

My Delegation also believes it important to remember in the present discussion the fact that many persons who joined the United Nations Secretariat are far removed from their normal sphere of alternative employment. It is very important to see to it that their security of tenure and the financial provisions for separations are adequate in the light of this difference between their conditions of employment and those enjoyed by the civil servants of some national services.

Criteria which govern disciplinary action or dismissals in national civil services may not necessarily be applicable in the international field. National traditions of service have been built up over the centuries, and our international civil service has the benefit of being able to take advantage of the experience of all in order to build up over time a tradition and a code of conduct applicable to all members of the Secretariat. Naturally, clarification of standards will be required from time to time in the light of experience.

We wonder, therefore, whether it would not be well to arrange to record more formally than is proposed by the Secretary-General the principles which have been and will be applied in interpreting the Staff Regulations. Delegations might find it acceptable to have a provision written into the regulations for a periodic review by the Assembly of the principles governing the Secretary-General's decisions. The Secretary-General's principles of interpretation might be attached in the first instance as an appendix, later to be crystallized into additions to the Staff Regulations after they have been applied over a period of years. A body of equity might well be built up in this traditional way; first to supplement and then to be embodied in the law. In the opinion of my Delegation a first review of these principles might usefully form the basis for a reconsideration of the new amendments and the regulations as a whole after the two-year period to which I referred earlier.

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 colleague 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 84 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)iii; 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