

The Columbian delegate again this year dealt with the codification of international law, and moved the following draft resolution, which was subsequently referred to the First Committee:—

“The Assembly decides to request the Council to invite the Committee of Experts for the Codification of International Law set up by the Assembly to continue its work. The Committee will meet in 1930 after the close of the first Codification Conference, and thereafter on dates to be fixed by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.”

The Norwegian delegation moved a resolution to refer to the Sixth Committee the reports on mandated territories issued since the last Assembly.

ELECTION OF NON-PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

The debate was interrupted on the 9th September in order to permit of the election of three non-permanent members of the Council to the seats being vacated by Poland, Chile, and Roumania. In 1926 Poland was elected to fill a non-permanent seat for three years, and at that election was declared re-eligible for election. She therefore became a candidate for a further period of three years. The other countries, Chile and Roumania, had not applied to be considered re-eligible, and under the rules were not therefore able to stand this year for election. Poland was re-elected, receiving fifty votes. The other two seats were allotted to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and to Peru. These two countries received forty-two and thirty-six votes respectively. Norway, although not elected, obtained twenty-two votes.

ELECTION OF JUDGES OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

At the Assembly meeting of the 19th September two Judges were elected to fill the vacancies on the Bench created by the death of Lord Finlay and M. Weiss. Amongst those nominated for election by the various national groups were Sir Cecil Hurst, Legal Adviser to the Foreign Office, and M. Fromageot, Legal Adviser to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Fifty-two States voted, therefore a candidate required twenty-seven votes in order to be elected. Sir Cecil Hurst received forty votes and M. Fromageot thirty-seven. The Council, which under the rules is required to elect at the same time, gave the majority of its votes to Sir Cecil Hurst and M. Fromageot, who were therefore declared by the President of the Assembly elected to fill the vacant judgeships.

ASSEMBLY. OPENING DATE OF FUTURE SESSIONS.

An experience of nine years shows that there are many defects in the running of the Assembly which should be remedied. The General Committee of the Assembly had under consideration a number of points, and appointed a sub-committee of five members to make preliminary suggestions. The time at the disposal of the sub-committee was too short to allow it to examine fully the questions requiring solution, and the Assembly, at its meeting on the 25th September, authorized the committee to continue its work with a view of reporting to the Eleventh Assembly.

One decision which this year's Assembly took, however, concerned the date of the meeting of the next Assembly, a date which it is hoped will always in future be observed. The opening is fixed for the 10th September (or the 11th if the 10th falls on a Sunday). The change is all to the good, for it avoids the possibility of a movable date, since the first Monday in September, on which the Assembly has hitherto met since 1921, can fall between the 1st and 7th of that month. (See Document A. 75.)

OPTIONAL CLAUSE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

Great Britain having set the example, one delegate after another stated during the debate on the report of the year's work that it was his intention to sign, or that he had already signed this year on behalf of his country, the optional clause. Canada, Australia, France, India, Greece, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, and the Irish Free State made announcements to this effect. On the 19th September I made the following declaration on behalf of New Zealand:—

“On behalf of His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand, and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without special convention on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the statute of the Court, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification, other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and disputes with the Government of any other member of the League which is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of New Zealand, and subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in New Zealand reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.”