

organisation alone. There have been, as I said, a large number of speculative exporters who have done something for which they ought to be responsible. Government felt at one time and still feel that they cannot aid persons who have been irresponsible in their trading activities, but in view of the fact that there has been a representation by the Madras Government about the hardship caused to a large number of persons, Government is now considering how to give relief even to persons who have been irresponsible.

#### U. N. Secretariat

+

\*257. { Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:  
Shri Kodyan:  
Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether any changes are being brought about in the U.N. Secretariat in the light of the suggestions made at the last U.N. meeting; and

(b) if so, what is the nature of re-organisation?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):**

(a) Some suggestions for bringing about changes in the U.N. Secretariat have been made but, so far as the Government of India are aware, no decisions have been taken to implement any changes.

(b) Does not arise.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** What is the nature of the suggestions which we made in this respect for broadening the United Nations Secretariat, and may I also know whether we have pursued them any further?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** One of these suggestions is well known: the one that was made on behalf of the Soviet Union, that there should be three Secretaries-General instead of one. The others

are in regard to Assistant Secretaries-General, that is, under one Secretary-General, there should be one, two or three or more—whatever it may be—Assistant Secretaries-General. The others, I suppose relate to the lower staff.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** My question is whether we made any suggestions and whether we have pursued those suggestions and if so, with what result.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We made no formal suggestions but informally, I did suggest, when I was in the United Nations, that there might be Assistant Secretaries-General or Deputy Secretaries-General. The argument was that to split up the office of the Secretary-General into several, say, three, would make it rather ineffective. But the criticism often made of the United Nations' functioning had some substance in it, because it has to reflect the United Nations as it is—the world as it is—and if it does not reflect it, difficulties arise. Therefore, how far it was possible for this to be done, by having Assistant Secretaries-General or Deputies, and at the same time, not coming in the way of the effective functioning of the office through one head—these were the lines of argument.

**Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:** May I know if there was any response about the representation of the Asian countries for the increase of the Asian personnel in the staff of the UNO?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Response from whom?

**Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:** Response from the Secretary-General about any representations for increase in the personnel.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I want to know response from whom?

**Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:** From the Secretary-General about the employment of more Asian personnel in the subordinate staff of the UNO.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The subordinate staff is not exceedingly important. Probably there are quite a good few people in the subordinate staff; that is distinct from superior staff.

**Shri Kadiyan:** May I know whether the Government intend to submit a specific proposal, in the next meeting of the General Assembly, in this connection?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** No, Sir.

**Shri Nath Pai:** In view of the general criticism that the superior grade cadres of the United Nations' staff come only from certain number of nations, may we know whether anything has been done regarding our own, and what is the present number of Indian nationals who are employed in the superior grade?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Obviously I cannot give the figures here. Taking it as a whole, the representation of India in the UN has made fairly good progress in the last few years, right at the top, of course; there are, I believe, one or two Indians in the superior grades too. But we have no great cause for complaint at present moment merely in regard to appointments. But of course, there are so many other things apart from appointments; a man may be in an important position and yet not able, let us say, to influence the policy.

**Shri Hem Barua:** In view of the fact that a change in the U.N. Secretariat involves a revision of the United Nations Charter, may I know whether.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Why should he assume anything? Let him put a question.

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I know whether it is a fact that India has made a suggestion to the effect that a committee of the four big powers be appointed to study how best the U.N. Charter can be revised in order to

accommodate a change in the Secretariat?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I am speaking subject to correction. I do not know. I am not aware of India having suggested the appointment of such a committee. Of course, somebody might have suggested it in the course of speeches there, but I cannot guarantee. But the main point is, we have often pointed out that a revision of the Charter should not be undertaken till a suitable atmosphere for that is created. It cannot be revised in a basically cold war atmosphere, people pulling in different directions. It may crack up the whole thing. Not that we are against it, and we feel a revision has to be made—but we have seldom supported an immediate revision, because instead of revising, it may be lead to worse results. Therefore, the suggestion I made about the Assistant Secretaries-General etc., requires no revision of the Charter. It can be done even within the Charter. In fact, at the beginning of the United Nations there were such Deputy-Secretaries-General.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** May I know at what level the reorganisation of the United Nations Secretariat and the United Nations staff will be considered? Will it be considered by the whole Assembly or by the Security Council?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Could he repeat the question? He asked, "at what level". What does the hon. Member mean?

**Mr. Speaker:** He wanted to know whether it is considered by the whole Assembly or by the Security Council. He was referring to the increase in staff and so on.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Neither. I mean to say, it is considered in the sense that in the speeches of the General Assembly—it is referred to. It may be considered by some of the specialised committees of the Assembly.

It is not the function of the Security Council to do this.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** May I know what is the legal effect of the withdrawal of the recognition, by the Soviet bloc, of the Secretary-General? The Soviet bloc has withdrawn its recognition of the Secretary-General.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is rather difficult for me to answer about the legal effect, but practically, it may well have a somewhat crippling effect.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** In view of the fact that there is growing support for the suggestion that the United Nations Secretariat should reflect the different correlations of the forces in the world, may I know whether this matter needs to be discussed again at the next U.N. meeting which is scheduled to take place in one or two months' time?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member is asking for my opinion—if something is deserving of attention or deserving of discussion.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Does it continue on the agenda? Will it be taken up in the next session?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It has never been on the agenda. It is not a question of continuing; it has not been on the agenda. It has been referred to in some speeches but the question is not on the agenda.

**Shri Harish Chandra Mathur:** May I know what is the process through which this question of reorganisation of the U.N. will have to be examined and how it could be brought about? Will the Secretary-General's agreement be enough? What is the process which will have to be gone through before any reorganisation is brought about?

**Mr. Speaker:** He has just said there may be a committee.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If it involves an amendment of the Charter, it is a very basic issue. Only the

General Assembly through complicated processes can do it, after a specialised committee has done with it. But if it is something within the Charter, that may be important or unimportant. If it is important, it is bound to come before specialised committees and may be the General Assembly also.

**Shri Naldurgkar:** Has the hon. Prime Minister had any talk or discussion what Lord Attlee as regards the reorganisation of the U.N.—If so, may I know the nature of the suggestions made therein?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** So far as I know, it has nothing to do with this question.

#### U.N. Conciliation Commission in Congo

\*258. { **Shri Hem Barua:**  
**Shri Rameshwar Tantia:**  
**Shri Subiman Ghose:**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that President Kasavubu had expressed his opposition to the inclusion of India's representation in the U.N. Conciliation Commission;

(b) if so, the grounds thereof; and

(c) the reaction of Government thereto?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon):** (a) to (c). President Kasavubu seemed to have had doubts about the inclusion of certain countries in the so-called Conciliation Commission, presumably, on the ground that they had voted in the General Assembly against the seating of his delegation in the United Nations. However, as is known the 11-member Commission assembled in Leopoldville early in January this year and was received by President Kasavubu. India is represented on the Commission, but of the original fifteen members four, namely, Morocco, UAR, Guinea and Mali declined to participate.