

with national Governments or from lists of names recommended by Governments, whether or not such persons were employed in national services; selection was to be based on the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

When the report of the special Committee came before the *ad hoc* Political Committee it soon became clear that the majority of members were strongly in favour of the establishment of a Field Service, which they felt would make for more efficient operation of United Nations missions. The majority were also in favour of the Panel of Field Observers, although many reservations were made as to the actual methods whereby such a Panel should be established. The Eastern European States, however, maintained the opposition which had been expressed by their representatives in the special Committee. They claimed that the effect of the Secretary-General's plan would be to circumvent the Security Council and thus undermine the United Nations. The *Soviet* delegate, for instance, declared that what was really proposed was the establishment of an armed force which would be used in the interests of the "Anglo-American bloc," and more especially of the United States, to enable those Powers to interfere in the domestic affairs of States to whose territories United States missions might be sent. In his view, the Security Council alone had the power to set up armed forces, whatever their size.

The *United States* representative (and the majority of the Committee) agreed with the views of the Secretary-General on this question, and gave strong support to his efforts to increase the efficiency of United Nations missions. It was quite insane, in the view of the United States, to claim that the reorganization of service for field missions would be illegal and contrary to various provisions of the Charter, since it was clear that the Secretary-General possessed and would continue to possess, under the Charter, the authority to provide the services being contemplated for the Field Service and the Panel of Field Observers.

The *New Zealand* representative (Mr Shanahan) also regarded the juridical objections to the establishment of a United Nations Field Service as invalid, especially if one took into account the modifications which had been made to the original proposal. The establishment of a Field Service merely corresponded to a reorganization on a more systematic and rational basis of services that already existed in the Secretariat, and there could be no doubt that the Charter gave the Secretary-General the authority for such reorganization. The New Zealand delegation would therefore, without the slightest hesitation, vote in favour of the establishment of a Field Service. With regard to the proposal to establish a United Nations Panel of Field Observers, however, the New Zealand representative had grave doubts as to the