



BRAZIL

**REMARKS BY H. E. AMBASSADOR MARIA LUIZA RIBEIRO VIOTTI,
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL,
AT THE THIRD ROUND OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS
ON SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM**

New York, 1 September 2009

(check against delivery)

Mr. Chairman,

I thank you for convening this first meeting of the third round of intergovernmental negotiations. The past two rounds confirmed that we all coincide that a comprehensive reform of the Security Council is urgently and critically needed.

As spelled out in the 2005 Outcome Document, the objective of the reform is to make the Council more representative, efficient, transparent, effective and legitimate. This will not be achieved if we do not correct the mismatch between today's political realities and the composition of the organ.

The world today is very different from that of 1945. Power has become more diffuse and the nature of current threats requires a more inclusive kind of governance. New actors able and willing to give a special contribution to international peace and security have emerged on the international scene. Their enhanced participation in governing bodies will lead to more effective solutions to global problems. A third aspect is the extraordinary increase in the membership of the United Nations.

The logic consequence of what I have just said is the compelling need for an expansion of the Security Council in both permanent and non-permanent categories. Firstly, because leaving the core membership of the Council back in 1945 would defeat the very objective of the reform as agreed in 2005 and – worse - reinforce the status quo. Secondly, the increase in the number of non-permanent members is needed in order to properly reflect the overall increase in the membership of the Organization.

New permanent members should have the same responsibilities and obligations as the current ones, including with regard to the veto. Given the difficulties in this most sensitive issue, we have proposed that newcomers do not exercise the right of veto until the question of its extension to new permanent members has been decided in the framework of a review of the situation created by the reform 15 years after it enters into force. Making a final decision on this question later on could benefit from the actual experience accumulated with the addition of new permanent members. Some argue that permanent members unable at least before the review to veto draft resolutions would not bring change to the Council. This is not the case. The ability to alter the way the Council works does not derive from the legal capacity to stop action; rather, it is a function of positive political will, as well as permanency, which gives the clout needed to promote and gather support for change.

Mr. Chairman,

In complex and sometimes confuse debates, recourse to the Charter provides the necessary clarity. Think, for example, of the ill-defined idea of 'regional representation', of which there is no accepted definition. If it implies and means giving representation to regional institutions, the Charter is very clear in that only sovereign States are members of the Organization and there is room in the Council for them only. Our previous exchanges confirmed virtually universal agreement on such notion.

Obviously this does not deny the rights of regional groups to coordinate positions and policies in the election of their members. It may, for instance, decide on a 'clean slate' of candidates, although the final decision is to be taken by the General Assembly. Once in the Council, States – whether or not members of a regional organization – are

also free to coordinate or even align its positions and policies with whomever it sees fit. In both cases, however, individual States are solely accountable to the overall membership and the Security Council.

In light of the above, my delegation reiterates its suggestion that we abandon the expression "regional representation" and focus on the Charter-based notion of "equitable geographical distribution".

On the size of an enlarged Security Council, we stand by our proposal that the Council be expanded to 25 members. It is a number that we believe can strike a balance between representativeness and effectiveness in the Council deliberations. Here again there is a widespread agreement among delegations. We have to work further to allay the fears of those who still believe that a Council with 25 members would be unwieldy.

Enlargement and working methods need to be dealt with simultaneously in the process of reform. We support all measures mentioned in your overview. The letter and spirit of Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, in particular, should be fully implemented.

On the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly, strict adherence to the Charter is, again, the right path to take. The Council should refrain from encroaching on matters beyond its competencies and the Assembly must fully exercise its authority, as appropriate, in accordance with the Charter.

Mr. Chairman,

As we approach the end of the session, it is timely to recall that we must all strive to show flexibility in order to make progress in our deliberations. Flexibility, however, should be coupled with the ambition indispensable to bringing the kind of change this hour demands. Compromise is needed but not at the expense of the representativeness, effectiveness and legitimacy of the Security Council.

The Charter's stringent provisions for amendments are our best guarantee that a bold though feasible reform will have the political support of the vast majority of Member States. Unanimity is not possible and its search cannot be used as an excuse for paralysis.

In finding the right balance between the ideal and the possible, your continued efforts, Mr. Chairman, will be much valued. We will keep supporting you and all your initiatives leading to a meaningful reform of the Security Council.

Thank you.