

member concerned if he were terminated under it rather than under some other provision of the Regulations.

The Canadian Delegation spoke in favour of the Secretary-General's proposals, in the main, and supported these amendments. The Vice-Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, Mr. Alcide Côté, declared that there was no reason why public opinion should conclude that, because a few dismissals had been found necessary, the United Nations Secretariat was "a hotbed of intrigue". He said that the Canadian Delegation was agreed that the chance of conflict between the Secretary-General and the Administrative Tribunal should be lessened.

The Assembly also passed an amendment to the Statute of the Tribunal setting an upper limit on the amount of compensation the Tribunal could in future award and a resolution, sponsored by Canada, which called for a review by the Assembly in 1955 of the Staff Regulations and of the rules of interpretation used by the Secretary-General in applying the new amendments. This latter provision should help to safeguard the independence and security of the Secretariat.

When the supplementary appropriation to pay the awards of the Administrative Tribunal was discussed in the Fifth Committee, the United States Representative opposed Assembly approval on the grounds that the Tribunal had exceeded its jurisdiction, had committed errors of law in interpreting the Staff Regulations and errors of judgment and tact in its calculation of the awards. He claimed that the Assembly could review these awards, despite the provision in the Tribunal's Statute that there was to be no appeal from its decisions, because the Tribunal was merely a subsidiary body of the Assembly. During the debate many delegates rejected this argument, but some who did so thought that the amounts of the individual awards were inconsistent and in some cases too high. After pointing out that "the United Nations Administrative Tribunal was created by the General Assembly for the protection of the staff", Mr. Côté stated that the Canadian Delegation was convinced that the arguments in favour of paying the awards were very strong, but, since others held opposite views, the disputed awards should be referred to a "higher judicial authority". This idea, which was shared by other delegations, found expression in a resolution, co-sponsored by Canada, the United Kingdom and Colombia and approved by a vote of 41 to 6 with 12 abstentions (including the United States) in plenary. The resolution asks the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion as to whether the Assembly has the right, on any grounds, to reject awards of the Tribunal and what, if so, are the principal grounds on which it could lawfully exercise such a right. The Fifth Committee had rejected two French amendments, the first providing that the Court advise specifically on the awards in dispute (a proposal supported by all the sponsors of the resolution) and the second, that the Secretary-General be authorized to pay the awards if the Court should hold that the Assembly had no right to refuse them. The Assembly had previously elected a United States citizen to replace a Czechoslovak member of the Administrative Tribunal, and had re-