

It is worthy of note that the resolution is only a starting point: in its present state it could not be deemed to bind States in any rigid form, because it contains a disposition by which "each State shall retain the right to prohibit the whole or part of its territory being crossed by aircraft registered in another State or manned by a crew of foreign nationality, when such prohibition appears necessary for reasons of national safety." D

2. *Motor Transport*.—The Third Committee decided to take up also the question of granting certain facilities to motor transport as well as to aircraft. It examined the work of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit and the draft resolution recommended by the above technical Committee and passed a resolution arranging for Governments to help in every way motor vehicles crossing their territory, when engaged in League work in times of emergency.

The resolution concerning aircraft and motor transport are preliminary efforts only; undoubtedly, in the course of the next few years, there will be proposals tending to incorporate these resolutions in a General Convention.

(g) *Peruvian Proposal for the amendment of Article 18 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.*

In April, 1930, M. Cornejo, Representative of Peru, suggested the addition of the following paragraph to Article 18 of the Covenant:—

"The Secretariat of the League of Nations may not register any treaty of peace imposed by force as a consequence of war undertaken in violation of the Pact of Paris. The League of Nations shall consider as null and void any stipulations which it may contain and shall render every assistance in restoring the *status quo* destroyed by force."

Lord Cecil recalled that the Committee of Jurists, of which he was a member, had made it quite clear that it would be an entire misconception of Article 18 to ask the Secretary-General to perform any such functions as were suggested in the Peruvian amendment. He thought that the Committee ought to say quite definitely that it accepted the views of the Committee of Jurists.

M. Benes (Czechoslovakia) agreed with Lord Cecil, and the Committee finally disposed of the matter by stating that, in view of the opinion of the Committee of Jurists, it was not necessary to examine the Peruvian proposal further.

#### FOURTH COMMITTEE

(Budget and Financial Questions)

*Organization of the Secretariat, of the International Labour Office, and of the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice*

A long discussion took place on the report of the "Committee of Thirteen" appointed last year to consider this matter. The Committee of Thirteen was not unanimous, and minority reports were submitted on two questions—that of the appointment of the principal officers of the Secretariat, and that of the duration of certain appointments.

The high officials of the Secretariat are now: the Secretary-General, who is of British nationality, the Deputy Secretary-General (French), and three Under-Secretaries-General (German, Italian and Japanese). The German and Italian members of the Committee of Thirteen considered that, under the present system too much power was concentrated in the hands of the two highest officials, and proposed the institution of a Committee of five Under-Secretaries-General to advise the Secretary-General on all political questions and questions of principle.