

statement to which I have referred is more for the purposes of confirmation than anything else.

Mr. W. D. EULER: If there were a difference of opinion, upon what authority would the interpretation finally depend? Could the matter be referred to any authority that had jurisdiction?

Mr. ROWELL: I assume that if a dispute arose the matter would finally be decided by the Council, unless it was referred to the Court of International Justice when constituted under the Treaty. But in this statement the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France and the President of the United States say that the terms of the Covenant should receive a broad and generous interpretation in order that it may accomplish its obvious purpose, and that in their opinion no question could be raised on that point.

In reference to the Assembly, it is expressly provided that it shall be composed of representatives of the members of the League and as Canada and the other Dominions are members, there is no question about their right to vote in the Assembly, the question of our voting rights under Article 15 has been raised. Article 15 of the Covenant of the League provides 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 in accordance with Article 13, the members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council.

That is, for investigation and conciliation. Another clause of that same Article provides:

The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other members of the League, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

To illustrate, suppose a dispute should arise between any two nations. Simply in order to bring the point home, we will assume that the dispute is between the British

Empire and the United States. If that dispute is of such a character that it is likely to lead to a rupture in international relations and is referred not to arbitration but to the Council for investigation and conciliation, then either party may ask that it be referred to the Assembly. If it is referred to the Assembly and the Assembly investigates the matter and reports upon it, that report, if concurred in by the members of the Council who are members of the Assembly and by a majority of the other members of the League has the same force and effect as if decided by the Council and concurred in by all the members of the Council, exclusive in each case of the parties to the dispute.

Two questions have been raised under this article. In case there is a dispute, to which any portion of the British Empire is a part, with any foreign country, could the other portions of the British Empire vote in the Assembly in such a case? The view of the Government, and it is the view of the Government of Great Britain also, is that no other portions of the British Empire could vote under those conditions, and the reason is simple. If it be a dispute likely to lead to a rupture, so long as we acknowledge allegiance to the same Sovereign as does Great Britain, as do the other portions of the Empire, then such a dispute is a matter of interest to all portions of the Empire.

Mr. BELAND: Then Canada has no discretion in such a case?

Mr. ROWELL: In a case like that, Canada would be a party interested and would not claim a right to vote.

Mr. BELAND: In the Assembly?

Mr. ROWELL: In the Assembly.

Mr. KING: And would not have the right?

Mr. ROWELL: And under the Treaty would not have the right to vote.

Mr. BELAND: That is what is contended in the United States.

Mr. ROWELL: That is contended, but there is no objection, and there never has been any objection on the part of the Government of Canada, nor on the part of the Government of Great Britain, to that contention. Lord Grey, in his letter, made that point perfectly clear, and I hope I have made it perfectly clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does not that mean that the status of Canada is not the same