

The committee recommended the admission of Austria, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Finland, and Luxemburg, and after discussion in the Assembly, which was lengthy in respect to Austria and Bulgaria, these nations were admitted. With regard to Albania, the committee recommended the adjournment of the question, but there had been a very strong minority in the committee itself favourable to the admission of Albania, and their point of view was pressed in the Assembly, with the result that after listening to a speech by Mr. Fisher, representative for Great Britain, who withdrew his opposition, the Assembly voted Albania a member of the League. With regard to the Baltic States, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the committee recommended the adjournment of admission, the present state of Russia doubtless having influenced them in this decision, and the Assembly rejected the applications. The Assembly also refused to admit Georgia, although a very strong appeal had been made on her behalf. The Assembly, however, accepted the recommendation of the Fifth Committee to admit these countries into the technical organizations working with the League, and, *inter alia*, that of the Labour Bureau. Nor did the Assembly agree to the applications for admission of Azerbaidjan and the Ukraine, as their applications were not recommended by the committee. The same remark applies to Lichtenstein, although, in this connection, a recommendation made by the committee, expressing a wish that the special committee appointed by the Council of the League of Nations to consider proposals with reference to amendments to the Covenant should also consider whether and in what manner it would be possible to attach to the League of Nations Sovereign States which, by reason of their small size, could not be admitted as ordinary members, received the unanimous assent of the Assembly. As to Armenia, the committee recommended the Assembly to inform the Government of Armenia that, although its request for admission had been examined with sympathy, circumstances were such as to preclude the Assembly from arriving at a definite decision, but that pending subsequent decisions of the Assembly the State might participate in such technical organizations of the League as were of general interest. In the Assembly itself a very strong appeal was made for the admission of Armenia, but met with equally strong opposition, and the latter gained the day. In these circumstances it was felt that the suggestion that Armenia might participate in the technical organizations should not be made, and it was withdrawn.

Whilst on the subject of Armenia, I would draw your attention to the motion proposed by Mr. Rowell (Assembly Document No. 247) which was passed by the Assembly at its meeting on the 16th December. On the 18th December the Assembly considered the report (Assembly Document No. 256) of the Special Committee on Armenia, and adopted the following motion :—

“The Assembly, reaffirming its resolution of the 22nd November, 1920, continues its co-operation with the Council, and entrusts the latter with the task, while referring the question if necessary to the Members of the League, of looking after the fate of Armenia, in whose favour the intervention of the League has already secured, besides marks of universal sympathy, the valuable intervention of President Wilson, and the Governments of Spain and Brazil.”

A suggestion made by Monsieur Jonnesco on behalf of the Roumanian Government, and contained in Assembly Document No. 259, was referred to the Council.

COMMITTEE NO. 6.

The report to the Assembly by Committee No. 6 on the economic weapon will be found in Assembly Document No. 193/1, and is as amended by the Assembly.

The second matter which this committee considered was the question of the reduction of armaments, and the committee's report will be found in Assembly Document No. 223. The report is, unfortunately, of little value, and the only definite proposal tending to limit the reduction of armaments, which will be found in the conclusion of resolution No. 3, led to considerable discussion in the Assembly, and at length, owing to opposition, the President found it advisable to suggest that it be passed as a recommendation. In its weakened form as a recommendation it was moved, with the other resolutions, but was not passed unanimously, Brazil, Chile, France, Greece, Poland, Roumania, and Uruguay voting against it. The motions as passed will be found in Assembly Document No. 238, and I draw your special attention to the concluding recommendation to the Council of the League.

The last matter before this committee was the question of mandates. Although it had been referred to the Assembly, there was in fact nothing for the committee to consider except a report by the Council to the Assembly (Document No. 161), and a memorandum from the German Government concerning the fate of the former German colonies (Assembly Document No. 106). As time drew on and the mandates were not forthcoming from the Allied Powers, the Council addressed to them a strongly worded note. In the meantime the committee became impatient and appointed a small sub-committee to consider the question. The result was a report (Assembly Document No. 246), which was submitted to the Assembly at its penultimate meeting, and the following recommendations proposed by the committee were put to the vote and carried :—

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1.) The members of the committee should not be dismissed | } Refers to the committee to be appointed to consider the reports of the mandatories. |
| without the assent of the majority of the Assembly | |
| (2.) The committee should contain at least one woman | } |
| (3.) The mandatories should be asked to present to the committee a report on the recent administration of the territories now confided to their care. | |

Recommendations as to Mandates “A” :—

- (4.) The Mandatory should not be allowed to make use of its position to increase its military strength.