

## NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

In my report on the Eleventh Assembly I made brief reference to the question of nationality of women, which had been raised during the Codification Conference. In January last the Council of the League of Nations, on the motion of three members representatives of Latin American republics, resolved to place it on the agenda of the Assembly, and instructed the Secretary-General to prepare a report for submission to the Assembly after consultation with various women's organizations. Consultation took place, and the First Committee had before it a report by the Secretary-General (Document A. 19). As the report is dated 27th July, and Governments situate at a distance from the seat of the League of Nations have had no opportunity to examine it and instruct their delegates, the First Committee welcomed a motion proposed by the British delegate, that the report be transmitted to Governments for their observations with a view of the question being considered by the Thirteenth Assembly.

The question of the nationality of women has long occupied the attention of the various members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and all appreciate the desirability of unanimity in legislation, but the difficulty of achieving this is recognized.

On the 26th September a resolution providing for the transmission of papers to Governments for consideration and observations was passed by the Assembly (Document A. 84). The question will be placed on the agenda of the 13th Assembly.

## REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

You will recollect that the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice was revised by the Assembly in 1929. The protocol relating to this revision has not received the ratifications necessary to bring it into force, and on the 11th September a number of delegations joined in submitting to the Assembly the following motion:—

“The Assembly places on its agenda the examination of the situation as regards the entry into force of the protocol of 14th September, 1929, relating to the revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. It refers this question to its First Committee.” (Document A. 37.)

The First Committee had before it not only this document, but another—A. 1/3—giving particulars of the present situation as regards ratifications. The Government of Cuba, when ratifying, made some reservations, particularly regarding the application of the new text of Article 23 of the statute. These reservations were communicated to members of the League for their observations, and their replies are summarized in A. 1/3. In the First Committee the Cuban representative made a statement to the effect that, although his Government had not changed its opinion, it would, if requested to withdraw its reservations, ask the Senate to assent to this. After listening to this statement, the Committee decided to draft a motion which would take note of the new situation as disclosed by the Cuban delegate. This motion was introduced into the Assembly on the 25th September, and passed.

## AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

In my report on last year's Assembly I devoted several pages to an account of the efforts made by the First Committee to frame a text, generally acceptable, of amendments to certain articles of the Covenant, in order to bring it into harmony with the Pact of Paris. These efforts were not completely successful, and the Assembly was unable to arrive at a definite decision. The delay, however, gave Governments an opportunity of giving careful consideration to the text drawn up last year and to make observations thereon. Several Governments made observations and these are contained in three documents bearing the number A. 11.

Almost till the time the Assembly opened, there was reason to believe that the objections made by several delegates last year would be withdrawn, that the text evolved during the course of the Eleventh Assembly would, with slight modifications of drafting, be accepted by this year's Assembly and that a protocol embodying the amendments would be opened for signature. However, it soon became apparent that the First Committee's task would not be an easy one. Indeed, at the first meeting at which the question was discussed one delegate ventured to express the opinion that it was unlikely the committee would arrive at a definite settlement this year, an opinion which, in the long-run, was justified.

After a general discussion the matter was adjourned to enable the Secretariat to prepare a précis of the observations presented by Governments since the last Assembly. This précis (A. 1/2) was subsequently presented to the First Committee.

When the discussion was resumed, the committee was still confronted with the problems on which so much time and thought had been spent last year, such, for example, as the reservations made by various Governments in the diplomatic correspondence which preceded signature to the Pact of Paris; the extension of sanctions; and the contention that there was no conflict between the two instruments, since, although the Pact of Paris condemned war as an instrument of national policy, the Covenant merely left certain wars unprohibited.

After a full exchange of views the question was remitted to a sub-committee specially constituted for the purpose of examining it. The sub-committee's report, which the First Committee