



MÉXICO

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR CLAUDE HELLER,
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF MEXICO TO
THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE CONSULTATION OF THE OPEN
ENDED WORKING GROUP ON THE QUESTION OF THE
EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE
MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND OTHER
MATTERS RELATED TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

New York, December 14, 2007

(Check against delivery)

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR CLAUDE HELLER, PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF MEXICO TO THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE
CONSULTATIONS OF THE OPEN ENDED WORKING GROUP ON THE
EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP
OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO THE
SECURITY COUNCIL

New York, N.Y., December 14, 2007

Mr. President:

We have listened attentively to the presentation of your proposals on the future of the process, including the conformation of a task force, which you will preside, with three vice-presidents. We consider that the direct involvement of the President is essential not only to move forward this issue but also to guarantee that the opinions of Member States are truthfully gathered. In this sense, my Delegation wishes to reiterate its vote of confidence in you and to offer you our support and collaboration with the aim of obtaining concrete progress in the issue of the reform of the Security Council.

Also, we consider it necessary to reiterate that the only forum for consultations and for eventual negotiations is this Open-Ended Working Group. The consultations that we carry out must be, at all time, open, inclusive and transparent and should have an intergovernmental character that allows Member States to preserve the control and ownership of the process. Any decision that may be adopted must reflect the widest possible agreement and unilateral, hasty actions, that attempt to prejudge the process, should be avoided. If at least these very basic "set of rules" could be agreed, we think that we would then have a solid basis to define other aspects.

The Security Council reform has become a priority for this Organization. Undoubtedly, many of the failures that are pointed out to the Council derive from original mistakes in its conception that have no solution in sight. That is why, after 14 years of discussion of its reform, we are convinced that the only viable thing to do is to try to establish new balances within that Organ through the modification of its structure, of the form of representation of its members and of the improvement of its working methods.

My delegation does not wish to repeat our fundamental position which can be consulted in our recent interventions. We are ready to commence this new phase of identifying the elements for a negotiation. That is why we wish to offer our point of view to answer to the question posed by the President, in his letter dated December 6, as to what is negotiable.

In our opinion, the task of identifying what is negotiable is already answered, in great length, in the reports of the two groups of facilitators of the 61st Session. The fundamental conclusion of such reports remains valid: as long as there is a radical polarization among States, as the one that we have now, regarding the increase in the category of permanent members, with or without veto, the only solution is to bet for a transitional increase.

We haven't heard, in the past 14 years, that any of the five permanent members is ready to accept the possibility of new permanent members with the right of veto. The argument of those who insist on having a new permanent seat, as legitimate as their aspirations could be, loses much of its sense at the very moment when it is known they will lack the veto power. It is paradoxical that, under the argument of building a Security Council that reflects the contemporary reality, we end up having a Security Council that accentuates the inequalities within this Organization. In fact, if we continue on this road, we would end up having four categories of members of this Organization: a) permanent members of the Council with the right of veto; b) permanent members without a right of veto; c) members that eventually participate in the Council as non-permanent and d) States that have never been part of the Council.

The only viable formula to guarantee that new members can reestablish the balance of power in the Council would be, in any case, through regional seats, even without a veto power, precisely because their representativity will bestow on them an unquestionable legitimacy. But we must be aware that even such a formula would require an intense negotiating work within the regions and some subregions. In Latin America we have not advanced in this issue and we well know that other groups have not done so either. Yet, nobody, outside of our respective regions or groups, can take the decision of who should represent us in the Council.

All this reinforces the conclusion of the facilitators that the only viable and realistic formula is the one of a transitional expansion. Such an expansion, could include or not, a new intermediate category of members -with long term seats, subject or not to reelection, or to a regionally agreed rotation-, that would be subject to a future review mechanism. That is why Mr. President, the first issue we should define is if we are going to accept this intermediary approach, considering that otherwise it would be futile to embark on a discussion of other aspects.

Once we have defined that this is the negotiating framework, to which the five permanent members should commit themselves, we could start the task of identifying what specific elements of that intermediary approach would be subject to negotiation. The principal elements would be, in our opinion, the following: 1) define how many years this intermediary phase should last; 2) define the modalities and temporality of the intermediate seats; 3) define the form of representation in those seats, that is, if they will be national, regional or

subregional; 4) set criteria and standards for the improvement of the working methods and 5) set a precise date, even as part of the amendments to the Charter, for a review conference, without, in any way, prejudging its contents or results.

We hope Mr. President that our point of view is properly registered and acknowledged. We reiterate our commitment to participate in this process which we expect to be, at the same time, inclusive and effective in the launching of genuine negotiations tending to achieve the reform of the Security Council.

Thank you.