

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



Wednesday, 1 April 1953, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Report of the Secretary-General on personnel policy (A/2364) (concluded) 663

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Report of the Secretary-General on personnel policy (A/2364) (concluded)

[Agenda item 75]

1. Mr. MENON (India): At this stage of the discussion on the subject, it is neither appropriate nor necessary that I should argue any general principles. My task in coming before the General Assembly is to speak in support of our draft resolution [A/L.145/Rev.4], to answer any criticism that has been made of it and perhaps to correct at least one fundamental misconception. In doing that it may be necessary to refer to statements that have been made either by way of report to us or in the speeches thereafter. Therefore I propose to deal with the draft resolution before us paragraph by paragraph, explaining it and showing why we support it.

2. I feel sure that there is no need for me to argue that the second paragraph of the preamble will be one which the General Assembly will desire to record and vote on, namely, "Taking note of the satisfaction reported by the Secretary-General with respect to the efficiency and integrity of the Secretariat". While it is true that this sentiment is shared by all governments and delegations, and while it is true that all of us would want it to be proclaimed, it is equally true that numerous delegations, in the course of the debate, have expressed the view—and this also seems to be the general impression that has long been created in the public mind—that a considerable degree of unrest, or other bad feelings, exist in the Secretariat of the Organization.

3. I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Indian delegation and the other delegations which sponsored this draft resolution, to state publicly that we have the highest regard for the efficiency and integrity of the members of the Secretariat. Were it not so, this matter would have come up from one delegation or another long before there was a report from the Secretary-General. Indeed, when my delegation first wrote to the President on this matter, it was with a view to clearing up all these questions, so that this kind of atmosphere that surrounds the men and women who work for us, who make the work of our Assembly, the implementation of our decisions and the considerations of problems by us possible,

should not go unnoticed and that they should not be under any suspicion. I therefore hope that those who have not subscribed to this draft resolution hitherto will consider that this aspect of it is worth recording and proclaiming.

4. Then we come to the third paragraph of the preamble, concerning the "importance of maintaining and developing an international civil service in accordance with the purposes and provisions of the Charter". What we have perhaps in too brief and abrupt form stated in this draft resolution is contained in the other draft resolution [A/L.146/Rev.1] in its quotation from the Charter; we have no objection to the preamble as set forth there. It is significant, however, that one of the most important features of both these draft resolutions is this reference to the international character of the civil service, expressed either in terms of our having to conform to the provisions of the Charter, or as in our draft resolution. Here I should like to say that the discussion which has taken place has clearly shown that what we are discussing is really not some small matter that has come up, but the question of the whole of the administrative machinery, its temper, its calibre and the basis on which it should rest. I therefore find myself in disagreement with the representative of Canada, who told us [418th meeting] that:

"Today our concern is not about millions but a few thousands of men and women in the Secretariat of the United Nations" [para. 55].

That may be the superficial aspect of it. What we are considering are the main principles on which the international civil service should be based.

5. If this is correct, then any review of the problem, which means an advance from the position already reached in the Charter, requires a close and detailed study, as indicated in the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

6. This item has come before us not quite in the usual way. I do not mean to say that it has come up in an improper way, but that it has come up for discussion in the Assembly without going before a committee. I do not for a moment suggest that there is anything improper, wrong or procedurally questionable in this, but it does give rise to difficulties in the sense that neither governments nor we ourselves in a col-

lective way have had an opportunity to discuss and consider, comment or formulate any proposals on the legal, the political or the various other aspects of this problem.

7. If it is to be suggested that these aspects do not exist, the briefest way of my meeting that argument would be to try and quote from the speeches that have already been made. I would ask the representative of France to forgive me if I start with him first—not because I want to single him out. The representative of France said [418th meeting]:

“It is the first time that, apart from the technical discussions in the Fifth Committee, the Members of the United Nations have been called upon to pass judgment on the work, organization, operation, merits and weaknesses of the Secretariat, and on the steps which should be taken to improve it” [para. 83].

That does not look as though we were dealing with a small problem of a few thousand people. Then he went on to say:

“Official optimism is now no longer in place; and it would be wrong to ignore the serious crises through which the Secretariat has been passing for several months” [para. 84].

The French representative said further:

“It is inevitable that such relations should not be easy. Obviously they raise very delicate problems owing to the intimacy and multiplicity of the contacts between the Secretariat and the host countries” [para. 86].

He said “host countries”, in the plural. That goes to the root of the consideration of this problem. He also said:

“Much energy could be used on more constructive and useful tasks than this ghost-hunt or witch-hunt” [para. 89].

These are not my words. The representative of France continued:

“Many of the best members of the staff are thinking of resigning, while others are discouraged. Unless care is taken, the stability and efficiency of the Organization may also be endangered” [para. 90].

He went on to say further:

“If, in connexion with his work, a conflict arises between his obligations as an international civil servant and his duties as a citizen, his only choice is either to remain faithful to the Organization or to submit his resignation” [para. 95].

The representative of France went on in that fashion. I do not propose to discuss this, but since I have quoted the delegation of France I should also like to quote one or two other people.

8. The representative of the Netherlands said [417th meeting] that the Secretary-General, in paragraph 97 of his report [A/2364], had endeavoured to define the expression “subversive activities”, but Mr. von Balluseck wondered whether that definition was precise enough. The same question could be raised, he said, with respect to paragraph 87. The Netherlands representative went on to say [417th meeting]: Furthermore, I have some doubts whether the report gives a full picture of the position taken by the Secretary-General” [para. 48]. The representative of the Netherlands drew

our attention to the point that staff members should not be automatically dismissed “exclusively on the grounds that they have used their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination in official inquiries concerned with subversive activities and espionage” [para. 56]. He said he could not agree with that.

9. These matters have been referred to by delegation after delegation. My purpose in quoting them is not to try to throw the burden of proof upon delegations that do not support the draft resolution, but merely to point out that whatever conclusions we may reach, here is a problem with so many facets that even those who put their names on draft resolutions have not necessarily differing points of view, but views covering a very wide field—the jurisprudence of Member States, their ideas of law, their ideas of public conduct and everything else.

10. Now in an organization like ours these things must necessarily vary. It is not my purpose nor the purpose of my delegation or of my Government to go into any argument or criticism or suggestion with regard to the nature of the law in each country or how governments should conduct their judicial or other institutions. We have nothing to do with that at all. We are only concerned with it as far as it affects the membership of the administrative staff—the servants of this Organization—who have been employed by us on conditions which were revealed to them at that time.

11. The Secretary-General has been good enough to say that no charges of any character have been made, much less been proved, against any member of the Secretariat. I am sure we are all happy to hear that. Therefore it appears that the problem before us is not one that can be easily disposed of without going into the question of principle.

12. A considerable amount of material has been sent to us. We had the Secretary-General’s report before this debate opened. It was our general impression that it would largely be based upon what is now called the jurists’ Opinion. With great respect, I say that the jurists’ Opinion, so far as we are now concerned, is “out of court”—because the Secretary-General has told us that he has not accepted it, that he has accepted only some parts of it. What we have is what the Secretary-General has made his own, and therefore it saves us the embarrassment of discussing from a juridical point of view the propositions of law and jurisprudence that have been propounded in that report. Thus, that is out of the way.

13. We have also been provided with volumes of evidence and records of examinations conducted by committees sitting in this country. It is neither my desire, nor would I consider it proper and appropriate, to go into any detail of this or into the manner in which these hearings were conducted or anything of that character. It has nothing to do with me, but I am entitled to say that in these documents I find certain examples, of which I shall cite only one.

14. If a witness is asked whether he would be loyal to the United Nations or to his own country and is thus put on the horns of a dilemma, then I think it is appropriate for us to take that question into consideration and be able to instruct our servants as to the conditions of employment and what their obligations

are and what they are not. I do not answer these questions. I simply say that problems of this character have been raised. It is equally necessary for us to consider whether or not it is appropriate, if a person withholds evidence in accordance with his constitutional rights—which may or may not exist, I do not know, it is not for me to inquire—that we, as employers, should use the economic pressure of employment in order that he may go back upon what he regards as his right.

15. I find it difficult to accept the idea that fear of incrimination is the same thing as having committed a crime. A crime must be proved beyond all reasonable doubt, so Sir Gladwyn Jebb told us this morning [421st meeting]. Now, what is reasonable doubt? It is doubt of reasonable minds. Reasonable minds are minds that are not inspired by passion, but by reason, according to law. What is more, it is possible to prove a crime beyond reasonable doubt only when the examination of witnesses is undertaken by counsel on one side and cross-examination takes place by the other, and there are no questions from the court itself. But these hearings are not conducted by courts. These are other inquiries for other purposes and are legitimate within the law of a particular country. However, we are not dealing here with either jurisprudence or the relations that exist between one country and another.

16. In the very beginning, my delegation, in dealing with the principles of this matter, said that we did not accept this view of "host" country. We are all host countries and it is quite arguable that another country may have laws which the majority of the people in this Assembly may not be willing to understand in the same way.

17. At the same time, practical problems have arisen. The draft resolution we have put forward does not have the implication that the representative of the United Kingdom thought it had. I am sure that he does not think so as to its purpose, which is not to hamstring any action that the Secretary-General might take. The Secretary-General acts in conformity with the principles of the Charter and such institutions, administrative or otherwise, that exist in this place. If the servants of this Organization have complaints or rights, they go before the various bodies constituted for that purpose. There is nothing in the draft resolution or in the mind of anybody to tie the hands of the Secretary-General or anyone else in this respect; that is, the power and the legitimate authority of the Secretary-General remains. No speeches and no resolutions, except an amendment to the Charter, can take that away. On the other hand, if we are to consider something fundamentally new and not in detail—if it is something in detail, it does not come here—or if we are to endorse something that has been done in interpretation of the various purposes of the Charter, then of course we are entitled, in all humility, to say that we want to think it over. That is all that the draft resolution says. It does not prevent the Secretary-General from taking such action as he wants to take within the limits of the Charter and within the purview of the institutions that exist. Indeed, as the supporters of the other draft resolution have said, this does not confer any right of dismissal, this does not displace administrative tribunals, this does not dismiss the Joint Appeals Board, etc. Therefore all that machinery

would work, and it would be fallacious to suggest that the draft resolution that we put forward does not take into account the difficult position in which the administration finds itself by not having made provision for the immediate situation.

18. At the same time, I am fully aware of the fact that we have to take into account the great many misconceptions about this Organization as a result of the kind of publicity to which the representative of France referred in his speech, and therefore something will have to be done. That is why we have produced this draft resolution. My delegation and others associated with us have put forward this draft resolution without placing any blame or responsibility. We have simply asked for a study of this question.

19. The original draft resolution submitted by France, the United Kingdom and the United States [A/L.146] has now undergone some substantial changes by the acceptance of the amendment [A/L.147] offered by certain other countries. But even then, it does not include the recognition of the integrity and efficiency of the Secretariat. It makes no provision for communicating with other governments. What is more, we are very doubtful whether the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has the competence to deal with all these problems. However, if the Assembly believes it has, that of course improves it somewhat. The fact still remains that what we are proposing is that there should be a study on behalf of the Assembly as a whole, without in any way stopping the administrative processes that obtain in this Organization.

20. For all these reasons, we commend this draft resolution to the Assembly for its acceptance, and we hope that it will bring to its consideration its dispassionate judgment and the points of view that have been heard, not only from me or from those who are supporting this draft resolution, but from various others. I am sure that everybody must have been impressed by the amplitude of the views expressed, the concern in the minds of people, the various questions raised, their reactions to our own institutions, our own relationships and so on.

21. Having said that much, we who have sponsored this draft resolution are at one with everybody in thinking that a civil servant, international or otherwise, must remain non-political, non-partisan and not concerned with action against any party who may be a client of the Organization as a whole.

22. I wish, therefore, to commend this draft resolution in these terms to the Assembly for its acceptance. As the sponsors of the other draft resolution know, we have tried—as they indeed have tried—to introduce a single draft resolution, but we have not been able to do so.

23. Before retiring from this rostrum, I should like to say, mainly on behalf of my own delegation because we have not had the opportunity of consulting the co-sponsors of this draft, that a new factor has recently entered the situation: that is, that the implementation of this resolution would fall to a new incumbent of the office of Secretary-General. In those circumstances, while I entirely agree that there is no personal question involved here, the reference being solely to the institution of Secretary-General, then, if the Assembly

in its wisdom thinks that this discussion has provided adequate guidance and that nothing further is now required, I feel sure that those who have sponsored this draft resolution would be prepared to give every consideration to the idea that both these drafts should be shelved or withdrawn, or that some other draft should be substituted, saying simply that the Assembly has considered these problems and reaffirms the principles of the Charter. I propose no draft resolution to that effect because I do not have any authority to do so, since my delegation is working with others in submitting the present draft resolution. However, I throw out the suggestion for what it is worth. I say this particularly to those who have every reason to show interest in their own proposals—legitimate ones—in the hope that instead of dividing the Assembly on an issue of this kind, which concerns our own staff, we might be able to act together.

24. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation wishes briefly to explain its vote and the considerations on which it was based.

25. My delegation has given respectful and sympathetic consideration to the twelve-Power draft resolution [A/L.145/Rev.4], the operative part of which provides for the appointment of a committee of fifteen members, to be nominated by the President, to study the report of the Secretary-General on personnel policy in all its implications and to report to the General Assembly at its eighth session.

26. The draft resolution of France, the United Kingdom and the United States [A/L.146], on the other hand, sets forth the principles to be applied by quoting the relevant articles of the Charter, and paragraph 1 of its operative part expresses "confidence that the Secretary-General will conduct personnel policy with these considerations in mind". The considerations referred to are the principles laid down in Articles 100 and 101 of the Charter. Paragraph 2 of the operative part calls upon the Members of the United Nations to assist the Secretary-General in this matter.

27. In addition, the amendment of Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden [A/L.147] requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly, at its eighth session, a report on the progress made in the conduct and development of personnel policy, together with the comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions thereon, and further invites the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to submit their recommendations to the General Assembly, after the appropriate consultations.

28. Faced with these three approaches, or possible solutions, to the grave problem with which we are dealing, the delegation of Peru, after the most objective consideration, has come to the conclusion that the twelve-Power draft resolution, despite the noble intentions which motivated it and the great legal exactitude of the text, has the drawback that in present circumstances it would have the effect of restricting, limiting or impeding the policy which the new Secretary-General may follow.

29. I think it is in the general interest that the new Secretary-General who is to be appointed by the Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council should have the greatest possible freedom of action

and should be in a position to solve this difficult problem without restriction or hindrance of any kind. I cannot conceal from the Assembly my delegation's view as to the extremely serious legal and political problems raised, not only by the events which have taken place but also by the Secretary-General's report. But let us not forget that caution is needed even from a purely legal standpoint, and caution is necessary not only in the actual laying down of a rule, which must be strictly enforced, but also in the time and the manner in which it is enforced.

30. From the point of view both of the new international atmosphere which seems to be coming into being and of the very existence of the United Nations itself, it would seem that this is certainly not the moment for us to enter into the legal and political intricacies of problems as difficult as these. We should look forward, not back; our aim should be to establish new principles or to define the principles upon which the status of the United Nations and its Secretariat are based. It would be both prudent and expedient for us to leave the way clear and opportunities open to the new Secretary-General, who must possess all the necessary qualifications of competence and moral integrity to carry out a policy and to comply with the instructions brought to his attention in the draft resolution submitted by the United States, France and the United Kingdom.

31. For those reasons my delegation, while paying tribute to the legal value of the twelve-Power draft resolution and the excellent intentions of its sponsors, will be obliged to vote against it, since it is incompatible with the other proposal.

32. At the same time my delegation considers that the amendment submitted by Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden constitutes a natural, logical, necessary and practical complement to the draft resolution of the United States, France and the United Kingdom. While it is certainly desirable to recall and reproduce the text of the articles which constitute the guarantee of our international status and also to express confidence that those principles will be strictly observed and scrupulously upheld by the new Secretary-General, it is also essential, having regard to the existing situation, that the Secretary-General should report to the General Assembly on the development and conduct of this policy. The discussion of this report will enable the Assembly to discuss in a more favourable atmosphere the serious problems affecting the status of our Organization.

33. For these reasons, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution of the United States, France and the United Kingdom, and for the amendment to it submitted by Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.

34. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand): Speaking at the beginning of the debate on this item [416th meeting], I was not in a position to express the views of my delegation on the draft resolutions which are now before us. I should like, therefore, to explain very briefly how my delegation proposes to vote on these draft resolutions, and why. I pause to say here that at this stage of our deliberations we should attempt to achieve some finality and actually vote on the draft resolutions.

35. The first draft resolution before us is that submitted by twelve delegations [A/L.145/Rev.4]. My delegation has no objection to the preamble of this draft resolution, which is indeed unexceptionable. We doubt the wisdom, however, of the proposal contained in paragraph 1 of the operative part. It seems to us that the practical result of this proposal, whatever the intentions of the sponsors may be, would be to leave this acute and complicated problem in suspense, a state of affairs which would not only create difficulties for the Secretary-General, but which would not be conducive to the improvement in the morale of the Secretariat which should, in our opinion, be one of the principal aims of this debate.

36. It is our hope that, by the eighth session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General will have solved the problems facing him. In my speech in the general debate on this item I indicated my country's belief that this can and should be done in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the relevant provisions of the Charter and in conformity with the Staff Regulations. We are convinced as a result of the debate that this belief is shared by a large majority in the General Assembly. We see no reason why the Secretary-General should be required to delay the development of personnel policy while the subject continues to be debated, not privately but publicly, and not by independent experts but by governmental representatives.

37. The proper development and administration of personnel policy must depend in the last resort on the good sense of the Secretary-General, assisted by the expert counsel of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Advisory Panel. We feel that, having fully debated the matter, we should now—for an interval, at least—rely on that good sense.

38. Excellent though the report of the Secretary-General is in many respects, a number of delegations, including my own, have expressed reservations about this or that feature of the report—if only, in some cases, because the Secretary-General accepted certain recommendations of the jurists with which those delegations did not agree. It is not our wish, therefore—and we believe it is not the wish of the majority of the Assembly—to express either approval or disapproval, either explicitly or implicitly, of the Secretary-General's report as a whole.

39. Since it is possible, in the case of the revised draft resolution [A/L.146/Rev.1] presented by the United Kingdom, the United States, France and ten other countries, to read the last paragraph of the preamble and paragraph 1 of the operative part as including the Secretary-General's own report among the "considerations" which he should bear in mind in the conduct of personnel policy, I should like to make it clear that this is not the interpretation which my delegation places on the text. I am reinforced in this view by the explanations which have been made in this connexion by two of the sponsors, the delegations of France and the Netherlands. What the Secretary-General should bear in mind, in the opinion of my delegation—and what we feel he will wish to bear in mind—are the relevant articles of the Charter and the consensus of views expressed in this debate. That is the interpretation which my delegation wishes to

place on paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, and, in this understanding, we support the draft.

40. As the two draft resolutions before us are not compatible, we find it necessary, therefore, to vote against the twelve-Power draft resolution.

41. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): When the problem before us was first considered by the General Assembly, it was obviously connected with a new fact: the Secretary-General's reiteration of his resignation simultaneously with the presentation of this matter. Now, at the conclusion of this debate, that resignation is related to another new fact: the appointment, or at least the election by the Security Council, of one who may, by vote of the General Assembly, become the new Secretary-General.

42. The presence of a new Secretary-General would alter somewhat, but substantively, the nature of the question as it was presented to the Assembly. Consequently the aspects under which that question was considered have also changed.

43. My delegation would prefer the new Secretary-General to have absolute freedom of action, so that he could perform his duties in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the Staff Regulations and so that, conforming his action to those principles, which should guide him in the execution of his functions, he could at once establish and maintain the fundamental safeguards that the Organization should offer to the host country, it being understood that he must enforce the Staff Regulations and the principles of the Charter, which forbid any irregular conduct or political activity on the part of members of the Secretariat.

44. My delegation would therefore have preferred that the Assembly should not take a decision at this time and should refer the problem to the Secretary-General so that he might report to the Assembly at its next session if he saw fit to do so.

45. However, the draft resolutions are before us and their sponsors have not withdrawn them. As the representative of Peru has said, they have certain features which now, given the new circumstances, appear contradictory.

46. My delegation will therefore vote in accordance with the principles that it has supported, taking into account the new circumstances and mindful of the fact that one of the draft resolutions on which the Assembly is to take a decision has been clarified by its sponsors—thanks, particularly, to the considerations of a legal and political character outlined this morning by the United Kingdom representative, and by the representatives of France, Denmark and other countries yesterday afternoon.

47. My delegation therefore hopes that when the President puts these texts to a vote he will call for a separate vote on each paragraph of the operative part, particularly as regards the original three-Power draft [A/L.146] as amended subsequently by a text [A/L.147] which the sponsors have accepted. My delegation will vote in due course in accordance with this view.

48. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation fully shares the views expressed here in the course of the general discussion by the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Poland and a number of other States.

49. As regards the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly, the delegation of the Soviet Union feels it necessary to state that it will vote for the twelve-Power draft resolution [A/L.145/Rev.4] as a whole, although there are individual paragraphs in that draft with which it is not fully in agreement.

50. At the same time, the USSR delegation will vote against the thirteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.146/Rev.1] as a whole, although there are individual paragraphs in that draft, in particular those referring to the provisions of the Charter, for which the Soviet Union delegation will vote. This draft, however, also contains unacceptable paragraphs, which make it impossible for the USSR delegation to vote for it as a whole.

51. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the two draft resolutions which are before it.

52. We shall vote first on the twelve-Power draft resolution [A/L.145/Rev.4].

The draft resolution was rejected by 29 votes to 21, with 8 abstentions.

53. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the thirteen-Power draft resolution [A/L.146/Rev.1].

54. The representative of Uruguay has requested a separate vote on the paragraphs of the operative part of the draft resolution.

55. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

56. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation requests a separate vote on each paragraph of the preamble and of the operative part.

57. The PRESIDENT: A paragraph-by-paragraph vote on the whole draft resolution has been requested and will be taken.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted unanimously.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 41 votes to 10, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 40 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 44 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 41 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 54 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 41 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions.

58. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): The Mexican delegation, which has never favoured hasty decisions, particularly in such complex matters involving such important and worthy interests, sympathized with and voted for the twelve-Power draft resolution which proposed the appointment of a fifteen-member committee to study the Secretary-General's

report in all its implications and to report to the General Assembly at its eighth session.

59. For the same reasons of prudence and caution we refrained from supporting the draft submitted by France, the United Kingdom and the United States, even with the amendment proposed by a number of other countries, which, while unquestionably improving the original draft, did not make it entirely acceptable to us. This amendment called for the collaboration of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, but the Advisory Committee, as is known, has been empowered by the Assembly to examine personnel questions only in their budgetary aspects.

60. It is obvious that a body of such limited competence as the Advisory Committee would find it difficult to collaborate with the Secretary-General in the clarification of a problem which, to our knowledge, involves not budgetary considerations but matters of a very different nature. For this reason we consider that the proper body to help the Secretary-General in solving this delicate question would be a truly representative body of the Member States, and that no other technical body—particularly one of such limited powers—can take its place.

61. I should like it to be clearly understood that what I have just said does not mean that the Mexican delegation was opposed to the resolution that has been adopted. That text unquestionably has commendable features which deserve our support, but we did not feel that they were sufficient to justify our voting for the proposal. For that reason, my delegation abstained from voting on that text.

62. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): I should like to give a brief explanation of my delegation's vote.

63. Although my delegation was one of the sponsors of the twelve-Power draft resolution, it felt able to vote for the draft resolution just adopted by the Assembly.

64. In the first place, we should like to give an explanation both for the record and for the Secretary-General's information. In voting for this draft resolution, we interpreted the words "*Having reviewed and considered*" the report of the Secretary-General on personnel policy" as a statement of fact and not as an expression of opinion on the contents of the report. In our view, these words should not be construed as acceptance of the report submitted by the Secretary-General or as any evaluation of its merits.

65. In the second place, the draft resolution contains the words "*Expresses its confidence* that the Secretary-General will conduct personnel policy with these considerations in mind". We interpret this paragraph to mean that the Secretary-General's administration of personnel should be based exclusively on the requirements of the Charter referred to in the preamble of the draft resolution. He may certainly also have regard to the suggestions made by delegations in the course of the debate. The report should not, however, form a basis for his work, though he is free to glean what he wishes from it. In any event, our vote for this draft resolution should not be interpreted in any sense as approval of the Secretary-General's report.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.