



**PERMANENT MISSION OF SINGAPORE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

231 East 51st Street, New York, NY 10022
Tel: 212-826 0840 x 104 · Fax: 212-826 2964

**STATEMENT BY MR KEVIN CHEOK
DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SINGAPORE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
AT THE MEETING 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,
19 JULY 2007**

1 Frederick Douglass once said, "If there is no struggle, there is no progress". I say this to cheer us all up, for we have been struggling with the topic of Security Council Reform for many years!

2 That said, I think that we are making some progress. The G4, AU, and UfC positions on Security Council expansion have been discussed at length. To date, none have emerged as the consensus approach. Thus came the Five Facilitator process. Their report in April alluded to a transitional approach as a possible way forward. They listed elements that could be part of this approach, the key suggestion being the possibility of a new "intermediate" category of Security Council seats. The details were left vague at that point in time.

3 This was followed by the Two Facilitator process led by Ambassadors Heraldo Munoz and Christian Wenaweser. Their elegant report of June has been equally useful. Without prejudice to previous positions, they have helped us explore what a transitional arrangement might look like. They have listed a plethora of complex and inter-related issues that must be addressed. This includes the size of an expansion, the categories of membership under which such an expansion might occur, and the question of regional representation. There is also election procedure, the veto, and working methods reform. These are very difficult issues where member states often do not share common views. These issues will need much discussion and agreement before we can proceed on any transitional path. In this context, the report's focus on the need for a mandatory and comprehensive review gains added salience.

4 Can we bridge these divides and agree on a transitional approach? It will be difficult, but we can try. More importantly, is there the political will to pursue a transitional arrangement? It is difficult to tell at this stage. In any case, my delegation will approach this with an open mind. But we should be mindful that any interim solution could well become relatively permanent, even with a mandatory review process. This means that we need a clear understanding of the nuts and bolts of any transitional approach. We must also try to find a solution with very broad based support. Here, I congratulate the two Facilitators for stressing the need for a "solid political majority" that will have to "take into account the interests and concerns of all major interest groups and States". Kudos also to them for specifically mentioning the interests of small states.

5 In this context, let me reiterate three suggestions that will help ensure that small states are not disadvantaged in any transitional arrangement. First, any interim solution should not neglect the expansion of traditional non-permanent seats. Second, we reiterate the suggestion for "time bar" measures to restrict countries from flip-flopping between categories, assuming a new intermediate category is created. This means that once a country decides to run for a seat in the "intermediate" category, and irrespective of the outcome of that election, it should be precluded from running for a traditional non-permanent seat for a certain number of years. A candidate for a traditional non-permanent seat would likewise be time barred for running in the intermediate category. This addresses concerns that larger countries might have "two bites of the cherry".

6 Third, progress on working methods remains crucial. Reforms in this area would benefit all states by making the Council more accessible and by extension, more effective. While complementary, working methods and expansion can be pursued on parallel tracks. We are gratified that the report of the two facilitators makes reference to the "different nature of the two aspects of reform". As part of the S5, we are pleased to support the S5 position as articulated by the Ambassador of Switzerland.

7 Thank you.

.....