

elected Lord Crook, the United Kingdom member, who was one of the three who made the disputed awards.

A number of resolutions arising out of the second part of the Secretary-General's report were also considered and a series of recommendations was approved designed to guide the Secretary-General in the formulation of appropriate staff rules in connection with the United States Immigration and Nationality Act of November 24, 1952. The new rules will affect those staff members who decide to retain permanent residence status in the country of their duty station. One of these resolutions states that staff members electing to retain permanent residence visas should be excluded from national quotas under the principle of geographical distribution and be included in a "special category" of staff members. Another resolution endorses recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General that staff members electing to retain permanent residence status should receive reimbursement of national income taxes (to which they will be subject under the new United States Act). The eighth session also endorsed a further recommendation by the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee that staff members who remain in permanent residence status should lose various staff rights such as home leave and non-resident's allowance. The recommendation of the Secretary-General for an addition to the staff regulations to provide for a probationary period of two years with a possible extension to three years for staff members prior to their permanent appointment was adopted unanimously.

The International Court of Justice began consideration of the reference concerning the Administrative Tribunal by receiving written statements from the Secretary-General, the International Labour Organization and a number of countries including France, the United Kingdom and the United States. In a letter to the Registrar of the Court, the Canadian Ambassador in The Hague declared that Canada did not wish to submit a written statement but referred the Court to the views of the Canadian Government given in the Fifth Committee of the Assembly. The United States statement contended that the General Assembly had the right to refuse to give effect to an award of the Administrative Tribunal and that this must be a policy decision "based on the Charter principle of paramount consideration for maintaining the high standards of efficiency, competence and integrity in the Secretariat". The United Kingdom statement, on the other hand, claimed that the Assembly has the power to refuse to give effect to Tribunal awards only in cases where "it is evident that the Tribunal has acted in excess of the powers conferred on it by the Statute, i.e., has acted *ultra vires*, and has been guilty of misconduct, e.g., in allowing itself to be influenced by considerations of a venal character, or of conduct which amounts to a denial of justice".

The Court hearings in the case began on June 10. A number of countries made oral statements to the Court and a representative of the Secretary-General made a statement concerning the payment of awards and the relation of various subsidiary organs to the General Assembly. On July 13 the advisory opinion was delivered. To the first question submitted by the General Assembly, the Court