettably, however, no substantial change has taken place regarding those positions since the first round. The discrepancies and the divergence of views have continued. We therefore

need to adopt practical measures that will take the negotiation process forward from the current stalemate, including a new consensus text that provides the basis for negotiations.

Libya, as an African country, believes that one of the major steps of reform is to redress the historical injustice that the African continent has suffered by not being represented in the permanent membership category. Therefore, that right must be recognized as a non-negotiable one, especially because one third of the issues on the agenda of the Council are purely African ones. The Group of African States constitutes more than one quarter of the membership of the United Nations. That injustice can be redressed by according Africa two permanent seats in the Security Council, with all of the privileges enjoyed by the current permanent members, including the veto. It should also be granted two additional non-permanent seats, in conformity with the position of the Group of African States as set out in the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration.

On the other hand, we emphasize that any expansion of the Security Council membership must include granting one permanent seat to the Arab Group, in conformity with the resolution of the Arab Summit held in Sirte, Libya, in 2010, and the paper that was drafted by the Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations.

The reform of the Security Council is not simply a question of increasing the number of seats or of the right of the veto. It touches on other aspects that have been discussed. We believe that all aspects of reform are interrelated and include the Council's working methods and its relations with the other organs of the United Nations. We emphasize the importance of implementing reform of the working methods of the Council itself so as to guarantee transparency and openness in its work, activities and procedures. Meetings should be open and closed negotiations should be avoided whenever possible.

Until the right of the veto is abolished, we should seek to limit its use in cases of war crimes, crimes against humanity and foreign occupation. The participation of non-members of the Council in the work of the Council should be encouraged, especially by those countries on the Council's agenda.

Libya emphasizes the importance of agreeing on fixed rules of procedure to replace the current provisional rules of procedure, which have been in place since the establishment of the Security Council.

With regard to the relationship between the Council and other organs and bodies, we emphasize that the Council should strengthen its relations with other organs of the United Nations and not encroach upon their mandates, especially the General Assembly. It should also increase consultations with other organs of the United Nations in a manner that respects the mandates of each and every organ in keeping with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. We believe it is important to hold consultations between the various organs and to increase the number of open briefings and debates, as well as to provide quarterly reports to the General Assembly regarding issues threatening international peace and security, as the Assembly is the more representative organ. Such reports should be comprehensive, transparent and include all of the necessary analysis.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reaffirm that Libya has been and remains ready to participate constructively and effectively in all efforts to reach consensus and achieve the objectives desired of the process of reform.

Mr. Zinsou (Benin) (*spoke in French*): The reform of the United Nations system, in particular of the Security Council, is an essential requirement to give real prospects for global governance that is fairer and more equitable.

The current composition of the Security Council no longer reflects contemporary international society. If the Council does not involve more States in its work, it will not be able, for all the goodwill of its members, to provide viable solutions to the multidimensional challenges of sustainable development and the complex problems related to the maintenance of international peace and security.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the President of the General Assembly, His Excellency Mr. Sam Kutesa, for having emphasized in his statement during the general debate of the sixty-ninth session (see A/69/PV.6) the vital importance to the world of swiftly completing the reform of the system, in particular the Security Council. His predecessor, His Excellency Mr. John Ashe, rightly made that one of his priorities throughout his mandate and worked to ensure that the issue was discussed with all the attention it deserved during the Assembly's sixty-eighth session, in the context of negotiations conducted by Ambassador Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan. I

would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Ambassador Tanin for his tireless efforts to generate consensus on the issue of reform throughout the 10 sessions of consultations that he facilitated.

Benin aligns itself with the statements delivered by the Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia on behalf of the L.69 Group, and by the representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group (see A/69/PV.49). The contents of their statements convey the position and views of my country perfectly.

We believe that, following so many rounds of intergovernmental negotiations, the round we are embarking upon now should take as a basis a condensed text by the President of the General Assembly grouping together the points of reform on which a great number of States agree, so as to significantly facilitate our deliberations.

Points of convergence do exist and are constantly crosschecked in the positions expressed by the vast majority of States. In previous intergovernmental negotiations they opted clearly for the enlargement of the Council in both categories of membership — non-permanent members, and permanent members with the right to the veto, that right to veto being, without a doubt, one of the key aspects of Security Council reform to which the African continent attaches the highest importance.

Such reform must correct the historic injustice whereby Africa has not been represented among the permanent membership of the Council. In that regard, I would like to recall the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration, which clearly set out the unanimous position of the continent on this issue. I would like to reaffirm Benin's commitment to that position, which, in our view, is a minimal requirement, given Africa's importance in the Council's work, when more than 60 per cent of the items on its agenda concern African States.

My delegation also believes that the right of the veto should be exercised under the same conditions by all States that have that privilege. The discussion undertaken during the previous session on the limitation of its use must continue, as their outcome will allow the Council to become more democratic.

Benin welcomes the appointment of Ambassador Courtney Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, to chair the eleventh round of the intergovernmental

negotiations. Our confidence in him to lead our deliberations is inspired by his abilities as a distinguished diplomat whose skill, professionalism and composure have been demonstrated time and again. All of those qualities will contribute to productive deliberations and ensure that the celebration of the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations, in 2015, is a very memorable occasion.

Mr. Shingiro (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, my delegation would like to thank the President for convening this timely debate on a subject as important as Security Council reform, an issue with which we have been concerned for more than two decades. My delegation welcomes the appointment of our Jamaican colleague, Ambassador Rattray, as Chair of the forthcoming cycle of negotiations on Security Council reform, which we very much hope will lead to concrete results in 2015. He can count on Burundi's firm support throughout his term. I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the excellent work of Ambassador Tanin of Afghanistan during his term as Chair, which he has just concluded with such flair.

Although we fully endorse the statement made earlier today by our colleague from Sierra Leone on behalf of the Group African States (see A/69/PV.49), we would like to make several observations in our national capacity.

Twenty years after the establishment of the Open-ended Working Group on Security Council reform, the General Assembly should set aside the divisions that continue to undermine the successful conclusion of negotiations on the reform of an organ that since 1965 has consisted of 15 members, even as the United Nations has grown by 76 more States. Everyone agrees that the size of the Security Council has not kept pace with the pace of substantial increase in the number of States Members of the United Nations that we have witnessed over the past half-century. Both the composition and the size of the Council reflect the world of 1965 — not that of today. Multiple shifts have taken place during the intervening years, during which dozens of new countries have been born.

We emphasize the need to speed up the process of reform, especially with respect to expanding the number of permanent and non-permanent seats. It is essential to bear in mind that the pressure to move towards a more representative and more efficient Council is going to increase year after year, and that reform will

eventually take place, however long it takes and despite the resistance it may face.

As is well known, there have been many cycles of intergovernmental negotiations since 2009, all held literally in a vacuum, without a text and defying the logic of multilateral diplomacy. Anyone who says that it is impossible to advance towards text-based negotiations is in effect saying no to progress. How is it possible to negotiate without a base text? Where should we begin? Those are serious questions that deserve appropriate answers.

It would be a mistake to automatically view the call for text-based negotiations as an attempt to dilute the divergent positions on the issue. But neither should a base text be viewed as a final document. Additions, amendments and deletions can always be proposed at the appropriate time to a document that is still in progress.

We all know that with a subject as complex as Security Council reform there will eventually be a vote in the General Assembly, as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations. We are clearly not yet at that stage, but to claim that no movement is possible without full consensus is to hold the process back, when the overwhelming majority of Member States favours expanding both the permanent and non-permanent membership categories of the Council.

The process currently under way does not aim to determine which country will or will not be a member of the Security Council, but rather to define the parameters that will shape the profile of the expanded future Council and to present viable options in response to the key questions identified in decision 62/557, of 15 September 2008.

Since 2005, numerous African Heads of State have repeatedly reaffirmed the need to reform the Security Council in order to make it more representative, democratic, effective, transparent, accessible and legitimate. We must quickly reach agreement on a model for reform that will take into account the primary values of the United Nations, which are inclusiveness, democracy, accountability, equality and transparency.

More than 100 Heads of State and Government, speaking from this very rostrum during the general debate at this session, reiterated the demand for swift Security Council reform. That urgent appeal by our leaders must be heard. We believe that Africa's

shared position has always enjoyed the support of the majority of Member States, inasmuch as it is a viable option for Security Council reform. It is imperative to address the historical injustice with respect to Africa without further delay. Africa is the only continent not represented in the category of permanent members of the Council, and it is also underrepresented among the non-permanent members. The year 2015 is the right time to bring that historical injustice to an end.

My country, Burundi, remains committed to the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration, which propose assigning Africa two permanent seats on the Council with all the prerogatives and privileges, including the right to the veto if that continues to exist, as well as two additional non-permanent seats.

We look forward to an inclusive, transparent and open negotiation process that takes place in a spirit of flexibility and compromise. The reform of the Council's working methods also requires dedicated attention. We hope that the Council will demonstrate greater transparency and responsibility. Burundi acknowledges the progress already made but believes that much more can be done. We of course hope for stronger ties between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as between the Security Council and the Peace and Security Council of the African Union.

Mr. Aisi (Papua New Guinea): I would like to thank the President for convening this timely meeting.

We fully support the statement delivered by Her Excellency Ambassador Menissa Rambally, Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia, on behalf of the L.69 Group of countries (see A/69/PV.49), which essentially supports the position that Papua New Guinea has taken, in particular with respect to the reform of the Security Council in both categories of membership. My remarks will therefore be brief. But let me also acknowledge and support the African position and its rationale as reiterated in the statement delivered this morning by His Excellency Ambassador Chidi Minah, the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone (*ibid.*)

We thank the President for recognizing, in both his acceptance speech (see A/68/PV.93) and his closing remarks at the conclusion of the high-level segment of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly (see A/69/PV.20) the importance of this matter, thus making it one of his top priorities during his presidency.

We warmly welcome the appointment of His Excellency Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent

Representative of Jamaica, as Chair for the next rounds of the intergovernmental negotiations and look forward to working with him during his stewardship. We also thank His Excellency Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for his leadership under sometimes trying circumstances in guiding us through 10 rounds of the intergovernmental negotiations.

It has been 10 years since the 2005 World Summit, where all of our leaders unanimously called for, among other important issues, the early reform of the Security Council. While we are nowhere near an early reform of the Security Council, one fact remains true, namely, that the full United Nations membership agrees that the reform of the Council must happen. It was pleasing to note this morning that even all members of the Permanent Five have also agreed to that reform.

We should also continue to remind ourselves that the 2005 World Summit Outcome document (resolution 60/1) provided us with the Peacebuilding Commission, the Human Rights Council, UN-Women and ongoing reforms within the Secretariat. Some would argue that the reforms have been a little bit slow, but nevertheless, they are happening.

The outstanding issue that remains in need of substantive negotiations is the reform of the Security Council. The sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly, leading up to the historic seventieth anniversary summit of the United Nations in 2015, provides an important occasion for taking stock of the status and health of our Organization. Part of the process, we submit, must include the reform of the Security Council.

Unfortunately, despite 10 rounds of intergovernmental negotiations, we are still in a situation where we do not have a written text from which we can start substantive negotiations so that we can promptly implement the decision of the 2005 World Summit. But we support the statement made by the President this morning: "What is now required is a firm commitment to moving the process to text-based negotiation on all clusters." (*A/69/PV.49, p. 1*)

It is our submission that the eleventh round of the intergovernmental negotiations must start on the basis of a zero-draft text for negotiations. We propose that the text be introduced under the authority of the President of the General Assembly. In our view, introducing a text would move us from the business-as-usual

modality, which has become too familiar during the intergovernmental negotiations. Issuing a text would also create a situation where every United Nations State Member — large, small and medium — could actively and constructively participate in the negotiations.

To assist the Assembly President in conceiving a text for the negotiators, we propose that he refer to and consider the non-paper provided by the advisory group on Security Council reform that was convened under his predecessor, Ambassador John Ashe, as a guide. In that regard we re-emphasize that the non-paper was based upon the same five parameters provided for in decision 62/557. Furthermore, the essence of the non-paper is in the elaboration of all of the options that all United Nations Member States have alluded to, in one form or another, during the intergovernmental negotiations process, under each of the five headings. We are all familiar with them, but let me reiterate: categories of membership, the question of the veto, regional representation, enlargement and working methods, and the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council.

It is somewhat ironic to hear the criticism that the non-paper is somehow biased towards one group's position. Seen in its entirety, the non-paper is all-encompassing in its intent and ensures room for elaborating on all options in a process that could be enhanced during substantive text-based negotiations.

Again, we commend the non-paper to the President of the Assembly to use as a guide in his deliberations.

Mr. Balé (Congo) (*spoke in French*): The Congo is a member of the Committee of Ten Heads of State on United Nations Security Council Reforms and aligns itself with the statement made earlier by the representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group (see A/69/PV.49).

At the outset, I wish to pay well-deserved tribute to Ambassador Zahir Tanin, who has persevered in conducting the intergovernmental negotiations process since its launch in 2009. We are grateful to him for his pioneering and painstaking work and wish him the very best.

In his wisdom, and in order to kick-start the process, the President has kindly conferred the formidable task of propelling the negotiations to a new stage to Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica. My delegation is confident in his ability to lead delegations and regional and other relevant groups to move on from

their entrenched positions. We are ready to listen to him, and we assure him of our full cooperation.

It is therefore for the President of the General Assembly and the facilitator of the negotiations process to meet the challenge of bringing together the positions that have to date been scattered and of providing us with a platform that will generate the hope that the negotiations will effectively launch the process that we all wish to see advance inclusively, transparently and democratically.

The common position of the African States on Security Council reform is well known to all. Africa is the only continent that is not represented among the category of permanent members. It is also underrepresented in the category of non-permanent members. That is why a focus on the reparation of the historical injustice meted out to the continent is necessary. That involves the enlargement of the Council in the two categories of permanent and non-permanent members and the granting of all prerogatives and privileges to new members, including the right of the veto, if and only if it is retained.

My delegation welcomes the broad understanding of Africa's legitimate claim and the sincere nature of the nearly unanimous statements that we surely now need to move on from simple professions of faith. Having observed the various opinions that have emerged throughout our previous deliberations, we believe that it is now time to build alliances with greater transparency in order to restart negotiations on a basic text that will enable the identification of common issues and lead to genuine compromise.

We are all aware of the universal responsibility for peace assumed by all nations, whether large or small. That is why we believe that, as the organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council must be more representative and must take into account the current configuration of our world and the complexity that now surrounds issues of peace and security. The vision of the founding fathers of this institution did not include freezing the United Nations in a sort of sclerosis tainted by anachronism.

As an eminent President of this great county, the United States, stated from this very rostrum in his address to the General Assembly at its eighteenth session, in 1963:

“The United Nations cannot survive as a static organization. Its obligations are increasing as well

as its size The authors of the Charter did not intend that it be frozen in perpetuity.” (A/PV.1209, para. 74)

The time has come for us to break the deadlock and move ahead in our efforts to give the world a Security Council that is more representative. Our advocacy for this goal is specific and is founded in decision 62/557 and other texts adopted by the Assembly General on this issue.

In September 2015, the United Nations will celebrate 70 years of existence. That will also provide an opportunity to assess the implementation of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), which called for a rapid reform of this universal institution. Those many symbolic milestones should refocus our attention as we embark upon a new round of negotiations during the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly, which my delegation believes to be a pivotal moment. Without being held hostage to the deadline of September 2015 or to some sort of dash to the finish line, the process to which we have committed ourselves will gain in credibility if we fully take advantage of the symbolism of such a deadline.

In this exercise, it is clear that political will is one of the key drivers without which it will not be possible to reach the necessary compromises. The emergence of a Security Council that espouses the values, goals and ideals of the Charter of the United Nations depends on it. Congo, for its part, will continue to work to that end, with the same commitment and the same openness, within the African Union Committee of Ten.

Mrs. Nguyen Phuong Nga (Viet Nam): I would like to begin by expressing our thanks to the President of the General Assembly for having convened this meeting on this important agenda item, entitled “Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters”.

We also thank Ambassador Zahir Tanin of Afghanistan for his efforts in chairing the intergovernmental negotiations over the past years. We would like to assure the newly appointed Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica, of our full support and wish him every success.

The position of the Vietnamese delegation on the reform of the United Nations, including the

Security Council, has been stated on a number of occasions. It is our view that more than ever before, the United Nations is faced with growing challenges and with unprecedented complexities, ranging from climate change and transnational diseases to regional conflicts and tensions. While trying to adapt to new circumstances, the evolution of the structure of the Organization in accordance with the Charter has shown limitations in serving the international community in our collective efforts to tackle our common challenges head on.

As we approach the commemoration of the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations, it is high time that Member States intensify the process of reform of the United Nations. The reform of the Security Council is a crucial area in that regard. It has been more than 50 years since the Council was enlarged, whereas the number of Member States has in the meantime almost doubled. Security Council reform should therefore be accorded adequate attention so that the Council can more effectively perform its functions as the primary body responsible for maintaining international peace and security.

The Council needs to be enlarged in both categories of membership so as 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 at that important organ.

The working methods of the Council should also be improved to ensure greater democracy and transparency. We therefore welcome the recent Council practice of holding, on a more regular basis, wrap-up sessions and public briefings on its work for non-members of the Council.

As various United Nations entities are about to undertake comprehensive reviews of their work in 2015, we look forward to our next round of the intergovernmental negotiations on the question of the equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters. We appreciate the letter from the President of the General Assembly dated 10 November 2014, in which he observes that an early resumption of the intergovernmental negotiations process is necessary and encourages Member States to move the process to text-based negotiations.

I would like to reiterate the readiness of our delegation to work closely with the President and the

Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations towards meaningful progress in our work ahead.

Mr. Mashabane (South Africa): I thank you, Madam, for giving me the floor to participate in this debate on the question of increase in the membership of the Security Council. We have the honour to be one of the later speakers, and we have had the benefit of being able to reflect upon some of the important and salient points that have been raised by those who spoke before us here.

Views have been expressed as to the reasons for the need for the Security Council to be reformed. Many characterizations have been presented, including the fact that the Council is unrepresentative, undemocratic and stuck in a bygone era. That is undoubtedly the characterization put forward in this important organ of the United Nations, the General Assembly. Some members of the Security Council, in particular the permanent members themselves, have agreed that there is need for reform. The difference is with regard how we actually implement or carry out the reform of the Security Council, one of the principal organs of the United Nations.

The decision that was taken at the 2005 World Summit (see resolution 60/1) agreed in part with the characterization that was just made today regarding the current configuration of the Security Council. But what is important about the decision is its call for the early reform of the Council. It has been 10 years since that decision was taken. Do we, as the General Assembly, really believe that 10 years can still be characterized as early? Surely, it cannot be. That also raises the question of why we have not moved forward since then. The Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea correctly reflected on how some of the decisions that were taken 2005 have been implemented and some structures created, but with regard to the Security Council, there alone, there has there been no movement.

An overwhelming number of speakers before me, including the five permanent members of the Security Council, have agreed on the need for reform with regard to both categories of membership. That is an undisputable fact; anybody who is keeping the records can take note of that. Many of us have spoken of the need to take advantage of the looming seventieth anniversary of the United Nations. I think it is very important that we all agree on this. We are following in the footsteps of our leaders, who were here just a little more than a month ago, in September, and who spoke

on precisely this point: the need for us to adopt concrete proposals that will ensure that when we celebrate the seventieth anniversary of our Organization, we will be able to take measures for the reform of that important principal organ, the Security Council.

Since the intergovernmental negotiations began more than six years ago, we have expressed our views and stated and restated and rehashed our positions. Many of us, and all of us here, know one another's positions as far as reform is concerned. The question is, since we know one another's positions, why is it that we cannot move forward? The truth of the matter is that for the past seven years we have not engaged in negotiations, in spite of the fact that the process is called intergovernmental negotiations. What we have done is simply to continue the debate, but in a different format. We have not necessarily got down to the business of negotiating. Only a few years ago, about 140 countries signed a letter calling for text-based negotiations. That number is clearly more than a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly, and that in itself represented a clear, overwhelming political commitment to moving towards negotiations based on a text.

In our view, the sixty-ninth session has to be a major turning point as far as reform of the Security Council is concerned, for the same simple reason: the following session will mark the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations. It cannot be that we will go beyond 70 years since the Organization's establishment and still maintain the Security Council's current configuration in spite of all the global challenges to peace and security we are currently facing.

Views have been raised about decision 62/557. In our view, it was not meant to impede progress; it was not meant to veto the process of reforming the Security Council. Rather, it was meant to move the process forward. In that decision, the General Assembly clearly and unambiguously identifies five key areas that must be addressed in order to reform the Council. That makes it very easy to have a text on the table that focuses on those areas. We are aware of the concern that we should not have a piecemeal approach, that we must agree on all of those issues. That was not necessarily the intention of that particular decision. Nonetheless, even if that is a point, let us have a text so that we can begin to negotiate on those five key areas.

None of us here has failed to express views on those five areas. We say that because the current President of the Assembly has committed to moving

the process forward, and we welcome his appointment of the Permanent Representative of Jamaica. It is a well-considered view that the first round that the new facilitator has to convene should surely address the question of a text: what should it look like? We would like to congratulate Ambassador Tanin, who has been moving this process for the past seven years. Two years ago, as we all know, he produced a third revision of the document, known as Rev. 3, that sought to reduce all the different positions we have on the five key areas. In our view, that is not a very difficult exercise; it should be one of the easiest. The facilitator, through the authority of the President of the General Assembly, should be able to move and bring us together, as members of the Assembly, to focus on those specific areas.

We cannot bury our heads in the sand and pretend that the veto is not a major issue. It is a major issue. On various occasions the five permanent members of the Security Council have clearly expressed their views on this matter. It is clear that they have difficulties with extending the use of the veto to new members. The African Group, which is guided by the common African position, has a clear position on this, which is that we do not believe in the veto. But as long as it exists, as a matter of common justice it should be extended to all. We understand the initiatives being taken and proposals made for restraint on the use of veto. The challenge we have is doing that outside the broader concern for the need to reform the Security Council. In our view, that is a mere tweaking of the major challenge, which is not necessarily the utilization of the veto. The major challenge is the unsustainable nature and current composition of the Security Council.

It is our well-considered view that it would indeed be a travesty if we passed the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations without agreeing on a concrete way forward that will deliver reform of the Security Council. We support the view that the new facilitator, under the authority of the President of the General Assembly, should begin working immediately and tirelessly to come up with a text that we can all work on, a clear road map. We have heard the concerns about artificial deadlines. Surely, if more than 20 years have passed since we identified the need to reform the Security Council, it cannot be said that taking advantage of the seventieth anniversary constitutes setting artificial deadlines.

Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, we are pleased to be able to thank and commend

Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for his laudable efforts to facilitate and guide the process of the intergovernmental negotiations over the past five years, during which he showed great competence and skills in orchestrating multilateral negotiations involving numerous positions in a difficult, complicated task addressing a very important issue: Security Council reform. We also welcome the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations and would like to assure him of our support in his new job. We also wish to congratulate the new non-permanent members of the Council on their election for the biennium 2015-2016.

We associate ourselves with the statements delivered by the representatives of Iran and of our own country, Kuwait, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of Arab States, respectively (see A/69/PV.49).

More than 20 years have elapsed since discussions began on expanding the membership of the Security Council and improving its working methods. Many initiatives and ideas have been launched. The issue is still stalled, however, and needs the political will required to bridge differences and achieve the desired goals.

The ongoing challenges in the political and international arena prompt us to make further efforts to improve the negotiation track and affirm our collective action. The desired objective is very lofty and noble, and it includes the entire international community. That is why any proposals for the expansion and reform of the Security Council must have general agreement, or at least a great measure of consensus.

Over the past years the position of the State of Kuwait on Security Council reform has been one of principle, based on the following foundations.

First, the question of Security Council reform must be handled in accordance with a general concept aimed at continuing to reform all the organs of the United Nations and seeking to render the work of the Organization more complementary and more balanced. That should be done while focusing on developing the Security Council's relationships with the other bodies, such as the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, without infringing on their mandates. The Council should confine its role to the tasks assigned

to it by the Charter of the United Nations, which is the maintenance of international peace and security.

Secondly, any ideas put forward to reform the Council must stem from our commitment to enable the Council to become more representative of the Member States and must reflect the international reality, which has changed a great deal since the inception of the United Nations in 1945.

Thirdly, it is very important to continue to improve the Council's working methods, to imbue its work with more transparency and clarity and to ensure that permanent and official rules of procedure are adopted to organize and approve the working methods.

Fourthly, the question of the veto must be placed within constraints and limits that codify the use of that right, such as the use of the veto only on the questions included under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

Fifthly, any increase in the membership of the Council must take into account the need to give greater opportunity for small States to accede to the membership of the Council and to contribute to its work. Also, the right of the Arab and Islamic States to representation commensurate with their number, importance and contributions in defending the purposes and principles of the Charter should not be overlooked. With regard to improving the working methods of the Council, including the calls to rationalize the exercise of the veto, the State of Kuwait welcomes the French proposal regarding limiting the exercise of the veto in questions of crimes against humanity through the voluntary abstention by the five permanent member States from exercising their veto.

We underscore that the intergovernmental negotiations of the General Assembly is the only forum in which to achieve an agreement on the expansion and reform of the Security Council, in accordance with decision 62/557. That decision established the basis for negotiations and their ownership by the Member States.

The accelerating challenges and the interrelated questions faced by the international community make us more resolved to intensify efforts to enhance the role of the Council so as to render it more capable and effective in overcoming challenges, as well as more representative, transparent, impartial and credible.

Ms. Beck (Solomon Islands): Let me, through you, Madam President, thank and congratulate the President

of the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session for convening this plenary meeting on agenda item 119, entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters".

Solomon Islands would like to associate itself with the statement made by Her Excellency Ambassador Menissa Rambally, Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia, on behalf of the L.69 Group (see A/69/PV.49).

The reform of the Security Council remains an essential and integral element of our overall effort to reform our multilateral system. It has eluded us over the years despite the wealth of ideas that have been collated during that time.

Solomon Islands registers its appreciation of the President for his taking a fresh look at where we are in the negotiations and giving the matter high priority on the agenda of the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session. My delegation appreciates his commitment to the reform of the Security Council by appointing the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, His Excellency Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, as the Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations to lead us forward on this important process.

We congratulate Ambassador Rattray and assure him of our support. We trust that his leadership will guide us to make tangible progress in reforming the Council and to make it relevant to the challenges of the twenty-first century. We need to make tangible progress, especially as we move to the seventieth anniversary of this body next year. Also on that note, we acknowledge and thank Ambassador Tanin of Afghanistan for his leadership and guidance on Security Council reform and in the intergovernmental negotiation process.

The work of the intergovernmental negotiation process is guided by the Charter of the United Nations, the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), the relevant rules of procedures and past practice. Decision 62/557 identifies the five key negotiable elements. Last year, under the leadership of the President of the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session, His Excellency Ambassador Ashe, a non-paper was produced that compiled all our positions. It now needs to be put forward as a basis for a negotiable text.

We live and operate in a fast-changing world. We have already seen deep integration within some regions of our Organization that have already developed

a common foreign policy. That needs to be taken into consideration in any reform outcome. We must also avoid coming to the negotiations with conditions that put the negotiation process in a straightjacket. We call on everyone to come to the table with a vision to strengthen the Council's role in the maintenance of international peace and security and ensure that structural change in the Council happens.

The position of Solomon Islands on the five Security Council reform elements has been stated and restated over the years. Those are the question of the veto, regional representation, the size of an enlarged Council, the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly, and the working methods.

On the question of the veto, we would like to see it abolished. In the event that it is retained, however, the rights and privileges of the veto should be accorded to all new members. That is to ensure that everyone on a permanent seat is on equal footing. The use of the veto is also linked to having improved working methods that provide for a limitation on the use of the veto.

On the enlargement of the permanent and non-permanent categories, Solomon Islands supports enlargement in both. We would like to see a sixth seat in the non-permanent-seat category.

On the regional question, with regard to equitable geographical representation for the permanent seat, we would like special attention to be given to regions that are not represented and regions that are underrepresented.

On the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly, we would also like to see that improved.

Finally, I conclude by saying that we need a reformed Security Council to match the twenty-first century realities. Solomon Islands, like all other reform-minded countries, stands ready to engage in reforming the Security Council. We hope to see progress in the negotiations, done in good faith with mutual respect and in an open, inclusive and transparent manner.

Mr. Bhattarai (Nepal): At the outset, allow me to thank the President of the General Assembly, His Excellency Mr. Sam Kutesa, for his letter of 10 November 2014, which underscores yet again the need to make progress on the reform of the Security Council, as well as for convening this important meeting today. We thank him, as well, for appointing Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica as Chair of the intergovernmental

negotiations in the course of the Assembly's current session. Nepal appreciates the President's determination and welcomes those important steps, which are in keeping with the Assembly's decision at the previous session to immediately continue the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform in informal plenary at the sixty-ninth session.

In that connection, I wish to commend Ambassador Rattray on his appointment and to thank him for assuming the responsibility in the run-up to the world summit next year on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of the Organization, and to encourage him to employ all his talents to make definite progress. I am confident that, with the President's wisdom and trust and with his own diplomatic experience and skills, Ambassador Rattray will prove to be instrumental in making headway in this much-awaited, but also much-stalled, crucial matter in the United Nations system. I wish to take this opportunity to pledge my delegation's full support and cooperation to the President of the General Assembly and to Ambassador Rattray in all their sincere efforts to that end.

I consider it fitting to recall here how diligently and admirably His Excellency Mr. Zahir Tanin of Afghanistan chaired the intergovernmental negotiations over the past six years. During the Assembly's previous session, then President John Ashe and Ambassador Tanin worked very hard in ways that deserve our sincere tribute.

Today I do not wish to repeat the rationales for introducing reforms in the Security Council's present structure, which dates back to 1963, when the United Nations had only 117 Members as opposed to the current 193. They are well known and have been well articulated under the broad themes of structure and working methods. The key words in the debate on reforms have been representativeness, effectiveness, transparency, legitimacy and relations with the General Assembly, as well as with the non-members of the Council.

Yet the reform is all too conspicuous by its absence. The Assembly's active deliberations on Security Council reform during 10 rounds of the intergovernmental negotiations, as well as the preceding Open-ended Working Group process, have taken hundreds of meetings over the past 20 years, involving enormous amounts of time, energy and other resources. We must build on the momentum in a results-oriented manner to justify all that has been invested so far in search

of meaningful progress. That can be done only when we focus on points of convergence and enter into real negotiations.

What has been seen throughout the intergovernmental negotiations process is an expression of the collective will of the large majority of Member States, articulated separately or through various groups of like-minded countries, to expand Security Council membership in both the permanent and non-permanent categories. Nepal supports the idea of the expansion of membership in both categories. Expanding the permanent category should be able to correct the historical wrong that Africa has had to endure from the very beginning, so as to make the Council membership representative of the present-day membership in the General Assembly, to correct the underrepresentation of the developing countries and to reflect the present-day capability to carry out the requisite responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.

Nepal believes the aspirations of India, Japan, Germany and Brazil to acquire permanent membership in the Council are in tune with the present-day reality. In the case of non-permanent membership, Nepal believes there should be a fair and judicious principle of rotation on a regional and subregional basis as well. Among many criteria, the contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security should be taken into account, especially when the contributing countries are relatively small and landlocked. In fact, it is important that the landlocked developing countries be represented as a special constituency, given their special, permanent feature of hardship with serious security implications.

With regard to the veto, Nepal believes that provision has outlived whatever utility it had and should be abolished entirely. As long as it continues to exist, the veto power should not be used to create additional tiers of members other than permanent and non-permanent members as at present, even when the Council is expanded. The threat of the use of the veto, which is many times instrumental in undermining the credibility and the real utility of the Council, should be tamed. The proposal of France for a voluntary moratorium on the veto would be a very good step forward in that direction.

On the size of the expanded Council, it should not be so big that it compromises the Council's efficiency, and should not be so small that it cannot have the due representative character. The ideal number would be around 24, as that should also ensure that each

member, including the non-permanent, could preside at least once over the work of an expanded Council for a one-month period during the country's two-year term in the Council.

My delegation understands the concern as well as the high degree of determination of the President of the General Assembly to make progress in the intergovernmental negotiations process so that we can all collectively deliver what our leaders envision for us to do by 2015 in reforming the Security Council. Nepal believes that the President and the Chair of intergovernmental negotiations should do what it takes to keep up the current momentum, with a tangible instrument at hand to begin with.

I wish to conclude by congratulating the newly elected non-permanent members of the Security Council: Angola, Malaysia, New Zealand, Spain and Venezuela. Nepal believes their presence will significantly influence the Council in its work, and we wish them all a very successful tenure in the Council during 2015 and 2016.

Mr. Rattray (Jamaica): I appreciate the opportunity to make some brief remarks at the end of this meeting. At the outset, permit me to convey my thanks to the President of the General Assembly for appointing me Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on the reform of the Security Council. I am humbled and honoured by the trust and responsibility that has been placed in me, and I assure the Assembly of my commitment to undertake the assignment with diligence, perseverance and the utmost respect for the views of the membership of the Organization.

I wish to recognize the committed work of my predecessor and good friend, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, who has done yeoman's service in advancing the cause of Security Council reform. The membership of the Assembly owes him a great debt of gratitude for the tireless and faithful efforts he has made over the past years.

I very much appreciate the expressions of congratulation and support offered by my colleagues, for which I am most grateful. I pledge my intention to foster an environment in which all ideas and views can be considered on an equal basis, in a constructive atmosphere and reinforced by mutual respect — an environment conducive to creative thinking and characterized by openness, transparency and flexibility.

There can be no question that our collective and long-running endeavour to accomplish Security Council reform represents one of the highest priorities of our membership. Paradoxically — or perhaps because that is the case — this enterprise also reflects one of the most challenging processes we have pursued. Although I am realistic about the prospects for success, I am nonetheless aware that it would be impossible to achieve results in the absence of the hope that our aspirations for reform will ultimately be realized. The expectation is that all Member States will come to the negotiating table imbued with a spirit of good faith and

certain that that which may appear to be beyond our reach is in fact well within our grasp.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. It is particularly apt that we should have heard from the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform.

The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 119.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.