

PLENARY MEETING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**ITEM 117: QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE
IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

ITEM 120: FOLLOW-UP TO THE OUTCOME OF THE MILLENNIUM SUMMIT

STATEMENT

BY

**MR. STEFAN BARRIGA
CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A.I.
OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN
TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

NEW YORK, 20 JULY 2006

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Mr. President

We appreciate this opportunity to address Security Council reform in all its aspects, given the continued high importance of this topic for the overall reform agenda of the United Nations. We do agree that UN reform will not be complete unless it encompasses Security Council reform. This is a good moment to revert to this topic, after having taken decisions on numerous important reform topics, including the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Human Rights Council, and after recent decisions on management reform.

We attach equal importance to the questions of enlargement and of working methods, in line with the World Summit Outcome. This, however, does not mean that the two issues need to be addressed simultaneously. Having dealt with the complex topic of Security Council reform in a rather intense manner in the past and particularly during 2005, we have come to the conclusion that the organization will greatly benefit by addressing working methods first, thereby creating the necessary momentum for enlargement and treating the two topics with the same level of intensity. It is against this background that we have presented the S5 resolution, together with Costa Rica, Jordan, Singapore and Switzerland, contained in document A/60/L.49.

Mr. President

As you know, the **S5 resolution** has been on the table for quite some time, so this is a good moment for us to take stock. First, we note with appreciation the strong support which many States have expressed in principle. This support confirmed our view that there is a strong need for reform of the working methods of the Security Council and that the General Assembly has a catalytic role to play in this respect. The fact that using the word "encroachment" has somewhat become the flavor of the season makes it clear that a more balanced relationship between the Security Council and the membership at large is indeed what most States wish for.

The S5 resolution addresses precisely that question. Our initiative aims at creating a more constructive and cooperative climate and at preventing antagonistic discussions such as those which took place over the past few months. We do not think that competence and power within the UN system are a pie which can be evenly divided between the two most important organs. Quite the opposite: Improving the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council will make both organs stronger and more relevant. The efficiency of the Security Council is one of its biggest assets, clearly. We do believe, however, that if the Security Council activities are more consistently guided by the principles of accountability and legitimacy, as called for in the World Summit Outcome, its efficiency need not suffer. But at the same time, its effectiveness will improve as a result of better implementation of Security Council decisions by Member States.

The Security Council has revitalized its **Working Group on Documentation** and thereby itself acknowledged that change is needed. Reform from within is the ideal solution, and we are highly appreciative of the work carried out by Ambassador Oshima of Japan as Chairman of the Group. We had hoped that the outcome of the Working Group would be available sooner in order to be commented on during this debate. This would have contributed to a more informed discussion on where we stand, and our views are therefore only preliminary. We nevertheless note with satisfaction that the S5 initiative has already had a positive impact and hopefully will continue to do so, as there is a continued need for action - in parallel and in support - by the General Assembly.

The importance of reform on Working Methods cannot be overstated. At a time when the Security Council has dramatically expanded its field of activities and more and more relies on the political will of Member States to effectively implement its decisions on increasingly complex and far-reaching topics, a stronger reflection of the views of States that are not members of the Security Council is a necessity and ultimately in the interest of the Council itself.

Mr. President

As far as **enlargement** is concerned, we have concluded quite a while ago that none of the proposals currently on the table will succeed. Our understanding of "success" in this context is a very strong political and numerical support that goes beyond what is legally required. We therefore need new ideas, possibly new alliances and a stronger role of States and other actors which do not have an immediate interest in the difficult question of Security Council reform. There must be an open and sober discussion of all aspects of Security Council enlargement, of the concepts of size and "permanency" - including in ways deviating from the ones currently established in the Charter. This requires, more than anything else, openness on the side of the proponents of models currently on the table. Such discussions would have to be conducted under the auspices of someone who does not belong to any "side". The President of the General Assembly is of course a natural first choice, but there are other possibilities. We hope that such a process can be initiated soon, because we need a modern Security Council which reflects the geopolitical realities of today, rather than those of 1945.

I thank you.