

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Official Journal

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT No. 47

RECORDS

OF THE

SEVENTH ORDINARY SESSION

OF THE

ASSEMBLY

4

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEES

MINUTES

OF THE

THIRD COMMITTEE

(REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS)

GENEVA 1926

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF MEMBERS	5
AGENDA	7
FIRST MEETING, September 7th, 1926, at 6 p.m. :	
1. Election of Vice-Chairman.....	9
2. Agenda.....	9
SECOND MEETING, September 9th, 1926, at 4 p.m. :	
3. Procedure. General Discussion on Questions 1, 2 and 3 of the Agenda.....	9
THIRD MEETING, September 13th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m. :	
4. Welcome to the German Delegation	12
5. Private Manufacture : Statistical Information and Supervision of International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War : General Discussion.	12
FOURTH MEETING, September 13th, 1926, at 4.30 p.m. :	
6. Control of Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements of War : Adoption of Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegate of France and Appointment of a Rapporteur to the Assembly.....	17
7. Military Year-Book (document A. 32, pages 9 and 24).....	18
8. Pacific Settlement of International Disputes : Arbitration, Security and Reduction of Armaments.....	18
9. Appointment of a Sub-Committee.....	20
FIFTH MEETING, September 17th, 1926, at 3 p.m. :	
10. Supervision of the Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements of War : Adoption of the Report and Resolution (Annex 1).....	21
11. Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments (document A. 32, 1926. IX, pages 2-7 and 14-21).....	21
SIXTH MEETING, September 18th, 1926, at 3 p.m. :	
12. Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments : Work of the Preparatory Commission (<i>continuation</i>).....	27
13. Arbitration Conventions and Treaties of Mutual Security registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations : Draft Resolution submitted by the Norwegian Delegate.....	33
14. Arbitration and Security.....	33
15. Proposal by the French Delegation relative to the Preliminary Work on Disarmament.....	38
SEVENTH MEETING, September 20th, 1926, at 5 p.m. :	
16. Adoption of the Report and Resolution of the Third Committee concerning Arbitration and Security (Annex 2).....	39
17. Proposal submitted by the French Delegation regarding Preliminary Work on Disarmament (<i>continuation</i>).....	39
ANNEXES.....	45

LIST OF MEMBERS

President : His Excellency M. E. VILLEGAS (Chile).

Vice-President : His Excellency M. E. BUERO (Uruguay).

Members :

- Abysinia* : His Excellency M. LAGARDE, Duc d'ENTOTTO.
His Excellency M. Tomas Francisco MEDINA (Substitute).
- Albania* :
- Australia* : The Hon. J. G. LATHAM, C.M.G., K.C., M.P.
- Austria* : His Excellency M. PFLÜGL.
- Belgium* : M. DE BROUCKÈRE.
M. JANSON (Substitute).
- British Empire* : The Right Hon. the Earl of ONSLOW, C.B.E. ; or
The Right Hon. Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD, K.C.
- Bulgaria* : His Excellency M. BOUROFF.
- Canada* : The Hon. Philippe ROY, C.P., M.D. ; or
Sir Herbert AMES, Kt., LL.D.
- Chile* : His Excellency M. E. VILLEGAS.
- China* : M. Tchang GUI-TONG.
M. Chen TING (Substitute).
- Colombia* : His Excellency M. F. URRUTIA.
- Cuba* : His Excellency M. J. M. CORTINA.
M. R. H. PORTELA (Substitute).
- Czechoslovakia* : His Excellency Dr. E. BENEŠ.
His Excellency Dr. K. KROFTA (Substitute).
- Denmark* : M. MUNCH.
- Dominican Republic* : Dr. T. FRANCO FRANCO.
M. PARADAS (Substitute).
- Estonia* : General LAIDONER.
- Finland* : His Excellency M. R. HOLSTI.
- France* : M. PAUL-BONCOUR.
M. DE JOUVENEL.
M. JOUHAUX.
M. CASSIN.
- Germany* : Count BERNSTORFF.
Dr. VON BÜLOW.
- Greece* : His Excellency M. D. CACLAMANOS ; or
His Excellency M. S. POLYCHRONIADIS.
- Guatemala* :
- Haïti* : His Excellency M. A. NEMOURS.
- Hungary* : General G. TANCZOS.
M. DE VLADÁR.
- India* : Sir William VINCENT.
His Highness the Maharaja of KAPURTHALA, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.; and
Sir E. M. des Champs CHAMIER, K.C.I.E. (Substitutes).

- Irish Free State* : Mr. MACNEILL, D.Litt.
Mr. Daniel BINCHY, M.A., Ph.D.
- Italy* : His Excellency General DE MARINIS STENDARDO DI RIGIGLIANO.
Captain Don F. RUSPOLI.
Count M. GRAVINA.
- Japan* : His Excellency Viscount ISHII.
His Excellency M. N. SATO (Substitute).
- Latvia* : His Excellency M. W. SCHUMANS.
M. WELPS (Substitute).
- Liberia* : M. OOMS.
- Lithuania* : His Excellency M. V. SIDZIKAUSKAS.
- Luxemburg* : M. DIDERICH.
M. WEHRER (Substitute).
- Netherlands* : His Excellency Jonkheer J. LOUDON.
- New Zealand* : The Hon. Sir James PARR, K.C.M.G.
- Nicaragua* : His Excellency M. Tomas F. MEDINA.
- Norway* : Dr. Ch. L. LANGE.
- Panama* :
- Paraguay* : Dr. R. V. CABALLERO.
- Persia* : His Excellency M. AMID.
M. CHAYESTEH (Substitute).
- Poland* : M. Jean DEBSKI.
Prof. M. ROSTWOROWSKI.
- Portugal* : His Excellency General FREIRE D'ANDRADE.
M. d'ALMENDRA (Substitute).
- Roumania* : His Excellency M. N. P. COMNÈNE.
General DUMITRESCO.
M. NEGULESCO (Substitute).
- Salvador* : His Excellency Dr. G. GUERRERO.
- Kingdom of the Serbs,
Croats and Slovenes* : His Excellency Dr. L. MARKOVITCH.
Dr. Y. KRNYEVITCH.
- Siam* : His Highness Prince Vipulya SVASTIVONGS.
Nai Thawin ARTHAYUKTI (Substitute).
- South Africa* : Mr. J. S. SMIT.
- Sweden* : M. J. A. ENGBERG.
His Excellency Dr. T. M. HÖJER.
- Switzerland* : His Excellency M. G. MOTTA.
Colonel BOLLI (Substitute).
- Uruguay* : His Excellency M. E. BUERO; or
His Excellency M. B. FERNANDEZ Y MEDINA.
- Venezuela* : His Excellency M. D. ESCALANTE.
His Excellency M. C. PARRA-PÉREZ (Substitute).
-

THIRD COMMITTEE

(REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS).

AGENDA.

*Questions referred to the Third Committee by the Assembly on Monday,
September 6th (Afternoon Meeting) :*

I. CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS :

Report on the Work of the Preparatory Commission.
(Document A. 32, pages 2-7 and 14-21.)

2. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.

Report of the Council on the Proposals, Declarations and Suggestions made with
a View to the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.
(Document A. 32, pages 2 and 12-14.)

3. ARBITRATION, SECURITY AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

Report of the Council on the Progress which has been achieved from the Point
of View of General Security by the Conclusion of Conventions and Treaties.
(Document A. 32, pages 2 and 10-12.)

*Questions referred to the Third Committee by the Assembly on Friday,
September 10th (Afternoon Meeting) :*

4. PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.
(Document A. 32, pages 7-8 and 21-24, and Document A. 47.)

**5. STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON THE TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF
WAR.**
(Document A. 32, pages 8-9 and 24.)

6. MILITARY YEAR-BOOK.
(Document A. 32, pages 9 and 24.)

**7. SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS
OF WAR.**
(Document A. 32, pages 24-25.)

FIRST MEETING

Held on Tuesday, September 7th, 1926, at 6 p.m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

1. — Election of Vice-Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for the honour they had done him in electing him Chairman. He asked the Committee to elect its Vice-Chairman.

M. PORTELA (Cuba) proposed as Vice-Chairman of the Committee M. Buero (Uruguay), whose capability was well known to all the members of the Committee.

This proposal was supported by several delegations.

M. BUERO *was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.*

M. BUERO (Uruguay) (Vice-Chairman) thanked his colleagues in the name of his country for the honour they had just done him in electing him Vice-Chairman. He wished particularly to thank the delegate of Cuba for his courtesy in proposing him.

2. — Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee if they had any observations to make regarding the agenda (see Agenda, page 7, questions 1, 2 and 3).

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) asked the Chairman whether the question of the private manufacture of arms ought not to be on the agenda.

The CHAIRMAN replied that this question had not so far been referred to the Committee by the Assembly, but that it might be so referred later on.

The meeting closed at 6.15 p.m.

SECOND MEETING

Held on Thursday, September 9th, 1926, at 4 p.m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

3. — Procedure : General Discussion on Questions 1, 2 and 3 of the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the questions before the Committee were items 7, 8 and 20 of the report by the Council to the Assembly (document A. 32, 1926). He asked the members of the Committee to offer suggestions as to procedure.

The Chairman proposed to discuss the questions of arbitration, security, disarmament and the pacific settlement of international disputes as a whole, as these questions were closely related and formed items 1, 2 and 3 on the agenda.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) considered that the question which came first in order was that of the pacific settlement of international disputes. If this question could be settled, that of disarmament would at the same time be suitably solved. He recalled that the problem of disarmament was bound to that of security, and that security could only be assured by a system which put States in a position where they could not be

attacked and which allowed the practical and judicial settlement of all international disputes by peaceful methods. It was this system that must be sought.

The speaker suggested that there was a contradiction in the report of the Council. This report began with an optimism which was encouraging to everyone if well founded, but concluded with disappointing statements which suggested that at the moment no action could be taken. He wished to quote the following passage from the report :

“ The general impression given by these proposals, declarations and suggestions is that the movement for the pacific settlement of international disputes which has undoubtedly started in the public opinion of all civilised nations has acquired an ever-increasing force and can already be regarded as part of the practical policy which a number of States are in a position to adopt.

“ ...It is quite clear that their authors do not wish to confine themselves to the field covered by the Protocol or to the general ideas on which it is based. In other words, the movement for the pacific settlement of international disputes goes beyond the scope of the Protocol and may be said to be independent of it. ”

Such optimism seemed to him somewhat exaggerated when followed by the conclusions of the same report with regard to special agreements :

“ ...We may express the hope that their development will help to bring about the general solution which the Assembly has so often endeavoured to find. ”

It seemed that an endeavour was being made in the report to find some form of words which would give satisfaction to everyone, but these statements did not correspond with the facts. He considered that the problem of the pacific settlement of international disputes was one of such importance and gravity that the Third Committee should examine again the means by which it might reach more precise, more practical and more concrete conclusions than those submitted in the report of the Council. If the League of Nations limited itself merely to the registration of as many separate agreements as was possible, agreements which were not capable of assuring the necessary element of security for world peace, its activity would be extremely small. M. Markovitch therefore asked the members of the Third Committee not to bind themselves by the conclusions of the report but to seek for general principles which might serve as a guarantee for the peace of the world. He considered that it was possible to gather from particular agreements certain principles having a general value which would assist in the solution of this problem. This solution would not be in such a general form as that suggested by the Geneva Protocol, but it would establish a basis for general agreements.

M. CABALLERO (Paraguay) said that, at the time when the Geneva Protocol was rejected, a Committee was appointed to study the question of disarmament. He would like to have some information as to the work that had already been done by that Committee.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) was extremely impressed with the remarks of the delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes who had enunciated a profound truth when he had shown the direct relations existing between the reduction and limitation of armaments, and the guarantees of security which must be closely connected with the submission to arbitration of international disputes.

The delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had tendered posthumous homage to the Protocol, and the speaker recalled with regret that it was two years ago in this same room that the Protocol was drawn up.

The French delegate wondered whether the suggestion made by M. Markovitch in his observations on the report, which he considered rather curtailed, was a complete and more forceful statement of the necessary union between the work of disarmament — regarding which M. Caballero had asked for information — and the guarantee of security bound up with the general submission to arbitration of international disputes. If this was the tenure of M. Markovitch's statement, the French delegate suggested that the Third Committee would do well to draw the attention of the Assembly, and particularly of the Council, to this subject.

He considered, however, that the wisest plan would be to follow the general line of the suggestions contained in the Protocol, or to look for other analogous suggestions ; and he wondered if this was the desire of M. Markovitch. It was certainly to be regretted that the Protocol had not been ratified by a sufficient number of Powers, but it was because the text of the Protocol was very complete that he foresaw considerable difficulty if an attempt were made to substitute for it another Protocol. He feared that, if an attempt were made to do this, the result would only be to weaken the statement of a principle to which it would be necessary to return some day and which had animated the partial agreements which would not exist without it.

He thought that on this account the value of partial agreements should not be underestimated. By an increase in the number of less general but more precise agreements, a state of security would ultimately be reached similar to that which had been sought by the framers of the Protocol. It was essential that these partial agreements should finally cover all the possibilities of conflict, and, above all, that they should continue to find inspiration in the principles contained in the Protocol.

The League of Nations should particularly take care lest, under the guise of partial agreements, the old alliances which had caused so much suffering should again be produced. The work of the Third Committee should be to draw up a very brief statement, while clearly and firmly expressing its wish that these partial agreements should increase in number, than which

nothing could be better. Attempts in any other direction would run the risk of proving futile and even of compromising the extremely happy results already obtained.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) agreed in general with the delegate of France. He had only wished to lay stress on the close union which existed between the problem of disarmament and the pacific settlement of international disputes, and he had wished particularly to make this observation at a time when the work of the Disarmament Conference had to be examined. He did not wish in any way to diminish the value of the Protocol and had not thought that these should be a further discussion on the question. He had only desired to state that, even if partial agreements contributed to the realisation of security, they could at no time provide a definite solution of this problem. He saw in them an efficient means for maintaining peace, but he felt that everyone would agree with him that since there could be no disarmament without arbitration and without security, partial agreements could not be accepted as an absolute security. Consequently, it was wise to seek in these partial agreements for certain essential truths and certain general principles which would serve as a rule and an example to be followed in the future.

M. LANGE (Norway) suggested that there was in the Committee some doubt as to the course to be pursued in examining points 2 and 3 of the agenda. This uncertainty was inevitable, as these two questions had been submitted by the Assembly at the same time, to the First and the Third Committees. It would therefore be necessary to draw a line between that which would be suitable for discussion in the Third Committee and that which would be within the competence of the First. He felt that the Third Committee could well compare the system underlying the application of the three great principles which were the foundation of the Protocol (Arbitration, Security, Disarmament) with the system of partial agreements; but, in order to do this, it would be necessary for the members of the Committee to have access to certain documents which had been submitted to the Council by the Legal Section of the Secretariat, particularly documents C. 33 and C. 34.

He agreed with the delegate of Paraguay that the principal object of the Third Committee would be the examination of the work which had already been accomplished and which was being carried on in the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

While agreeing with the delegate of France as to the importance of the Protocol, he wished to remark that this system was still incomplete in certain respects. For example, the Protocol had merely expressed the desire for a conference on disarmament and this omission had been realised by the sixth session of the Assembly, which had asked for the establishment of a Preparatory Commission for this Conference.

In conclusion, he suggested that it would be unwise to continue a theoretical debate until the members of the Committee had had an opportunity to study the documents of the Council, which would form the basis of their examination of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal of M. Lange constituted a kind of preliminary question, and asked the opinion of the Committee upon it.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) wished to know what was the exact tenor of M. Lange's suggestion. Did he propose to adjourn the discussion?

The SECRETARY said that the documents mentioned by M. Lange had been prepared by the Secretariat for the use of the Council, but that a copy could be supplied to each delegation.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee was in agreement with M. Lange's proposal and that this implied the treatment together of the first three questions on the agenda at the following meeting.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) did not see how these questions could be dealt with simultaneously. On the other hand, he considered that, as regards the first question, a certain number of delegates would wish, in the first place, to have information as to the actual state of the preparatory work.

He suggested, however, that there was a connection between the work of the First and the Third Committees, and it might be dangerous to work on parallel lines without liaison. While waiting for the distribution of the documents asked for by M. Lange, perhaps the officers of the First and Third Committees might get in touch.

M. LANGE (Norway) supported the suggestion of M. Paul-Boncour.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) added that it must be understood that the Third Committee would keep its freedom of action and that it would probably have to study the second and the third questions on the agenda before the First Committee could take them up.

M. BUERO (Uruguay) suggested that as the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, M. Loudon, was present as a member of the Third Committee, it would perhaps be possible to ask him to give the Committee at the next meeting the information as to the work of this Commission for which it was waiting.

M. LOUDON (Netherlands) said that he would be in a position at the beginning of the following week to give any information asked for as to the state of the work of the Preparatory Commission and the Sub-Commissions, particularly of Sub-Commission A, which was dealing with military matters from the technical aspect.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee was agreed to adjourn till the beginning of the following week when M. Loudon would be in a position to give the report for which he had been asked.

The meeting closed at 5.25 p.m.

THIRD MEETING

Held on Monday, September 13th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

4. — Welcome to the German Delegation.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the representative of Germany, who was sitting for the first time on the Committee.

5. — Private Manufacture : Statistical Information and Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War : General Discussion.

The CHAIRMAN opened the general discussion on the following items of the agenda :

4. Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements of War ;
5. Statistical Information on the Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War ;
7. Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War.

M. GUERRERO (Salvador), speaking as author of the resolutions adopted by the last Assembly, said that there was a very close relation between these three items on the agenda. He noted that the majority of the Governments found it difficult to accept the suggestions of the last Assembly relative to the adoption of a uniform formula for international statistics for the private manufacture of arms until the Convention on Traffic in Arms had come into force. Unfortunately, since the Convention had been signed in 1925, very few of the States signatories had ratified it.

The problem of the supervision of the trade in arms and that of private manufacture were two questions which could not be dealt with separately, as had been shown on several occasions by the French representative, who had stated that it was impossible to solve the problem of the trade in arms without having already solved the problem of manufacture.

The speaker felt that they would remain in this vicious circle so long as the Convention on Private Manufacture was not ratified. He wished to recall the words of the report which he had submitted to the Assembly in 1925, to the following effect :

“ The time has come when preparations must be made as rapidly as possible for a conference to conclude a Convention on the Supervision of the Manufacture of Arms, in agreement with the steps already taken in this direction by former Assemblies and by the Council. ”

Document A. 47 contained elsewhere a report by M. Beneš, which was adopted by the Council on September 4th, 1926, as well as several other documents which gave the history of the question during the current year.

The wish of the Assembly in 1925 to see an international conference convoked this year on the subject of the private manufacture of arms had not yet been gratified, but the drafts prepared were such as would serve as a basis for a conference similar to that which met in May 1925. According to M. Guerrero, the Assembly should itself insist that, on the basis of such a preliminary draft, the question might take a further and possibly a decisive step.

M. Guerrero did not feel that he was authorised to submit a resolution on this subject, but he hoped that the discussions might lead to some definite conclusion.

It was important to put into force the Convention on the International Supervision of the Trade in Arms, which was signed some fifteen months ago but which it had not been possible to ratify, in particular, because those States which were non-producing were awaiting the second Convention, that on the Control of Private Manufacture, which would complete the first.

He concluded by emphasising that it was necessary to arrive at a resolution which might enable the Council to call a conference with a view to drawing up this second Convention.

M. LANGE (Norway) agreed with the suggestions made by M. Guerrero, and he wished to press the argument put forward by the representative of Salvador that there was a visible liaison between the problem of the supervision of the trade in arms and the supervision of private manufacture.

All those who had attended the Conference in 1925 remembered that certain States had refused to agree to a convention on the subject of the supervision of the trade in arms, and that

the resolution which appeared on page 3 of document A. 47 was the result of a compromise which it had been difficult to reach. He was astonished to find it stated that there was now a totally different relationship, viz., that between the problem of the supervision of private manufacture and the whole general problem of the reduction of armaments. He would be glad to know why the connection between these two questions was closer than that between the trade in arms and private manufacture.

However, he was unable to believe that the problems could not be solved separately. Moreover, by the terms of Article 8 of the Covenant, the supervision of private manufacture was one of the tasks assigned to the League of Nations, and all the States which had signed the Covenant had admitted the dire effects of this manufacture and the necessity of abolishing them.

This was an urgent task. Since 1921 or 1922, it had been the object of numerous enquiries, and the Committee of Enquiry which was directed to prepare a draft convention found that this draft could not be improved upon. He would like to know the reasons which prevented the convening of a conference this year to study this question.

Like M. Guerrero, the speaker insisted that the Third Committee should submit a resolution asking the Council, in definite terms, to call this conference without delay.

General LAIDONER (Estonia) agreed with the suggestions made by the delegates of Salvador and Norway.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) likewise agreed with M. Guerrero. He felt that there was an intimate connection between the problem of the manufacture of arms and the question of the international trade in arms. He referred to the provisional report of the Council, in which it was stated that the Council had decided to send the preliminary draft elaborated by the Committee of Enquiry to the Assembly purely for information. If it was a question of the postponement of an international conference for the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition until the general problem of disarmament had been solved, he was quite unable to support such a suggestion. If, on the other hand, the Council wished not only to note the existing connection between the problems of the international trade in arms and the question of manufacture, but also — and with this he fully agreed — the connection with the general problem of disarmament, he was in agreement with the words which he found in the report of the Council. He would be glad to have some information on this point.

Mr. LATHAM (Australia) said that there were different aspects of the problem submitted to the Third Committee, and every speaker had pointed out that those problems were inter-related. But they were not solving the problem by pointing out this relation. He agreed that the Committee was not prepared that morning to discuss the question before them. As the question of the reduction of armaments would be laid before the Committee, it was not, in his opinion, useful to continue the present discussion.

Count BERNSTORFF (Germany) said that he was greatly moved by the kind words which had been addressed to the German delegation. He wished to affirm that it would collaborate with the utmost loyalty and diligence in the work of the Assembly. He felt, however, that, if two conferences were meeting at the same time, there would perhaps be considerable difficulties to overcome, particularly as regards the delegates who were called upon to represent the various Governments. He suggested as a possible solution of the problem that they should entrust the question of private manufacture to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France), in replying to questions submitted by several delegates, explained that the decision of the Council was founded upon the feeling that the draft resolution submitted by the Committee of Enquiry was so complete and so precise that the Third Committee had really nothing to add to it; and that it could be sent to the Assembly and, if it were felt wise, to a conference for the supervision of private manufacture.

The Council had also felt that there was an undoubted liaison between this problem and that of the general reduction of armaments and of the supervision of this reduction. The speaker recalled that, in the course of previous discussions, he had already emphasised the difficulties which would present themselves as regards the supervision of this trade if it were not joined to the supervision of private manufacture. These apprehensions had been justified by the facts. Only one country, France, had ratified the Convention on the Trade in Arms. Various delegations had observed that the non-ratification of this Convention by their countries was due entirely to the difficulty of separating the question of private manufacture and that of the trade. The French delegate wished to remark that it would have been preferable to have noticed beforehand this serious difficulty. He drew attention to the danger which confronted the League of Nations, in studying these problems, if it elaborated conventions which, though signed by the delegates of Governments, were not ratified by the Governments themselves.

He felt that private manufacture was at least as much connected with the reduction of armaments and with the international supervision of the reduction of armaments as it was with the trade in arms. The speaker agreed with the German delegate in drawing the attention of his colleagues to the necessity of avoiding double work. While the Conference on the Supervision of Private Manufacture would be meeting, the technical committees and the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament would not cease their activities. Again, private manufacture was only a part of the general problem, the proof being that the technical committees on disarmament had already had occasion to touch upon this question in the course of their work. The situation would be most difficult if a conference were deliberating on a particular chapter of the general problem of disarmament, with which the organisations of the League of Nations and the

Preparatory Commission itself were already dealing. Such a procedure would possibly lead to contradiction, particularly on the vital point of supervision. It must not be forgotten that it was this question of supervision which had finally made the work pursued by the Conference on the Trade in Arms so difficult.

Certain States, not being producers, found themselves in a situation inferior to that of producing States. International supervision increased this inferiority, and the majority of the delegations had been unable to accept it.

The same objection, on grounds both of logic and justice, would arise as regards the question of manufacture if it should be examined outside the general problem. Certain nations would say that they had no State arsenals, that it was their private industry which produced for them, and that here they were undergoing a supervision to which nations possessing arsenals were not subjected. These nations would reject this supervision as they had rejected it for the trade. The result would be that, without this control, the inconveniences of private manufacture would remain, whatever conventions were adopted. It was therefore absolutely necessary not to lose sight of the fact that the question with which they were dealing was only part of a whole. It was the general question which must be dealt with. Trade and private manufacture were the vital elements on which to found an international convention for the limitation and reduction of armaments. If the League of Nations were capable of solving this general question, the individual problems would be solved with it. If the League of Nations were unable to do this, all that could be done as regards the individual problems would be an outward show, which was the last thing desirable in the work of the League of Nations.

If the members of the Third Committee thought that an international conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments, with the consequently necessary supervision, could not meet, they would be quite right in wishing to solve at the present time at least one of the particular aspects of the problem, that of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms; but this idea was not shared by the French delegate, who held the opinion that such a conference could meet very shortly. Not only could it meet but it must meet, unless the League of Nations were to undergo a most serious setback.

It was necessary to prepare as soon as possible an international convention for the limitation and reduction of armaments with the necessary supervision. Without such a convention, the race of armaments would begin again.

The speaker recalled that it was the Third Committee which had taken the initiative last year in the preparatory work of disarmament. It had taken it after the abandonment of the General Protocol of Security, before the conclusion of the Treaties of Locarno, and before the entry of Germany into the League of Nations. The Committee could well be congratulated upon this act of faith. The Committees which were dealing with the work were meeting with serious difficulties, and many shades of opinion were being brought to light. This was not surprising, for it was the first time that the problem had been approached seriously.

The time had come once more for the Third Committee to show its firm desire for success in the problem of disarmament. Its task was very precise. Moreover, the initiative should come from a Committee like this one, where all the States Members of the League of Nations were represented. The Preparatory Commission was only an instrument and all the States were not represented on it.

The Third Committee must seek to hasten the meeting of a conference which would examine the problem in its entirety. Once the general problem were solved, the particular points, such as private manufacture of arms and trade in arms, would be solved at the same time.

M. GUERRERO (Salvador), in reply to the French delegate, recalled the fact that last year in May and June it had been said several times at the Conference on the International Trade in Arms that it was impossible to recommend the supervision of the trade in arms without at the same time recommending the supervision of the manufacture of arms.

M. Paul-Boncour had observed that the question of private manufacture was only a part of the general problem of disarmament, but the speaker thought that the first chapter of the book of disarmament had already been written in 1925 at the time of the regulation of the supervision of the international trade in arms. The second chapter would comprise the supervision of private manufacture, and the third would deal with the general problem of disarmament.

He wished to suggest that the prestige of the League of Nations would be lessened if such a categorical resolution as that adopted by the Assembly in 1925, asking that a conference should establish the control of private manufacture, were annulled by a resolution of the Assembly in 1926. It must be remembered that, by joining this problem to the more general problem of disarmament, they would be practically burying it. Disarmament was a lengthy task, and there were many obstacles.

In conclusion, he was not of the opinion that the question should be referred to the Preparatory Commission, and he insisted that the Council should decide soon to convene a conference to examine the question of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms.

M. KROFTA (Czechoslovakia) supported the clear and definite explanations which had just been given by the delegate of France. He hoped that a Disarmament Conference would be able to meet next year.

M. DE BROUCKÈRE (Belgium) had been particularly struck with the arguments presented by M. Paul-Boncour, and felt that the members of the Third Committee should take into serious consideration the connection which existed between the problem of the private manufacture of arms and the general problem of disarmament.

He did not wish to give a definite expression of opinion as to the arguments suggested by

certain of his colleagues in favour of the calling of the Conference on the Private Manufacture of Arms, arguments which were undoubtedly of value. But he wished to appeal strongly to his colleagues who had spoken suggesting that the proposed meeting was the only thing to be worked for, and to suggest that one could infer from this that they had decided, or were resigned to the decision, to postpone indefinitely the general Disarmament Conference. In this question, the League of Nations was risking all its prestige and possibly its whole future.

He recalled the debates which had taken place last year. There had been two lines of opinion: certain members had felt that it was unwise, under present circumstances, to be in too great a hurry, but the majority, and finally the whole Committee, had declared that the work of disarmament was for the League of Nations an absolute duty, which could not be impeded.

The speaker felt that, after the solemn meeting which had taken place at the Assembly when Germany entered the League of Nations, the Third Committee could not state nor allow it to be believed that a disarmament conference was not anticipated in the near future. This would be a blow which public opinion could never overlook. Moreover, the future would then be very dark.

He suggested that, even if the Assembly could call a conference on the supervision of the manufacture of arms, and that this conference had reasonable prospects of success, the programme of its work should be enlarged and should not be limited to private manufacture, since there was an intimate connection between the problem of private manufacture and that of manufacture by the State.

The reason why so many countries wished to see a conference called at an early date was that a Convention on the International Trade in Arms must rest without practical effect as long as the manufacture was not seriously supervised as a whole. If public manufacture was not supervised as well as private manufacture, there was a risk of treating very unequally various States which would never submit to it.

He did not feel, moreover, that the control of public manufacture was impossible. He referred to the answer made by his Government to the questionnaire, which stated that this supervision existed in Belgium.

The Belgian delegate feared also that, in wishing to deal with the general problem of disarmament in several separate chapters, the result would be to leave without a conclusion, the first chapter, which dealt with the supervision of the trade in arms, because the second chapter encroached upon the first, and thus a whole series of chapters would remain incomplete. He felt that a book written in this manner would be very difficult to read and would be inconclusive.

Referring to the statement by the delegate of France that his country had been the only one to ratify the Convention, the Belgian delegate said that many countries, Belgium in particular, were ready to make this ratification on condition that other producing States did so as well. Negotiations were in progress for the ratification by all producing States on the same day, and it was hoped that these negotiations would soon reach a successful conclusion.

In conclusion, if a sufficient number of ideas as to the subject of private manufacture were held in common, they could go ahead and examine the question whether the chapter on the manufacture of arms should be separated from the rest of the book; this could be done but on condition that the book in its entirety should not be delayed.

General DE MARINIS (Italy) supported the statement made by M. Paul-Boncour. There was a close relation between the problem of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and the more general problem of disarmament. He did not share the fears expressed by the delegate of Salvador. He did not believe that the subject would be buried; he felt, on the other hand, that they might congratulate themselves upon the way in which the preparatory work had hitherto opened out and upon the hope which it gave of calling a conference without much delay.

He felt that the Third Committee would gain increased confidence when it received the report which M. Loudon would present for the Disarmament Committee.

In speaking of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms, the Italian delegate remarked that twenty-five Governments only had acknowledged the questionnaire, and that three of these Governments had said that they would not reply to the questions. The examination of these answers had persuaded him that he could not entirely support the conclusions of the Committee of Enquiry to the effect that its preliminary draft was in conformity with the spirit of these replies. On the other hand, this preliminary draft would have to be reconsidered, and the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament might be entrusted with the work.

Viscount ISHII (Japan) wished to state the reasons which had led him to give his support to the report of M. Beneš. In view of the considerations presented by the delegate of France, he would confine himself to a short speech.

He felt that there was undoubtedly a very close connection between the various points with which the different organisations of the League of Nations were dealing in this connection. He drew attention to the fact, however, that, if it were desired to hasten the supervision of the private manufacture of arms, it had not yet been decided what kind of arms and ammunition was being dealt with. This question was one of the most important of those with which the Preparatory Commission was actually dealing, and in raising the subject now there was a risk of two committees doing the same work with possibly contradictory results.

He felt that a premature calling of a conference for the supervision of the manufacture of arms and ammunition would not produce the result which the League of Nations had the right to expect from it.

Lord ONSLOW (British Empire) said that he had heard with great interest the speeches of the honourable delegates for France, Czechoslovakia, Italy and Japan. Stress had been laid by M. Guerrero on the conclusion arrived at by the Conference which had met the previous year. Lord Onslow then quoted the following :

“ That the Convention of to-day's date must be considered as an important step towards a general system of international agreements regarding arms and ammunition and implements of war, and that it is desirable that the international aspect of the manufacture of such arms, ammunition and implements of war should receive early consideration by the different Governments. ”

He pointed out that, when that resolution was passed, the situation had been very different from what it was that day. In March, the Council had taken the whole matter into careful consideration and established the Preparatory Commission, which met in May. The technical sub-committees of that Commission had not yet completed their labours, and he thought that it would be a great pity if the Committee took any steps which might jeopardise the success of the International Conference on Disarmament.

As M. Paul-Boncour had observed, the task before the Assembly and the Preparatory Commission was a tremendous one, and he thought, therefore, that the Committee should proceed with the greatest caution. He reminded the Committee that it had not yet heard the results of the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission, which would be communicated by M. Loudon in due course.

The only Power which had actually notified ratification of the previous year's Convention was, as M. Paul-Boncour had said, the French Republic. The British Government felt that it was in the interests of all arms-producing States to ratify the Convention simultaneously, and they had recently made a suggestion to this effect to various Governments. The representatives of these Governments were all present and knew the views put forward and the replies which had been sent. He did not despair at all that the question of ratification would be duly considered, though in many cases such a constitutional question took some time. He did not feel the necessity of urging on the question of a separate conference in order to secure the ratification of the agreement drawn up at the last one. He therefore supported the proposals of the Committee of the Council and of the Council.

M. LANGE (Norway) suggested that the Committee might congratulate itself on the result of M. Guerrero's action at the beginning of the discussion, as it had led those who were in the circle of the initiated to make satisfactory declarations.

M. Paul-Boncour had shown a remarkable optimism, and at the same time a will to make the work of the Preparatory Commission succeed his statements, which would be a bond of union between that orator and those who had listened to him were of great value. Likewise, the representative of Italy had shown an optimism all the more significant because it had not always characterised his utterances.

This was gratifying, but he wondered whether one could truly accuse the Committee of hampering the preparatory work for the Conference on Disarmament, and, however likely this idea might seem in the spirit of certain speakers, he felt that he must protest.

If the Council was convinced that there was an intimate connection between the general problem of disarmament and that of the supervision of private manufacture, was it not extraordinary that they had only discovered its existence on September 3rd? If this connection was so obvious, why did the question of the supervision of private manufacture not appear in the questionnaire prepared for the work of the Preparatory Commission? Until September 3rd, there had been a general conviction that the question of the supervision of private manufacture could be solved independently.

If, as M. Guerrero had said, a book was composed of chapters, a beginning could and should be made by preparing certain of them individually, for they could not all be written together. Was it indispensable to postpone all close study of the question in a conference until the preparatory work for the Conference on Disarmament had been terminated and the said Conference could deal with it? M. Lange reserved his reply to this question until the Committee had heard the report of M. Loudon.

M. Paul-Boncour had raised certain questions when pointing out the difficulties which would be encountered by States which did not possess public arsenals and had to rely upon private manufacture. This was not a new question and, moreover, he thought he was right in saying that it would only apply to a very small number of countries.

Actually, the question of supervision of private manufacture had always been considered as closely related to that of the question of trade in arms, and it had been made a moral obligation upon the producing countries to complete the system of supervision of this trade by measures which, when applied to certain countries, affected these said countries somewhat unjustly.

M. Lange wished to reserve his opinion until he had heard the further debate on the subject.

M. GUERRERO (Salvador) stated that he agreed with the Belgian delegate, and also with the other members of the Committee, that the most urgent task for the League of Nations was disarmament, or at least the reduction of armaments. He wished also to support the protest made by M. Lange. So far from thinking that the suggestions made could hamper the work of the Conference on Disarmament, he would be glad to see a conference called the next day which might deal with the private manufacture and the day following the general Conference on Disarmament. He would even wish that this order might be changed, and that the Conference on

Disarmament might meet first. However, he felt that agreement on the subject of disarmament would be more easily attained if there was first of all an agreement on private manufacture.

In conclusion, M. Guerrero said that he agreed with the proposal which would be made by the French delegation, and the terms of which he knew.

M. JOUHAUX (France) wished to avoid any confusion and to dispel the impression that dilatory methods were being used to delay the end which the different Assemblies had had in view.

He had been obliged to note that, in the discussion upon the international trade in arms, reservations had been made by the non-producing countries at the same time that producing countries had bound themselves by stipulations to give to the others the security for which they were waiting.

It would, however, be necessary to apply the decisions of the Assembly as to the International Conference on the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments, for, in the eyes of public opinion, the important point was the general question of disarmament. If public opinion felt that it was desired to postpone the date of the Disarmament Conference in order to hold beforehand a Conference on the Supervision of Private Manufacture, the League of Nations might perhaps have made some progress with this last problem, but it would have lessened the enthusiasm of the whole world which was so necessary to it. For these reasons, M. Jouhaux agreed with M. Paul-Boncour in adding to the general resolution an additional paragraph to the following effect :

“ That enquiries should be continued into the question of private manufacture, in order that it may be included in the programme of the Disarmament Conference, provided that that Conference can be convened before the meeting of the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly, or, if that should not be the case, in order that these questions might be the subject of a special conference, which should be convened at the earliest possible moment. ”

Thus, concluded M. Jouhaux, the Committee would carry out the engagements which it had made, and would realise those made by the Assembly. If the general Conference on Disarmament did not meet, the Committee would be free from responsibility. On the other hand, the work would continue, since the special Conference on the Supervision of Private Manufacture would be held.

M. MUNCH (Denmark) thought that all the members of the Committee would be glad to learn that M. Paul-Boncour hoped that the Disarmament Conference would be able to meet in a short time. The Danish delegate felt that this hope was shared by the delegates of several other States represented on the Preparatory Commission and on the Council. It would undoubtedly be useful for the Assembly to emphasise this hope in a resolution.

He did not see the necessity of suspending or abandoning the conference suggested for the discussion of the private manufacture of arms even if the Disarmament Conference was as near as they hoped. If they were to be satisfied with a Convention as modest as that which had been circulated as a draft, he was not under the impression that there was a very close connection between such a convention and a general reduction of armaments. Such a convention could well be applied before the general reduction took place. This would not prevent them from going further in the direction of the supervision of private manufacture after the preparatory work had been finished and a general reduction of armaments could be realised. It might even be possible to obtain the general prohibition of this manufacture, which was so dangerous to the interests of peace.

In conclusion, he agreed with the views expressed by the honourable delegate of Salvador and by the other members of the Committee in agreement with him. However, it would perhaps be useful that this question should be studied by a sub-committee before any decision was taken.

M. DIDERICH (Luxemburg) felt that the proposal of M. Jouhaux seemed to voice the general opinion. He supported a proposal which would allow the Committee to conclude successfully and quickly the serious and weighty question of disarmament. Thus the eloquent words of the representative of France at the historical meeting of the Assembly on September 10th would be realised : “ Away with rifles, guns, machine-guns ! ”

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee would meet again at 4.30 p.m. to vote upon the proposal of M. Jouhaux and to examine the following items on the agenda : the *Military Year-Book*, the pacific settlement of international disputes; arbitration, security and the reduction of armaments.

On the following Wednesday, M. Loudon would present his report upon the work of the Preparatory Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 1.20 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING

Held on Monday, September 13th, 1926, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

6. — Control of Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements of War : Adoption of a Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegate of France and Appointment of a Rapporteur to the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there were no objections to the draft resolution submitted by the French delegate as follows :

“ The Assembly once again draws attention to the close connection which exists between the question of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war and the international trade in these articles ;

“ It notes that up to the present the Convention on the Supervision of the International Trade has been ratified by only one signatory country, and hopes that the efforts which are being made to obtain the ratification of the principal producing countries will soon be successful ;

“ It notes the work which has been carried out under the direction of the Council with regard to the supervision of private manufacture ;

“ It declares that it is in agreement with the Council as regards the connection which exists between this question and the whole problem now being examined by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference ;

“ It lays stress upon the necessity of concluding a convention as soon as possible, though it recognises that priority must be accorded to work in connection with the Convention on Disarmament ;

“ It therefore proposes that the Council should continue its enquiries regarding private manufacture, in order that these questions may be included in the programme of the Disarmament Conference, if this Conference can be convened before the eighth session of the Assembly, or, if that is impossible, in order that a special conference may be convened as soon as possible to deal with the matter. ”

The resolution was adopted.

On the proposal of M. JOUHAUX, M. GUERRERO (Salvador) was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly.

7. — Military Year-Book (Document A. 32, 1926. IX, pages 9 and 24).

M. JOUHAUX (France) suggested that it would be to the general interest that the information contained in the *Military Year-Book* should be given on a uniform plan by the various States and that a very clear distinction should be made between home forces and those which have to be supported by nations which are responsible for overseas territory.

The French representative asked whether the references in this *Military Year-Book*, which was in itself an excellent publication, could not be made somewhat more exact. The information as a whole contained in this work would thus have considerably greater value.

Replying to a question put by the Chairman, M. Jouhaux remarked that he was not putting forward a definite proposal but merely a suggestion. It was evident that, in the *Military Year-Book*, a distinction must be made between the home effectives and colonial forces. Moreover, he would suggest that States which noticed mistakes might communicate them to the Secretariat in order that they might be rectified.

General DE MARINIS (Italy) thought that the Secretariat deserved praise for the way in which it accomplished the work entrusted to it. The *Military Year-Book* now contained much more information than in the past.

M. LANGE (Norway) supported the observation of the previous speaker. He felt that the *Military Year-Book* was a source of extremely valuable information for the study of the problem of disarmament. He wished, however, to ask if this publication could not in future appear every two years, for reasons of economy.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the expenses of printing were partly covered by the sales.

8. — Pacific Settlement of International Disputes : Arbitration : Security and the Reduction of Armaments (Document A. 32, 1926. IX, pages 2 and 10-14).

The CHAIRMAN explained to the delegates that he was in touch with the Chairman of the First Committee in order to study with him the procedure which it would be suitable to follow in examining those questions concerning both Committees.

M. MOTTA, Chairman of the First Committee, said he would offer some suggestions later on.

M. LANGE (Norway) recalled that it was upon his request that document C. 34 had been distributed to this Committee. He remarked how difficult it was, after a study of only a few days, to comment on the work examined. Nevertheless, it would be possible, in considering it from the historical point of view, to realise at once that such study had only a limited scope.

In the opinion of M. Lange, it was not only a question of making a statement as to the efforts made towards the peaceful or judicial settlement of international disputes. He read from document C. 34, 1926, page 1, as follows :

“ It has not been possible in this memorandum to deal with conventions on the subject which have neither been registered nor deposited with the Secretariat. It may, however, be assumed that such instruments are very few in number. ”

The speaker was surprised that the unregistered conventions had not been taken into account. There were collections of treaties which were well known by all the historians and lawyers. It would be possible to draw conclusions from them. Such work would not be difficult. The

results of such researches would be very interesting, as they would prove whether, in certain parts of the world, there was what one might call "a sphere of pacification".

He thought, moreover, that, in the text he had just quoted, it was hardly true to say that the number of unregistered conventions was small. More than ten years ago, when acting for the Inter-Parliamentary Union, he had made a study of the extension of obligatory arbitration in the world. There were then two elements : treaties of arbitration properly so called and clauses of arbitration included in other treaties.

The speaker had found about 130 treaties of arbitration, most of them of limited extent and efficacy, and about 130 arbitration clauses. He thought that the majority of these agreements were still in force. There might clearly be widely differing opinions on the question whether such a number of treaties was restricted or not, but, in any case, it was a considerably larger number than those mentioned in the collection.

He wished to recall that, at the last meeting, the delegate for the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, M. Markovitch, had made some extremely interesting observations, and he wondered whether this delegate intended to put before the Committee some suggestions as to the line to be taken by the Assembly of the League of Nations as regards the movement in favour of arbitration. The speaker felt that this would be an extremely useful work, and he wondered whether the Committee could direct its efforts in this direction. It was possible to imagine some kind of benevolent supervision on the part of the League of Nations as regards these different treaties. He had noted, in his extremely rapid survey of the collection, that there were very profound differences between the treaties of arbitration, of guarantee, etc., contained therein. Some of them presented drafts which might be considered as an excellent example, while others were somewhat disturbing in outlook.

In repeating his question, and asking how the work of the Committee could be directed, the Norwegian delegate pointed out that the total number of treaties of arbitration, conciliation, etc., was not more than 100. If all nations were to be protected by arbitration, he imagined that 1,400 treaties at least would be necessary. It was therefore obvious that the process of special treaties was only a makeshift.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) felt that the system of special agreements recommended by the last Assembly instead of the Protocol only offered a relative security to States.

The situation had undoubtedly been improved by the signing of the Locarno Agreements, but the Committee had before it a report of the Council declaring that, under the circumstances, it was impossible to extract from special agreements now in force principles of a general order of equal value for all States. The Third Committee, in consequence, should proceed to a political and juridical examination of the special agreements in order to draw from them certain general conclusions. It was not a question of reviving the Protocol of Geneva, nor of applying the same procedure of arbitration and the same sanctions to all States, but merely of putting the question of arbitration on a common footing.

He wished to recall the recent words of M. Paul-Boncour by which he had shown the connection between the questions of arbitration, security and disarmament. It was the question of security which had prevented the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament from arriving at practical conclusions. All countries were ready to reduce their armaments, but on condition that they should have the double guarantee of not being attacked and of being defended in case of aggression.

An endeavour had been made to reply to these States that the Covenant itself had created a state of security, increased, indeed, by the special agreements, but this argument had not seemed to convince them, and M. Markovitch feared that the Disarmament Conference, which had been mentioned at the previous meeting, might encounter the same obstacle. If all they had to offer was the example of those States which had signed special agreements, this would not appear sufficient compensation for the risks they would run in disarming themselves.

He proposed that the Assembly should recommend the Council to proceed to a thorough examination, political and legal, of the special agreements in force in order to draw from them conclusions to be recommended to all States Members of the League of Nations as permanent principles to be adopted in their foreign policy. If Germany and France had had the courage and good sense to sign a Treaty of Arbitration and to bind themselves to take every dispute of whatever kind before an arbitral bench, why could not the other European States sign a similar treaty?

As to the territorial guarantees of States, M. Markovitch felt obliged to remind the Committee that Article 10 of the Covenant stipulates that States not only guarantee the territorial and political integrity of each Member of the League of Nations, but they bind themselves further to defend this integrity in case of attack. Why should a State Member of the League of Nations refuse to bind itself by a solemn obligation to take no action against the integrity of any other State when it has already taken upon itself, through the Covenant, the same obligation in a general form?

He concluded by expressing the desire that the Third Committee should recommend the Assembly to ask the Council to examine the special treaties in order to draw from them general conclusions which could govern the foreign policy of all the Members of the League and giving the necessary guarantees to the States invited to disarm.

Mr. LATHAM (Australia) said that the Committee was confronted with the combined problem of arbitration and security, the arguments tending to move in a vicious circle of no arbitration without security and no security without a method of arbitration.

He ventured to suggest that, behind the subjects of arbitration and security, lay another subject which was fundamental to the whole question. He considered that an analogy could be drawn from private citizens, who enjoyed safety and were able to pursue the activities of human life. Nations required this security in the same way as individuals. The security of citizens rested not only on the methods of settling their disputes but also on a system of law which determined their rights and duties. The settling of disputes was therefore secondary to the legal system.

He suggested that international security must, upon the analogy he had just drawn, depend on one of two things : while recognising that all civilised nations accepted the principle that agreements should be honoured, they might either rely upon international agreements, with methods of interpretation and enforcement, or upon a system of law, to be similarly interpreted and enforced. Arbitration could only exist under such systems.

If it were desired to remedy international wrongs, the terms " international right " and " international wrong " must be defined ; these could only derive their meaning from some system of legal conception. With individuals, a clear distinction was drawn between judicature and legislature, and he suggested with diffidence that there appeared to be a tendency to set up an international judicature without recognising the necessity of a source of law for it to administer.

On page 12 of Document C. 34, they would find that the arbitration provisions were confined to " any question with regard to which the parties are in conflict as to their respective rights ". It appeared that only questions of right were submitted to judicial decision, other matters being left to diplomatic procedure.

In consequence of the impossibility of establishing an international legislature, he suggested the possible course of defining the source of legal right, and he emphasised the great importance of the codification of international law in these methods of arbitration and security.

He felt that this matter was more suitable for the First than for the Third Committee. They were waiting for a communication from the First Committee as to how the work might be divided. As, however, he considered that it would be very difficult for them to work conjointly upon these particular subjects, he felt that, under the circumstances, the Third Committee might leave the subject substantially to the First Committee, unless some suggestion could be made for a useful field of work for itself.

M. GUERRERO (Salvador) explained the method of working adopted by the Committee for the Codification of International Law appointed by the Council. This Committee was not seeking for the principles of international law in order to classify them in a code but was taking certain questions which could be codified, that was to say regulated by international agreement. Having chosen a subject, a Sub-Committee studied it and prepared a report, which was discussed by the full Committee later. If the conclusions in the report were adopted by the Committee copies of both were sent to all the Governments. When the replies from the Governments reached the Secretariat, the Committee examined them and decided whether the subject was ripe for regulation by international agreement. It was only then that the Council was called upon to convoke an international conference.

He thought that it might be possible, in agreement with the First Committee, to put the necessary question before the Committee for Codification. In doing this, they would be accomplishing a definite piece of work in the direction of security and disarmament.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that the Third Committee, specially entrusted with disarmament problems, was essentially political. Looking at the problems from the political point of view, the Committee had to seek formulæ and solutions which might take their place in international law. The Committee, however, was primarily a political Committee, and there was therefore no necessity to send the whole of this question on to the First Committee.

The Third Committee should, first of all, find a solution, and after this it could get into touch with the First Committee to see that this solution did not run counter to any legal point of view.

The CHAIRMAN, summarising the discussion, indicated that there were two questions before the Committee, a legal and a political question. The Committee would proceed with its work, only dealing with the political side. As regards the legal side, the necessary suggestions could be presented to the First Committee, of which M. Guerrero was a member. He himself, as Chairman of the Third Committee, would get in touch with M. Motta, the Chairman of the First Committee.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) supported the Chairman's proposal.

9. Appointment of a Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the nomination of a Sub-Committee which should be asked to draft a resolution at a subsequent meeting.

The Sub-Committee would be composed of : Lord ONSLOW (British Empire), M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France), Count BERNSTORFF (Germany), General DE MARINIS (Italy), Viscount ISHII (Japan), M. LANGE (Norway), M. GUERRERO (Salvador) and M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).

The proposal was adopted.

The meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.

FIFTH MEETING

Held on Friday, September 17th, 1926, at 3 p m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

10. — Supervision of the Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements of War : Adoption of the Report and Resolution (Annex 1).

M. GUERRERO (Salvador), Rapporteur, read his report.

M. LANGE (Norway) paid tribute to the clear and precise character of M. Guerrero's report but drew attention to one omission in it. He felt that some reference should be made to the fact that the problem of the supervision of private manufacture was referred to in the Covenant of the League of Nations. He therefore proposed that the second line of the second paragraph of the report be amended to read as follows :

“ The problem of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war is raised in precise terms in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. It has received the constant attention of the Assembly since the foundation of the League. ”

M. GUERRERO (Salvador), Rapporteur, accepted the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee if they were prepared to adopt the report and draft resolution submitted by M. Guerrero, together with the modification proposed by M. Lange.

The draft report and resolution were adopted.

11. — Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments : Work of the Preparatory Commission (Document A. 32. 1926. IX, pages 2-7 and 14-21).

The CHAIRMAN called upon M. Loudon to give his résumé on the work of the Preparatory Commission.

M. LOUDON (Netherlands) gave the following résumé :

As has been said in the report on the work of the Council, the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference met at Geneva from May 18th to 26th in accordance with the decision of the Council taken on March 18th. It adapted the organisation accorded to it by the Council to the needs of the work by creating two Sub-Commissions, namely A and B. The first, composed of technical military representatives of all the Powers, dealt purely with technical military questions. The second dealt with economic and civil questions. M. Cobián and M. Buero were appointed Chairmen of Sub-Commissions A and B respectively. As, however, M. Cobián was frequently prevented from undertaking the work, M. Buero presided in fact over Sub-Commission A. Both Chairmen carried out their duties in an exemplary way.

The session of the Preparatory Commission properly so called was devoted to a study of the questionnaire, which, prepared by the Committee of the Council, had been submitted to it by the latter. The details of this questionnaire and the conclusions formed upon it are given on page 14 and following pages of document A. 32. 1926, IX.

The field of activity of these two Sub-Commissions, particularly that of Sub-Commission A, was as arduous as it was complex. The science of disarmament is as yet in its infancy; it offers varying perspectives and touches upon controversial questions.

It was necessary to begin by seeking some definition of the field of work and the exact aim of the limitation of armaments; consequently, Question I in the questionnaire asked what was to be understood by the expression “ armaments ”, thereby demanding a definition of the various military, economic and geographic elements on which the war-time power of a country depend, and the determination and special properties of the various elements constituting the armaments of a country in peace-time. Question II (a), asking whether it was possible to limit the ultimate war-time armaments of a country, went more deeply into the same problem.

Question VI was to some extent an auxiliary question. It asked whether it was desirable to make a distinction between commercial and military aeroplanes, and what was the value to be attributed to commercial fleets in taking account of the naval strength of a country.

It was necessary to consider definitely whether it was possible to make a distinction between offensive and defensive armaments, and whether any method existed for determining whether a certain force was organised for defensive or aggressive purposes. The central problem was dealt with by Questions II (b) and III, which asked for a definite explanation of the expression “ reduction and limitation of armaments ”, together with the various forms which reduction or limitation

may take, the relative advantages or disadvantages of each of the different forms or methods, and by what standard it was possible to measure the armaments of one country against the armaments of another.

Question V (a) dealt with the future convention. It asked on what principle it would be possible to draw up a scale of armaments permissible to each of the contracting parties, taking into account the number of inhabitants, the resources of the country, etc.

Question VII envisaged the extremely delicate problem of the possibility of obtaining partial solutions on the basis of regional disarmament, in order to arrive step by step at general disarmament.

The problem of security had been begun by Question V, seeing that, in the view of more than one delegation, security entered into the question of the measurement of armaments. This important question had been the subject of a proposal of the French delegate, which was commented upon in the report of the Preparatory Commission.

The Preparatory Commission had had to study not only the above questions but also four proposals which had been presented by the delegations of Belgium, Great Britain, Poland and Finland.

The first, that of Belgium, dealt with the international supervision of armaments. The second, that of Great Britain, dealt with the rapid utilisation of chemical factories for the ends of war, and with general questions as to chemical warfare. The third, that of Poland, concerned the organisation of regional assistance for a State when attacked. The fourth proposal, that of Finland, proposed "the examination of special arrangements whereby a reduction of armaments agreed to by States unfavourably placed, owing to geographical or other exceptional circumstances, might be compensated in order to meet their requirements for security".

The Preparatory Commission had, at its first session, separated questions of military character from civil questions, and had divided the subject into three groups, of which the first, consisting of technical questions, had been studied by Sub-Commission A, which subdivided into three Committees, naval, military and air, whose conclusions were examined by Sub-Commission A. The second group, comprising economic, financial, industrial and labour questions, had been dealt with by Sub-Commission B, and the third group, dealing with the questions which touched upon the subject of security and the proposals of Belgium, Poland, France and Finland, had been sent for discussion to the Council.

Sub-Commission A had worked from May 28th to July 6th and from August 2nd to September 9th. It had worked hard during these two sessions and had obtained a very satisfactory result. It had held 51 plenary meetings and each of its Committees between twenty-five and twenty-seven meetings, making a total of 128. It would continue its work at the end of September as soon as the Secretariat was free from the heavy work of the Assembly.

At the moment, Sub-Commission A had finished the first reading of the reports on Question I, definition of armaments; on Question II, "Is it practicable to limit the war strength of a country or only the peace strength?"; the larger part of Questions II (b) and III, standards of measuring the armaments of the different countries; on Question IV, "Can there be said to be offensive and defensive armaments?"; on Question VI relating to aircraft; and, finally, it had almost completed the examination of the Belgian proposal on supervision.

It had still to consider one point of Question II (b) and III, the strength of the armaments to be attributed to each country, a question which was included in No. V, regional disarmament (Question VII); the British proposal as to chemical warfare; part of the Belgian proposal as to the possibility of inserting in a convention arrangements analogous to those of the International Labour Office (Articles 411-420 of the Treaty of Versailles).

It was difficult to enter into the details of the work and the conclusions of Sub-Commission A; its texts had been adopted at a first reading and in private sitting. M. Loudon was not, therefore, authorised to communicate these texts immediately to the Committee.

The differences of opinion which had been manifested within this Sub-Commission were only the reflection in the technical field of differences of a political character.

Here, however, could be given a résumé of the very considerable work accomplished by Sub-Commission A.

After a brief definition in the first part of the texts of what must be understood by "armaments", it had elaborated in the second part a definition of the various military, economic, geographical, etc., elements on which the war-time strength of a country depended, viz., the answer to Question I (a). Three chapters had dealt with this question. The first chapter dealt with the elements upon which the power of a country in war-time depended, the second defined some of the principal methods of overcoming the enemy forces, and the third chapter determined the chief factors to be taken into consideration during a war and on which the strength of a belligerent consequently depended. A table was attached giving the military, human, material, geographical, financial and political elements.

The answer to Question I (b) — definition and characteristics of the various factors constituting the armaments of a country in time of peace — comprised four chapters, of which the first defined such armaments; the second, the particular characteristics of the three large categories of armaments: naval, military and air; the third, the characteristics of the various systems of military organisations, the methods of recruiting and instruction, and the fourth pointed out the elements characterising peace-time armaments.

There followed the answer to the questions contained in the Commentary of the Preparatory Commission relative to Question II (a): "Is it practicable to limit the ultimate war strength of a country, or must any measures of disarmament be confined to the peace strength?" This answer was in two parts, the first determining the character of war-time forces in time of peace which were permanently maintained and could be immediately utilised for war without needing mobilisation. The second part dealt in three chapters with elements capable of a wider limitation.

The reply to Question (a) of the commentary on II (b) and III — dealing with the definition of armaments — was treated in great detail in five parts. The first part dealt with general principles, the second with land forces, which had been divided into three chapters followed by conclusions. The first of the chapters dealt with peace-time armaments and was divided into four parts: the number of effectives, the organisation of effectives, the length of service and the degree of instruction and the materials used in service. The second dealt with the subject of armaments for war, reserves at command, of material in stock and of all kinds of preparation.

The third part dealt with standards relative to naval armaments, basic standards in the first chapter and supplementary standards in the second.

The fourth part dealt with air armaments and comprised five chapters dealing with personnel and material.

The fifth and last part dealt with the auxiliary standards on the subject of armaments as a whole.

In passing to the work of Sub-Commission B, the speaker stated that this Commission met on May 26th and had sent a certain number of questions to the Joint Commission for an opinion. This Joint Commission had been established by a resolution of the Council, and comprised representatives of the Economic, Financial and Transit Organisations as well as of the International Labour Office. It was also free to summon other experts. They might see in the report that the Council had decided to appoint M. Buero Chairman of the Joint Commission.

The questions sent to the Joint Commission were as follows :

In connection with Question II (b) and III :

“ Can the magnitude of the armaments of the various States be compared by comparing their military expenditure, and, if so, what method should be followed ? ”

In connection with the Belgian delegate's proposal :

“ 1. What would be the consequences, from the economic point of view, of inserting in the convention relative to disarmament, or in that regarding the prohibition of certain forms of warfare, provisions similar to those contained in the Statute of the International Labour Office (Articles 411-420 of the Treaty of Versailles) ? ”

“ 2. Does the supervision of disarmament offer any difficulties from the economic point of view, and, if so, what difficulties ? ”

In connection with the proposal of the delegate of the British Empire regarding chemical warfare :

“ 1. (a) Can factories normally and legitimately employed for chemical purposes, including dyeworks, be quickly adapted to manufacture poison gases ?

“ (b) If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, how long would it take to effect the change ?

“ (c) Can any proposals be made to prevent or hinder chemical factories from being used for the production of poisonous gases ? ”

The Joint Commission would probably deal with the subject next month, when it received the report of the three Sub-Committees, which had been constituted to examine these questions.

Sub-Commission B was therefore faced with the following programme : (1) Questions II (b) and III : Could a limitation of the armed forces of a State be regulated by reduction or limitation of the budget for the national defence, and, if so, under what conditions ? The Joint Commission confined its examination of the question to the following question : Can the magnitude of the armaments of the various States be compared by comparing their military expenditure and by what method ? (2) Certain points of the Belgian proposal regarding supervision. (3) British proposal regarding chemical warfare ; and questions referred by Sub-Commission A in order to discover the effect of the material resources of a country on its wartime strength, and to determine what were the war elements of which statistics are available, such as population, certain raw materials, etc.

Sub-Commission A recommended that a study should be undertaken immediately of the methods for making the budgets of the national expenditure of the various States as far as possible comparable.

The Joint Commission at its next meeting would have to examine all the questions which had been sent to it by Sub-Commission B, after having received the reports of its three sub-committees and, besides, after having studied the economic consequences of the supervision of disarmament.

A number of proposals sent by the Preparatory Commission to the Council had been referred by it to the Committee of the Council for enquiry. This Committee would probably meet very shortly.

The Preparatory Commission would no doubt meet the following week to arrange its future work, but it was difficult, however, to say when it could meet to examine the reports of Sub-Commissions A and B — possibly in December, possibly in February.

M. Loudon felt sure that the Sub-Committees which had worked so hard — and, in particular, Sub-Commission A — would do their best to speed up the work. They understood perfectly that the problem had to be taken up with all the energy possible and as rapidly as possible. As President, he need scarcely say that he would do all he could to hasten the solution.

As to the date when the final Conference on Disarmament might meet, the question could not yet be answered. He could only say that they would do their best to make it as soon as

possible, and that, without making a definite statement, he thought that, in the course of the debate, they would be able to foresee an approximate date.

Before concluding, he must once more recall that, after the elections of the previous day, the Council had decided to modify the composition of the Preparatory Commission in the following manner. Besides the new Members of the Council which were not already represented on this Commission, *i.e.*, China, Colombia and Salvador, which would enter automatically, the Council would invite those States Members which were already sitting on the Preparatory Commission, *i.e.*, Brazil, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay, to continue their collaboration, in order that the continuity of the work of the Commission might benefit.

In conclusion, he regretted being unable to give more information on the work itself, but he had shown its method of working and the various divisions of the work, and he had not the authority of the Commission to give details of the exact texts of their decisions.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was sure that his colleagues agreed with him in expressing gratitude to M. Loudon for his excellent exposé.

M. MUNCH (Denmark) had been most interested in the report of M. Loudon, which gave a very complete idea of the work accomplished and which made it possible to hope that the work might be finished at the end of some months.

The list of questions submitted to the Preparatory Commission gave the impression that it was necessary to solve all the difficult problems of the world before being able really to touch upon the actual reduction of armaments. He thought, however, that the work ought to be simplified in order to arrive at results, and he wondered if there was present any member of the Preparatory Commission who could say whether such simplification was possible. It would be interesting to know if the Preparatory Commission could decide on methods of simplifying the many and complex questions which it had to study. Thus, would it not be possible to take the number of inhabitants of a country as a basis for comparison and to give other elements a secondary value?

The Danish delegate would be grateful if any member of the Preparatory Commission could say whether the possibility had been foreseen of undertaking an annual reduction of armaments in such a way that, while fixing a final limit, States could, during a certain number of years, reduce their armaments by ten per cent, for example, every two years. Such a system would greatly facilitate the adoption of future agreements.

He felt, however, that one could say that the preparatory work was going on well, and that the situation was much more favourable for a Disarmament Conference now than formerly. Since the Locarno Agreements had been put into force, the feeling of insecurity had, to say the least, been greatly diminished in certain countries. However, there would be anxiety in other countries as long as Russia remained outside agreements as to the reduction of armaments.

It was therefore most important, added the speaker, that the reason which had prevented Russia from taking part in the discussions on the reduction of armaments should vanish, or at least that the League of Nations should leave no pretext for reproach.

In conclusion, he expressed the hope that both the military and political members of the Preparatory Commission would always remember that a general and radical reduction of armaments was in itself an important element of security. Personally, he felt that it was the principal means of creating the security for which the world hoped.

M. LANGE (Norway) congratulated M. Loudon for his clear exposé of a situation which was to-day characterised by a great many details and different aspects.

It was difficult to speak of anything else but the organisation of the work undertaken, for, after all, they had only reached the organisation stage of the work. He wished, therefore, to present certain personal observations on the way the problem had been treated.

He felt that everyone would regret that the League of Nations had only begun, in its seventh year, to deal with a problem which the authors of the Covenant had stated to be its principal duty.

With M. Munch, the speaker regretted the absence on the Preparatory Commission of a representative of Russia. He felt, too, that there must not even exist in this direction the appearance of a reproach towards the League of Nations.

Turning to the questionnaire, he asked this first question: Was the questionnaire limitative? Could not the general lines indicated by the Council be modified or extended in certain directions? He asked this question because only a few days ago it had been said that the problem of the supervision of private manufacture was so closely connected with the general problem of disarmament that it would be necessary to postpone a study of the matter until the meeting of the general Conference on Disarmament, but in the questionnaire there was only one single reference to the supervision of private manufacture.

Under these circumstances, M. Lange hoped that the questionnaire was not limitative, and that the Commission would have the right to deal with subjects which it considered within its sphere of action, for example, the connection between the general problem and that of the supervision of private manufacture.

He thought that other questions might be dealt with by the Commission, for example, the prohibition of certain kinds of arms. The questionnaire foresaw the possibility of forbidding chemical or bacteriological warfare, but had not the Conference of Washington dealt, on the suggestion of the British Government, with the question of the prohibition of submarines? Were not these only of use for warlike purposes? Likewise, in the case of land warfare, one might contemplate the prohibition of tanks, which were undoubtedly of no use in peace. As regards the employment of armed aircraft, the question was more complex, but here the questionnaire was very definite.

He was therefore led to make a general observation on the character of the questionnaire, in which he found really metaphysical questions which, as the problems dealt with were abstract, it really seemed as if they had been asked merely in order to avoid the reproach that some of the theoretical questions raised by the question of armaments had been left untouched.

Then, added M. Lange, was the questionnaire really dealing with the subject as put by the Covenant ? Question V was as follows :

“ On what principle will it be possible to draw up a scale of armaments permissible to the various countries, taking into account particularly... ? ”

The Covenant did not foresee that States should be given a certain degree of armament, but it only foresaw an agreement between the said countries and the Council of the League, which was not a superior authority which could ration the armaments of a country. The speaker felt, as he had already said on several occasions, that it was in the actual state of things that the basis and starting-point for an agreement on the reduction and limitation of armaments could be found and that by starting from this basis it would be possible to make more rapid progress ; if they looked for abstract principles in order to fix the proportions, their work would be in vain and might give rise to serious misunderstanding, which might damage the League of Nations.

M. Lange was also disturbed by the fact that there existed in the questionnaire the idea, almost an obsession, that they would always have to deal with a state of armaments which would be a cause of uneasiness between neighbours. They must try, if they were to make progress, to look into the future ; the questionnaire, however, only contemplated the present. It did not take account of the new conditions between States which would be created by the reduction of armaments itself. It was characteristic that the only indication of such a conception came from the representative of a disarmed State who was present in the Committee. The German representative alone had realised the future, as was shown in the report to the Council, in which his delegation said :

“ This examination should have as a starting-point a state of disarmament resulting from the Conference such that no country would be powerful enough to be in a position to assert its strength against that of the League of Nations. ”

In conclusion, the speaker insisted upon a truth which the smaller States had always supported in the Committee that it was by the reduction of armaments that the feeling of security would be created. To-day, armaments were clearly of an offensive character, and it was a mistake to believe that a country could “ defend ” itself by military means ; it could only institute reprisals which were hurtful to the enemy ; it could not defend itself by military measures.

When the world had realised this elementary truth, it would be in a position to understand that a state of security would come through the reduction of armaments.

M. BENEŠ (Czechoslovakia) was not entirely in agreement with M. Lange ; he thought his criticisms of the questionnaire were rather severe. M. Lange had said that it was too abstract, but M. Beneš felt that the criticisms were themselves too abstract. Logically, it was true that, if there were no armaments, people would not fight, but this was only logically true. It was otherwise in real life, and politicians could not remain in the realm of pure logic. They must not lose sight of realities.

As regards the prohibition of certain kinds of armaments, M. Beneš entirely agreed. It was indispensable that, at the moment of the Conference on Disarmament, they should examine what kind of armaments were to be prohibited. They must, however, take care not to establish prohibitions which would not be respected, which could only damage the results of the Conference. As regards the criticisms which the last speaker had made of the questionnaire in relation to the Covenant, they appeared likewise a little hard. In drawing up the questionnaire, it had been the intention to prepare a basis for discussion which was fully in accordance with the spirit of the Covenant. There had been no desire to consider the Council as a super-State, but the general idea was that the proportions of the various armaments should be fixed by agreement at the Disarmament Conference.

The responsible politician who attended the Conference must move step by step towards the ideal. Progress must be gradual, for, if they failed owing to too much haste, an extremely dangerous situation might be created. It was necessary therefore to go forward carefully.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) recalled that he had had the honour of participating in the preparatory work for disarmament. He noted that there was still a certain hesitation in speaking of the problem, a hesitation which might be interpreted unfavourably.

They had before them a report of the Council on the preliminary work of the Conference itself and of the two Sub-Commissions, and the delegate for the Netherlands had given them a very clear exposé.

M. Markovitch wondered whether the Committee was in a position to treat the problem as a whole and to take up a discussion on all the aspects of the Disarmament Conference. It was a question of the procedure and of the competence of the Third Committee.

The speaker felt that, once the question of disarmament had been entrusted to a large special committee, there was perhaps no reason why the Third Committee should debate upon

the very problems which were being examined by the organisations to which the League of Nations had given this task. He recalled that each State Member of the League of Nations had been invited by the Council to present observations. On the other hand, he noticed that the questionnaire was in no way a necessity, for the Disarmament Conference had every opportunity to restrict the extent of the questions if it thought wise to limit the problem to certain fundamental principles. On the other hand, nothing prevented the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament from adding to the questionnaire questions which had not yet been put on it. He felt that the Third Committee had only to examine from the general political point of view the work being accomplished by the Preparatory Commission.

With reference to the French, Polish and Finnish proposals which had been submitted to the Council, this body might possibly decide to send them to the Third Committee for examination.

M. DE BROUCKÈRE (Belgium) expressed the opinion that M. Markovitch was right in saying that the Committee had not to replace the Disarmament Conference and that it must confine itself to seeking for the most favourable conditions for the meeting of the Conference, which it was desirable should take place as soon as possible. After the report of M. Loudon, they might well be hopeful. On the other hand, numerous criticisms had been formulated and the Belgian delegate wished to point out to what extent he could agree with them. The complexity of the problem had already been pointed out, as well as the fact that, if they were to reach an exact formula fixing the number of rifles, guns and machine-guns to which each State would be entitled, the problem would be insoluble, but the question had not been put in such a rigid form, and it was the Commission itself which had put the technical experts and the public on guard against the danger of a mathematical disarmament.

A speaker had suggested that, instead of considering the length of railways, accessibility of passes and the depths of rivers, they should merely consider the number of inhabitants of a country as a basis for disarmament. He considered this would substitute a false formula for a complicated one. It must be realised that other things being equal, a country which was less populous than another would, as it was more exposed to danger, need an army proportionately larger.

M. Lange had said in effect that they should start from what existed, and not from the number of soldiers which a country should have but from the number which it had. He quite agreed. M. Lange had said, however, that statesmen must look into the future, but it was already very difficult in many cases to take the present into account. If they suggested to a people that they must disarm because, later on, more favourable circumstances would present themselves, that people would reply that they would wait for these circumstances before disarming.

M. de Brouckère suggested that they must reach disarmament by starting from the present and the concrete. He did not wish to enter the depths of the question, but he wished to draw their attention to part of M. Lange's speech, in which he had pointed out the need to reach certain prohibitions of armaments. M. de Brouckère agreed, but on one condition: that they must reach a situation that would give them the power to prohibit in war the employment of arms which caused needless suffering. What a blessing for the whole world if they could suppress chemical warfare! On the other hand, they must remember that, if there was war between two countries, it would be difficult to prevent them from using every means to defend not only their life but all that lay behind it. M. de Brouckère strongly supported M. Lange's proposal, but an amendment was necessary. They must prohibit certain kinds of armaments, but in a practical way. Rather than content themselves with signing conventions prohibiting the use of certain arms in war, they must, while it was still peace, render the ultimate use of such arms impossible.

M. de Brouckère paid tribute to the efforts of the technical experts to hasten their work, but this technical effort was not of itself sufficient. The experts had only produced documents which the politicians might use when representing their different countries at the Disarmament Conference. He emphasised again the great urgency of this Conference, which could not be delayed until the end of the work entrusted to the experts. As the conditions necessary for such a Conference were about to be realised, they must decide that it would take place soon; within a few months. Hence it was necessary to open debates upon concrete subjects where they would know, after having discussed the problem in theory, whether States were ready to take up the practical work of disarmament.

Count BERNSTORFF (Germany) agreed with the sentiments expressed by several other delegates that it would be better to leave the intricacies of the question to be debated by the competent Committees.

He also wished to remove a misunderstanding which had arisen in the debates in the Preparatory Commission. Contrary to what one might have thought, he had in no way envisaged an imaginary situation, but M. Lange was quoting M. Paul-Boncour's proposals when he had said that it was not possible for Germany, while completely disarmed, to bind herself by the obligations of Article 16 of the Covenant, as Germany was not in a position to carry them out.

He wished to support the desire expressed by the Belgian delegate that the Preparatory Commission should recommence its work as soon as possible.

M. BENEŠ (Czechoslovakia) asked whether he was right in understanding from M. Markovitch that the French, Polish and Finnish proposals, which had been sent by the Preparatory Commission to the Council, would come before the Third Committee.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) replied that he had asked whether it would not be possible for these questions to be sent to the Third Committee with the observations which the Council would have given on the subject.

M. BENEŠ (Czechoslovakia) said that the proposals had been sent by the Council, as technical questions which the Council could not discuss itself in public or private sessions frequently were, to the Committee of the Council, which would deal with it at its next session.

Without wishing to speak in the name of his colleagues on the Council, he added that he thought that the Committee of the Council would have to deal with this work at more than one sitting owing to its complexity.

M. MUNCH (Denmark) apologised for not having expressed himself sufficiently clearly, but felt that the Belgian delegate had not quite understood his statements about the number of population being the standard for armaments. He had not wished to say that they must take into mathematical account the figures for population and say, for example, that the maximum limit of the armaments of a nation Country A should be twice as large as those of Country B if the population of Country A was twice as great as that of Country B.

On the other hand, the Danish delegate wished to emphasise that it would be contrary to the system adopted by the questionnaire to abandon all ideas of proportion. He repeated that, in his opinion, the elements of the problem must be simplified in order to arrive at the correct proportion and practical results. He would be grateful to the Belgian delegate if he would explain what he had meant when he said that realities must above all be considered. If they were going to ask States what armaments they wished to have, how would these States be able to reply without having a general basis to start from? Thus they would only be able to frame a maximum limit if their neighbours accepted it as well.

The Danish delegate insisted again on the necessity of proceeding to a simplification of the complex and multiple question submitted to the Preparatory Commission, and he would be extremely grateful to the members of the Preparatory Commission if they could give him the hope of seeing such a simplification accomplished in the near future.

In conclusion, the Danish delegate agreed entirely with the opinion of his Belgian colleague that it would be well if they could state now that the general Disarmament Conference could meet before the next Assembly. He was very glad that he had heard the Belgian delegate state that this was possible.

The meeting closed at 6.5 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

Held on Saturday, September 18th, 1926, at 3 p.m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

12. — Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments : Work of the Preparatory Commission (Continuation).

M. DEBSKI (Poland) felt that the Council's report as well as the extremely clear and precise résumé given by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission were such as to give every satisfaction to the Committee, which might confine itself to noting the work of the Preparatory Commission and expressing the wish that it might reach its conclusions speedily.

Agreeing with opinions and suggestions made by several speakers, he wished to state that the interdependence of security and disarmament was recognised by all. He would reserve his observations on the report of the Sub-Committee in order to expose clearly his Government's point of view.

He wished, however, to draw attention to a resolution of the sixth session of the Assembly, of which the last paragraph was as follows :

“ And, in conformity with the spirit of Article 8 of the Covenant, requests the Council to make a preparatory study, with a view to a Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, in order that, as soon as satisfactory conditions have been assured from the point of view of general security as provided for in Resolution XIV of the Third Assembly, the said Conference may be convened and a general reduction and limitation of armaments may be realised. ”

He did not feel that they could deviate in any particular from that point of view.

The armed conflicts of the future would be very different from those hitherto witnessed, which showed the urgent necessity of contemplating the problem of security and disarmament

as a problem of a very serious and complex nature. The simplification of the work, however desirable it might be, could never be a practical and realisable solution.

His Government was very anxious that the preliminary work of the Preparatory Commission should result as soon as possible in the establishment of a programme for the future Disarmament Conference, but it thought that no pressure should be exercised upon the Commission, which had to take all the aspects of the problem into consideration. It would be better to have a conference a little later than a conference resulting in a setback, which might be very dangerous.

In conclusion, the Polish delegate proposed the following motion :

“ The Assembly takes note of the reports which have been submitted to it on the activities of the Preparatory Commission, congratulates the Commission on the real progress which has been made in the course of its work, and expresses the hope that this progress will in the near future allow of a Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments being called in accordance with the existing conditions of security. ”

M. ENGBERG (Sweden) considered it most important that the Disarmament Conference should attain practical results, for it was on this that all the nations had laid their hopes, and here lay the justification of the very existence of the League of Nations. A setback would damage popular confidence and would inevitably do great moral harm. Consequently, it would be better to have the conference late than to have it unsuccessful.

Though it was impossible to express an opinion on the definite results of the Preparatory Commission, it seemed to him that the programme of this Commission was too theoretical and too wide. A restricted but practical programme would be better than one full of theoretical details.

He entirely agreed with M. de Brouckère's replies to the suggestions made by M. Munch. The figures for population could not alone serve as a basis for the calculation of armaments, but formed only one among many factors. A comparison could not only be made on the technical side but should be based also on political and economic considerations. He urged that the political point of view predominated, and it was only by negotiation that Governments could take a decisive step on the road to disarmament.

M. LANGE (Norway) wished to dispel certain possible misunderstandings of his speech of the previous day. He had not been greatly moved by M. Beneš' reproaches, to the effect that the problem must be solved on a political basis of reality and idealism. He thought that this difference of opinion had appeared before.

In the discussions in 1922 and 1923 of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance, the Norwegian delegate had defined a view which M. Beneš had suggested was too idealistic, because it proposed not to contemplate exclusively the aspect of the use of force but to complete this by the discussion of a juridical and judicial element : arbitration. The speaker was glad to see that, after only one year, everyone realised the necessity of the presence of arbitration side by side with the elements of security. He might perhaps have the satisfaction of noting the same evolution in the work of the Committee at the moment.

When speaking on the previous day, he had only wished to say that, in seeking to solve a problem, one must take realities as a point of departure. Consequently, he felt that, in order to accomplish serious work in the reduction of armaments, they must start from the basis of the *status quo*.

However, they must know where they were going. It was because M. Beneš knew where he was going, and because he had had a clear vision of the destinies of his country and the means of gaining them, that he had been able to give such great services to the country he represented. It was the duty of statesmen to form a mental picture of the future of their nation in order to reach such a future. Consequently, in speaking of efforts of imagination, one was not always dealing with imaginary things. In order to prepare the road for the future, care was necessary to avoid all the false ideas of the present which might confront a statesman or a technician.

He noted that his remarks of the day previous had provoked valuable answers and explanations, of which he recalled, above all, M. Markovitch's declaration, which had been supported by M. Beneš. He had stated that the questionnaire was in no way limitative and that the members of the Committee could well suggest or elaborate the study of certain questions.

The speaker agreed with M. de Brouckère as to the wisdom of asking how certain forms of armaments might be prohibited. It was a technical question but one which the Committee had to deal with, and, without doubt, in order to prevent the use of certain methods of warfare, it was necessary to be sure that in time of peace preparations for such methods were not being made. It was not sufficient to forbid the use of chemicals in war in an international agreement. Such a procedure was illusory, but a more practical method might be followed by leading States to forbid the preparation in peace-time of certain means of warfare. It would be possible to obtain practical results in the supervision of certain armaments which had been characterised as being capable of control, such as submarines, tanks, etc.

The Committee had been told that it was not wise to enter into the substance of the questions before it, but the speaker felt that certain examples must necessarily be quoted when looking for the means of establishing a questionnaire, and, in consequence, he could not understand why the Committee should not discuss certain questions. In view, however, of the desire which had been expressed, he would abstain from such discussion.

In conclusion, the Norwegian delegate thought that the following question would immediately arise if the idea of the *status quo* were adopted as a basis. Could the reduction of armaments be accomplished by a single leap or must it be gradual ? This very important question, especially

as regards great Powers, which attached such importance to military organisation, had not been touched by the questionnaire. If it had been proved that a great Power could reduce its military strength by 90 per cent, it was none the less true that such a reduction would produce important economic and social difficulties. In consequence, he was of opinion that it would be extremely interesting if the Preparatory Commission could put this question on its agenda rather than certain questions of comparison which it already had before it. The speaker felt, while admiring the energy of the technical experts of the Preparatory Commission, that such great efforts in the realm of theory might perhaps have been better directed.

In conclusion, he said that the reduction of armaments could only be realised gradually, and that real efforts towards this end must be made as quickly as possible. When M. Beneš suggested that he had forgotten what had been done in this field hitherto, the Norwegian delegate wished to reply to him that, right from the beginning, he had insisted on the necessity of a technical enquiry, though it must be remembered that the political aspect was still the dominant one.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) wished publicly to express his profound gratitude to the military, naval and air experts of all the nations, who had for months provided a rare example of labour and self-sacrifice, and were endeavouring to give precision to an immense complexity of questions which, from their nature, were confused and obscure. If a conference for the limitation and reduction of armaments were to reach positive results, they would owe it to these men, who had provided the elements of discussion which had been lacking.

M. Paul-Boncour regretted that certain of his colleagues thought the work of the experts was too detailed. He asked the Committee to imagine for a moment the Disarmament Conference, which would comprise delegates from all nations, even those which were not represented on the Third Committee. Would such a Conference accept a scale of armaments laid down as obligatory by some superior body? This was not possible. But it would be the task which the League of Nations would have to accomplish if it had undertaken to guarantee security. This might have been possible under the conceptions entertained by M. Léon Bourgeois in 1919. It might have been possible under the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the Protocol of Geneva if the League of Nations had had the power to move armed forces to assure the security of an attacked State.

The situation, however, was not thus, and States could not be made to reckon for such things in contemplating their security. This rested upon their own efforts, and in order to maintain it they would not fail to appreciate the wide general terms of the Covenant and the special agreements which were endeavouring to apply in individual cases the principles of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and of the Protocol, which had not been acceptable generally, but which had been accepted by certain Powers in certain hypothetical cases.

He asked who would appreciate the elements of security thus produced, who would judge of the connection between this personal element of security and the partial reduction of armaments? Every Power would undoubtedly do so.

A Disarmament Conference would nevertheless be far from useless. If the exchanges of opinion and friendly criticism, together with the elements of comparison which would result from what each State brought to the Conference, were not in evidence, the Conference would not have a practical aim and would be a failure. They must therefore admit that, while respecting the independence of nations in appreciating their security, there would be nevertheless these exchanges of opinion, these possibilities of comparison and these reciprocal criticisms. Such would be the Conference for the Reduction of Armaments, and it would end in an International Convention in which the armaments to be kept by each Power for a limited time would be inscribed. The very fact that such a contract would exist would be a considerable benefit. Article 8 of the Covenant stated in effect that, if a Convention on Reduction and Limitation of Armaments was reached, it could only be modified by the agreement of the Powers. The race of armaments would thus be stopped. But in order to reach these results, what would be the terms of comparison, and what bitter controversy would they not encounter if previously they had not recognised certain principles by which armaments could be justified and compared?

The experts, then, were working slowly and honestly to find what was the actual offensive or defensive strength of a nation. If their analysis was a complex one, it must not be imputed to their imagination or to a muddled spirit, but to the actual circumstances. They were searching for information on population, frontiers, economic strength and other details in order to try and solve the problem with the aid of comparisons verified by experts. It was consequently these experts who had made the Disarmament Conference possible.

By adding to such complex questions they would not be hastening the solution of the problem. They were not, in the first place, in a position to dictate to the Preparatory Commission for the Reduction of Armaments, which included representatives of nations which were not Members of the League of Nations. It was not, then, their part to modify the work of the technical organisations or of the Preparatory Commission.

It had been suggested that the Committee should add to the questionnaire something about prohibiting the use of certain weapons. M. Paul-Boncour felt that nothing would be more useless. Why should a submarine be prohibited while battleships were not? M. Lange had said that the submarine was a weapon of war, but he asked whether an ironclad could be considered a peaceful merchantman. The prohibition of the submarine and the authorisation of the battleship would not be advantageous for poor nations, and, if the horrors of war had ever to return, would it be more humane to send men to the attack with bared breasts instead of protecting them by that walking suit of armour which was called a tank? He did not feel that their efforts lay in that direction.

Chemical warfare, however, was another thing. Doubtless it might be a matter of indifference whether one were killed by gas or by shells, but the danger of chemical warfare was that it was impossible to control it, owing to the ease with which peace-time factories could be changed into munition factories.

What, then, could the Third Committee do? Could it merely declare itself incapable of continuing the work which it had begun so well last year and simply adopt the report of the Secretariat and the résumé of M. Loudon with a few friendly words. It could do more than this. It could express its wish to urge on the work and could ask the Assembly to do the same. It was the Committee which had last year taken a step really inspired by faith, between the failure of the Protocol and the success of Locarno, when it had begun the technical study of the question, even before the realisation of the partial state of security which could be expected from the treaties being negotiated.

The Committee had the right to see the first results of its initiative and to see if the steps could not be quickened. These steps were the work of the technical committees and the meeting of the Preparatory Commission, the drawing up the definite programme of the conference which States would have to convoke to deal with the actual state of security.

The speaker thought that they might move somewhat quicker than had been indicated by a rather pessimistic note from the Secretariat. Actually, the majority of the questions submitted to Sub-Commission A had already been dealt with in principle under different forms. The Third Committee must suggest that the Preparatory Commission beg the technical organisations not to re-open the discussions which had already arisen. These organisations had not to deal with the problems which the politicians in the Preparatory Commission could alone solve in the name of their Governments. If the technicians were not in agreement, they had only to submit their differences and the Preparatory Commission would see to what extent conciliation would be possible. M. Paul-Boncour felt, therefore, that Sub-Commission A might, under these circumstances, rapidly conclude its work.

On the other hand, Sub-Commission B was somewhat of an intermediary between the Preparatory Commission and the Joint Economic Commission which, comprising members of the technical organisations of the League, really dealt with the questions. Would it be possible to avoid delays resulting from the fact that Sub-Commission B was composed of delegates taken directly from the Preparatory Commission, politicians who sometimes found it difficult to meet, so that the work of the Joint Economic Commission should be completed at the same time as that of Sub-Commission A. This would be possible, above all, if it did not wait, in order to deal with its agenda, until the latter had finished its work, and if they both considered the technical aspect of the work at the same time.

If the Third Committee expressed its wish to see the rapid conclusion of the work of the technical committee, the Preparatory Commission would be able to meet before or about the end of the year to deal with the definite programme of the Conference on the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments.

M. Paul-Boncour submitted the following draft resolution :

“ The Assembly takes note of the report submitted to it by the Secretariat and the very full information furnished it by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission on the work of that Commission, its technical Sub-Commissions A and B, and the Joint Economic Commission.

“ It expresses its complete satisfaction with the work performed and thanks those who have contributed to its success.

“ Being desirous that the investigations, in regard to which the Assembly itself took the initiative in its resolution of September 25th, 1925, should be brought to a successful conclusion as soon as possible, it requests the Council to call upon the Preparatory Commission to take steps to hasten the completion of the technical work and thus be able to draw up, if possible at the end of this year or at the beginning of next, the programme for a Conference on the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments corresponding to existing conditions regarding security. This Conference should meet before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly. ”

General DE MARINIS (Italy) recalled the criticisms which had been made against the questionnaire, which, he said, was altogether too large and contemplated questions which were entirely theoretical, as well as a large number of problems which were far from practical.

There was not, in his opinion, one question in the questionnaire which had not given rise to long and often heated discussions in the technical committees, whose work had thereby been prolonged.

But, on the other hand, one must remember, as the delegate for Italy on the Third Committee of the last session of the Assembly had pointed out, that this Committee would have met with the greatest difficulty if it had decided to solve the problem exclusively on technical grounds. In reality, the question of the reduction of armaments was essentially a political one, as would be undoubtedly shown by the final report which would contain the answers to the questionnaire.

General de Marinis, however, did not wish it to be thought that the technical work was useless, but suggested that, besides questions of a political nature, there were more or less secondary problems which necessitated the work of experts. M. Paul-Boncour had wisely shown this in alluding to the difficulties or the advantages to be derived from suppressing certain kinds of arms.

In reply to M. Lange, the speaker ventured to disagree with him. If the armaments of all countries were reduced in the same proportion, the same danger of war would remain.

As regards the hastening of the work, the speaker recalled that he was speaking in the name of a country which was pursuing a peaceful policy, which had reduced its armaments after the war and had signed treaties of friendship with a certain number of States, the last of which had been signed yesterday with a country to which Italy had been bound for centuries. He added that, when faced with such a formidable problem, he found it somewhat strange to hear talk of saving several days or several weeks. A report by the Secretariat had defined all the practical difficulties which lay before the meeting of the Preparatory Commission, and he thought that it would be undesirable, from a certain sense of pride, to hasten the work and risk obtaining unsatisfactory results.

For example, Sub-Commission A had yet to reply to many questions. Was it to be told that it was too late and that it could not pursue its work to a finish? In such a case, they ought to construct the questionnaire in a different way. Sub-Commission B was the result of the initiative of certain delegates, who wished to have an organ where those responsible for their Governments might be represented. It had been authorised to get advice from the Joint Commission, whose members had been furnished by the technical organisations of the League; it was now proposed, in order to gain time, that the Joint Commission should send its replies direct to the Preparatory Commission.

Again, Sub-Commission B had sent certain questions to Sub-Commission A and was waiting for the answers. It was now suggested that such inter-communication was useless, and that each of the Sub-Commissions might send their answers direct to the Preparatory Commission. This was the procedure which had been foreseen in the report of the Council. Could it reasonably be modified?

Finally, the speaker recalled that it had been agreed, after the work of the technical commissions should have been finished, to send their reports to the Governments, and the Preparatory Commission was to meet when the answers of the Governments should have arrived. But here he found it suggested, in order to gain time, that the reports of the technical commissions should go direct to the Preparatory Commission.

In conclusion, the speaker asked his colleagues to remember how necessary it was to probe the problem to the bottom when one was dealing with such a vast and important problem as that of the reduction and limitation of armaments. They should not interrupt the necessary enquiries merely in order to be able to say to themselves that the Preparatory Commission would have finished its work at Christmas instead of, for example, March 20th.

M. LANGE (Norway) wished to reply to M. Paul-Boncour, who had recalled his suggestion of the study in the Commission of the prohibition of certain kinds of armaments, such as submarines and tanks. He would welcome also a proposal from the French delegate asking for the abolition of battleships.

If he had taken submarines and tanks as an example, it was because public treaties rightly contained the prohibition of these means of warfare for certain States.

The Earl of ONSLOW (British Empire) supported the views expressed by M. Paul-Boncour. He thought the resolution he had in mind went a trifle further than the Polish proposal which had just been distributed (A. III. 1926). He had seen the draft of M. Paul-Boncour's resolution, and gathered that it was not proposed that the date should be absolutely mandatory. He had been impressed by the observations of General de Marinis, who was the only member of the Committee who had been through the whole of the arduous tasks of Sub-Commission A, and agreed that it would be a pity if, in order to get done by a certain time, questions were scamped. In spite of that, however, he thought that a resolution asking that an effort should be made to finish by a certain approximate date would be helpful.

M. DE BROUCKÈRE (Belgium), agreeing with M. Paul-Boncour, felt that the essential factor in the question of armaments was the rapidity with which these could be utilised for war. The time factor was likewise vital for disarmament.

A Disarmament Conference which could be very useful at a near date would lose its utility if postponed indefinitely. He therefore attached great importance to the speedy ending of the work. He agreed with M. Paul-Boncour in asking the Third Committee to endeavour to arrange that the meeting of the Preparatory Commission should be fixed towards the end of the year.

The Italian delegate had just said that it was not wise to be in too great a hurry and that the eventual delay would only be of a few weeks. He thought that, if they adopted the dates suggested in the memorandum by the Secretariat instead of those proposed by the French delegation, the delay encountered might be extremely long and dangerous. In choosing, the month of April and taking into account future delays, one would reach a time too near the Assembly to allow of a long period of work in order to submit the result of the work to the Council and to reach conclusions before the session of the next Assembly. In this case, the meeting could only take place a long time afterwards, namely, in November or December, and it was really a question of choosing between the end of this year and the end of next year. Loss of time would be, both for the Commission and for the League of Nations, a veritable lapse from duty.

General de Marinis had said that the problem of disarmament was not a technical but a political problem. This was quite true. At the same time, he asked that much time should be allowed to the technical commissions. Fully realising the importance of technical considerations, they must not be emphasised to such an extent as to prevent the accomplishment of the work. In a world where there were so many causes of war, it appeared that the opportunity of attaining peace must not be missed, and he felt that, at the present moment, conditions were most favourable.

M. DEBSKI (Poland) withdrew his proposal in favour of that of the French delegation.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) was most anxious to reconcile the views of all his colleagues, but he must emphasise what had been said by M. de Brouckère, that the question of time was a serious one, and in this debate it seemed so important that it rather transcended the limits of ordinary courtesy. If the Third Committee wished that the first Conference for Disarmament should result in a first International Convention, it must also wish to have this Convention as quickly as possible.

There were, as M. de Brouckère had said, moral and political circumstances which demanded a quick decision. It was a favourable opportunity to take, and it must not be missed. Was it certain that, if action were delayed, it would be possible later to stop a new development of armaments? It was not a question of a delay of several weeks but whether the Preparatory Commission would be able to meet before, or not before, the next session of the Assembly.

If the members of the Committee wished to see it meet before the next session of the Assembly, they could accept the French proposal in the wise form in which it had been constructed. M. Paul-Boncour proposed further, if this would satisfy certain of his colleagues, to say that it must meet at latest at the beginning of next year. He recalled that one must not forget that, between the moment that the Preparatory Commission would take up its definite work and the moment when Governments would agree to meet in a conference, several months would elapse.

If he had ventured to suggest a certain definite chronology, it was because he saw opportunities for reducing delay foreseen in the memorandum submitted by the Secretariat. It appeared to him that Sub-Commission A would be able to finish its work considerably before November 15th, because it would meet again on September 27th, and many of the questions which it had to examine had already been studied in a different form and it was not necessary to reexamine those which had already been dealt with.

The Secretariat had contemplated a session of Sub-Commission B in the month of November. Why could it not sit after this session of the Assembly, considering that most of its members were already at Geneva? The work of the Technical Commissions could thus be finished at least in November, and the reports sent to the Governments, so that the Preparatory Commission could meet at the end of this year or at the beginning of next. It was most necessary that the Conference should meet before the next session of the Assembly.

A motion had been adopted by which the question of private manufacture would be added to the studies of the Preparatory Commission. The technical organisations were already dealing with this, for supervision should be used for all armaments. In accordance with the resolution adopted, if the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments did not meet, another Conference would be convened to deal with private manufacture, and considerable complications would ensue.

The speaker did not propose a definite and compelling system of dates, but a rather pressing invitation which might be formulated as in the resolution which he submitted to the Third Committee.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) felt that the ideas of the delegations on the problem of disarmament had undergone a slight change. When discussing the report on the work of the Preparatory Commission, they had arrived at the basis of the question, which was that the Disarmament Conference should be convoked before the next session of the Assembly. If that was so, it would not matter if the Preparatory Commission finished in January or February. If the Members of the League of Nations had decided to convene a large Disarmament Conference, it would be possible to find means to speed up the technical work.

The question was now entirely a political one, and the speaker felt bound to state that he was not in a position at the moment to express the opinion of his Government on this point, but he felt that, to some extent, the resolution submitted by M. Paul-Boncour abandoned the point of view of last year's Assembly when passing its resolution of September 25th, in which it was said :

“ And in conformity with the spirit of Article 8 of the Covenant, requests the Council to make a preparatory study with a view to a Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, in order that, as soon as satisfactory conditions have been assured from the point of view of general security as provided for in Resolution XIV of the Third Assembly, the said Conference may be convened and a general reduction and limitation of armaments may be realised.”

M. Paul-Boncour's proposal spoke no longer of *general security*, but it was a question of drawing up the programme of a Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments *in accordance with the existing conditions of security*.

The speaker felt that the change was connected with the Treaties of Locarno, which must effect a greatly increased security for the peoples interested, and consequently render possible a reduction of armaments, but these Treaties did not extend to the conditions in that part of Europe in which the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was situated.

If M. Paul-Boncour's proposal only dealt with the security guaranteed by the Treaties of Locarno, and if the convocation of an international conference were due to this, the speaker could agree to this proposal, but if they were to understand that the general conditions of security spoken of in the resolution of September 25th of last year were already realised, he would have to consult his Government before expressing an opinion.

M. NEGULESCO (Roumania) asked M. Paul-Boncour to modify somewhat his proposal and to put it in agreement with the text passed by the Assembly last year. Under such conditions, he would be ready to support it.

The discussion was postponed until the text of M. Paul-Boncour should be distributed.

13. — Arbitration Conventions and Treaties of Mutual Security registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

M. LANGE (Norway) submitted the following draft resolution :

“ The Third Committee, having examined document C. 34, M. 74, 1926, V, entitled ‘ Systematic Survey of the Arbitration Conventions and Treaties of Mutual Security deposited with the League of Nations ’ :

“ Expresses its genuine satisfaction with this valuable survey.

“ The Committee observes, however, that, owing to the lines on which it is compiled, this survey necessarily presents serious deficiencies as a statement of the present situation in regard to engagements binding countries to resort to peaceful means for settling disputes, since a considerable number of such engagements, dating from before the formation of the League of Nations but still in force, have not been deposited with the Secretariat.

“ The Third Committee suggests that the First Committee should discuss the question of instructing the Secretariat to prepare as full a schedule as possible of the engagements at present in force between States Members or non-Members of the League providing for the compulsory, judicial or amicable settlement of disputes between them, as also treaties of security by mutual guarantee. ”

M. Lange did not feel that it was necessary to explain at length his draft resolution. It was a question of examining whether the collection of treaties of arbitration could not be extended. At the moment it only affected the treaties registered at the Secretariat. It would be more interesting and more important to have a collection of all the engagements which bound a State both as to arbitration and as to security and mutual guarantee.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, as the proposal was more within the competence of the First Committee, he would suggest putting it before them first of all.

This proposal was adopted.

14. — Arbitration and Security.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) recalled that, following a debate of the First Committee on the question of arbitration and security, the Committee had decided to appoint a Sub-Committee to give a résumé of the arguments and to prepare a report. This Sub-Committee had adopted the following draft resolution :

“ The Assembly,

“ Having examined the reports of the Council on Arbitration, Security and the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes :

“ Records the fact that the resolution of the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly to the effect that the most urgent need of the present time is the re-establishment of mutual confidence between nations has had definite results. It sees clear proof of this in the ever-increasing number of arbitration conventions and treaties of security conceived in the spirit of the Covenant of the League of Nations and in harmony with the principles of the Geneva Protocol (Arbitration, Security and Disarmament). It emphasises in particular the importance of the Treaties of Locarno, the coming into force of which has been rendered possible by the admission of Germany into the League of Nations and the principal object of which is to ensure peace in one of the most sensitive regions of Europe ;

“ Sees in the last-mentioned Treaties a definite step forward in the establishment of mutual confidence between nations ;

“ Considers that agreements of this kind need not necessarily be restricted to a limited area, but may be applied to the whole world ;

“ Proclaims its conviction that the general ideas embodied in the clauses of the Treaties of Locarno, whereby provision is made for conciliation and arbitration and for security by the mutual guaranteeing of States against any unprovoked aggression, are susceptible of acceptance as fundamental rules which should govern the foreign policy of every civilised nation ;

“ Expresses the hope that these general principles will be recognised by the States Members of the League of Nations and will be put into practice as soon as possible by all States in whose interest it is to contract such a treaty ;

“ And requests the Council to recommend the States Members of the League of Nations to put into practice the above-mentioned principles and to offer, if necessary, its good offices for the conclusion of suitable agreements likely to establish confidence, the indispensable condition of the maintenance of international peace, and, as a result, to facilitate the reduction and limitation of the armaments of all States. ”

M. MARKOVITCH was appointed Rapporteur to the Third Committee and the following draft report was submitted :

" The Assembly of the League of Nations at its last ordinary session, after noting that the Geneva Protocol had not received the ratifications necessary for putting it into operation immediately, decided to reserve its decision as to the advisability of drawing up a fresh general convention concerning the pacific settlement of international disputes. The principles of the Protocol in themselves retained their full value for the solution of the problem of the friendly settlement of disputes between nations. Although the resolution voted on September 25th, 1925, by the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly of the League of Nations formally abandons the Protocol it nevertheless insists on the advisability and necessity of working for the establishment of peace by the sure method of arbitration, security and disarmament. Inspired by these sentiments and determined to continue its efforts with a view to discovering the most appropriate means of ensuring peace, the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly drew the attention of the States Members of the League of Nations to the advantages, from the point of view of their security, of the conclusion of individual arbitration or judicial settlement conventions.

" The preliminary negotiations entered into last year between Germany and the Western Powers concerning a pact of guarantee had become a matter of common knowledge and they were expected to lead to results which would be favourable to the re-establishment of mutual confidence between nations. It was for that reason that the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly openly referred to these negotiations and proclaimed in advance that it regarded them with favour and hoped for their final success. The Assembly went even further in its anticipation of events and formally requested the Council, in its resolution of September 25th, 1925, to examine all these conventions and to submit a report to the seventh ordinary session of the Assembly on the progress in general security brought about by such agreements.

" The events which have taken place since September 1925 are well known. The recommendation of the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly with regard to arbitration conventions and treaties of mutual security has had its effect. Clear proof of this is to be found in the ever-increasing number of such treaties published by the Secretariat in the interesting volume entitled " Arbitration and Security " (a systematic survey of the arbitration conventions and treaties of mutual security deposited with the League of Nations ; document C. 34. M. 74. 1926. V), which has been communicated to all the members of the Third Committee. The most important event, however, and one which marks a definite stage in the evolution of the problem of the pacific settlement of international disputes, is the conclusion of the Treaties of Locarno, the realisation of the wish alluded to in the Assembly resolution of September 25th, 1925. This event has aroused world-wide interest. It is therefore not surprising that the Council of the League of Nations, in emphasising, in its reports on the matter, the capital importance of this historic fact, should not have hesitated to draw from it certain hopeful conclusions as to the maintenance of peace.

" Acting in accordance with the recommendation of the last ordinary session of the Assembly, the Council has undertaken, through the intermediary of its competent organs, an examination of all the declarations, proposals and suggestions made to it or to the Assembly. It has also undertaken an examination of the treaties deposited with the League of Nations, in particular the Treaties of Locarno. The conclusions at which the Council has arrived will not fail to produce an impression on all sides. The Council notes that the movement towards the pacific settlement of international disputes is constantly gaining force in international policy.

" In another passage of its report (document A. 32. 1926, page 12) the Council notes that this movement has acquired an ever-increasing force and can already be regarded as part of the practical policy which a number of States are in a position to adopt. The Third Committee is fully aware of the importance of these declarations ; without indulging in exaggerated optimism, it has come to the conclusion that appreciable progress has been achieved by the Treaties of Locarno and that it is essential to continue along the road of confidence and peace so clearly traced by the signing of these Treaties.

" When examining all these facts and endeavouring to determine their political significance, the Third Committee thought it desirable to recommend that the Assembly should not only note the progress realised in the matter, but should also take steps more particularly to promote the development of international relations in the spirit of mutual confidence and security which prevailed at Locarno and which should not remain the exclusive privilege of a few Powers. The Third Committee regards the present moment as most favourable for the consolidation of peace by means of the extension of the principles of the Protocol which were so emphatically confirmed by the Treaties of Locarno. It is convinced that the growing tendency to settle international disputes by pacific means, a tendency dwelt on in the report of the Council, stands in need of encouragement and support. It was for this reason and in view of the considerations to which reference has just been made that the Third Committee, on the proposal of the delegation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, drafted the proposal submitted to the Assembly for approval.

" This resolution bears some relation to those of previous years and more particularly to the resolution of September 25th, 1925. It is designed to testify to the League's desire to pursue the admirable work accomplished at Locarno and to make that work more far-reaching by extending it to other regions of Europe and the whole world, and by bringing it more fully within the framework of the Covenant and under the protection of the League. The resolution does not claim to exhaust the vast and complex question of the pacific settlement of international disputes.

" The resolution is in the nature rather of a political resolution bearing upon the actual

state and stage of evolution of those ideas of the Covenant which have found expression in the different Conventions on arbitration and security and more particularly in the Treaties of Locarno.

“ Further, we desire to mention a fresh element which would be introduced into the Council's sphere of activity by the last paragraph of the resolution. This contains a provision requesting the Council to offer its good offices, if necessary, for the conclusion of suitable agreements on the lines of the Locarno agreements. This simply means that the Council would be asked to give its encouragement and authorisation but would be left to judge, in its discretion, of the expediency of such mediation and the conditions under which it should be offered in concrete cases.

“ The seventh ordinary session of the Assembly, by adopting this resolution would set the seal of its authority on the peaceful policy which it desires to see adopted by the States Members of the League in their individual policy and would thus be discharging the duty so eloquently described in the preamble to the Covenant as that of achieving international peace and security by the establishment of the principles which should be regarded as the actual rule of conduct among Governments.”

M. DEBSKI (Poland) made the following statement :

“ The draft resolution which has just been put before us by the Sub-Committee deals with the problem of security, the realisation of which is the only thing which can hasten the general reduction and limitation of armaments. We are making in this difficult task a slow but, as the resolution has it, appreciable progress in the establishment of mutual confidence between nations. We see the number of conventions for arbitration and treaties for security daily increasing. Nevertheless, we wish to see the progress in this direction as rapid and noticeable as possible. We realise, however, the necessity of dealing with this subject with great caution, for we are far from losing sight of the great difficulties of the moment.

“ I have no wish to prolong the present discussion. I merely wish to recall certain suggestions made by the Polish delegation to the Preparatory Commission relative to the realisation of practical results in the questions of security and the reduction of armaments. While in no way wishing to complicate the work of the Preparatory Commission, we cannot, however, lose sight of the fact that this Commission is dealing in particular with certain aspects only of the question, notably the work of the technical sub-commissions which are studying specially the question of disarmament. It is the Assembly and its Committees which must in the first place express their opinion on the general problem.

“ The resolution of the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly expresses clearly the direction in which the work must be ordered. I wish to recall to you the final paragraph of this resolution :

“ ‘ And, in conformity with the spirit of Article 8 of the Covenant, requests the Council to make a preparatory study with a view to a Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, in order that, as soon as satisfactory conditions have been assured from the point of view of general security as provided for in Resolution XIV of the third Assembly, the said Conference may be convened and a general reduction and limitation of armaments may be realised.’

“ This was the chief reason why the Assembly did not confine itself to a simple statement of the present conditions of security. It is its duty to direct the development of international relations along certain predetermined lines. In particular, it must play an active part in the elaboration of a system of special agreements. I entirely agree with the honourable Rapporteur, M. Markovitch. It would otherwise be quite impossible to establish certain common principles which might result in the creation of wider systems. We believe, too, that the Assembly can take into consideration the proposals made in the course of the work of the Preparatory Commission, having in view the necessary precision in accordance with the articles of the Covenant which deal with the problem of security.

“ These proposals have been referred by the Council for examination to the competent organisations of the League of Nations. It would be well, in my opinion, to take these proposals into account here while discussing the problems of security and disarmament.

“ We are glad to state, with the honourable Rapporteur on disarmament questions, that ‘ the movement for the pacific settlement of international disputes is daily spreading in international politics. This is no mere movement of ideas ; it can be seen in actual facts, for it is producing an increasing number of conciliation and arbitration agreements.’

“ I should like to quote as an example the case of my own country, which has concluded Treaties of Arbitration and Conciliation with the following countries : the Balkan States, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Sweden, Germany and Denmark. The Treaty of Arbitration and Conciliation with the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes has been signed this morning, and an analogous Treaty with the Government of the Netherlands will be signed very soon.

“ The various political Agreements, particularly those concluded in Europe after the war with a view to the maintenance of peace within the framework of existing Treaties, prove by the very fact of their existence that the necessity for a certain precision in connection with the problem of security is very keenly felt, even among the States Members of the League of Nations.

“ I realise the great importance of these agreements, and here I wish particularly to note those concluded last year.

“ Special agreements, however, cannot assure general security so long as, first, they do not absolutely remove the chances of armed conflict. Secondly, they deal in the majority of cases with only part of a territory, or with a frontier already determined ; consequently, it is only in an indirect way that they increase the general guarantees of territorial integrity resulting from

Article 10 of the Covenant. Thirdly, owing to the very fact that these agreements are limited to certain States only, and do not deal with all the vital interests of States, the danger of serious conflicts between the signatories of these special agreements with their other neighbours who have not signed them is in no way diminished.

"Again, the agreements in question are not sufficient to give practical guarantees to the contracting countries and do not give them a complete assurance of security in all cases of aggression by a third Power, or by another group of Powers. The Polish delegation to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference has submitted certain suggestions relative to the organisation of a system of regional security and mutual assistance within the general terms of the Covenant. In emphasising its point of view, the Polish delegation only proposed to find certain formulas for the practical and immediate realisation of the great ideals behind the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"It is clear that only a general agreement could satisfy all the needs of security, and bring about a general limitation of armaments. If in the very near future, as we must hope, certain progress can be made in this direction, we may perhaps take even quicker steps in regional matters. If one could bring into force certain agreements by putting them before all the States Members of the League of Nations, it might perhaps be possible to do still more by referring to countries to which a very close union is necessary from the point of view of security. It is by this road that we shall have the opportunity of constituting 'a region', which must be defined as a territorial unit within the limits of which the existence of interests very closely bound together makes possible the organisation of a system of guarantee sufficiently complete and capable of assuring a high degree of security to all the parts constituting this unit.

"Two elements thus enter into the definition 'of regions': (1) The idea of the solidarity which unifies the countries composing the region, in particular as regards the maintenance of peace (regional solidarity); every conflict within the borders of a region affects the vital interests of each member of this region; (2) The existence of certain conditions rendering the organisation for assistance possible, both from military and economic points of view; such assistance must be rapid and effectual.

"Hitherto there have only been a few examples of regional organisation, while elsewhere all the necessary constituent elements have not been present. There have been, as far as I know, two examples, the Convention for the Limitation of Armaments between the Republics of Central America, signed at Washington on February 7th, 1923, and the continental Treaty for the Avoidance of Conflicts between South American States, signed at Santiago de Chile on March 3rd, 1923.

"The organisation of these 'regions' appears in conformity in every way with the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Regional organisations would not create new obligations but would only render possible a more rapid and effective execution of the engagements entered into under the Covenant within a region.

"It is quite possible that the creation of certain regional organisations in order to ensure the working of mutual assistance might be indispensable; but, in any case, such organisations would only come from the Council of the League of Nations.

"It is perhaps wise to make reference here to the report on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes submitted at the last session of the Council (C. 371, 1926, IX) where it reads: ' . . . the desirability of establishing special Conciliation Committees — for example, for the affairs of Eastern Europe, for Eastern affairs, for American affairs — which would be in the nature of Advisory Committees to advise the Council when necessary.'

"Future enquiries should be directed along this road in order to hasten the creation of a complete system of regional organisation, and it is perhaps thus that a general agreement on security will be most surely reached.

"There would be then three phases in the development of international security: Special Agreements, Regional Agreements and a General Agreement on Security and Disarmament.

"I have confined myself here to offering certain observations to show how my country contemplates the possibility of reaching certain practical realisation in the sphere of security and disarmament. On the work done towards this end by the competent organisations of the League of Nations, the Polish delegates will without doubt have the opportunity of explaining to a greater extent the point of view of their Government. We shall lose no opportunity of proving that Poland is deeply interested in the great work undertaken by the League of Nations.

"In supporting the draft resolution as well as the report which the honourable delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes has submitted, I should like to suggest a slight amendment to the text of the last paragraph of the resolution, namely, the addition of the words 'and security' after the words 'to establish confidence', in order to point out somewhat more clearly the mutual interdependence of the two sides of the problem."

M. MUNCH (Denmark) said that the resolution emphasised the importance of the Locarno Agreements, and he also thought that they would result in a great improvement of the political situation of Europe.

This draft resolution recommended that similar treaties should be concluded by groups of States, and this was most desirable, but the speaker added that the principles of Locarno could not be applied in an identical manner in other regions, for there were States which had no need to sign treaties of mutual guarantee between each other, and there were others who were not entirely satisfied by the principles contained in the treaties of arbitration signed at Locarno, for in these States conditions were such that it had been possible to make greater progress.

Thus Denmark had signed before the war treaties of obligatory arbitration with Brazil, Portugal, Netherlands and Italy, and after the war similar treaties with Norway, Sweden, Finland,

Poland and France. Likewise a treaty of arbitration going a little less far had been concluded with Germany and gave every satisfaction to Denmark.

Under these conditions, he felt that the example of the Agreements of Locarno could not be followed everywhere, as, in certain cases, the agreements had gone even further.

M. Munch therefore proposed to modify as follows paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution :

“ Considers that agreements of this kind need not necessarily be restricted to a limited area ;

“ Proclaims its conviction that the general idea embodied in the clauses of the Treaties of Locarno whereby provision is made for conciliation and arbitration and for security by the mutual guaranteeing of States against any unprovoked aggression will be put into practice as soon as possible by all States in whose interests it is ”, etc.

M. CABALLERO (Paraguay) was glad to hear M. Debski's reference to the Pact of Gondra, which had been named after the former President of Paraguay, and which aimed at preventing conflicts between countries on the whole American continent, and had been elaborated in 1923 at the Pan-American Congress at Santiago de Chile.

Once the Protocol of Geneva had been rejected, it was evident that the only course open in future to States was the conclusion of pacts similar to the Pact of Gondra. He recalled that he had had the honour of making this suggestion in his speech before the Assembly in 1925.

M. CASSIN (France) wished to formulate an observation as regards the principle and certain formal observations on the draft report and the draft resolution.

As regards principle, he wished to emphasise the importance that this resolution would have for public opinion, which was so important to the League of Nations, for public opinion as expressed by the ex-combatants in all countries had attached a particular value to the formula “ Arbitration, Security and Disarmament ” inscribed in the Protocol, and it would note with joy that the League of Nations never lost sight of the indivisible character of these three words. Though the Protocol had not been ratified, its principles remained.

As regards the system of special agreements, they were only of use as a preparation for general security, which they could only hasten as far as they enjoyed community of principle. It would not, therefore, be wise to suppress in the resolution every allusion to common principles of conduct.

The resolution had also the merit of showing the continuity of the competence of the League of Nations. The sanctions which it would be necessary to take if peace were disturbed were frequently discussed, but the preventive elements must not be forgotten. The Agreements of Locarno formed a moral element, which was bound up in the spirit of the Preamble of the Covenant with the material element for preparing the reduction of armaments foreseen by Article 8.

Under these circumstances, the Assembly must seize the opportunity to congratulate itself that the external policy of the Members of the League of Nations was in conformity with the Covenant. There was no question of discussing the large problem of the supervision of the League of Nations over treaties, nor to give a complete interpretation of Article 20, paragraph 1, sentence 2.

M. Cassin continued with the text of the report and of the resolution. As regards the latter, he was unable to accept all the proposals of M. Munch. The latter was right in saying that one could not ask States which had no chance of friction with each other to sign agreements like those of Locarno, and in consequence M. Cassin proposed to amend thus the fourth paragraph of the resolution :

“ Expresses the hope that these principles will be recognised by all States and will be put into practice as soon as possible by all States in whose interest it is to contract such treaties. ”

But M. Cassin did not wish to combine paragraphs 5 and 6 in one. He wished to keep the words “ fundamental rules ” and “ general principles ” in order to derive general instruction from the Treaties of Locarno. He hoped that M. Munch would not insist on this point.

Passing to the final paragraph, the delegate of Poland, M. Cassin recalled, had asked for the addition of the words “ and security ” after the word “ confidence ”. The French delegation felt that this addition would not make any sensible alteration to the spirit of the resolution and would not oppose it.

As to the report itself, M. Cassin proposed to replace the following sentence in the first paragraph :

“ Although the resolution voted on September 25th, 1925, by the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly of the League of Nations formally abandons the Protocol, it nevertheless insists on the advisability and necessity of working for the establishment of peace ”, etc., by the following :

“ It is for this reason that the resolution voted on September 25th, 1925, by the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly of the League of Nations insists upon the advisability and the necessity of working for the establishment of peace ”, etc.

M. Cassin proposed that the last sentence of the first paragraph should read as follows :

“ Inspired by these sentiments, and determined to continue its efforts with a view to discovering the most appropriate means of ensuring peace, the Assembly recalled the guarantees provided by the Covenant and drew the attention of States Members of the League of Nations ”, etc.

In paragraph 7 M. Cassin proposed to say :

“ This resolution bears some relation to those of previous years, and more particularly to the resolution of September 25th, 1925. It is designed to testify to the League's desire to pursue the admirable work accomplished at Locarno ”, etc.

In the last paragraph but one M. Cassin proposed :

“ This simply means that the Council would be asked to give its encouragement and make a recommendation ”, etc.

Lord ONSLOW (British Empire), referring to paragraph 7, proposed that the phrase “ and by bringing it more fully within the framework of the Covenant and under the protection of the League ” should be suppressed. He thought the phrase was useless as the Treaties of Locarno were already within the framework of the Covenant.

M. MUNCH (Denmark) thanked the representatives of France and Great Britain for accepting his amendment.

There was possibly some contradiction between paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the resolution, but this was diminished by the use of the word “ among ” in the fifth paragraph. This word showed that there was no desire to create a sort of exclusiveness in favour of the Locarno Agreements. The adoption of the resolution did not, he felt, indicate that the system of mutual guarantee was acceptable to all countries, for this system was unnecessary in certain parts. It did not signify either that there was any wish to exclude treaties of arbitration of a superior character to those of Locarno. It would be desirable that this reservation should figure not only in the Minutes but also in the report and the explanations furnished to the Assembly.

With these reservations, he accepted the resolution with the proposed amendments.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) agreed with all the proposed modifications, which expressed his own idea.

In order to satisfy the delegate of Denmark, he proposed to make the text clearer by adding the following paragraph after the sentence beginning with the words : “ The resolution does not claim. ”

“ The Committee fully recognises that in certain regions of the world, and even of Europe, States can without doubt go further towards a regime which shall be more strictly judicial than that of the Treaties of Locarno. Moreover, certain countries will not require to adhere strictly to the system of security by means of mutual guarantee which is consecrated by the aforesaid Treaties. ”

This addition, which had also been proposed by M. Lange, did not modify the sense of the text but would explain the proposed resolution somewhat better.

M. Markovitch supported the addition of the word “ security ” in the last part of the resolution, as was suggested by the delegate of Poland.

M. CASSIN (France) accepted the proposal of the delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. He asked the latter if he would accept the amendment of the second sentence as follows :

“ Moreover, certain States which consider themselves already in a state of security will not need . . . ”

The adoption of the report and resolution was postponed until the following meeting.

15. — Proposal by the French Delegation relative to the Preliminary Work on Disarmament (Continuation).

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) stated that, at the request of other delegations, the following amendments to the draft resolution were acceptable to the French delegation.

(1) Amendment proposed by General de Marinis : the deletion of the words “ at the end of the present year ” ;

(2) Amendment proposed by the Roumanian delegation, namely, the addition of the words “ regional and general ” in the phrase “ in the present conditions of security ”.

General DE MARINIS (Italy) thanked the French delegate for having noted his observation.

M. LANGE (Norway) stated that he quite agreed with the proposal of M. Paul-Boncour but that he would like to refer it to his delegation. As the present meeting would not be the last one, it might be possible to postpone the matter for definite decision.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) accepted this postponement.

The Committee decided to adjourn the discussion of the draft resolution.

The meeting adjourned at 7.25 p.m.

SEVENTH MEETING

Held on Monday, September 20th, 1926, at 5 p.m.

Chairman : M. VILLEGAS (Chile).

16. — Adoption of the Report and Resolution of the Third Committee Concerning Arbitration and Security (Rapporteur, M. Markovitch) (Annex 2).

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the report.
As no observations were made, *he declared the report adopted.*

M. SCHUMANS (Latvia) asked the Rapporteur if he would be ready to accept an amendment of the last paragraph but one of the resolution. He wished to add the words : " and non-Members of the League of Nations ", to the sentence : " expresses the hope that these principles will be recognised by States Members of the League of Nations ". The Latvian delegate cited in support of this amendment the resolution of September 25th, 1925, and the Geneva Protocol, which mentioned States non-Members of the League of Nations.

M. MARKOVITCH (Rapporteur) accepted this amendment.

The Earl of ONSLOW (British Empire) suggested that, in the interests of simplicity, the paragraph should read :

" Expresses the hope that these principles will be recognised by all States and will be put into practice . . . "

The resolution, as amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN, after having consulted the Committee, asked M. Markovitch to be the Rapporteur to the Assembly on this question.

17. — Proposal submitted by the French Delegation regarding Preliminary Work on Disarmament (Continuation).

The SECRETARY read the draft resolution (see Annex 3).

The Earl of ONSLOW (British Empire) pointed out that the last sentence : " this Conference should meet before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly " was absolutely mandatory. He hoped that an alteration would be agreed to.

In addition to the Sub-Commissions which were now sitting, all the Governments of the numerous States of the world would have to undertake the consideration of the proposals put forward. Everyone would like to see the Conference meet as soon as possible, but as it would be engaged in one of the biggest, most important and most complicated tasks which a diplomatic or any other conference had ever attempted to tackle, it would be inadvisable to hurry too much. When all the preparatory work had been completed there still remained the duty incumbent on the Council of drawing up the programme of the Conference, and that programme would have to be examined by the Governments, which would take some time.

Then there was the question of the appointment of delegates. Every Government would endeavour to secure the services of those who had the highest possible qualifications, and it was not always very easy for people in that position to get ready immediately. Even if everything was ready for the Conference to begin before the next session of the Assembly, it might be more convenient to wait till the Assembly was over in order to go on without interruption.

He did not think the Assembly now sitting should proclaim that the Conference should meet before next September and then for some reason, wholly unavoidable, find that it was not possible to do so. The general public did not understand those matters so well as those who had been at Geneva, and might be led to suppose that the delay was indefinite if the Conference did not take place when proclaimed, and he thought they should not run the risk of disappointing public opinion. He entirely agreed as to fixing a time-table for the preparatory work, but considered that the last sentence might be deleted with advantage. According to paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Covenant, it was for the Council, taking account of the geographical situation and the circumstances of each State, to formulate a plan. The inference was that it was for the Council to decide, and last year that duty was left to the Council.

M. MARKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) recalled that last year the Council had been left to judge when the conditions of security would allow the convocation of

a large international Conference on Disarmament. In the proposal of the French delegation, the conditions of security were no longer spoken of in the same terms. He fully understood the reasons underlying the French proposal, which aimed at taking account of the security realised in certain parts of Europe, but as regards his own country, M. Markovitch regretted that he must state that, from the point of view of security, conditions had hardly changed in that part of Europe since last year. He therefore felt that he must here make a slight reservation, though he would nevertheless support the French proposal.

M. NEGULESCO (Roumania) explained that the alteration that he had requested at the previous meeting appeared to him necessary because at the Disarmament Conference there would be States bound together by obligations derived from the Locarno Treaties, while other States would not have signed any regional agreement.

He was satisfied that M. Paul-Boncour had accepted his proposal and he supported the proposal of the French delegation.

He had been much struck by the remarks of Lord Onslow, and he was ready to admit that, if material difficulties prevented the calling of the Conference before the next session of the Assembly, the impression on public opinion would be most unfavourable. He therefore proposed the addition of the words " if possible before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly ".

M. MOTTA (Switzerland) felt that the expression used in the second paragraph was hardly a happy one. Perhaps another formula might be used, such as : " The Assembly thanks the authors of the report for the work accomplished. "

He asked if the delegations would be willing to give a moral undertaking that the Disarmament Conference should take place before the next session of the Assembly. Even if the date was still uncertain, the Conference certainly would be held, which was the most important point. If a date were fixed now, public opinion might be misled in a dangerous manner, and to take such a definite undertaking might perhaps be neither wise nor prudent.

The Earl of ONSLOW (British Empire) thanked M. Motta and M. Negulesco for what they had said.

The former had expressed in very eloquent language the certainty that there was going to be a Conference and the desire that nothing should be done which would make people think that those concerned were half-hearted about it. If a date was fixed for the Conference, and the Conference could not meet on that date, an unfortunate impression would be produced.

The honourable delegate for Roumania had proposed the adoption of the resolution submitted by the French delegation with the addition of the two words, " if possible ". The English text, which was a little different from the French, would then read : " This Conference should, if possible, meet before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly. " He did not know whether his French colleagues would agree to that, but some simple alteration of that kind might meet the case.

Mr. LATHAM (Australia) said that the last clause of the resolution was really intended to express a wish and not to give a direction. The English text appeared rather to give a direction and he understood that was the subject-matter of the Roumanian amendment. If it was said that the Conference would meet, the date ought to be fixed ; plainly, they were not in a position to do that. He supported what had been said on the subject by the last three speakers.

On the point mentioned by M. Motta, he suggested that the Assembly should express its complete satisfaction with the work accomplished.

In regard to the opening words of the resolution :

" The Assembly takes note of the report submitted to it by the Secretariat and the very full information furnished it by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission on the work of that Commission " —

the members of the Third Committee had had the very great advantage of hearing from M. Loudon a very full report of the work of the Preparatory Commission. The Assembly itself had not heard that report, and some members of the Assembly who were not members of this Committee might think that the wording was slightly out of order. He suggested, therefore, that some difference in phraseology might be introduced.

In conclusion, he cordially supported the resolution in its general terms.

M. DE JOUVENEL (France) readily accepted the observations of M. Motta as to the corrections in style of the resolution, though they were not entirely necessary. The second paragraph merely meant that the Assembly expressed its satisfaction.

The French delegate regretted that he could not say the same as regards the substance. As the Swiss delegate had said, the really important thing was not the date of the Conference but the assurance that it would meet. It was to be feared that, if they did not fix a date, there might be a risk that the Conference would not meet.

In reply to Lord Onslow, the French delegate said that it was not the Council but the Preparatory Commission which had to arrange the programme of the Conference. As this programme would be drawn up at the beginning of next year, public opinion would never understand how in eight months the Council was unable to fix a date. This would be a great and serious danger, for the present opportunity was a good one. There was a spirit of friendliness in a large part of Europe. The Treaties of Locarno had entered into force and Germany was

a Member of the League of Nations. They must not let slip an opportunity which might not occur again.

The French delegate fully realised, as all his colleagues did, that this Conference would not be a Conference for total disarmament, but they must still make the effort to arrange for it to meet. The French delegation was absolutely ready, as were their experts; and asked that this Conference should meet as quickly as possible.

General DE MARINIS (Italy) thanked M. Paul-Boncour for having, at the end of the last meeting, modified his text by withdrawing the date of December as a time for the completion of the work of the Preparatory Commission.

Encouraged by certain considerations which had just been mentioned by several delegates, he would like to see the last part of the resolution modified, where it was a question of convening the General Disarmament Conference before the eighth session of the Assembly. Having some experience of the work of technical commissions, he doubted whether it would be possible to draw up the programme of the general Conference within so short a space of time.

If it was true that it was not the Council which was to arrange the programme but the Preparatory Commission itself, he wished to recall the decision of the sixth session of the Assembly that it was the Council's duty to decide itself on a suitable date for the meeting of the Conference, taking into account the general state of security.

In conclusion, he felt that, under the circumstances, it would be wise to accept the amendment proposed by the delegate of Roumania. By inserting the words "if possible" they would be taking a step which would be favourable to public opinion, which could best be served by the elimination of promises difficult to fulfil.

M. JANSON (Belgium) strongly supported, in the name of his delegation, the view put forward by M. de Jouvenel. Without doubt, the Swiss, Italian and Roumanian representatives had shown a conciliatory spirit in proposing or supporting the insertion of the words "if possible". However, the introduction of these words into the text would offer no advantage and would, on the other hand, present difficulties. Public opinion was following closely the work of the Committee, and if, after making a solemn statement that the Conference must meet as soon as possible, the Committee itself introduced into the draft resolution the words "if possible", it would give the impression that it did not really believe that its wishes could be realised in the near future.

In conclusion, the Belgian delegate said that the Committee could very well support the French text, for the last sentence of this text had in no way a mandatory character but, on the contrary, the element of possibility was suggested in the form submitted. The Committee would do well to support this text, and in any case the Belgian delegate was definitely opposed to the Roumanian amendment.

M. SATO (Japan) drew the attention of his colleagues to the fact that at least a month was necessary before the decisions taken by the Preparatory Commission could reach Japan. A similar delay would be necessary in the case of other countries, and yet another month would have to be allowed before the delegates appointed could reach Europe. He therefore thought that the Conference could not meet before June or July, and he wondered whether the latter time would be suitable for the proposed meeting.

He did not wish in any way to underestimate the importance of the proposed resolution, and if, as the Belgian delegate had said, the conditional sense of the resolution gave the same meaning as would be obtained by the words "if possible", M. Sato was ready to accept them. He would add that Japan would be one of the first countries to send delegates to the Conference. He had wished to point out certain material difficulties which would arise from the question of time.

M. LANGE (Norway) recalled that, at the last meeting, he had stated that he agreed with the spirit of M. Paul-Boncour's proposal, and that, after re-examining this text, he was only more fully convinced that the Third Committee should accept it in its present form.

He wished to draw the attention of his colleagues to a word in the resolution which appeared to him very important. It spoke of "a Conference", and not of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. As M. de Jouvenel had said, they had to begin by taking the first step. Who would imagine that the great task of liquidating past armaments and the military organisations of the world could be accomplished in the course of a single Conference? This would be a mistake. It appeared to the Norwegian delegation that the Rapporteur to the Assembly would need to emphasise this point and to show that it was not possible to pass in a single step from a state of insecurity and of armaments to a state of the reduction of armaments.

The League of Nations was moving towards organised peace. Its work must be directed to practical ends, and this was the task of the First Conference provided for by the resolution.

He ventured to say to those of his colleagues who hesitated to accept the proposal in the form in which it stood, and who wished to insert in it certain reservations, that, in contemplating the adjournment of this First Conference, they were pledging themselves to another Conference before the eighth session of the Assembly, that of the Supervision of the Private Manufacture of Arms. Those who wished for the meeting of this latter Conference would have the right, if the Conference provided for in the resolution under discussion did not take place before the eighth session of the Assembly, to insist that the Conference for the Supervision of Private Manufacture should be called.

M. MOTTA (Switzerland) wished, first of all, to assure the members of the Committee that he would in every way abide by the decision of the majority, and that the observations which he wished to make did not constitute definite opposition.

He ventured to suggest that M. Lange had introduced a dangerous idea into the discussion. The Norwegian delegate had drawn attention to the word "a" and had emphasised that it was a question of "a" Conference and not "the" Conference. M. Motta felt that it was a question of a First Conference.

Elsewhere it had been said that the words "if possible" meant no more than the meaning already given by the last sentence of the resolution which was conditional. M. Motta thought that they had some considerable signification. The formula which did not include the words "if possible" was a very hopeful one and had a sort of moral implication. The other, including these two words, was a formula which was intended to avoid any deception. The expressions "would meet", "should meet", "should meet if possible", had shades of meaning which the Committee might discuss but which, for the public, would have no more definite meaning than was in the resolution.

Everyone was in agreement that they were not political but technical and material reasons that would delay the meeting of the Conference. The speaker also thought that it was possible to find an agreement on a text which would show the possibility of delay owing to technical difficulties.

M. Motta therefore asked the author of the resolution if the following amendment: "Which would meet if technically possible", would not be acceptable to him and to the rest of the Committee.

M. DE JOUVENEL (France) stated that he was ready to make the necessary concession, but it was important that the members of the Committee should not have any differences of opinion as to the substance of the resolution.

M. Motta had just proposed the words "technical impossibilities", but the French delegation could not accept it without entirely losing sight of the ideas put forward by M. Paul-Boncour at the last meeting. The French delegation did not recognise the existence of technical impossibilities. They were ready to respect the delays mentioned by M. Sato. The Japanese delegate had had a certain difficulty in postponing the Conference to June, and one might assume that the Japanese experts would keep their Government informed as to the debates which had taken place. There could therefore be no technical impossibilities, but one might suppose that a delegate could be kept back or hindered from being present at the Conference. Considering this hypothesis, it could be said that there would be material difficulties, and the French delegation was therefore ready to agree to the amendment and to accept the expression "unless material difficulties render this impossible".

But, as M. Motta said, they must really be agreed as to the meaning of M. Paul-Boncour's resolution. M. Motta had said that the conditional time in the sentence was important; this was true. He had said at the same time that it was the "first Conference", but that it would not be the last one. M. Lange, moreover, had insisted on the idea that they must make a beginning and this was truly an essential. The impression must assuredly be given of the termination of the period of preparation, and that the League of Nations was arriving at conclusions. This was the meaning of the Third Committee when it had adopted M. Markovitch's resolution stating that the League of Nations was not any longer to be a kind of passive institution for the registration of treaties, but that it had diplomatic methods. It was time to have done with platonic vows.

M. de Jouvenel expressed his conviction that the last war would not have taken place if it had been possible to take the necessary decision in time. Such dangers must not be run again. They must not allow difficulties to accumulate before endeavouring to surmount them. The French delegate well knew that the Conference would go through difficult times, but it must go through them with a courageous spirit.

The EARL OF ONSLOW (British Empire) thanked the French delegation for its conciliatory attitude, and agreed to the proposed amendment: "Will meet unless material difficulties render this impossible."

M. CABALLERO (Paraguay) stated that his delegation was entirely in agreement with the French draft resolution. His country was one which was perpetually disarmed, and for this very reason it meant much to him that other nations should likewise disarm and that the problem of disarmament should once and for all be really begun. The League of Nations was now sufficiently strong to abandon platonic vows, as M. de Jouvenel had just stated.

General DE MARINIS (Italy) would have preferred the use of the words "should meet".

M. DE JOUVENEL (France) thought that one conditional would be enough.

M. LATHAM (Australia) supported the French proposal.

General DE MARINIS (Italy) thought the expression suggested might allow it to be understood that the Assembly intended to give orders to the Council.

M. DE JOUVENEL (France) emphasised that the terms proposed by the French delegation clearly indicated that there was no technical or political impossibility. There might indeed be material difficulties, but the Committee did not recognise others.

M. MOTTA (Switzerland) supported the French proposal.

M. LOUDON (Netherlands) proposed a formula which he thought would emphasise the unanimous approval of the Committee : " And asks the Council to convene this Conference before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly unless material difficulties render this impossible. "

General DE MARINIS (Italy) accepted the French proposal and suggested the nomination of M. Paul-Boncour as Rapporteur.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR (France) thanked General de Marinis and agreed to be Rapporteur. As he had the intention of taking part in the discussion, he in no way abandoned this intention.

He hoped, however, that the Committee would not be surprised if, after having submitted his report, he took part in the discussion.

The final draft resolution was read :

" The Assembly takes note of the report submitted to it by the Secretariat and the very full information furnished to the Third Committee by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission on the work of that Commission, its technical Sub-Commissions A and B and the Joint Commission.

" It expresses its complete satisfaction with the work performed and thanks those who have contributed to it.

" Being desirous that the investigations in regard to which the Assembly itself took the initiative in its resolution of September 25th, 1925, should be brought to a successful conclusion as soon as possible, it requests the Council to call upon the Preparatory Commission to take steps to hasten the completion of the technical work and thus be able to draw up, at the beginning of next year, the programme for a Conference on the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments corresponding to existing conditions in regard to regional and general security, and it asks the Council to convene this Conference before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly unless material difficulties render this impossible. "

The draft resolution was unanimously adopted.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that, as this was the last meeting of the Committee, a Sub-Committee, consisting of M. Loudon, Count Bernstorff, the Earl of Onslow, General de Marinis and M. Sato, should meet later on to examine in the name of the Committee the report which M. Paul-Boncour would present (Annex 3).

This proposal was carried.

Count BERNSTORFF (Germany) said that he was quite sure of voicing the feeling of the Committee in warmly thanking the Chairman and in congratulating him on the way he had conducted the work of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Count Bernstorff, as well as all the members of the Committee, for this mark of confidence.

The meeting closed at 7.15 p.m.

ANNEXES

1. Report of the Third Committee to the Seventh ordinary Session of the Assembly :
Supervision of the Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements
of War..... 47
 2. Report of the Third Committee to the Seventh Ordinary Session of the Assembly :
Arbitration and Security..... 48
 3. Report of the Third Committee to the Seventh Ordinary Session of the Assembly :
Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference..... 50
-

Annex 1.

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE TO THE SEVENTH ORDINARY SESSION OF
THE ASSEMBLY : SUPERVISION OF THE PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND
AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

Rapporteur : H. E. M. GUERRERO (*Salvador*).

The Third Committee has considered the problem of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war, and has noted the close connection which exists between this problem and the other items on its agenda ; namely, that of the limitation and general reduction of armaments, that of the supervision of the international trade in arms and ammunition and in implements of war, and that of statistical information concerning this trade. The close connection between these questions is due to the fact that, on the one hand, several countries experience great difficulty in adopting the standard form recommended by the last Assembly for the communication of statistical information to the Secretariat before ratifying the Convention ; that, on the other hand, the coming into force of the Convention on the Trade in Arms is delayed because most countries cannot ratify it until the cognate problem of the private manufacture of arms has been solved ; and finally, that it might prove equally difficult to ratify a convention on the latter subject before knowing what a general convention on the limitation of armaments would be.

The problem of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war is raised in precise terms in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. It has received the constant attention of the Assembly since the foundation of the League. Document A. 47. 1926. IX, distributed to the Assembly, contains a preliminary draft Convention prepared by the Committee of Enquiry of the Committee of the Council, together with other documents, including a report submitted by M. Beneš and adopted by the Council, and a Council resolution drawing the attention of the Assembly to the connection which exists between this problem and the more general question now being considered by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

The Third Committee unanimously recognises that the patient and methodical enquiries which the different Committees of the Council and of various Assemblies have conducted in this matter make it possible to conclude that, from a technical point of view, the problem might be solved in the near future. There was, however, evidence of two currents of opinion in the Committee with regard to the desirability of convening, immediately, an international conference to conclude the desired Convention. Though the Committee was unanimous concerning the necessity for dealing with this question as soon as possible, the opinion was expressed that it would be desirable to avoid separating the work connected with the private manufacture of arms from the preparatory work in connection with the General Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments — a problem of which the private manufacture of arms, after all, forms but a part. Unanimity was reached on the basis of a conditional proposal to the effect that the lesser problem was capable of early solution in any case, either by its inclusion in the programme of the General Conference on Disarmament, if the latter can be convened before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly, or, failing this, by means of a special Conference.

Your Committee therefore proposes that you should adopt the following resolution :

“ The Assembly once again draws attention to the close connection which exists between the question of the supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war and the international trade in these articles ;

“ It notes that, up to the present, the Convention on the Supervision of the International Trade has been ratified by only one signatory country, and hopes that the efforts which are being made to obtain the ratification of the principal producing countries will soon be successful ;

“ It notes the work which has been carried out under the direction of the Council with regard to the supervision of private manufacture ;

“ It declares that it is in agreement with the Council as regards the connection which exists between this question and the whole problem now being examined by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

“ It lays stress upon the necessity of concluding a Convention as soon as possible, though it recognises that priority must be accorded to work in connection with the Convention on Disarmament ;

“ It therefore proposes that the Council should continue its enquiries regarding private manufacture, in order that these questions may be included in the programme of the Disarmament Conference, if this Conference can be convened before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly, or, if that is impossible, in order that a special Conference may be convened as soon as possible to deal with the matter. ”

Annex 2.

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE TO THE SEVENTH ORDINARY SESSION
OF THE ASSEMBLY : ARBITRATION AND SECURITY.

Rapporteur : H.E. Dr. Lazare MARKOVITCH (*Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes*).

The Assembly of the League of Nations, at its last ordinary session, after noting that the Geneva Protocol had not received the ratifications necessary for putting it into operation immediately, decided to reserve its decision as to the advisability of drawing up a fresh general convention concerning the pacific settlement of international disputes. The general principles of the Protocol — arbitration, security and disarmament — in themselves retained their full value for the solution of the problem of the friendly settlement of disputes between nations. For this reason, the resolution voted on September 25th, 1925, by the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly of the League of Nations insists on the advisability and necessity of working for the establishment of peace by the sure method of arbitration, security and disarmament. Inspired by these sentiments and determined to continue its efforts with a view to discovering the most appropriate means of ensuring peace, the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly recalled the guarantees provided by the Covenant and drew the attention of the States Members of the League of Nations to the advantages, from the point of view of their security, of the conclusion of individual arbitration or judicial settlement conventions.

The preliminary negotiations entered into last year between Germany and the Western Powers concerning a pact of guarantee had become a matter of common knowledge and they were expected to lead to results which would be favourable to the re-establishment of mutual confidence between nations. It was for that reason that the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly openly referred to these negotiations and proclaimed in advance that it regarded them with favour and hoped for their final success. The Assembly went even further in its anticipation of events and formally requested the Council, in its resolution of September 25th, 1925, to examine all these conventions and to submit a report to the seventh ordinary session of the Assembly on the progress in general security brought about by such agreements.

The events which have taken place since September 1925 are well known. The recommendation of the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly with regard to arbitration conventions and treaties of mutual security has had its effect. Clear proof of this is to be found in the ever increasing number of such treaties published by the Secretariat in the interesting volume entitled "Arbitration and Security" (a systematic survey of the arbitration conventions and treaties of mutual security deposited with the League of Nations : document C. 34. M. 74, 1926, V), which has been communicated to all the members of the Third Committee. The most important event, however, and one which marks a definite stage in the evolution of the problem of the pacific settlement of international disputes, is the conclusion of the Treaties of Locarno, the realisation of the wish alluded to in the Assembly Resolution of September 25th, 1925. This event has aroused world-wide interest. It is therefore not surprising that the Council of the League of Nations, in emphasising, in its reports on the matter, the capital importance of this historic fact, should not have hesitated to draw from it certain hopeful conclusions as to the maintenance of peace.

Acting in accordance with the recommendation of the last ordinary session of the Assembly, the Council has undertaken, through the intermediary of its competent organs, an examination of all the declarations, proposals and suggestions made to it or to the Assembly. It has also undertaken an examination of the treaties deposited with the League of Nations, in particular the Treaties of Locarno. The conclusions at which the Council has arrived will not fail to produce an impression on all sides. The Council notes that the movement towards the pacific settlement of international disputes is constantly gaining force in international policy.

In another passage of its report (document A. 32, 1926, page 12) the Council notes that this movement has acquired an ever-increasing force and can already be regarded as part of the practical policy which a number of States are in a position to adopt. The Third Committee is fully aware of the importance of these declarations ; without indulging in exaggerated optimism, it has come to the conclusion that appreciable progress has been achieved by the Treaties of Locarno and that it is essential to continue along the road of confidence and peace so clearly traced by the signing of these Treaties.

When examining all these facts and endeavouring to determine their political significance, the Third Committee thought it desirable to recommend that the Assembly should not only note the progress realised in the matter, but should also take steps more particularly to promote the development of international relations in the spirit of mutual confidence and security which prevailed at Locarno and which should not remain the exclusive privilege of a few Powers. The

Third Committee regards the present moment as most favourable for the consolidation of peace by means of the extension of the principles of the Protocol which were so emphatically confirmed by the Treaties of Locarno. It is convinced that the growing tendency to settle international disputes by pacific means, a tendency dwelt on in the reports of the Council, stands in need of encouragement and support. It was for this reason and in view of the considerations to which reference has just been made that the Third Committee, on the proposal of the delegation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, drafted the proposal submitted to the Assembly for approval.

This resolution bears some relation to those of previous years and more particularly to the resolutions of September 25th, 1925. It is designed to testify to the League's desire to promote the continuation of the admirable work accomplished at Locarno and to make that work more far-reaching by extending it to other regions of Europe and the whole world. The resolution does not claim to exhaust the vast and complex question of the pacific settlement of international disputes.

The Committee fully realises that in certain parts of the world, and even in Europe, States will no doubt be able to go further and adopt a more strictly judicial system than that of the Locarno Treaties.

Furthermore, certain States which may consider themselves to be already in a position of security will not need to identify themselves strictly with the system of security by mutual guarantee provided for in these Treaties.

The resolution is in the nature rather of a political resolution bearing upon the actual state and stage of evolution of those ideas of the Covenant which have found expression in the different Conventions on arbitration and security and more particularly in the Treaties of Locarno.

Further, we desire to mention a fresh element which would be introduced into the Council's sphere of activity by the last paragraph of the resolution. This contains a provision requesting the Council to offer its good offices, if necessary, for the conclusion of suitable agreements on the lines of the Locarno agreements. This simply means that the Council would be asked to give its encouragement and make a recommendation but would be left to judge, in its discretion, of the expediency of such mediation and the conditions under which it should be offered in concrete cases.

The seventh ordinary session of the Assembly, by adopting this resolution would set the seal of its authority on the peaceful policy which it desires to see adopted by the States Members of the League in their individual policy and would thus be discharging the duty so eloquently described in the preamble to the Covenant as that of achieving international peace and security by the establishment of the principles which should be regarded as the actual rule of conduct among Governments.

Draft Resolution

" The Assembly,

" Having examined the reports of the Council on Arbitration, Security and the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes,

" Records the fact that the resolution of the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly, to the effect that the most urgent need of the present time is the re-establishment of mutual confidence between nations, has had definite results. It sees clear proof of this in the ever-increasing number of arbitration conventions and treaties of security conceived in the spirit of the Covenant of the League of Nations and in harmony with the principles of the Geneva Protocol (Arbitration, Security and Disarmament). It emphasises in particular the importance of the Treaties of Locarno, the coming into force of which has been rendered possible by the admission of Germany into the League of Nations and the principal object of which is to ensure peace in one of the most sensitive regions of Europe,

" Sees in the last-mentioned Treaties a definite step forward in the establishment of mutual confidence between nations,

" Considers that agreements of this kind need not necessarily be restricted to a limited area, but may be applied to different parts of the world.

" Asserts its conviction that the general ideas embodied in the clauses of the Treaties of Locarno, whereby provision is made for conciliation and arbitration and for security by the mutual guaranteeing of States against any unprovoked aggression, may well be accepted amongst the fundamental rules which should govern the foreign policy of every civilised nation.

" Expresses the hope that these principles will be recognised by all States and will be put into practice as soon as possible by all States in whose interest it is to contract such treaties.

" And requests the Council to recommend the States Members of the League of Nations to put into practice the above-mentioned principles and to offer, if necessary, its good offices, for the conclusion of suitable agreements likely to establish confidence and security, the indispensable conditions of the maintenance of international peace and, as a result, to facilitate the reduction and limitation of the armaments of all States."

Annex 3.

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE TO THE SEVENTH ORDINARY SESSION
OF THE ASSEMBLY : PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT
CONFERENCE.

Rapporteur : H. E. M. PAUL-BONCOUR (*France*).

After taking note of the negotiations at that time in progress with a view to the conclusion of arbitration conventions and of treaties of mutual security, and anticipating the successful conclusion of these negotiations, the Assembly, at its sixth ordinary session, decided that it could ask the Council to proceed immediately to preparatory studies for the organisation of a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments.

In taking this step on the proposal of its Third Committee, it fully realised that these studies would necessarily take a considerable time in view of the wide scope and the complicated nature of a problem which had hitherto never been approached.

It hoped that in this way, when political conditions permitted — the preparatory studies having already been carried out — a conference for the reduction and limitation of armaments could usefully be convened.

In the Third Committee's opinion, this step was a wise one and these hopes will not prove vain. After hearing the statement made by M. Loudon, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission to which the Council entrusted the investigations called for by the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly, on the state of this Commission's work and also of that of its technical Sub-Commissions, and having regard also to the fact that the situation has become more favourable by the ratification of the Locarno Agreements and Germany's admission to the League of Nations, the Third Committee recognised that a conference on the limitation of armaments can and should be convened.

Differences of opinion, or, more exactly, apprehensions, have been manifested as to when the technical preparations will be complete and consequently as to when the Preparatory Commission can draw up the programme of the Conference and when the Conference itself can be convened.

Nevertheless, the work has been pursued with such energy and has reached such a stage of development that the Third Committee believes that it will be possible to draw up the programme of the Conference at the beginning of next year, and accordingly proposes that the Assembly should congratulate those who have taken part in this work.

It will then be for the Council to fix the date of convening the Conference. In this connection it should be pointed out that, while great progress has been made with regard to security, thanks to the Locarno Agreements, this progress only affects one part of the continent of Europe.

For this reason it appeared necessary to state that the limitation and reduction of armaments should "correspond to existing conditions in regard to regional and general security". Furthermore, there can be no question of solving the problem of disarmament at the first attempt. As security increases, disarmament will increase. The Disarmament Conference will therefore only be the first of a series and, even apart from the importance of the reductions and limitations which it may bring about, it must in any case have the immense advantage of transforming into an international contract the degree of armament of the different States, and of thus putting a stop for a definite period to any possibility of competition in armaments.

In these circumstances there can be no objection in principle to contemplating the possibility of holding a conference before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly. Several members of the Third Committee, however, have emphasised the grave disappointment which would be felt by public opinion if, after it had been announced for a definite date, it proved impossible to hold the Conference at the date in question. The Third Committee duly weighed this drawback and made allowance for it, to the extent of recommending that the Conference should be held before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly, "unless material difficulties render this impossible", and it emphasises the considerable importance of surmounting such difficulties and accelerating the work of the technical Commissions, which must first be completed before the Preparatory Commission can usefully meet. The Third Committee has therefore decided to propose to the Assembly the adoption of a resolution asking the Council to convene a first conference before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly, unless material difficulties should render this impossible, in order to agree upon the first stage of the work of disarmament.

Draft Resolution.

“ The Assembly takes note of the report submitted to it by the Secretariat and the very full information furnished to the Third Committee by the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission on the work of that Commission, its technical Sub-Commissions A and B, and the Joint Commission.

“ It expresses its complete satisfaction with the work performed and thanks those who have contributed to it.

“ Being desirous that the investigations, in regard to which the Assembly itself took the initiative in its resolution of September 25th, 1925, should be brought to a successful conclusion as soon as possible, it requests the Council to call upon the Preparatory Commission to take steps to hasten the completion of the technical work and thus be able to draw up, at the beginning of next year, the programme for a Conference on the limitation and reduction of armaments corresponding to existing conditions in regard to regional and general security, and it asks the Council to convene this conference before the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly unless material difficulties render this impossible. ”
