Mr. President,

On behalf of Pakistan delegation, I would like to thank you for convening this meeting for the purpose of the introduction of the draft resolution contained in document A/59/L.68 containing the proposal for Security Council reform submitted by the Uniting for Consensus Movement. Pakistan fully supports the introductory statement made so eloquently on behalf of the co-sponsors by Ambassador Allan Rock of Canada.

2. The Permanent Representative of Canada has outlined the major merits of our draft resolution. My delegation has also had the opportunity during our statement in the General assembly on 11 July 2005 to explain the proposal. Let me briefly recapitulate the virtues of our draft resolution:

i) It is fair and equitable. It adheres to the principle of sovereign equality and will not discriminate between member states;

ii) It will increase the Council’s representativeness. The majority of the membership of the United Nations are small and medium states. Our proposal will double the chances of 186 countries to secure membership of the Council;

iii) It will enhance the accountability, through the mechanism of periodic elections and re-elections. Those States which seek Council membership to represent regions or groups will remain periodically answerable to those regions and groups as well as to the general membership.

iv) Our proposal is simple. It proposes direct approval of a Charter amendment rather than a complex and uncertain three-stage process;

v) Our proposal is realistic. Since it accommodates the interests and positions of all Member States, it is more likely to secure eventual ratification.

3. As I have mentioned before, the greatest virtue of the draft resolution submitted by the UfC is its flexibility. It can accommodate, through variable geometry, the aspirations and interests of the majority of the membership including regional groups such as the African Union.

4. We have taken full note of the proposal submitted by the African Union in document A/59/L.67. I would like to submit that our resolution and that submitted by the African Union are fully compatible. Both proposals are based on the principle that each region would be in a position to construct its own architecture for representation on the Security Council. The African Union has called for two permanent seats for Africa with full rights. We see the African demand as qualitatively different from the call in the G-4’s draft resolution for six new “permanent members”. Permanent members do not represent their regions, only themselves. The G-4 countries are seeking permanent membership for themselves, not for their regions. The African Union has indicated that the two permanent seats it is seeking would represent Africa and “act on its behalf”. The African Union would also select its own representatives for these permanent seats. If the AU chooses two countries to represent it continuously or in other words “permanently” against those two seats, this would be possible under the UfC resolution. If the African Union decides that 3, 4, 5 or more countries should occupy these two seats by rotation,
that too could also be accommodated under our proposal. The additional benefit of our proposal is that the African Union would retain the power to ensure accountability on the part of those States which will represent it on the Council. Our proposal could also ensure representation of all the sub-regions of Africa. The six non-permanent seats for Africa under our proposal could enable it to fulfill the desire for equitable representation of each of its five sub-regions.

5. We also fully understand Africa’s desire to possess the same rights as other regions. Africa is seeking this right i.e. veto, on behalf of the entire African region, not for one or two States. My delegation believes that ways and means can be evolved, under the UfC proposal, to provide Africa with the collective ability to uphold its interests in a reformed Security Council.

6. Another commonality between the positions of the UfC and the African Union is our shared desire to achieve a result based on the broadest possible agreement. We value the Sirte Summit’s emphasis on solidarity and unity. We believe that such solidarity and unity must be upheld not only within the African Union but within the general membership of the United Nations.

7. Since our proposal is based on a regional approach, it can also accommodate the interests of sub-regions such as the Arab League, CARICOM and Central America. The larger number of elected seats which would be available under our proposals could be appropriately distributed within each region to ensure the representation of sub-regions as well as other political groupings such as the OIC.

8. Through the provision for immediate re-election, our proposal could also offer the possibility for long-term and even continuous membership for some states if they are nominated for this purpose by their respective regions. Thus, the G-4 can hope to realize their aspirations if they have regional support. Yet there are two important differences between the G-4’s approach and our proposal: Firstly, we preserve the principle of sovereign equality enshrined in the Charter, and, secondly, we ensure that through periodical elections, any country, seeking to represent its region will continue to be accountable to the general membership through the process of such elections. This is indeed the essence of democracy.

Mr. President,

9. The formal tabling of our draft proposal should not be construed as our concurrence with a vote on the crucial issue of Security Council reform. On the contrary, the UfC remains convinced that any proposal for Security Council reform to be successful and conclusive must be evolved on the basis of consensus or broadest possible agreement. Our proposal has been submitted to indicate the serious nature of our position and our desire for an early agreement on Security Council reform. Such a solution can be achieved through patient dialogue and consultations.

10. Therefore, Mr. President, we must express concern at reports that the sponsors of the draft resolution document A/59/L.64 – the G-4 – will call for a vote on their draft in the near future. Such a vote will be a recipe for disaster – disaster for Security Council reform, for UN reform, and for international peace and cooperation.

11. A vote will divide the United Nations membership exacerbating tensions in every region of the world and thus would prevent the central purpose of the United Nations Charter. The adoption of the G-4’s resolution – in the unlikely event that it happens, will lead to a dead-end. It will freeze the whole issue of Security Council reform for many years and oblige the general membership to live with the status quo.

12. Furthermore, in the unlikely event that it is adopted, the G-4’s framework resolution, one can expect to result in a spate of candidatures for permanent membership from every region. The September Summit will then become a lobbying bazaar as countries seek to promote their national ambitions or to protect their national interests. Other reform proposals contained in your
draft Outcome Document, Mr. President, would become peripheral. UN reform will become hostage to Security Council expansion.

13. At the same time, Mr. President, a vote on Security Council reform will also change the rules by which we are preparing for the September Summit. Votes could also be called on other controversial issues which are currently under consideration in your consultative process. The final outcome of the September Summit would thus be contested and leave the membership of the United Nations divided.

14. It is incumbent upon you, Mr. President, to save the situation, to avoid this headlong rush to catastrophe. The process for preparations for the September Summit is governed by the resolutions of the General Assembly we have adopted regarding the modalities for our work. Resolution 59/291 states clearly that our objective is to promote the “widest possible agreement” on “all major issues”. Widest possible agreement cannot be achieved through divisive and controversial vote.

Mr. President,

15. We hope that you will declare that such a vote is inconsistent with rules and modalities adopted for the preparation of the September Summit. Such a vote will be all the more questionable in view of the methods resorted to garner support, as has been mentioned by the Permanent Representative of Italy. Instead of scheduling a vote, we hope, you will resume the process of dialogue and consultations you had initiated between the G-4 and the UfC to include the AU and other stakeholders. It is only through such dialogue and consultations that we can reach an agreement which can accommodate the interests of all Member States, be approved by consensus, and stand a realistic chance of securing an early and equitable reform of the Security Council.