for the foreign services of most countries. The Canadian representative therefore introduced a proposal requesting the Secretary-General to amend the staff rules so that home leave would be granted in future at three-year instead of two-year intervals. This proposal was defeated by 22 votes to 15 with 4 abstentions. A similar New Zealand proposal, that home leave be granted only every thirty months' was defeated also. In opposing the Canadian proposal, several delegations, principally European, emphasized the importance of frequent home leaves in order to preserve the international character of the Secretariat.

As regards the retirement age for members of the United Nations staff, the Secretary-General proposed that the normal age for retirement should be fixed at 65 instead of 60. A number of delegations, including the Canadian, opposed this suggestion on the ground that 60 is a better average age for retirement for an international civil servant than 65. In the event, while not accepting the Secretary-General's proposal, the Assembly recognized that he could retain an employee beyond 60, subject to the present staff regulations.

The Fifth Committee concurred in the proposed new regulations submitted by the Secretary-General and by the Advisory Committee, which clarified the Secretary-General's competence in regard to the termination of the appointment of staff members employed on probation or under temporary contracts. In this connection several delegations expressed the view that the granting of permanent contracts to staff members should be accelerated since uncertainty of tenure of office would have an adverse effect on the morale of the Secretariat.

On the initiative of the Canadian delegation, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to all Members, four months before its next session, a codification of the staff rules now in force. During the Second Session, the Secretary-General had submitted a document containing references to the staff rules which he had developed. The Canadian delegation did not believe that