

be taken concerning it. In view of the wide differences of opinion which existed as to the proper meaning of Article 10, we suggested that, instead of striking it out, as proposed by Canada's representatives at previous meetings, it be allowed to stand with the addition of a few explanatory words.

Article 10 as it stands in the Covenant reads as follows:—

“The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in the case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.”

With the addition of the words proposed, the Article would read:—

“The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled, taking into account the political and geographical circumstances of each State. The opinion given by the Council in such cases shall be regarded as a matter of the highest importance, and shall be taken into consideration by all the Members of the League, who shall use their utmost endeavours to conform to the conclusions of the Council; but no Member shall be under the obligation to engage in any act of war without the consent of its Parliament, legislature, or other representative body.”

The amendment was considered by the First Committee (Legal and constitutional) and a recommendation was made as follows:—

“The Assembly of the League of Nations decides that the Canadian proposal with regard to Article 10 of the Covenant shall be adjourned until the Fourth Assembly, in order that the subject may be considered in all its bearings. The Assembly leaves it to the Council to decide on the steps to be taken to provide for a detailed study of the Canadian proposal before the meeting of the Fourth Assembly.”

When this report came before the Assembly for approval a strong speech was made by Mr. Joseph Barthelemy, representing France, who argued against any interference with Article 10 as it stands. Mr. Fielding replied, and the report of the committee was adopted.

At the Second Assembly, on the motion of a Canadian Delegate, a resolution was adopted expressing hope of an early settlement of the question of the status of Eastern Galicia. That matter being still unsettled, Mr. Fielding moved a renewal of the expression of last year in the following terms:—

“The Assembly of the League of Nations renews its wish, expressed in the resolution adopted by the Second Assembly on September 27, 1921, that the Council of the League draw the attention of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to the desirability of determining at an early date the status of Eastern Galicia.”

The resolution was adopted.

The question of the allocation of the expenses of the League which had been considered at previous Assemblies again came up.

Under the provisions of the Covenant, the expenses of the League were allocated between the various countries in the proportion established for the