

SECRETARIAT.

In my report on the Assembly of 1928 I referred to the uneasiness felt by a number of delegates regarding the method of recruiting the staff. The Ninth Assembly had called for a report, and it was fully expected that this report would be before the delegates to the Tenth Assembly. Unfortunately, no such document was presented. It appeared from the statement made to the Fourth Committee by the Secretary-General that the question had been fully examined by two committees formed from amongst the members of the Secretariat, whose reports had been placed in the hands of the Supervisory Commission. The Supervisory Commission, however, had not had at its disposal time to examine the material submitted, and stated in its report (document A. 5 (a)) that it would submit its conclusions to the Assembly of 1930.

Mr. Henderson (representing Great Britain) had indicated in his speech to the Assembly early in the session that concrete proposals for examining all matters relating to the staff of the Secretariat would be submitted, and the Fourth Committee accordingly received in due course a motion in the name of the British delegation. This motion proposed a committee of five, including two members or the Supervisory Commission, to inquire as to what steps (and, in particular, what amendments to the Staff Regulations) could be taken to ensure the best possible administrative results, and it proceeded to lay down the terms of reference. There was another motion, standing in the name of the Italian delegation, which, whilst having the same object in view, would have allowed the Committee of Inquiry greater scope, since it would be directed to "consider all matters connected with the organization and duties of the Secretariat." Each motion found its partisans and its critics. The debate was protracted and interesting. There were those who would have applied principles of nationalism, whilst, on the other hand, there were advocates of abstract internationalism.

I cannot conceive of a more difficult problem than that of the method of appointing members of the staff. The solution, whatever it may be, cannot possibly, except by a miracle, satisfy everybody. Some of the nations will continue to insist on an adequate representation of their nationals on the staff of the Secretariat; but, to mention one of many important aspects of the question, the disinterested advocates for efficiency will demand in candidates a close acquaintance with the two official languages of the League—French and English. The ideal to be aimed at—an International Civil Service, the members of which, whilst not forgetting their own country, yet cultivate an international spirit which makes for impartiality—will, I am afraid, long remain a fine ideal. Nevertheless, the necessity for reform is obvious.

In the course of the debate it was suggested that the British and Italian motions should be considered by a small sub-committee of about four in an endeavour to bring the conflicting elements into line. This suggestion was eventually accepted. The report of the sub-committee was in the nature of a compromise. It took the form of a recital of the British and Italian draft resolutions, and concluded as follows:—

"The Assembly, taking note of these two draft resolutions, decides that a Committee of Inquiry shall be constituted, consisting of nine members, two of whom shall be members of the Supervisory Commission, to be appointed by the Assembly, to examine what steps could be taken to ensure, in the future as in the past, the best possible administrative results for the Secretariat, the International Labour Office, and the Permanent Court of International Justice, and to prepare a report thereon in adequate time so that it may be submitted to the Governments for consideration before the next session of the Assembly. For that purpose, the various resolutions proposed on the subject to the Fourth Committee shall be transmitted to the Committee of Inquiry."

After further discussion the sub-committee's report was adopted by the Fourth Committee, with slight amendments, and passed by the Assembly at its meeting on the 23rd September (Document A. 79).

After the Fourth Committee's report had been passed by the Assembly it was considered by the General Committee of the Assembly in order that the latter body might suggest the names of nine persons to compose the Committee of Inquiry. The General Committee at this stage proposed that the Committee of Inquiry should be increased from nine to thirteen in number. The question of numbers had been the subject of some discussion in the Fourth Committee, and many delegates had been of opinion that a small committee was much better suited to the task. These delegates had accepted the increase from five to nine as a compromise. However, the Assembly, on the 24th September, agreed to the Committee of Inquiry being composed of thirteen members, and on the next day elected the following to serve (Document A. 92): M. Adatci, Count Bernstorff, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, Sir Atul Chatterjee, H. Hambro, Mme. Kluyver, M. Loucheur, M. Osusky (member of the Supervisory Commission), M. Quinones de Leon, M. Parra-Perez (member of the Supervisory Commission), M. Scialoja, M. Sokal, M. Urrutia.

FIFTH COMMITTEE.

The Fifth Committee continued on the same lines as heretofore, and it feels that a distinct advance has been made in the work that has been delegated to it.

CHILD WELFARE.

In the child-welfare work it has completed the important and difficult task of preparing two draft international conventions intended to meet the difficulties which have been often referred to by associations or groups engaged in child-welfare work. The first one deals with the moral and material neglect suffered by children and young people who have escaped or been removed from the authority of their parents or guardians, and the second is wider and more important in scope, and is intended to