

In signing I followed the Right Hon. Arthur Henderson, British Minister of Foreign Affairs, who had made a declaration in similar terms, and had also made a statement explaining the effect of the declaration. The statement is reported on pages 291 and 292 of the *Journal* of the 20th September, and to this I refer you.

The optional clause was signed on the same day by the representatives of South Africa and India, and also by those of France, Czecho-Slovakia, and Peru. Mr. Dandurand and Sir Granville Ryrie, not having then received precise instructions from Canada and Australia, were unable to sign on that day, and they so informed those assembled, but they were able to do so on the following day. As the Irish delegate had previously signed, all the members of the British Commonwealth which are also members of the League of Nations have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, and, with one exception, on the same terms. The exception is the Irish Free State, which has accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court for a period of twenty years, and on the sole condition of reciprocity.

During this Assembly no less than thirteen States have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, including the Great Powers of Europe.

The Tenth Session of the Assembly closed on Wednesday, 25th September, 1929.

FIRST COMMITTEE.

LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

The First Committee dealt with a large number of questions, varying considerably both with regard to their character and their importance, as will be seen from the list of subjects appended:—

- (1) Question of the revision of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Documents A. 9, A. 22, A. 1/6, A. 50, A. 50, Annex, and C. 166, M. 66.)
- (2) Question of the accession of the United States of America to the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. (Documents A. 11, A. 28, A. 32, A. 49, and A. 49, Annex.)
- (3) Question of the modification of the Covenant consequent upon the adoption of the Kellogg Pact. (Documents A. 38, A. 43, and A. 73.)
- (4) The Danish resolution as to inquiry into the means whereby ratification of international conventions approved by the League and International Labour Office may be accelerated. (Documents A. 37, A. 1/7, and A. 76.)
- (5) Chinese resolution *re* application of Article 19 of the Covenant regarding the reconsideration of treaties which have become inapplicable. (Documents A. 47 and A. 91.)
- (6) Proposal of the Government of Finland to confer on the Permanent Court of International Justice jurisdiction as a Court of review in respect of arbitral tribunals established by States. (Documents A. 21, A. 1/4, and A. 77.)
- (7) Progressive codification of international law. (Documents A. 6, A. 6 (a), A. 12, A. 48, and A. 78.)
- (8) Proposed amendment to Article 7 of the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly, with regard to the number of Vice-Presidents elected by the Assembly. (Documents A. 39 and A. 72.)

REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND PROTOCOL REGARDING THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO STATUTE OF PERMANENT COURT.

These two questions having been fully considered by the Special Conference on the subject, concerning which particulars will be found in Document A. 1/3 and A. 1/6, the two protocols, as amended by the Conference, were adopted by the committee unanimously and without debate. There was, however, considerable difference of opinion with regard to the recommendation of the Committee of Jurists (endorsed by the majority of members of the Conference)—namely, that only persons possessing recognized practical experience in international law should be nominated for the position of Judge of the Permanent Court. It was contended by the opponents of this recommendation that in very few countries indeed were there any persons possessing practical experience in international law, and that such a recommendation would debar from consideration persons, such as professors of international law, whose special knowledge of the subject might render them more suitable for the position than persons with practical experience either as advocates or judges, but with only slight knowledge of international law. The recommendation was, however, passed by twenty-seven votes to thirteen. The point was raised again in the Assembly by the Norwegian delegation, and the voting there resulted in the recommendation being adopted by a slightly reduced majority.

MODIFICATION OF ARTICLES 12, 13, AND 15 OF THE COVENANT AS THE RESULT OF THE KELLOGG PACT.

Two resolutions were moved on this subject—one by the British delegation (Document A. 38), limited to the three articles referred to in the heading, and one by the Peruvian delegation (A. 43), suggesting a more general examination of the Covenant in order to bring it into harmony with the changed situation created by the adoption by almost all States members of the League of the Briand-Kellogg Pact. The British delegate (the Right Hon. Arthur Henderson) pressed for immediate action in this matter, so that, if possible, the necessary amendments in the text of the three articles concerned might be approved by the Assembly at the present session. He admitted that the liability of States under Article 16 would be slightly increased by the amendments proposed, as wars which would have been legitimate under the Covenant were prohibited by the Kellogg Pact, and therefore it might become