

In view of the difference of opinion, the original draft resolution was modified to read as follows:—

“The Assembly, noting the divergencies of opinion which exist as regards the requirements for voting in the Council or the Assembly a resolution requesting an advisory opinion from the Permanent Court of International Justice, expresses the desire that, when circumstances permit, the Council may have a study made of the question whether the Council or the Assembly may, by a simple majority, ask for an advisory opinion within the meaning of Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.”

### *Pacific Settlement of International Disputes*

While the Conventions on Conciliation, Arbitration, and Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, prepared by the Committee on Arbitration and Security, were considered by the Third Committee, they were discussed by the First as well, a liaison committee under the chairmanship of M. Politis (Greece) being the connecting link.

In a long *exposé*, M. Politis outlined the work of the sub-committee, and reviewed the problems confronting it. The chief point to be decided was whether the three conventions should be maintained as distinct with no connection between them, or whether an improvement could not be effected by drafting the three into one complete instrument. After much study, it was found that the objection to the amalgamation was a purely technical one, and the finished draft, as drawn up by M. Uden (Sweden) and M. Rolin (Belgium), entirely met the previous objection raised by members of the committee. Moreover, the final draft, while preserving the advantages of the old system, actually brought about further improvements. It created a distinct bond between the three instruments; presented greater simplicity and more practical facilities both for its adoption and for its application; and finally, by its very elasticity and flexibility could more easily adapt itself to every need and peculiar circumstance which might occur in the future. Provision is made, in Article 38, for admission to only one of the four chapters of the convention or to the convention as a whole; each State becoming bound to each other State only to the extent to which it and the other State have incurred equal commitments. Another important Article is Article 45 which provides for partial denunciation.

M. Politis then replied to objections raised by certain members of the committee, notably Sir William Harrison Moore (Australia) and the representative of India, who opposed the merging of the three conventions into one at the last moment, when it was impossible for the representatives of distant countries to get adequate instructions. M. Ito (Japan) questioned the wisdom of the policy of eliminating draft bilateral conventions in favour of a general convention, while Sir Cecil Hurst (Great Britain) thought it desirable to ascertain, before opening the convention for general accession, what Governments would favour bilateral agreements: otherwise there would be danger of producing conditions similar to those of 1923 and 1924. Eventually the draft was approved and passed on for comment to the Third Committee.

## SECOND COMMITTEE

(TECHNICAL ORGANIZATIONS)

### *Economic Organization*

The most important question before the Second Committee was the discussion of the report submitted by M. Loucheur (France), dealing with the Economic Organization of the League and the work accomplished since the resolutions of the International Economic Conference had been recommended to the favourable attention of all Governments by the Eighth Assembly.