

**Remarks by Ambassador Abdullah Hussain Haroon,
Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations in the Intergovernmental
Negotiations on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership
of the Security Council and Related Matters,
New York, 21 February 2012**

Mr. Chairman,

Thank you for convening today's meeting.

Our delegation aligns with the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Italy. We support the model of Security Council reform presented in the Italy-Colombia proposal.

Before going into details, let me offer a reality check given to the House by the P-5 that the P-5 members have the power and right to say yes or no to any reform proposal. We should not lose sight of the fact that the P-5 members can say no to any reform formula. We should therefore be realistic in our deliberations and objectives.

As distinguished colleagues would recall, prior to the intergovernmental negotiations (IGN), many proposals on Security Council reform were tabled in the General Assembly in the form of formal draft resolutions. However, none of these drafts could graduate beyond the L-document stage, due to lack of requisite support. The impasse spawned by failed initiatives led to GA decision 62/557 and start of inter-governmental negotiations.

Compromise and flexibility are necessary for fruitful negotiations. Harping on rejected positions while bemoaning lack of progress is oxymoronic to say the least!

Driven by a desire to unite the UN Membership rather than splintering it, the UfC modulated its position and presented a new compromise formula at the onset of the IGN in 2009. The formula is contained in the Italy-Colombia paper.

Let me also stress that the UfC's position of "expansion in non-permanent category" has the distinction of eliciting unanimity of support in this august house. Not a single delegation present here is opposed to the idea of expansion in non-permanent category.

Mr. Chairman,

The Italy-Colombia paper is a realistic basis for forward movement in the reform process. As Italy has stated, it is not a take-it-or-leave-it offer but holds the prospect of real dialogue on an achievable final outcome.

The Italy-Colombia paper does not serve the interest of its authors alone but offers a collective bargain to reform an institution whose ownership is shared by all UN Member States.

Underpinned by the eternal principle of sovereign equality of all UN Member States, the proposal is not spurred by any contrived power politics exigency nor by any of us seats from this august house.

In a rapidly changing global geopolitical landscape, our proposal rises above the straitjacket of the perceived and parroted here and now and caters to the political configuration of the real world (not the other dimension from which some proposals come!) in which a handful of large States, a number of medium sized States, majority of small States and a some regional organizations play an important role in international and regional peace and security.

Mr. Chairman,

Addressing all five key issues in a comprehensive approach, the Italy-Colombia paper is concordant with GA decision 62/557. Individual separations are not in concordant of GA decision.

It is not in denial of the reality that major differences exist among Member States on issues of categories and veto. Negotiating space is further restricted by the intractability of changing the existing veto structure as well as the imperative of a ceiling on the size of the reformed Security Council. These obstacles can be transcended by creating a new category of long-term seats and allowing re-election on existing non-permanent category of seats.

Duration of each term, number of seats in each category and modalities of elections, as listed in Italy-Colombia paper are subject to negotiations, which the UfC is always willing to interact.

The Italy Colombia paper addresses the question of regional representation. The concept of Regional Representation draws strength from Article 23 (1) of the UN Charter which mentions the importance of “equitable geographical distribution” in regard to non-permanent membership of the Council.

The Italy-Colombia paper proposes longer-term seats to be allocated to the regional Groups as follows: Africa, Asia, Asia/Africa (on rotational basis), GRULAC and WEOG/Eastern European Group. This would cater for the growing need to enhance the role of regional organizations in a reformed Security Council. In this context, the African Union is relatively more advanced in terms of regional approach and has created elaborate institutions for peace and security in Africa. Its position for regional representation, which has commanded wide support, fits easily in the configuration of the African Group.

Similarly, many major issues on the Council’s agenda relate to the Islamic world. The OIC and the Arab League have clear demands for representation in an enlarged Council. While these two are cross-regional groupings, their representation can be accommodated through, inter-alia, increasing representation from Africa and Asia as well as allocating more seats to be shared between Africa and Asia on rotation basis. This will specifically provide for continuous representation of the Islamic world on the Council as demanded by the OIC and the Arab League.

The Italy-Colombia paper provides adequate room for maneuver in negotiations to ensure appropriate regional representation of all under-represented groups, especially Africa.

The paper also offers realistic prospects for the Small States. By having a dedicated arrangement, we can secure a perennial presence of small-states in the reformed Security Council. The distinguished Permanent Representative of Malta has described the point in greater detail and I totally subscribe to his statement.

Mr. Chairman,

In regard to a question about the harmony and workability of the UfC approach vis-a-vis Africa, it is essential to mention, as long as Ezulwini consensus, without Africa there can be no majoritythe following five points are noteworthy:

Firstly, both Africa and the UfC agree on the need for comprehensive reform and to eschew a piecemeal approach. We share views on inter-linkages of five key issues.

Secondly, UfC believes that historical injustices suffered by Africa justify the African demand to be treated as a Special Case and on priority basis. This is absolutely clear.

Thirdly, we make a qualifying distinction between the individual pursuits of permanent membership and Africa's principled demand for permanent seats. We support African position on this issue because it is basically about representation of a region and not individual representation. This difference should be appreciated. In Security Council reform, Africa unites the entire membership, while individual claimants of permanent seats will only divide it.

Fourthly, the statement delivered by the PR of Italy has enumerated the provisions for Africa in the Italy-Colombia paper. I just need to highlight that 40% of the proposed expansion in our proposal will go to Africa. It will be for the African Group or the African Union to decide on the duration of term of its representative. Thus, African Group can choose to have its representative serve at the Security Council for as many terms as the Group decides. By this logic, African representatives can have extended presence at the Security Council, subject to the collective will of the African continent.

Finally, let me reiterate that unlike some other groups who are trying to manipulate Africa's common position as a stepping-stone to serve their own interests, we will never do that. We do not hide the differences that exist between Africa and the UfC but try to bridge them. We will strive to augment our commonalities and promote Africa's legitimate interests.

Mr. Chairman,

In response to questions raised about the level of support for the UfC proposal, suffice it to say that we have never bluffed or pretended to have overwhelming support! For us the reform process is a serious exercise and not a game of poker. In the realm of reality in which the UfC operates, no proposal enjoys the requisite support in the house. Therefore, we have not proposed the

Italy-Colombia paper as a draft resolution or a decision. We are not counting votes but offering a compromise formula for future negotiations.

The UfC proposal has also been questioned for perpetuating the status quo. The fact is that our proposal raises the ratio of electable seats, which could usher in important changes in decision-making, working methods and relationship of the Security Council and the General Assembly. All this will diminish the status quo tendencies of managing the Security Council as an exclusive club. As opposed, the G-4 wants four to six new permanent members. Considering that we can only have modest expansion in the Security Council, adding four or six new permanent members will reduce the ratio of electable members --- making the Council less accountable, less representative and more exclusive, thereby reinforcing the status quo.

Mr. Chairman,

I will conclude by reiterating that we, the Member States, must never abdicate our right to elect our representatives to the Security Council. For the sake of compromise, those wishing to serve the cause of international peace and security can be allowed to stay at the Security Council for extended terms but they must revert to their constituencies and electorate for the sake of democracy, accountability and representation. This is the principle behind Italy-Colombia proposal and is the essence of the spirit of the UfC position.

Thank you