



PERMANENT MISSION OF HUNGARY  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
NEW YORK

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY!

**Inter-governmental negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters**

**Intervention by H.E. Zsolt Hetesy  
Deputy Permanent Representative, Chargé d'affaires a.i.  
HUNGARY**

**New York, 9 March, 2016**

Madam Chair,

After promising discussions on the first two key elements, today's topic on the question of veto does not offer itself for easy solution. Therefore, it is even more important to stick to the procedure and working methods devised by you, and to utilize practices that have been fruitful during the first two meetings.

Even the divergent views on the veto can also be further crystalized around the main proposals. The availability of consolidated text on the different main options would assist us in moving closer to finding compromise solutions.

As an example, on granting the right of veto for new permanent members, we have three main options: One that would give the right to new members; one that would not; and one that would leave this issue for the first review process in 20 years' time. This later proposal could present itself as a compromise solution for the two other contradictory options.

Subchapters, such as the one concerning the voluntary restraint on the use of veto, or on the abolition of veto could also be significantly shortened through the consolidation of similar proposals, through regrouping the proposals and by presenting some recurring elements only under one subchapter.

In the subchapter on the voluntary restraint on the use of veto we detect more convergence than divergence. This is the result of the growing support of Member States for the ACT Group's Code of Conduct to prevent or stop atrocity crimes and the support received by the French-Mexican proposal on the voluntary restraint of veto power.

The practical implementation of these two proposals is not tied to the reform process. These are efforts that must be pursued by the Council on a daily basis, and the Council does not have to wait until we agree on reform. Already nine members of the Council are signatories to the ACT Code of Conduct. As we know, this is exactly the number of affirmative votes that is required for the adoption of a Council resolution.

Having said that, Hungary believes that these efforts can be further strengthened if the General Assembly includes recommendations in its final product on Security Council reform. When formulating such recommendations, Hungary prefers them to be in line with the ACT Code of Conduct that requires active participation of all Members of the Council and puts

more emphasis on facilitation of timely and decisive action. We have also taken note of the proposal of Malta to include the elements of the ACT CoC in a Charter Amendment.

Other mandatory restrictions on the use of veto would also require Charter amendments and therefore, they would be harder to achieve. However, the General Assembly, at a minimum, should request / recommend strict adherence to the Charter provisions that would already result in more limited use of the veto. Examples include Article 24 (Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations); Article 27 (in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting).

Among other proposals, Hungary strongly supports mandatory explanation of reasons for veto, at the time of veto, to be circulated as Security Council document.

Hungary acknowledges the ultimate responsibility of the Security Council with regard to its activities and working methods. This is precisely why Hungary suggests that the Security Council review its procedures on the use of veto and regularly inform the broader membership about the outcome of such deliberations.

This undertaking will become unavoidable once we agree on Security Council reform. However, this exercise should be a continuous one, even parallel to the reform process, especially based on the proposals contained in the ACT Code of Conduct and in the French-Mexican proposal.

Thank you, Madam Chair!