

does not mean that the composition of the Secretariat should not reflect the changed membership of the United Nations. On the contrary, all Member States have a legitimate interest in ensuring that the main geographical areas have equitable representation. However, no State or group of States should be in a position within the Secretariat to veto the implementation of decisions of any organ of the United Nations.

We stand firmly behind Article 100 of the Charter which provides that the Secretary-General and his staff "shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization". And how essential that is if this United Nations is to live and to expand and to meet the challenge which faces it. An independent international civil service must be preserved if the United Nations is to perform its impartial role.

There is no reason, moreover, why Member States should try to keep control of their nationals in the Secretariat. The appropriate political control of Secretariat activities is exercised by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the other organs of the United Nations. Those organs can give full instructions to the Secretary-General.

As well, we have wisely adopted the practice of establishing advisory committees especially for peace-keeping operations. I referred a few moments ago to the Congo Advisory Committee which we think is an excellent committee; perhaps that is because we are a member of the Committee. These committees afford an additional opportunity for interested States to offer advice and to give political guidance to the Secretary-General in the discharge of his mandates. This is a practice which has proven its worth and one which can be developed further in relation to many activities of the United Nations.

Now I go to deal with five different subjects: Berlin, nuclear testing and radiation, disarmament, outer space, and strengthening the United Nations.

#### The Berlin Impasse

First of all, Berlin. Most speakers in this debate have referred to the prevailing crisis over Berlin. The Soviet Union has seen fit to create there a very dangerous situation, where a few months ago no imminent threat to peace existed.

The peoples of the world are watching anxiously the steps which are being taken in the direction of negotiation. I have no doubt at all that it is the universal desire of this Assembly that a settlement in Berlin be negotiated with the least possible delay. Clearly the tension must be reduced and the frightening threat of armed conflict must be removed.