

fixed. Should it happen, therefore, that the amendments to Article 26 were ratified before the amendments to other articles, the whole of the other amendments would lapse, as more than twenty-two months has already elapsed since they were passed by the Assembly. In order to ensure that the matter was not lost sight of, I moved that the question be referred to the First Committee for consideration, and that the committee be asked to suggest a solution. No. 1 Committee was unable to suggest any solution except that the Secretary-General should be instructed to again write to all States asking those who had not ratified to do so with as little delay as possible (*vide* Document A. 91). I had really not expected that anything more could be done, but the discussion of the situation has, I think, done good, and the States represented on the Council which had not ratified have since done so, or have promised to arrange for ratification at an early date. It will probably be arranged that one such State shall withhold ratification of the amendments to Article 26 until the amendments to most of the other articles have become operative, so that they shall not be killed by the operation of the twenty-two months' time-limit. You will notice that in the resolution on this subject (Document A. 91), while members who have not yet ratified are requested to expedite the ratification of the amendments to Articles 4, 6, 12, 13, 15, and 26, they are merely asked "to express, if they think proper to do so, their intention with regard to the ratification of the amendments to Article 16." The reason why this distinction is made between the amendments to Article 16 and the amendments to the other articles is that, whereas in regard to the first-mentioned six articles it is understood that the non-ratification of amendments by the various States is merely owing to negligence or pressure of other parliamentary business, and not to any actual objection to the proposed amendments, it is known that both Britain and France object to the wording of the first amendment to Article 16, and do not propose to ratify it in its present form.

*Mandates.*—The question of mandates did not occupy a very prominent place in the proceedings of the Assembly. Owing to pressure of other business, particularly arising out of the Italo-Greek trouble, the Council had not been able to consider the report of the Permanent Mandates Commission before the Assembly dealt with the subject, and, to a very large extent, the delegates adopted the suggestion of the rapporteur on the subject, that the Assembly should refrain from any detailed examination of the report of the Permanent Mandates Commission, allowing this work to be done by the Council. The only matter which gave rise to some debate was the reference in the motion eventually adopted by the Assembly (*vide* Document A. 97) to the Bondelzwarts rebellion in South-west Africa.

*Consideration of Health Sections of Mandates' Reports by Health Committee of the League.*—I propose to give particulars of the new arrangements with regard to the health organization of the League in a later part of this report, dealing with the labours of Committee No. 2; but I would draw attention here to the resolution adopted by the Assembly at its sitting on the 15th September, "That the Assembly is of the opinion that it would be desirable for all health reports presented to the Permanent Mandates Commission to be communicated to the Health Committee of the League of Nations for any recommendations it may desire to make to the Permanent Mandates Commission." This suggestion emanated from Sir Neville Howse, V.C., one of the Australian delegates, who was Surgeon-General to the Australian Forces during the war. In committee he indicated very plainly that, in his opinion, the remarks of the Permanent Mandates Commission in regard to health matters in the mandated territories indicated an entire lack of expert knowledge, and that the Commission was not competent to express any opinion in regard to health matters. The Portuguese delegate (M. Friere d'Andrade), who is a member of the Permanent Mandates Commission, strongly opposed the suggestion in the first place, as infringing the rights of the Mandates Commission, but subsequently, in the Assembly debate, he expressed himself as satisfied that the arrangement suggested in the motion would be useful.

*Women Police.*—At its meeting on the 15th September the Assembly approved the recommendation of the Fifth Committee regarding the traffic in women and children (*vide* Document A. 75). In the course of the debate several speakers, notably Dame Edith Lyttelton (one of the British delegates), strongly urged the usefulness of women police.

*Reparations Question.*—During the third week of September the committees proceeded steadily with their work, but the Assembly met only twice. The greater part of these meetings was occupied with the conclusion of the debate on the report of the Council. Several speakers, notably Dr. Nansen (Norway) and M. Zahle (Denmark), expressed considerable misgivings concerning the future of the League, owing to its failure to contribute in any way to the solution of the reparations problem and the other causes of unrest and unsettled conditions and exchanges in Europe. But the most outspoken of all was Professor Gilbert Murray, who was attending the Assembly as a representative of South Africa. His speech will be found in the Verbatim Record of the Eleventh Meeting of the Assembly. He urged that, as the Allied Governments had failed in four years to find any solution to the reparations problem, the matter should now be handed over to the League. It was anticipated that the French or Belgian representatives would reply to this challenge, but, after a hurried consultation between the delegates of those countries, it was evidently decided not to reply, and almost immediately afterwards the debate came to a sudden and unexpected conclusion.

*Technical Organizations of the League: Effect of Reductions in Budget.*—The Chairman of No. 2 Committee (the Jam Sahab of Nawanagar—better known as Ranjitsinghi), at the meeting on the 22nd September, in opening the discussion on the report of the committee with regard to the communications and transit organization, stressed the fact that extremely useful work had been done by the various technical organizations of the League, but that, as it was necessary, for reasons of economy, to make considerable reductions in the amounts voted for such organizations during the year 1924, it was necessary to realize that the technical organizations would unavoidably suffer in power and potentiality. The reductions referred to will render it impossible to hold a number of conferences,