

This is a convenient stage at which to refer to the composition of the New Zealand delegation. As sole delegate for New Zealand, I nominated myself for all Committees, such an arrangement making it possible for me to attend any meeting at which I felt my presence was required. At the same time I nominated as substitute delegates for

Committees 1 and 2	Mr. R. M. Campbell.
Committee 3	Mr. R. M. Campbell and Mr. C. A. Knowles.
Committees 4 and 6	Mr. C. A. Knowles, and
Committee 5	Miss J. R. McKenzie.

The delegation was completed by my personal assistant and typiste, Miss E. M. Hannan.

As to the remaining officers of the Assembly, the Nominations Committee proposed as Vice Presidents the first delegate of the United Kingdom, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Poland, Turkey, and the Irish Free State, and as Chairmen of Committees:

No. 1	M. Politis (Greece).
No. 2	M. Osusky (Czechoslovakia).
No. 3	M. Holsti (Finland).
No. 4	M. Guani (Uruguay).
No. 5	Countess Apponyi (Hungary).
No. 6	M. Santos (Colombia).

The Nominations Committee also proposed the appointment of M. Motta, President of the Swiss Confederation, as Honorary President.

The rules of procedure provided for the election of these officers, but in the case of the Honorary and the Vice-Presidents the Assembly dispensed with this procedure. As to the election of the Chairmen of Committees, it was left to the Committees themselves to ratify the appointments on the following day.

The above-mentioned officers, with the addition of M. Spaak (Belgium), Chairman of the Agenda Committee (a Committee of seven members which was constituted later on the proposal of the President), formed the General Committee of the Assembly, sometimes referred to as the Bureau.

On the 20th September the Assembly proceeded to the election of non-permanent members of the Council. Two days previously there was circulated a paper (A. 38, 1937) showing that Spain and Turkey, whose term was about to expire, had applied to be declared re-eligible. Before the election proper it was necessary to test the feeling of the Assembly on this question of re-eligibility, and a vote was taken, first on the Spanish application, and then on that of Turkey. To be declared re-eligible a two-thirds majority of the votes cast is required. Fifty-two States voted. In the case of Spain, twenty-three votes were cast in her favour, and in that of Turkey twenty-five. These two candidates having been unsuccessful in their applications, there were then in the field only two other candidates, with three vacancies to be filled. On the point whether the election of two members should take place at the next meeting, and the third at a later date, or whether all three members should be elected at a subsequent date and at the same time, the Assembly favoured the first course, and accordingly an election was held on the afternoon of the 20th September. Here again fifty-two States voted, Iran receiving forty-eight votes and Peru forty-six. As a simple majority only is required in such an election, the results may be considered eminently satisfactory to both countries, who then took the seats formerly occupied by Turkey and Chile. Spain's seat remained to be filled.

On the 28th September the Assembly filled the remaining vacancy on the Council by electing Belgium. Fifty-two States voted on this occasion, and Belgium, which was the only candidate, received forty-seven; the remaining voting-papers were either spoiled or left blank.

The debate on the work of the League was opened by M. Edwards, the first delegate of Chile, at the meeting held on the 14th September. The speech was largely a plea for a universal League. It seemed that in citing the effective co-operation between Latin-American States which, with one exception, are Spanish speaking, he desired to put forward an example to be followed, but I think that an experienced diplomatist such as M. Edwards would be the first to admit the circumstances which make comparison difficult. As he showed, even in Latin America there are two schools of thought—that which believes that the League can wait for a more propitious time to extend, and that which considers that a League which is not universal not only cannot render effective service, but is a danger to its members. It was perhaps unjust to say that the League has been completely sterile in its political activities (the solving of the Alexandretta question proves the reverse), and M. Edwards was on safer ground when he stressed the success of the technical activities of the organization, although one would perhaps question his contention that success in the technical sphere was due to universality of the technical organs. It is true that States non-members of the League co-operate in some of its technical activities, but it is to be doubted whether so-called universality is a cause of success in the one sphere, and lack of that quality of the want of success in the other. Later in the session M. Litvinoff had some hard things to say on the subject of universality as a cure for the League's ills. It is only fair to the Chilean delegate to state that he has consistently pursued his ideal. In spite of difficulties, he would invite at once non-member States to give their views on the reform of the Covenant. All who have the interests of the League at heart, all who believe that the League should be made the corner stone of effective international co-operation in the cause of peace, would welcome an institution universal in membership and application; but there are doubts in the minds of some who suggest that the price to be paid for universality would be too great, since it would imply a League so weakened or shorn of its power that it would be a hindrance rather than a help. But perhaps M. Edwards was