

This great work, written by Mr. Lange in French, is a tribute to French as the international language *par excellence*. It is a monument to the peace movement. It is a monument to the author.

In his last will and testament creating the five prizes, of which the peace prize is one, Mr. Alfred Nobel stated it to be his "express will that nationality shall not be taken into account in conferring the prizes, so that the prize may go to the most deserving, whether he be a Scandinavian or not." The Peace Prize for the year 1921 has been worthily bestowed, and to Scandinavians.

JAMES BROWN SCOTT.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The Second Assembly of the League of Nations, on October 3-5, 1921, passed a number of resolutions amending the Covenant of the League.<sup>1</sup> The amendments deal with the election of non-permanent members of the Council of the League, the allocation of the expenses of the League, recognize judicial settlement as a means of settling international disputes and fit the Permanent Court of International Justice into the scheme of the League, modify the existing provisions concerning the use of force and economic pressure, and change the method of amending the Covenant.

The Council of the League consists of "representatives of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, together with representatives of four other members of the League. These four members of the League," Article 4 provides, "shall be elected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion."<sup>2</sup> The Assembly now proposes to insert the following paragraph between the second and third paragraphs of Article 4:

The Assembly shall fix by a two-thirds majority the rules dealing with the election of the non-permanent Members of the Council, and particularly such regulations as relate to their term of office and the conditions of re-eligibility.

The allocation of the expenses of the League is provided for in Article 6 of the Covenant, the last paragraph of which reads that "the expenses of the Secretariat shall be borne by the members of the League in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union," and in the section of the peace treaties dealing with the International Labor Organization, under which all expenses of that organization "shall be paid to the Director by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations out of the general funds of the League," except

<sup>1</sup> *League of Nations Official Journal*, January, 1922, pages 6-34.

<sup>2</sup> The text of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which is referred to in this comment, may be found in the *Official Journal of the League of Nations*, No. 1, February, 1920, pages 3-12. It is printed in the Supplement to the *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 15, 1921, pp. 4-13.

traveling expenses of the delegates and advisers in attending meetings of the Conference or Governing Body.<sup>3</sup> The Assembly is, however, "of the opinion that the application of the Universal Postal Union system to the budget of the League gave rise to certain injustices" and it proposes that the above quoted paragraph of Article 6 of the Covenant be replaced by the following: "The expenses of the League shall be borne by the Members of the League in the proportion decided by the Assembly"; and a revised allocation has been made by the Assembly which it proposes as an amendment to the Annex to the Covenant. The Assembly further proposes to add a new paragraph to Article 6 providing that "the allocation of the expenses of the League set out on Annex 3 shall be applied as from January 1, 1922 until a revised allocation has come into force after adoption by the Assembly."

A memorandum by the Secretary-General of the League, dated November 15, 1921, explains that:

The Second Assembly, on October 3rd, 1921, unanimously passed the budget of the League of Nations for the fourth fiscal period (1922), which provides 14,738,335 gold francs for general League purposes and 6,135,610 gold francs for the International Labour Organisation. The total sum to be apportioned among the States Members of the League amounts, therefore, to 20,873,945 gold francs.

Previous contributions have, in accordance with Article 6 of the Covenant, been reckoned according to the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union, and this system, until the amendment proposed by the Second Assembly has been ratified, necessarily continues in force.<sup>4</sup>

The table on page 265 shows the apportionment of the budget of the League, for the fiscal period 1922, among the Members of the League on the basis of the new schedule adopted by the Assembly. For purposes of comparison we insert an additional column showing the apportionment of the same budget according to the old schedule, that is, on the basis of the apportionment of the Universal Postal Union, as now provided in the Covenant.

The next three amendments proposed by the Assembly are made necessary by the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice under Article 14 of the Covenant. It has been known from the beginning by some of those who were present at Paris that judicial settlement of international disputes formed no part of the plans of the originators and sponsors of the League. The Covenant centers around political, not legal, action. A reading of the Covenant discloses that Article 14, which provides for the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice, was not within the contemplation of the framers when the other articles of the Covenant were drawn.

<sup>3</sup> Art. 399 of the Peace Treaty with Germany, Supplement to this *Journal*, Vol. 13, 1919, p. 365, and Art. 327 of the Peace Treaty with Hungary, *ibid.*, Vol. 15, 1921, p. 137.

<sup>4</sup> *League of Nations Official Journal*, January, 1922, p. 32.

*Allocation of the expenses of the League*

	Units payable		Budget for the fiscal period 1922 (Gold francs, \$ .193)	
	Old Schedule	New Schedule	Old Schedule	New Schedule
Albania . . . . .	1	2	40,453	44,318
Argentine Republic <sup>a</sup> . . . . .				
Australia . . . . .	25	15	1,011,335	332,388
Austria . . . . .	5	2	202,267	44,318
Belgium . . . . .	15	15	606,801	332,388
Bolivia . . . . .	3	5	121,360	110,796
Brazil . . . . .	15	35	606,801	775,571
British Empire . . . . .	25	90	1,011,335	1,994,326
Bulgaria . . . . .	5	10	202,267	221,592
Canada . . . . .	25	35	1,011,335	775,571
Chile . . . . .	5	15	202,267	332,388
China . . . . .	25	65	1,011,335	1,440,347
Colombia . . . . .	5	10	202,267	221,592
Costa Rica . . . . .	3	2	121,360	44,318
Cuba . . . . .	3	10	121,360	221,592
Czecho-Slovakia . . . . .	15	35	606,801	775,571
Denmark . . . . .	10	10	404,533	221,592
Estonia <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	3	5	121,360	110,796
Finland . . . . .	10	5	404,533	110,796
France . . . . .	25	90	1,011,335	1,994,326
Greece . . . . .	5	2	202,267	221,592
Guatemala . . . . .	3	5	121,360	44,318
Haiti . . . . .	3	2	121,360	110,796
Honduras . . . . .	3	2	121,360	44,318
India . . . . .	25	65	1,011,335	1,440,347
Italy . . . . .	25	65	1,011,335	1,440,347
Japan . . . . .	25	65	1,011,335	1,440,347
Latvia . . . . .	5	5	202,267	110,796
Liberia . . . . .	1	2	40,453	44,318
Lithuania <sup>c</sup> . . . . .	3	5	121,360	110,796
Luxemburg . . . . .	3	5	121,360	44,318
Netherlands . . . . .	15	15	606,801	332,388
New Zealand . . . . .	3	10	121,360	332,388
Nicaragua . . . . .	3	2	121,360	221,592
Norway . . . . .	10	10	404,533	221,592
Panama . . . . .	3	2	121,360	44,318
Paraguay . . . . .	3	2	121,360	44,318
Persia . . . . .	3	10	121,360	221,592
Peru . . . . .	5	10	202,267	221,592
Poland . . . . .	25	15	1,011,335	332,388
Portugal . . . . .	10	10	404,533	221,592
Roumania . . . . .	15	35	606,801	775,571
Salvador . . . . .	3	2	121,360	44,318
Serb-Croat-Slovene State . . . . .	10	35	404,533	775,571
Siam . . . . .	3	10	121,360	221,592
South Africa . . . . .	25	15	1,011,335	332,388
Spain . . . . .	20	35	806,068	775,571
Sweden . . . . .	15	15	606,801	332,388
Switzerland . . . . .	15	10	606,801	221,592
Uruguay . . . . .	3	10	121,360	221,592
Venezuela . . . . .	3	5	121,360	110,796
Totals . . . . .	516	942	20,873,945	20,873,948
Unit of Calculation . . . . .			40,453.38	22,159.18

<sup>a</sup> Owing to the failure of the Argentine Republic to send contributions to the budget of the League, that member is not included by the Secretariat in the calculations of either schedule.

<sup>b</sup> Estonia, not having been as yet classified by the Universal Postal Union, is here placed in the sixth category and rated at 3 units.

<sup>c</sup> Lithuania, not having been as yet classified by the Universal Postal Union, is here placed in the sixth category and rated at 3 units.

The wording of Articles 12 to 16, inclusive, bears plain evidence of the exotic origin of Article 14. Article 12, which is quoted below, it will be noted, makes no mention of judicial settlement or of an International Court of Justice when making provision for the settlement of international disputes. It refers only "to arbitration or to inquiry by the Council." Article 13 deals

only with arbitration and defines as "suitable for submission to arbitration" the identical classes of cases which have now been recognized in the Statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice as coming within the jurisdiction of that Court. Article 13 specifies the court which shall consider such legal disputes, not, however, pointing to the Permanent Court of International Justice, but by providing that "the court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention between them," thereby entirely ignoring the existence of the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for in Article 14 inserted immediately thereafter.

Article 15, which immediately follows the Article providing for the Permanent Court of International Justice, also plainly ignores that tribunal. It provides that "if there should arise between the members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with Article 13, the members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council."

Article 16 also continues to ignore resort to the Permanent Court of International Justice. Its opening sentence reads: "Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the League, etc.," thus again omitting mention of Article 14.

The creation of the Permanent Court of International Justice is, in the words of Sir Eric Drummond, Secretary-General of the League, "clearly the greatest and will, I believe, be the most important creative act of the League. At last a judicial body is established which is entirely free from all political control and entirely unfettered as to its decisions by political bodies. Although it derives its authority from the League, its judgments are in no way subject to advice or revision by the Council or by the Assembly."<sup>5</sup> But, owing to the circumstances above set forth under which the provision for the Court was inserted in the Covenant of the League, it is now naturally necessary to recognize the Court in articles other than Article 14 in order, so to speak, to legalize the adoption of the foster child and make the Court the judicial organ of the League. The Assembly, therefore, proposes to modify Articles 12, 13 and 15 as follows (the amendments being inserted in italic):

#### ARTICLE 12

The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or *judicial settlement* or to enquiry by the Council and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or *the judicial decision*, or the report by the Council.

<sup>5</sup> *Monthly Summary of the League of Nations*, February, 1922, p. 27.

In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators *or the judicial decision* shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute."

#### ARTICLE 13

The Members of the League agree that, whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration *or judicial settlement*, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration *or judicial settlement*.

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration *or judicial settlement*.

*For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in accordance with Article 14, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.*<sup>6</sup>

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award *or decision* that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award *or decision*, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

#### ARTICLE 15

The first paragraph of Article 15 shall read as follows:

If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration *or judicial settlement* in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

Anent the antecedents of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the origin of the provision for it in the Covenant of the League of Nations, the following extract from an address delivered by Senator Cosme de la Torriente before the Cuban Society of International Law, at Havana, on March 1, 1922, is of timely interest:

I would not be fully discharging my duty—a duty which I have gladly accepted—of addressing you this evening if I did not dwell, although very briefly, upon the origin of the Permanent Court and the law upon

<sup>6</sup> This paragraph is inserted in lieu of the original paragraph which read:

"For the consideration of any such dispute the court of arbitration to which the case is referred, shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention between them."

which it is founded. I must confine my remarks upon this subject to a narrow compass because there is here a number of distinguished members of our Society who will surely discourse, in the coming sessions, upon the organization and functioning of the said tribunal.

The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 drew up a convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes, and created, at the same time, the so-called Permanent Court of Arbitration. The members of this court are not to exceed four in number for each of the signatory and adhering Powers to the convention; and with the names of the members thus chosen, a list is made from which the parties in controversy select the judges who are to compose the court for the decision of the question or questions which the parties have agreed to submit to arbitration.

At the time of the Hague Conference of 1907, the necessity was felt of creating a really permanent court of arbitral justice which should be composed of a limited number of judges, whose decisions should be grounded upon the rules and principles of international law and treaties. The American Delegation to the Conference of 1907, following the instructions of the Secretary of State, Elihu Root, proposed the creation of a Court of Arbitral Justice, and the Conference recommended to the signatory Powers of the Final Act the adoption of a draft convention which was to be put into force as soon as an agreement could be had upon the manner of selecting the judges and the composition of the court.

At the time of the meeting of the Naval Conference of London, in the latter part of 1908 and beginning of 1909, the American Secretary of State, then Mr. Robert Bacon, endeavored, through the American Delegation, to have the Powers concerned examine, for a second time, the creation of the Court of Arbitral Justice, and in March, 1909, he addressed, upon this matter, the Powers represented in the said Conference. In October of the same year, Philander C. Knox, who succeeded Mr. Bacon as Secretary of State, insisted again on the recommendation, so that some of the said Powers began to consider the subject, and when the administration of President Taft was ended, the Secretary had in mind the sending of a commissioner to Europe for the purpose of bringing about the creation of the court by some of the Powers already interested in the plan.

At the beginning of 1914, Mr. Loudon, Minister for Foreign Relations of The Netherlands, upon suggestion of an eminent American international lawyer, who, from his office in the Department of State at Washington, had been the principal instrumentality in the above-mentioned activities, proposed to the great Powers the plan prepared by the latter for the creation of the Court of Arbitral Justice. The great war which broke out soon afterwards as a consequence of the attitude of Austria-Hungary against Serbia and upon the occasion of the assassination of the heir apparent to that Monarchy, which took place at Serajevo, put a sudden stop to and paralyzed all these activities. It may be said, perhaps, that had the Court been already in existence at that time, it is possible that such a disastrous struggle might have been spared and prevented.

When in the fall of 1918, after the Central Empires of Europe had met with disaster and the armistice had been signed, all those who looked with approval to the creation of the court began to work with renewed vigor in order to attain their purpose, and from January 18, 1919, the date on which the Conference of the Allied and Associated Powers be-

gan at Paris, they brought their influence to bear upon the commission presided over by President Wilson, which was created to draw up a plan for a league or society of nations. In the draft convention presented to the commission by him for that purpose, there was a suggestion for the creation of the court; but the work prepared, in regard to the members of the court, by some persons, and especially by said eminent American international lawyer to whom reference has already been made, surely brought about the insertion of Article 14 in the Covenant creating the duty on the part of the Council of the League to formulate and submit plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice, having jurisdiction to decide all disputes of an international character which the interested parties should submit to it, and the further duty of giving its opinion on any dispute or question submitted to it by the Council or the Assembly of the League.

The Council, as soon as it could, appointed an Advisory Committee of Jurists, which met from June 16 to July 24, 1920, in the Peace Palace at The Hague, in which were represented the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Spain, Brazil, Belgium, The Netherlands and Norway, under the presidency of Baron Descamps, of Belgium, the United States of America being represented upon this occasion by Elihu Root, ex-Secretary of State and President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, who had with him during all the time the commission was in session the help and efficient cooperation of the Secretary of the Endowment and Director of its Division of International Law, and President of the American Institute of International Law, Mr. James Brown Scott.

The Council submitted, with some modifications, the draft convention prepared by the Advisory Committee of Jurists to the first Assembly of the League, and this, after introducing some changes in its provisions, especially in regard to the jurisdiction of the court, approved the draft convention, as already stated, at its session on December 13, 1920.

Article I on the Constitution of the Court, which I shall not examine for the reasons which I have already stated, specifically provides that independently of the Court of Arbitration, created by the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, and of the special courts of arbitration to which the states are always at liberty to entrust the settlement of their disputes, there is created, in accordance with Article 14 of the Covenant of the League or Society of Nations, a Permanent Court of International Justice. After this the Constitution contains three chapters: the first refers to the Organization of the Court and includes Article 2 to Article 33, inclusive; the second refers to the Jurisdiction of the Court and includes Articles 34 to 38, inclusive; the third refers to the Procedure, and includes Articles 39 to 64, which is the last. There is also as a final aspect of the Constitution, besides the protocol of signature, the so-called optional clause by virtue of which the states which have accepted it recognize the obligatory jurisdiction of the court upon the conditions which they have deemed advisable. For the other states the jurisdiction is not obligatory.

From a cursory comparison between the draft convention prepared since the Hague Conference of 1907 and the final Constitution of the Court, the conclusion is inevitable that a great part of the principles of the said constitution are based on the work already prepared by the

officials of the American Department of State, or by the Carnegie Endowment.

And, as the eminent international lawyer who has taken such a great share in the said work is no other than the President of our American Institute of International Law, the Honorable James Brown Scott, whom we have the honor to entertain for a few days and who has just preceded me on this floor, it is only just, very just, that in concluding my remarks I should extend to him my salutation and, in the name of our Society, congratulate him for having at last seen realized his aspirations of so many years, which he had always cherished and hoped he might one day see realized, together with the great work which he, more than anybody else has, by his learning and his personal efforts, contributed to bring to a happy result.

While it has been said of the League of Nations that Leon Burgeois, the learned and illustrious president of the French Senate, is the grandfather and that Woodrow Wilson, the eminent champion of liberty and democracy, Lord Robert Cecil, the illustrious English parliamentarian, and General Smuts, the noted Prime Minister of South Africa, are its fathers, I may say, perhaps, that if the Permanent Court of International Justice also has parents, no one can really deserve more appropriately that title than Elihu Root and James Brown Scott, the two great Americans who, in the main, steer the course of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which has given origin to the American Institute of International Law and our own Cuban Society of International Law!

To return to the Assembly amendments to the Covenant, Article 16 is practically rewritten. It is proposed, first to substitute "residents" for "nationals" in the prohibition of intercourse between Members of the League and Covenant-breaking States, to eliminate the recommendation of the Council for the contribution of military force and to substitute its opinion as to whether the Covenant has been broken, to eliminate the agreement for military, financial and economic support to protect the Covenants of the League, substituting therefor a recommendation of the Council concerning the application of economic pressure. In order fully to understand these amendments it seems best to quote Article 16 as it now stands and follow with the article as it will read, if amended:

*Article 16 as it now reads*

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force



the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League.

Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the Representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon.

*Proposed new Article 16*

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, prohibition of all intercourse between persons residing in their territory and the territory of the Covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between persons residing in the territory of the Covenant-breaking State and persons residing in the territory of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

It is for the Council to give an opinion whether or not a breach of the Covenant has taken place. In deliberations on this question in the Council the votes of Members of the League alleged to have resorted to war and of Members against whom such action was directed shall not be counted.

The Council will notify to all Members of the League the date which it recommends for the application of the economic pressure under this Article.

Nevertheless, the Council may, in the case of particular Members, postpone the coming into force of any of these measures for a specified period where it is satisfied that such a postponement will facilitate the attainment of the object of the measures referred to in the preceding paragraph, or that it is necessary in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience which will be caused to such Members.

Finally, the Assembly proposes to amend Article 26 governing the method of amending the Covenant. Since the article is completely revised, it again seems best to quote the article in its original form and follow it with its proposed amended form:

*Article 26 as it now reads*

Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Assembly.

No such amendment shall bind any Member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League.

*Proposed new Article 26*

Amendments to the present Covenant the text of which shall have been voted by the Assembly on a three-fourths majority, in which there shall be included the votes of all Members of the Council represented at the meeting, will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives composed the Council when the vote was taken and by the majority of those whose Representatives form the Assembly.

If the required number of ratifications shall not have been obtained within twenty-two months after the vote of the Assembly, the proposed amendment shall remain without effect.<sup>7</sup>

The Secretary-General shall inform the Members of the taking effect of an amendment.

Any Member of the League which has not at that time ratified the amendment is free to notify the Secretary-General within a year of its refusal to accept it, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League.

The proposed amendments have been embodied in separate protocols, each of which provides that "The present protocol will remain open for signature by the Members of the League; it will be ratified and the ratifications will be deposited as soon as possible with the Secretariat of the League." In explanation of this mode of procedure, the following extract from the report of the First Committee of the Second Assembly, dated September 30, 1921, is quoted by the Secretary-General in his letter transmitting copies of the protocols to the Members of the League:

A large number of Members expressed the opinion that the resolutions in no way formed a draft Convention, the product of a diplomatic conference, to which the representatives of the States would have to attach their signatures. It seemed to them rather the outcome of deliberation on the part of the Assembly, acting as an autonomous body in virtue of the competence conferred upon it by the Covenant.

Accordingly to this view, it is the Assembly's resolution which is subject to the ratification by the States and not the signatures of their representatives. Moreover, the representatives may not have voted in favour of the amendment ratified by the State which they represent. It would therefore seem sufficient that every resolution of amendment be drawn up in the form of an Act by the Assembly, signed by the President and the Secretary-General.

But certain Members of the Committee pointed out that such a procedure would violate the constitutional law of their State and would also conflict with diplomatic usage.

<sup>7</sup> In his letter of transmittal to the Members of the League, the Secretary-General, on Nov. 24, 1921 (*Official Journal*, p. 7) quotes paragraph 2 of the amended article as giving a period of eighteen months within which the required number of ratifications shall be obtained, but the text of the Protocol (*Official Journal*, p. 28) gives this period as twenty-two months.

The Committee considered that, to avoid any difficulty on this point, it was desirable that the amendments should take the form of Protocols, embodying the resolutions of amendment voted by the Assembly, signed by the President and the Secretary-General, and also open to signature by plenipotentiaries.

The signatures of various numbers of representatives are attached to the above protocols.

GEORGE A. FINCH.