

The keynote was struck by the delegate of the United Kingdom, a section of whose speech is printed in the Sixth Committee's report to the Assembly (Document A. 57). I quote the following passages, which are themselves quotations from a League document:—

“It must at once be placed on record that it was no part of the purpose of the authors of the treaties to set out principles of government which should be of universal obligation. What the Conference had to deal with was a number of problems which were purely local, which arose only in certain specified districts of Europe, but which at the same time, in view of the political conditions of the moment, were serious, urgent, and could not be neglected.” These words aptly express the principle. In the rearrangement of frontiers it was impossible not to include certain territories containing peoples differing in race, tongue, and culture from the peoples of the countries to which they would in future belong; and the bare elements of justice made it necessary that they should be protected.

Although the Polish motion obtained a considerable degree of sympathy, the opponents of generalization had the stronger voice, and towards the close of the debate the Chairman begged the Polish delegate not to insist on the motion being put to the vote. The latter, seeing that unanimity could not be obtained, agreed to the Chairman's request.

The Hungarian motion gave rise to a lively discussion, and there were the usual exchanges between the representatives of countries having minorities and those of countries whose former nationals had been incorporated in other States.

Whatever may be the views held on the principles involved, this annual debate in the Sixth Committee not only helps to keep alive interest in the question, but serves other useful purposes, even if, strictly speaking, it is the Council and not the Assembly which is charged with the work of supervision.

No formal resolution was passed by the Assembly, which accepted its Committee's report on the 27th September.

#### DISPUTE BETWEEN BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY.

At the request of the Bolivian Government this long-drawn-out dispute was referred by the Council to the Assembly, and the papers were considered by the Sixth Committee. These papers consist of—

- (1) Statement of the Bolivian Government's case (Document A. 22):
- (2) Statement of the Paraguayan case (Document A. 19).

The dispute concerns possession of a part of the territory known as the Chaco. Each side's case is fully developed in the statements and is supported by a wealth of historical and other information. All attempts at solution, both by the League and by others, have so far failed, and Bolivia had invoked the application of Article 15 of the Covenant.

When submitting his country's case the representative of Paraguay stated that the submission of his statement was not in any circumstances to be taken to imply acceptance of the application in its entirety of the procedure laid down in Article 15 of the Covenant before the definitive cessation of hostilities accompanied by effective measures of security. One of the first acts of the Sixth Committee, therefore, was to ask the First Committee to give an opinion on the applicability in its entirety of Article 15 of the Covenant to the dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay. The opinion of the First Committee is given in Document A. VI/12. Briefly, it is that Article 15 of the Covenant is applicable in its entirety, even in a case where the parties are at war, but that it would not necessarily apply in the event of a member of the League of Nations which is the victim of aggression applying to the Council in virtue of Article 10.

I do not think there is any need to recapitulate the debate in the Sixth Committee. The Committee's task was to find a means of putting an end to the unhappy state of affairs, and on the 27th September it submitted to the Assembly a draft motion, the text of which is given in Document A. 58. This motion provides for the establishment of a Committee composed of—

- (a) The members of the Council:
- (b) Those members of the League which, not being at present members of the Council, have taken part in the attempts previously made in America, as members of the Washington Committee of Neutrals or as States bordering upon the parties to the dispute—that is to say, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, and Uruguay:
- (c) Four other members to be selected by the Assembly.

The business of the Committee will be to endeavour to put an end to the dispute, and the motion then proceeds:—

“Should the Committee succeed in bringing about the settlement of the dispute by applying Article 15, paragraph 3, of the Covenant, the Committee will make public, on behalf of the Assembly, a statement giving facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof.”

“Should it prove impossible to settle the dispute, the Committee will submit to the Assembly the draft report contemplated in Article 15, paragraph 4, of the Covenant, containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations concerning the cessation of hostilities, the settlement of the dispute, and any consequences arising out of those recommendations in regard to the application of the prohibition to supply arms and war material, to which numerous Governments have subscribed, in some cases ‘subject to any further recommendation by the Council or the Assembly.’”

“In accordance with Rule 1, paragraph 2, of its Rules of Procedure, the Assembly will meet in extraordinary session at the request of the committee hereby set up.”