

present time might more properly be described as a treaty of mutual assistance against disarmament. He quite agreed that the question of limitation of war material was of most vital importance, and on this subject the Preparatory Commission had decided practically nothing but to exclude the whole question. Germany had proposed the abolition of aerial warfare and bombing, but without result. His country had hoped that the decisions of the Preparatory Commission might be reversed when the Disarmament Conference considered the questions, but he agreed with Viscount Cecil that it would be still more desirable if the Preparatory Commission itself were to revise its views on the subject. Unless they could solve these differences of opinion which existed in the Preparatory Commission, how could they hope for a Disarmament Conference to be successful?

The Italian delegate agreed with the views put forward by M. Loudon and the French delegate. The Governments had already gone as far in the matter of concessions as they found themselves able to go. Those who considered the results of the Preparatory Commission inadequate should express their opinions at the Disarmament Conference. It would only be a waste of time to reopen the question in the Preparatory Commission.

The Japanese delegate pointed out that the fourth point in the British proposal had not yet been considered by the Preparatory Commission, but was to be dealt with at its next meeting, and therefore he thought a resolution on that point unnecessary, and to press the other three points of the resolution would only be to expose to fresh hazards the results already obtained. He agreed with Viscount Cecil that it was most regrettable that no results had so far been obtained with regard to limitation of military and air armaments, such as had been made with reference to naval armaments at the Washington Conference, and they hoped to see the Washington results further extended by the present negotiations between Great Britain and America; but he thought it only possible, at the present, to lay down broad and general lines regarding military and air disarmament.

The majority of the speakers on the following day supported the resolution, and expressed the great disappointment of their countries that something more definite had not been done by the Preparatory Commission not merely to limit armaments, but to reduce them. The Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, Hungarian, and Austrian representatives all spoke more or less strongly in this sense. On the other hand, the Serbians, Poles, and Roumanians echoed the arguments put forward by the French representative and the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission. Some of the most interesting points made by the various speakers in support of the motion were as follows:—

The Norwegian delegate pointed out the contradiction between the great progress made by the signing of the Kellogg Pact and the optional clause, and, on the other hand, the absence of progress regarding disarmament. His Government greatly regretted the decision of the Preparatory Commission to exclude the question of the number of trained reservists from their calculations. As regards the difficulties in the way of reduction in armaments by means of limitation of budgetary expenditure, he agreed that it was almost impossible to compare budgetary expenditure as between countries, but that it was comparatively a simple matter to compare budgetary expenditure of the same country as between one year and another, and in this sense it would be possible to arrange for reduction by limitation of budgetary expenditure. Several previous speakers had appeared to assume that any decisions taken by the first Disarmament Conference when it met would necessarily remain unchanged for ten years. Ten years was mentioned in the Covenant, however, as a maximum period, and there would be nothing to prevent reconsideration in less than ten years if circumstances were propitious for a further step towards disarmament. The prolonged delay in achieving any progress towards disarmament naturally created a suspicion among the peoples of the world that behind the technical difficulties which were given as the grounds for inability to make progress there must be sinister forces at work.

The Danish delegate urged that, in any case, the work of the Preparatory Commission ought to be concluded at its next session, and the Disarmament Conference convened with as little delay as possible thereafter. The long delays of the Preparatory Commission had produced a most unfortunate impression, and the prestige of the League was at stake. While there might be danger in going forward, there was greater danger in going backward or doing nothing. He specially recommended for consideration by the Preparatory Commission a draft convention drawn up by the inter-parliamentary Union, which, in his opinion, was the most satisfactory attempt yet made to deal with this difficult subject. A copy of this draft convention will be found amongst the documents accompanying this report.

The Swedish delegate feared that the concessions made by those representing different views in the Preparatory Commission had always been at the expense of disarmament. They amounted to little more than an agreement to limit the limitation and reduce the reduction of armaments. He also strongly supported the calling of the Disarmament Conference without delay after the next session of the Preparatory Commission.

The Hungarian and Austrian delegates pointed out that their countries were not represented on the Preparatory Commission, and that the debate in the Third Committee was, therefore, their only chance to express the entire dissatisfaction with which their countries viewed what had been done in the Preparatory Commission, particularly with regard to the exclusion from consideration of trained reservists and stocks of war material. They heartily supported the British proposal, and hoped it might bring the Preparatory Commission back into the right path.

A notable speech of the session, however, on account of the earnestness and eloquence of the speaker, was that of Sir George Foster (Canada), who urged that the tremendously strong sentiment of the North American Continent—not only of Canada, but of the United States of America—with regard to the necessity for avoiding war and reducing armaments must be noted and taken account of. While difficulties certainly existed with regard to disarmament, they were of much less importance than human life and human happiness. Enlightened opinion of the world, and in particular of northern