

of the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of 125,000 dollars, to be spread over a period of five years, for running this bureau, which was established in March, 1925. There has always been an understanding that the demand made on this gift should decrease year by year, and that at the expiration of the five-years period it should be for the League, or for several countries deriving special benefit from the work of the bureau, to contribute to its keep. Now, it is beyond question that the greater part of the benefits conferred upon mankind by the League have been enjoyed by Europe. Consequently, at this stage, it would ill become a European State to suggest that the cost of work which was not primarily of importance to Europe should be defrayed by countries who were more intimately concerned in it. Indeed, such a suggestion is not of the spirit of the League. An attempt, and a successful one, was made in the committee—particularly by the Japanese delegate—to show that, after all, there is a direct relationship between the diseases prevalent in the East and the people of the West, and the committee showed no desire to make a demand on the Treasuries of the countries immediately served by the Singapore Bureau. In 1927 the money available from the Rockefeller grant will not be sufficient to cover the expenses of the bureau, and the deficit must be met. It was generally agreed that the money required should be found by the League, but there was a disagreement as to the method of doing so. Last year there was a general understanding amongst the members of the Second Committee that the Health Budget should be stabilized in the neighbourhood of 1,000,000 francs. One school of thought would have been content to have passed a resolution which would have enabled the Secretariat to find the deficit out of the money provided for the Health organization as a whole; but another school was anxious that the sum required for the purpose should be definitely voted by the Assembly.

Ultimately the Second Committee decided to ask the Fourth Committee to make a provision in the Budget for 1927 of 25,000 francs. The Fourth Committee recognized the necessity of inscribing the Singapore Bureau of Epidemiological Intelligence on the Health Budget, and provided funds by increasing the Health Budget to a maximum of 1,000,000 francs.

The Report of the Second Committee to the Assembly is set out in Documents A. 63 and A. 63A, and the resolutions contained therein were approved by the Assembly at its meeting on the 24th September. (See also Document A. 22.)

In previous years we have had the spectacle of a country's delegate on the Second Committee advocating work involving new expenditure, whilst that country's delegate on the Fourth Committee has resolutely opposed the voting of the money. There is a very natural desire on the part of many delegates not to oppose in strong terms demands made by countries for new investigations, but in the Fourth Committee the delegates generally favour economy. There is no doubt that last year's debates in both the Second and Fourth Committees made their influence felt this year, for there was no desire in the Second Committee to commit the League to an expenditure by the Health Organization of a sum greater than that to which it is entitled as an important organization, but by no means the only one, which is doing useful international work.

COMMITTEE No. 3.

SUPERVISION OF THE PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

As is known, there was held at Geneva in the summer of 1925 a Conference for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War. The Conference drew up a convention, which was submitted to the Sixth Assembly, and is contained in Document A. 16, 1925, sent under cover of last year's report.

The Third Committee had before it Document A. 47, which contains, amongst other papers, a preliminary draft convention concerning the supervision of the *private* manufacture of arms, &c. Although this problem is closely bound up with the general question of the limitation of armaments, several members of the Committee expressed the opinion that it was desirable to convene immediately a Conference to conclude a convention. This opinion had to be reconciled with the opposite view—that the question could not be separated from the proposed General Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. Unanimity was reached on the basis of a resolution proposing that the question be included amongst those to be considered at the General Conference, if the latter could be convened before the next Assembly; but, failing this, that a special Conference be convened for the purpose. This resolution was passed by the Assembly at its meeting on the 21st September. (See Document A. 73 and also A. 32.)

PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.

Little need be said on this question. The Preparatory Commission is still sitting, and until it has concluded its labours it would be unwise to offer any opinion. Sufficient progress has been made to lead to the belief that a programme for the Conference will be drawn up early next year for submission to the Council. Several delegates sitting on the Third Committee would have liked to make some definite suggestion as to the date of the Conference. A decision on this point, however, can very well be left to the Council. For the Assembly to have fixed a date which events would have proved to be too early would indeed have been unsatisfactory. Consequently the resolution put forward for the consideration of the Assembly recommends that the Conference should be held before the Eighth (ordinary) Session of the Assembly, unless material difficulties render this impossible. The Third Committee's report to the Assembly (Document A. 93) gave rise to several speeches, many of them of some length, and the resolution referred to above was passed at a meeting on the 24th September.