

LONDON, October 16, 1922.

*To His Excellency*

*The Governor General in Council:*

The undersigned delegates appointed to represent Canada at the Third Assembly of the League of Nations have the honour to report as follows:—

The Assembly met at Geneva on Monday, September 3, and continued its sittings until Saturday, September 30. The Canadian delegates remained in attendance throughout.

The business of the Assembly is distributed among six large committees as follows:—

First Committee—Legal and constitutional questions.

Second Committee—Technical organizations.

Third Committee—Reduction of armaments.

Fourth Committee—Budget and financial questions.

Fifth Committee—Social and general questions.

Sixth Committee—Political questions.

The plan of distribution is so arranged that where a country has three delegates it may be represented on all these committees. Thus, Mr. Fielding served on the Third Committee (Disarmament), and on the Fifth Committee (Social and general questions). Mr. Lapointe served on the First Committee (Legal and constitutional), and on the Sixth Committee (Political questions). Mr. Larkin served on the Second Committee (Technical organizations), and on the Fourth Committee (Finance).

Mr. Fielding was chosen Chairman of the Fifth Committee. This position carried with it a seat on the Bureau, or General Committee of the Assembly, which was composed of the President, six Vice-presidents, and the Chairmen of the six large committees herein referred to.

While there was not before the Assembly any question of special importance to Canada, many matters of wide interest were considered by the several committees and in due course the conclusions reached by these committees were reported to the Assembly and the Assembly's decision taken thereon.

The action of a Canadian representative at previous meetings left on the agenda for the Third Assembly a proposal on behalf of Canada to strike out Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. This proposal had received considerable attention at the previous meetings and its consideration had been postponed until the meeting of the Third Assembly. It did not appear that the proposal had found favour in any quarter in the Assembly. It had, on the contrary, aroused marked hostility. The French representatives were particularly strong in their objections to the elimination of the Article. Many of the smaller nations too were disposed to regard the Article as a protection against aggression and naturally did not look with approval on the proposal to strike it out. As the question remained on the agenda from last year, it was necessary for the delegates of the present year to determine what action should