

Third, there is also a need to reform the *agenda* of the Security Council, which has become excessively lengthy and glaringly outdated. Such reform should take into account the wider peace and security agenda stemming from a growing understanding of the various global issues facing the world. There is no doubt that refugee flows, desertification, gross poverty, massive human rights violations, and other factors bear significantly on questions of human security. But should the Security Council become more involved in these issues? To a considerable degree it already is, given that so much of the active Council agenda has to do with intra-state problems. Sovereignty is no longer considered sacrosanct. One participant observed that the issue of conventional arms proliferation was of serious concern to smaller countries, but that the P-5 were also the world's major arms suppliers. This would appear to be contradictory to their responsibility at the Security Council to ensure international peace and security, particularly in light of a broadened security agenda.

Related to the new security agenda, the fourth issue is the need for the Security Council to provide broader leadership in the area of *peacebuilding*. If member states are serious about investing significance in this issue for our collective human security agenda into the next century, the Council must seize the initiative and articulate new peacebuilding priorities. Without interfering in the various systems of governance of other international bodies, such as international financial institutions and regional organisations, the Council could give expression to the commitment of the international community to stand by nations facing or emerging from violent conflict. This would in effect assert the staying power that has so often failed the international community in the past. More broadly, the issue of how the Council should relate to the myriad other international bodies whose work touches indirectly on peace and security needs to be examined more closely.

Finally, the controversial issue of the *selection process for the Secretary-General* must be addressed. It is certainly debatable whether the Security Council should be vested with the responsibility of nominating the Secretary-General, who must oversee all aspects of the UN's work. In the absence of veto reform, this puts the P-5 in a key position of advantage. As one participant noted, this allows the P-5 to virtually hold the Secretary-General "hostage". This current state of affairs is widely recognised to be outdated and inappropriate, and a better system of identifying and selecting suitable candidates for the position must be developed. Several participants agreed that a single six or seven year term would also allow the incumbent to act freely without fear of political retaliation by any P-5 member.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

David M. Malone, Jules Léger Fellow of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, is a Canadian career foreign service officer currently engaged in research and writing at Magdalen College, Oxford, on the UN Security Council and Haiti. From 1992 to 1994 he was Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations, where he chaired the work of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (the so-called Committee of 34) and the UN General