

to the League for help: but, seeing that financial assistance had been given from time to time, it is late in the day to raise the question of principle in this matter, especially as 1927 will probably see the termination of the work. The Fifth Committee proposed a credit of 45,000 francs for 1927.

With regard to the similar work in Constantinople, some doubt was expressed as to whether this had not been recently changed in character, and whether it did not now belong to the general category of work for refugees. A small sub-committee was appointed to draw up a report. It had the advantage of going into the question with Miss C. E. Mills, who directs the work in Constantinople, and it reported to the effect that in practically all respects the work was similar to that performed in Aleppo and merited the support of the League for another year, at the end of which time it was hoped that no further money would be required under this special heading. In view of the fact that the work was diminishing in volume, it was decided to ask the Fourth Committee to include a sum of 20,000 francs in the Budget, being a reduction of 10,000 on last year's vote.

The Fourth Committee, however, acting on the advice of the supervisory committee, refused the credits, but the Fifth Committee subsequently learned that Miss Jeppe hoped to be able to carry on her work at Aleppo for another year with the aid of private subscriptions only, and that she was willing to do so under the auspices of the League, although without its financial aid. With regard to the house at Constantinople, the work being smaller in volume, it was not considered advisable to continue it under the auspices of the League; but the committee, having ascertained that it would probably be carried on for another year with the help of private resources, decided that Miss Mills, the lady in charge, should have the use of the equipment purchased with funds that had been provided by the League.

The Fifth Committee's report, with a resolution attached (Document A. 106), was passed by the Assembly at its meeting on the 25th September.

COMMITTEE No. 6.

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS AND CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

A motion by Lord Cecil regarding this matter was referred by the Assembly to the Sixth Committee, which submitted a report (Document A. 83), together with a resolution reading as follows:—

“The Assembly, observing with regret that many conventions and agreements concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations have remained ineffective, or have only come into force after undue delay owing to the difficulty experienced in securing a sufficient number of ratifications by the signatories, desires to call the attention of the Governments of all States members of the League to the necessity for taking all measures in their power to facilitate and expedite the ratification in all cases of conventions and agreements signed in their name; and decides to invite the Council of the League to call for a report every six months on the progress of ratification, and to consider methods for securing the more rapid bringing into force of these agreements and conventions.”

This resolution was passed by the Assembly at its meeting on the 23rd September.

SLAVERY.

The draft convention drawn up by the Sixth Assembly (Document A. 130, 1925), which had been circulated to various Governments, was considered by the Sixth Committee, together with the suggestions and amendments submitted. These, with the original draft convention, were prepared in a special report (Document A. VI/2/1926) in order to enable members to see exactly what alterations were proposed. Article 1 was agreed to after very little discussion, but some of the proposals in connection with other articles departed so much from the draft that it was decided to refer them with the draft to a special sub-committee.

The new draft convention recommended by the Sixth Committee, and adopted by the Assembly with certain resolutions on the 25th September, is fully outlined in the report presented by the Sixth Committee (Document A. 104) with full explanatory note. Whilst many alterations were made in the draft convention drawn up by the Sixth Assembly, they are mostly improvements in drafting and do not materially depart from the provisions of the former draft.

Article 2 has been slightly altered in redrafting.

Article 3 has been altered by the insertion of a new paragraph containing an undertaking to negotiate a convention extending rights and imposing duties similar to those provided in the convention of 1925, dealing with the international trade in arms.

Article 4: Unaltered.

Article 5, slightly amended, is now Article 6.

Article 6 is the old Article 5 extended to cover conditions developing analogous to slavery.

Article 7: Unaltered.

Article 8 has been omitted in view of the doubts that existed as to the legal position of previous conventions.

New Article 8 provides for disputes arising out of the convention being referred to arbitration, and imposes no new obligations on signatory States to the optional clause of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

New Article 9 merely provides that certain territorial exemptions may be declared by States at the time of signature, ratification, or accession, and is practically the same as old Article 9. As will be seen from the report of the discussion on the convention in the Assembly on the 25th September, 1926, such a declaration was made by the Indian Delegation respecting certain territories in India.