



Monday, 15 November 1954,  
at 10.30 a.m.

New York

**CONTENTS**

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Agenda item 53:  |      |
| Organization of the Secretariat ( <i>concluded</i> ) ..... | 187  |

**Chairman: Mr. Pote SARASIN (Thailand).**

**AGENDA ITEM 53**

**Organization of the Secretariat (A/2731, A/2745;  
A/C.5/580, A/C.5/581, A/C.5/591; A/C.5/  
L.282/Rev.1) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. NASH (United States of America) was afraid that the remarks made by the Indian representative at the 459th meeting regarding public reception activities and the role of the voluntary organizations might be misunderstood. The principle that voluntary organizations could co-operate with the Organization, particularly in the information field, had been accepted at the San Francisco Conference, and had been confirmed by various decisions of the Economic and Social Council. Moreover, the voluntary organizations had been authorized to organize public reception activities at Lake Success and later in Manhattan. The service appeared to have functioned satisfactorily, and if there had been occasion to complain of the lectures given by the guides, it should be remembered that the information they gave came from the Secretariat. It should also be recalled that the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee had approved the regulations for the organization of the guided tours service. As the Secretary-General was to report on the service and on the fees charged for visits, the United States delegation preferred to withhold judgment until it had seen the report.

2. With regard to the advisability of "farming out" work to agencies outside the Organization, the United States representative agreed with the Secretary-General that a fairly flexible policy should be adopted, and each case should be considered individually. He agreed with the Indian representative as to the necessity of an equitable distribution of posts on a geographical basis, but could not completely accept his comments on the International Civil Service Advisory Board.

3. The United States delegation would support the joint draft resolution proposed by Argentina, India, Lebanon and Yugoslavia (A/C.5/L.282/Rev.1).

4. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that at the 439th meeting during the general discussion the USSR delegation had not concealed its doubts regarding the advisability of some of the Secretary-General's recommendations, or its *disappointment in the budgetary implications of the reorganization of the Secretariat*. It had nevertheless stated that it was ready to agree in principle to the plan proposed by the Secretary-General, whose pro-

posals should improve the structure of the Secretariat, increase its efficiency and effect certain savings.

5. In the draft resolution before the Committee, the Secretary-General was invited, in proceeding with the implementation of his proposals, to take into account the observations and suggestions made in the Fifth Committee. In that connexion, the USSR delegation agreed with many other delegations that the number of senior posts was relatively too high, and that it was unnecessary to create an intermediate echelon of Deputy Under-Secretaries between the Under-Secretary and Director levels. In the opinion of the USSR delegation, the Under-Secretaries without department should supervise and assume responsibility for the work of individual departments in addition to their special duties. He shared the Indian representative's views on geographical distribution. The Secretary-General was to submit a report on the question to the next session; the General Assembly should take that opportunity to define the guiding principles in that field and to make the necessary regulations. The USSR delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee and most of the members of the Fifth Committee that the Department of Economic Affairs, the Department of Social Affairs and the Technical Assistance Administration (TAA) should be merged as soon as possible in a single department that would be responsible for all questions connected with assistance to the under-developed countries.

6. The USSR delegation would support the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.282/Rev.1), but it reserved the right to raise the question again at the tenth session if the steps taken by the Secretary-General to reorganize the Secretariat did not appear to have had the results anticipated.

7. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan) had been glad to hear from the Indian representative that he regarded the previous references to the new incumbent of the Department of Information as "a closed book". The Pakistan delegation felt strongly that the Secretary-General's freedom of action to recruit staff should not be impaired. The Secretary-General had exercised that freedom with good judgment up to the present. The Secretariat comprised many former State officials whose impartiality and faithfulness to the cause of the United Nations had never been questioned, and he did not see why that should not be so in the future.

8. At the 459th meeting, the Indian representative had stated that the Secretary-General had accepted the principle that any diplomat or statesman who had participated in an inter-State controversy should be debarred from Secretariat employment. The Pakistan delegation did not think that the Secretary-General had really endorsed that principle. In any case, the adoption of such a principle could not but lead to considerable difficulties. The principle laid down by the Indian delegation would debar nationals of all coun-

tries that were parties to any controversy. One of the responsibilities of the United Nations was to attempt the settlement of disputes between Member States. It was inevitable that the parties to such disputes should select their most talented nationals to plead their cause before the Organization but that did not mean that those chosen would not have the ability or the integrity required of the incumbents of the higher posts in the Secretariat. If persons who had represented their countries in disputes before the United Nations were excluded, the Organization would be unnecessarily deprived of the service of many highly qualified persons. Adherence to that principle would not only be unfair to the candidates debarred, but also to the countries which could not boast a super-abundance of first-rate talents.

9. The Pakistan delegation wished to know to what extent the Secretary-General had committed himself to the acceptance of that principle. It was convinced that he should have the independence of action with regard to recruitment given him by Article 101 of the Charter. It was for him to judge whether a candidate satisfied all the criteria stipulated in the Charter.

10. Finally, the Pakistan delegation would support the draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, India, Lebanon and Yugoslavia (A/C.5/L.282/Rev.1). However, it felt that, in order to prevent any misinterpretation, the words "observations and suggestions made..." in operative paragraph 2 should be replaced by "the discussions held...".

11. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) referred the Pakistan representative to the Secretary-General's statement at the 439th meeting in which he had defined his position with regard to the Indian delegation's principle in the following words:

"In recruiting officials to fill the higher posts, he had done his best to secure those whose ability, previous experience and general approach to United Nations problems seemed to him to meet the requirements of the Charter. In so doing he had imposed on himself certain restrictions, one of which had been mentioned by the Indian representative. He felt that everything possible should be done to avoid recruiting any person to whom objection might be raised on political grounds, though he did not consider that such a consideration could constitute an absolute prohibition. . . . He fully supported the principle set forth by the Indian representative but he did not wish to make that principle so rigid as not to permit of exceptions which, as in the case in question, served to prove the rule."

12. That statement was sufficiently explicit to make further comment unnecessary.

13. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan) noted that the Secretary-General did not entirely endorse the Indian delegation's principle. It was essential for the Secretary-General to have full freedom to recruit new staff and judge the value of officials already employed in the Secretariat.

14. Mr. SAPRU (India) regretted that the Secretary-General was not present to clarify his position.

15. Mr. ROUSSOS (Greece) stated that the Greek delegation would support the four-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.282/Rev.1), which was the logical outcome of the Committee's debates on the reorgan-

ization of the Secretariat. Some divergence of views had become apparent during the discussion. The Committee must now put its trust in the Secretary-General. The draft resolution invited the Secretary-General to take into account the comments contained in the Advisory Committee's report (A/2745). It might therefore be advisable for the Advisory Committee also to be invited to submit a progress report on the reorganization of the Secretariat to the tenth session of the General Assembly.

16. Mr. GANEM (France) regretted that at the 459th meeting the Indian representative had mentioned a difference in points of view between great and small Powers. However, he agreed with Mr. Menon that the Secretariat should become increasingly international in character, and he noted with satisfaction that the Secretary-General was intending to propose, in a report to the Advisory Committee, that the guided tours service should be taken over by the Secretariat. The French delegation wished to take the opportunity of paying a tribute to the voluntary organization that had carried out those functions up to the present for its excellent service.

17. Turning to the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.282/Rev.1), the French representative proposed the addition of the words "in 1955" after "detailed review" in the third paragraph of the preamble. The Secretary-General had mentioned in his report (A/2731, paragraph 5) that it was his intention to have the detailed survey carried out early in 1955. The French delegation felt that a study should be made as soon as possible, and it therefore thought that the date should be mentioned in the draft resolution.

18. The draft in question was both flexible and comprehensive. It took account of all the difficulties that the Secretary-General had to face in the accomplishment of his task, and at the same time left him the greatest possible freedom to carry it out. The French delegation would support the draft resolution.

19. Mr. SAPRU (India) wished to clear up certain points which had given rise to misunderstanding and with regard to which the United States representative in particular had felt misgivings. With regard to the guided tours and voluntary organizations, Mr. Menon had certainly not intended his statement at the 459th meeting to imply that the voluntary organizations had not performed their task with complete impartiality. He had simply wished to state a general principle, namely, that the work of the United Nations should be performed by the Organization itself. Those who worked for the Organization should be subject to the authority of the Secretary-General; that was the case with members of the Secretariat but it was not and could not be the case with the voluntary organizations. Mr. Menon's remarks should not, therefore, be taken as a criticism of the voluntary organizations, especially as he had been thinking of the future rather than the past.

20. He assured the French representative that the Indian delegation had not wished to give the impression that it was hostile to the great Powers or that it was trying to rally the small Powers against them. It had simply wished to suggest that the small Powers should be adequately represented in the Secretariat and in particular in the Trusteeship Department.

21. Referring to the question raised by the Pakistan representative concerning appointments to high positions, he reminded the Committee that he had said at the 439th meeting that it would be unwise for persons who had played a prominent part in inter-State controversies to be given a position in the United Nations Secretariat. The international civil servant must not only be impartial and free from any bias but must also enjoy that reputation. The Secretary-General had fully supported the principle set forth by the Indian representative, but had said that he did not wish to make that principle so rigid as not to permit of exceptions which, as in the case in question, served to prove the rule. It was for that reason that Mr. Menon had said at the 459th meeting that he considered the matter settled; the Indian delegation was prepared to give its full co-operation both to the Secretary-General and to the official in question.

22. At the 459th meeting, the Secretary-General had said that the Indian representative had given somewhat exaggerated importance to his proposal regarding the possibility of entrusting research work to institutes outside the Secretariat. The Indian delegation felt that the help of outside research institutes should be called upon as little as possible. Statistics often gave rise to disputes; it was proper, therefore, that work in that field should be done by the Secretariat itself. The principle was the same as that which the Indian delegation had defended earlier with respect to the guided tours and volunteers in the Department of Public Information: the basic work of the Organization should be carried out by the Secretariat and by no one else.

23. With regard to the geographical distribution of posts at the highest level of the Secretariat, the Secretary-General had stressed that it would be difficult, in the immediate future, to make major improvements in the geographical equilibrium of the staff, except at the expense of tried and tested staff. The Indian delegation believed that of the fifteen posts of Under-Secretaries and officials of equivalent rank, it should be possible to reserve a certain number of nationals of countries insufficiently represented who were not at present members of the Secretariat.

24. Turning to the amendment proposed by the Pakistan representative, he said that the Fifth Committee, far from limiting itself to mere discussion, had made practical suggestions and offered useful observations on various aspects of the reorganization of the Secretariat. The purpose of its debates had been to assist the Secretary-General, and he should take note of the opinions expressed before drawing up his final plan of reorganization. The terms used in the joint draft resolution were, therefore, more expressive and better chosen.

25. The Indian delegation was prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the French representative.

26. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that his delegation could not agree that the Secretary-General should in all cases be bound by a principle which prevented him from entrusting positions in the Secretariat to persons who had played a prominent part in inter-State controversies. That principle was only one of many which the Secretary-General should take into consideration.

27. The Norwegian delegation was in favour of the amendment proposed by Pakistan; the difference be-

tween the two texts was very slight, however, and since the Pakistan suggestion was not a formal proposal and appeared not to meet with the approval of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, the Pakistan delegation might perhaps consider withdrawing it.

28. The same applied to the Greek representative's suggestion. In fact, any report which the Secretary-General might submit would in the normal way be examined by the Advisory Committee. The General Assembly would be informed of any observations that Committee had to make. There seemed no point, therefore, in voting on the Greek proposal.

29. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) felt that the expression "the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations" used in the third paragraph of the preamble might give rise to misunderstandings. In fact, it was not the subsidiary bodies themselves which the Secretary-General intended to submit to detailed scrutiny, but their secretariats; he hoped that the authors of the draft resolution would take account of that fact.

30. At the 459th meeting, the Indian representative had pointed out that in its resolution 13 (I) of 13 February 1946, the General Assembly had decided to set up an International Civil Service Commission. In fact, however, only an advisory board had been set up, the International Civil Service Advisory Board, with far narrower functions than those which would have been possessed by the Commission it replaced. There was reason to regret the change, which was not a necessity and had not been approved by the General Assembly. Like the Indian representative, the members of the International Civil Service Advisory Board had been aware of the significance of that change and had wondered if they ought not to resign. They had nonetheless felt that they could still be of service to the United Nations and the specialized agencies. In any case, it was not for the Board to make definite proposals; its terms of reference were laid down in the resolution of 13 February 1946.

31. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) agreed with the Indian representative that the Secretary-General should recruit Secretariat staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible and that the percentage contribution of each Member State should not be the most important criterion. He further wished to associate himself with the Indian representative's remarks concerning the recruitment of officials in the Trusteeship Department; in that connexion, he referred to General Assembly resolution 746 (VIII) which had been adopted on the suggestion of the Pakistan and Iraqi delegations.

32. With regard to direct recruitment into the highest posts, he unhesitatingly supported the observations of the Pakistan and Norwegian representatives. It would be unfortunate to establish as a principle that no politician or diplomat might be accepted as a candidate; if there was no doubt as to his impartiality, there was no reason to invoke the principle championed by the Indian representative and it would be unjust to prejudge the issue. The Secretary-General should base his selection, first and foremost on the criteria established in Article 101 of the Charter. He might subsequently, if necessary, take into account other considerations, including the principle mentioned by the Indian representative.



33. In order to satisfy the Greek representative, it might perhaps be enough if the Rapporteur were to state in his report that the Fifth Committee expected to receive the Advisory Committee's observations on the Secretary-General's report at the tenth session.

34. In reply to a question by Mr. FRIIS (Denmark), Mr. CAFIERO (Argentina) said that the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations mentioned in the third paragraph of the preamble to the joint draft resolution were those referred to by the Secretary-General in his report (A/2731, paragraph 5). In the first draft resolution it had submitted (A/C.5/L.282), the Argentine delegation had listed the bodies it had had in mind, but on consideration it had decided that it would prefer a more flexible formula which would enable the Secretary-General to extend his review to other bodies as he thought necessary.

35. On behalf of the four delegations he accepted the amendments proposed by the French representative and by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. However, for the reasons stated by the Indian representative, he would prefer that operative paragraph 2 of the resolution should remain unchanged and he urged the Pakistan representative not to insist on his proposal.

36. With regard to the Greek representative's proposal, he had nothing to add to the explanations offered by the Norwegian and Iraqi representatives.

37. Mr. HASSAN (Pakistan) said that in view of the explanation given by the sponsors of the draft resolution, he would withdraw his proposal.

38. Mr. STRAUCH (Brazil) said that the draft resolution was generally in accordance with the position taken by the Brazilian delegation. He understood that there was no danger that it would unduly restrict the Secretary-General's freedom of action, and on this basis he would vote for it.

39. Mr. NATANAGARA (Indonesia) considered that the draft resolution represented the best way of concluding the Committee's discussion of the organization of the Secretariat. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of it.

40. The CHAIRMAN put the joint draft resolution A/C.5/L.282/Rev.1 to the vote. The third paragraph of the preamble, in accordance with the amendments proposed by the French representative and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution, read as follows:

*"Taking note of the Secretary-General's intention to bring under detailed review in 1955 those United Nations offices and activities external to Headquarters, as well as the secretariats of subsidiary bodies of the United Nations".*

*The draft resolution, as amended, was unanimously adopted.*

41. Mr. RYBAR (Czechoslovakia) said that he had voted for the draft resolution in the same spirit as the Soviet Union delegation; his delegation had voiced certain criticisms during the discussion and it reserved its right to revert to the question of the reorganization of the Secretariat at Headquarters, at the tenth session, if it felt that the measures taken had not achieved the results expected.

42. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it remained for the Committee to take a decision on the Secretary-General's proposal (A/2731, paragraph 30) for the amendment of staff regulations 1.10 and 4.5. The Rapporteur might perhaps deal with that matter in the draft report he would submit to the Committee.

43. Mr. LIVERAN (Israel) (Rapporteur), proposed that the text of the joint draft resolution which the Committee had just adopted should be annexed to its report, together with a second draft resolution amending the staff regulations mentioned by the Chairman. A General Assembly resolution was required for the modification of the staff regulations, and it would be better to adopt a separate resolution in order to deal with the questions in an orderly fashion.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.