

Delegation would be prepared to see it retained; for we are satisfied that adequate safeguards remain to the Staff through the Appeals and Tribunal procedures which have been set up for their protection. As the Secretary-General has said and I quote - "with the obligation of the Secretary-General to give to the Staff member his reasons for action if the Staff member so desires, his obligation to present the case fully to the Advisory Board, on which the Staff will be represented, and his obligation to explain his actions to the Tribunal, the safeguards against abuses are so strong that the risk cannot possibly outweigh the advantage of the clause from the Staff point of view".

We are also inclined to the view that the Secretary-General in the matter of definition of political activities should be able to make exceptions. But they should fall within established rules. For this reason, we lean more to the text proposed by the Secretary-General for the modification of Regulation 1.7 than we do to the more rigid text recommended by the Advisory Committee. But these and other questions of detail can more properly be dealt with later in the debate when the Committee begins a detailed consideration of the proposed amendment, at which time my Delegation may have more to say.



For reasons similar to those obtaining for security of tenure, the Canadian Delegation inclines to the view that the original proposal of the Secretary-General for compensation not to exceed two years' salary is to be preferred to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. In this regard we would associate ourselves with our colleagues from the United Kingdom in his comment that even a two year maximum might be too rigid; in fact, the Secretary-General has anticipated this in his comment in paragraph 8 of his report where he states, and I quote, "If in any case the Tribunal finds such compensation insufficient it is of course free to recommend the payment of a higher indemnity in the special case under consideration."

We have noted the objections expressed in the Staff Paper to the new Regulations 9.3(a)(i); but we have also been impressed by the statement of the Secretary-General as to the reasons which prompted him to ask for these powers in the interests of the staff themselves. We are of an open mind as to whether or not this section should be included. The Secretary-General has stated that he could get along without it. But he does not think it wise - and for what to us appear to be good reasons - that he should be asked to get along without it. We would therefore not attempt to block the exclusion of this section should substantial support for its exclusion develop within this Committee. But my