sanctions which might not be pursued to the point of military measures in the case of all States; and that ' a more or less universal or European Pact of that kind might be supplemented by separate regional pacts of mutual assistance, as proposed on a former occasion by the French delegation; there was no question of military alliances, or of the division of States into mutually hostile camps, or still less of a policy of encirclement; care must be taken not to create universal pacts which would exclude any State wishing to participate, or such regional pacts as would not admit all those interested in the security of the particular region concerned; in measures of security of this kind, the principle of equality of all States, without exception, could not arouse any doubts or hesitation';

"And that, as the first delegate of France observed in his speech on May 30th, 'the problem of security is to-day raised in such a form that henceforward no country can evade its terms', especially since, through the regional agreements contemplated by Article 21 of the Covenant, the solution of that problem does not necessarily involve the unanimous participation of all States;

"And that the President of the Conference, in his speech referred to above, interpreted the feeling of all the delegations when he said that 'it was vital that the Conference should endeavour to restore general confidence in the system of collective international action against aggression, which the Covenant was intended to create';

"Decides:

"(1) To prepare, in accordance with the proposal of the first delegate of the United Kingdom, protocols ready to be submitted to Governments for signature, on the following questions:

"(a) Chemical warfare,

"(b) Budgetary publicity,

"(c) Immediate creation of the Permanent Disarmament Commission, which would at the same time be responsible for the supervision of disarmament and of security;

"(2) To enter without delay upon an exhaustive study of the problem of security, with a view to arriving, especially on the European plane, by general or regional agreements based on the principles set down in the Pact of Locarno and in that of the Balkan Entente, at such solutions as might be best calculated to make it possible to conclude forthwith a first general Convention for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments;

"(3) To request the Bureau of the Conference to set up for that purpose a special committee on which all the Powers or groups of Powers directly interested in the practical settlement of the problem of security and that of disarmament should be represented, on the understanding that that committee might invite any other Power to participate in any particular part of its work.'

M. Titulesco (Roumania), on behalf of the Little Entente, fully supported the Turkish representative's proposal.

M. Maximos (Greece), on behalf of the Balkan Entente, supported the proposal of the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The President said that the very numerous proposals submitted at the meeting would place a heavy task upon the Bureau, and he had therefore decided to call the General Commission for Wednesday (June 6th) instead of Tuesday (June 5th). The Bureau would meet on Monday afternoon (June 4th). It might be necessary for the Bureau to appoint a drafting committee, and the draft prepared by that committee would have to be examined by the Bureau and circulated in time for the members of the General Commission to consider it before a meeting was held.

The proposals of the President were adopted.

EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING.

Held on Friday, June 8th, 1934, at 4 p.m.

President : Mr. A. Henderson.

157. APPEAL FROM THE CZECHOSLOVAK RED CROSS.

The President read the following letter, dated June 8th, 1934, which he had received from M. Beneš : 1

"I have the honour to enclose a proposal from the Czechoslovak Red Cross. The Czechoslovak delegation to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments regards this proposal as a very important one, capable of exerting a considerable moral

influence, apart from its undeniable political significance. It might be of particular service to the cause of moral disarmament, the indispensable condition of material disarmament.

Accordingly, the Czechoslovak delegation endorses this proposal, and transmits it to the President of the Conference, with the request that it be placed in due course on the agenda of the Political Commission or any other appropriate Commission.

ANNEX.

"Letter, dated May 26th, 1934, from Dr. Alice G. Masarykova, President of the Czechoslovak Red Cross, to the President of the Conference.

The General Assembly of the Czechoslovak Red Cross, which was held on May 20th and 21st, 1934, unanimously passed a resolution, which we venture to submit to you, together with the reasons that led to it.

The Assembly instructed the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Red Cross to transmit this resolution to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments with the request that the Conference should give urgent consideration to this proposal and do all in its power to put it into effect.

We would ask you to be so kind as to submit this resolution to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments in plenary session.

We are convinced that you will aid us with all the weight of your personal authority in the task that we are undertaking.

"Resolution of the General Assembly of the Czechoslovak Red Cross.

The General Assembly of the Czechoslovak Red Cross, held on May 20th and 21st, 1934, has unanimously decided to propose to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments that all the States represented at the Conference should undertake to reduce their armaments expenditure by 0.001 per cent in 1935, and that the amount of the savings thus effected should be handed over to the International Red Cross to form a fund for the study and organisation of the International Red Cross Truce.

"Reasons for this Resolution.

" The Czechoslovak Red Cross regards the convocation of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, in which statesmen from all over the world are assembled, as inaugurating a new epoch in the history of mankind.

" The Czechoslovak Red Cross is convinced that, side by side with the process of disarmament, a moral armament must be constituted. That moral armament is the awakening of a sense of scientific responsibility, of moral sensitiveness, and of spiritual life, which represent the unity of human activity.

" The Czechoslovak Red Cross accordingly proposes that all the delegates to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments should make representations to their Governments with a view to a reduction of 0.001 per cent in the armament budget, that amount to be paid to the fund for the International Red Cross Truce, which will be on the lines of the Truce organised by the Czechoslovak Red Cross, the principle being to observe peace in public and private life, to refrain from all controversy for three days, and to concentrate public opinion on moral questions in the sphere of private and public health.

" The Czechoslovak Red Cross proposes that the funds thus made available be placed at the disposal of the International Red Cross for the study and organisation of the Truce.

"Moral disarmament is not a question of money, but of principle and action. Moreover, the minimum levy which we propose does not represent any burden upon the nations, and will be amply sufficient for the preparation and organisation of the International Truce for 1935.

"The Red Cross earnestly begs the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments to consider the resolution with the closest attention. Just as modern doctors endeavour to prevent disease, so does the Red Cross endeavour to prevent war by summoning all the nations to take part in a common effort of moral armament, in a spirit of happiness and mutual understanding.

" (Signed): Dr. Alice G. Masarykova, President. General Dr. V. Haering, Vice-Presidents. Dr. V. Basika.

"How the money should be used.

"Should the proposal of the Czechoslovak Red Cross be accepted and the money placed at the disposal of the International Red Cross, we recommend that it be expended:

"(1) On theoretical and practical studies with a view to the Red Cross Truce. These studies should be entrusted to a sociologist, a lawyer and a hygienist of distinction.
"(2) On the preparation of the watchword of the Truce (e.g., 'An Independent Press'), in which work distinguished persons would take part.

"(3) On the maintenance of courses for leading Red Cross workers, who would subsequently have to organise the Truce in their countries.

"(4) On the preparation of a film."

The President hoped that the General Commission had no objection to the procedure suggested by M. Beneš.

158. FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE CONFERENCE: RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FRENCH DELEGATION AND RECOMMENDED BY THE BUREAU.

The President said that the Bureau had had several meetings for the consideration of the resolutions submitted by certain delegations during the General Commission’s meetings on May 20th and 30th and June 1st, and transmitted to the Bureau. As a result of all that had taken place, the Bureau, at a meeting that afternoon,1 had recommended unanimously—subject to reservations by two delegations, which were not, he thought, however, opposing the resolution—the sending forward to the General Commission of a text which would be introduced by the head of the French delegation.

M. Barthou (France) said that the draft resolution placed before the General Commission and now under discussion had been presented by the French delegation. The text submitted to the Commission was an amended text. That meant that the French delegation had taken into account the observations that had been put forward either in the General Commission or in the meetings of the Bureau. It had assembled the various comments which had been offered, and taken advantage of the extremely useful exchange of views that had taken place.

The French delegation had never regarded its original text as a final one, amenable neither to criticism nor amendment. That was the reverse of its idea. Its intention had been to carry on the search for compromise and conciliation. It had listened, without exception, to all the counsels proffered to it.

The text proposed by the French delegation did not depart from the fundamental principles upheld by that delegation and which he had developed in outline at the first meeting at which he had come into touch with the General Commission.

No surprise would be felt if, after paying this tribute to all those who had helped his delegation with criticism, advice or suggestions, the leader of the delegation should place particular stress on the assistance he had received, in preparing the text, from the leaders of the United States and United Kingdom delegations. In the leader of the United States delegation, the French delegation had found an experience, a wisdom, a caution and an authority, and, at the same time, a solicitude for general peace that had been of special aid in its difficult task. He thanked Mr. Norman Davis for the help he had given. Thus the old friendship between France and the United States of America was cemented once again. Nor would the members of the Commission be surprised at the quite special value attached by the French delegation to the help received from the head of the United Kingdom delegation in the revision of the draft. There had perhaps been at one of the meetings a somewhat animated exchange of words, the echo of which had been drawn out and accentuated by the Press; but, as he had already said, those who imagined that a storm had broken over Franco-British relations were mistaken, still more those who imagined that those relations were shrouded by the menacing curtain of a threatening cloud.

He was anxious not to abuse his right of speech—still less his right of quotation—but he wished to read certain extracts, for there were quotations that were essential, since they placed international situations in their true aspect. On March 17th, 1934, the United Kingdom Government had received from the French Ambassador a memorandum which, as early as its second paragraph, contained the following statement:2

"It notes, in the first place, that both Governments and both countries, whose friendship and mutual confidence are the principal guarantee of general stability, are agreed upon the object to be achieved. Actuated by the same European spirit, they desire, with equal good faith, to guarantee the peace of the world against disturbance by force. Though the systems proposed may be found to differ, they have a common starting-point, and it is far from impossible that, with frankness, understanding and conciliation on both sides, the desired end may be achieved. France is willing to make the attempt."

M. Barthou was glad to be able to repeat today these statements from the French memorandum of March 17th. He was glad, also, to express his personal appreciation of the spirit of conciliation, fraternisation and friendship shown by the distinguished leader of the United Kingdom delegation.

1 See Minutes of the sixtieth meeting of the Bureau.
2 Document Conf.D./Bureau 64.
3 See Minutes of the eighty-third meeting of the General Commission.
4 Document Conf.D.166(a).
To-day, as on March 17th, he would declare, on behalf of the Government of the French Republic, that trustful friendship between the two countries was a fundamental element of general stability. He repeated that there might be divergencies between them, but that, when those divergencies were examined, with the object of reducing them, in a common spirit of understanding and comprehension, they ceased to exist. In one word, which would be the last because it expressed his whole thought, the thought of every Frenchman, when there were differences between France and the United Kingdom, the two countries talked things over. They talked freely, because they were two countries where freedom reigned, and, in the last analysis, there was one word that united them in a common belief and a common attitude — friendship. The text on which the General Commission was asked to decide was the expression of the friendship, which nothing could affect, of France and the United Kingdom.

Having said that, he would not forget that there were other speakers on the President's list, and, with the authorisation of the President, whose kindness had deeply touched him, he would proceed by a method which appeared to him a particularly simple one and, indeed, the best. He would read the different paragraphs of the amended resolution. If, as he read the resolution, he thought that any particular paragraph called for an explanation, he would supply it; if not, he would spare the members of the General Commission the need for exerting their powers of attention, and would merely read the paragraph:

"The General Commission,
"Taking into consideration the resolutions submitted to it by the delegations of the six Powers, the Turkish delegation and the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics respectively;"

Here the French delegation was simply reproducing the proposal which he had made in its name at Tuesday's meeting.¹

"Taking account of the clarification of its work resulting from the French memorandum of January 1st, 1934, the Italian memorandum of January 4th, 1934, the United Kingdom memorandum of January 29th, 1934, and the German declaration of April 16th, 1934;"

There were four diplomatic notes. The question whether it was for the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments to express an opinion on them no longer arose. On that point, Mr. Eden, the head of the United Kingdom delegation, had given explanations which M. Barthou regarded as conclusive. There was no longer any question of comparing these different notes and attempting, so to speak, to blend them with one another. The point was to consider what were the important factors that were pertinent to the discussion. On that point there was agreement between the United Kingdom delegation's opinion and that of the French delegation, and that was why the first amendment in the French delegation's text was the introduction of the reference in question.

Convinced of the necessity of the Conference continuing its work with a view to arriving at a general Convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments;

"Resolved to continue without delay the investigations already undertaken;"

These two paragraphs called for a brief comment. The French delegation considered, as it had done since 1932, that the work pursued by the Conference should be that of the reduction and limitation of armaments. The French delegation had consistently desired, since 1932, to arrive at the goal pursued for the peace of the world. To that idea, unceasingly entertained, it remained faithful to-day.

Next for the resolutions submitted to the General Commission:

"I.

"Invites the Bureau to seek, by whatever means it deems appropriate and with a view to the general acceptance of a Disarmament Convention, a solution of the outstanding problems, without prejudice to the private conversations on which Governments will desire to enter in order to facilitate the attainment of final success by the return of Germany to the Conference."

That was a fundamental paragraph and he would endeavour to place it in a decisive light. Everyone was in favour of conversations. What should be the method by which those conversations should be pursued? The French delegation's opinion was that the Governments should undertake them. The original text had stated that they should lead to a general Convention and that their object was to smooth the path to final success. In that connection, one point had given pause in the expression of the French delegation's ideas. What had been the meaning of the paragraph before the addition of certain clear and decisive words? Everyone of course had had Germany in mind, both the framers of the draft resolution and the members of the Bureau or General Commission. In those circumstances, why not say so openly? Certain ideas gained by being clearly expressed, because that gave them greater force. He had stated in the Bureau that France, under all the Governments, all the Ministries that had succeeded one another, had pressed, in agreement with the United Kingdom delegation, for Germany's return to the League. In this connection there was a passage which it was

¹ See Minutes of the fifty-eighth meeting of the Bureau.
essential for him to read. He had done so at a private meeting, and he was impelled to do so in public, because it summed up, explained and confirmed the whole attitude of the French delegation:

"In the last resort (said the French note of March 17th, 1934), one must always come back to the League of Nations and to the Covenant on which the League is based. Whatever may have been said against the League, whatever attacks may have been made on it, the League is still the only organisation capable of furnishing a collective guarantee of peace. The Government of the Republic is still faithfully attached to that organisation. Accordingly, it was gratified to find that the United Kingdom Government made the return of Germany to the League of Nations an 'essential condition' for the signature of an armaments Convention. Germany can offer no better guarantee to world equilibrium than her return, free from all constraint, to the community of States to which she was admitted. Such a return would relax tension and thus permit of preparing and promoting agreements, of which France, wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of peace, once more affirms the utility."

He thought he might justly claim that the ideas underlying the French note of March 17th were expressed with the utmost lucidity. Speaking in the name of the French delegation, he adhered to those ideas and that attitude.

M. Barthou repeated the statements he had already made. Germany had left the League of her own accord; the door had closed upon her. Of her own accord she must come back to the League; the door must open before her. The French delegation did not desire—he said this by the way, but he said it forcibly—a policy of encirclement. That policy was not among its intentions; it was not among its acts. If it were true that, while faithfully adhering to old friendships, which it cherished and which were necessary for the peace of the world and the maintenance of order in Europe, the French Government had embarked, within the limits of the League's statutes, upon individual negotiations, it had from the outset desired Germany to take her place in them. There was, therefore, no policy of encirclement in any way whatever. Such was the explanation he had desired to furnish on this paragraph, perhaps the most important in the draft resolution for which the General Commission's approval was being sought.

"II.

"Having regard to the peculiar importance presented by the study and solution of certain problems to which attention was drawn at the beginning of the general discussion, 

"Takes the following decisions:

"(1) Security.

"(a) Since the results of the earlier work of the Conference have enabled certain regional security agreements to be concluded in Europe during the past year, the General Commission decides to appoint a special committee to conduct such preliminary studies as it may consider appropriate in order to facilitate the conclusion of further agreements of the same nature which may be negotiated outside the Conference. It would be for the General Commission to determine the relationship, if any, of these agreements to the General Convention.

At the present juncture, there was no question of taking up again in the Commission the problem of security as regards either the principle or the details. The details would be the concern of the special committee; as for the principle, the French contention concerning security had been sufficiently clearly stated to make it unnecessary for him to add anything.

"(b) The General Commission decides to appoint a special committee to study the question of guarantees of execution, and to resume the work relating to supervision."

The French delegation was still anxious that guarantees of execution should be sought; it also remained a partisan of the idea of supervision. But he would be failing to satisfy his conscience if he omitted to say that the question of supervision was a particularly intricate one, that supervision was a means that did not suffice in itself, that it could not be a final aim. It was none the less true that supervision organised in a certain way might be efficacious. That idea, therefore, must not be dropped; on the contrary, it must be examined more closely with the object of trying to secure such results as it carried within itself.

"(2) Air Forces.

"The General Commission instructs its Air Committee to resume forthwith the study of the questions mentioned in its resolution of July 23rd, 1932, under the heading: '1. Air Forces'."

The document circulated to the Commission contained a note reproducing the text of the resolution of July 23rd, 1932. Was there any need to mention the importance attached by the French delegation, like all delegations, to the question of air forces? Was there any need to repeat all that, at the beginning of the Commission's present work, the President had said with so much authority concerning the special dangers of this form of warfare, which attacked

---

1 See document Conf.D.166(a).
defenceless beings? M. Barthou would not say that to put the question was to solve it, for that would be really too facile; but, if there was the will to solve it, the necessary solutions would be facilitated.

"(3) Manufacture of and Trade in Arms.

"The General Commission requests its special Committee on questions relating to the manufacture of and trade in arms to resume its work forthwith and, in the light of the statements made by the United States delegate at the meeting of May 29th, 1934, to report to it as early as possible on the solutions it recommends."

On this point the statements made by the distinguished United States delegate sufficed. France had indicated her approval of them. She renewed her approval.

"These Committees will carry on their work on parallel lines; and it will be co-ordinated by the Bureau.

"III.

"The General Commission leaves it to the Bureau to take the necessary steps at the proper time to ensure that, when the President convenes the General Commission, it will have before it, as far as possible, a complete draft Convention."

Was it possible to say more clearly or more forcibly that the French delegation desired and was striving for a complete draft Convention, and would co-operate in bringing one about?

The last paragraph referred to a new proposal that had been placed before the General Commission. It stated:

"IV.

"Recognising that the proposal of the Soviet delegation that the Conference be declared a permanent institution under the title of the Peace Conference calls for careful study, the General Commission requests the President to submit that proposal (document Conf.D./C.G.I63) to the Governments."

That was an absolutely novel and original idea which, speaking personally, M. Barthou considered helpful. It was, however, impossible to withdraw the limitation and reduction of armaments from a Conference known by that name, or, to put it more exactly, to transform the Conference, should that become necessary, without first securing the consent of the Governments which had taken part in its work. That was what was called in law, if his now somewhat ancient recollections were correct, a sort of mutation or novation. The terminology did not matter; it was only the idea that must be borne in mind.

M. Barthou would be tempted to apologise for having taken so much of the Commission's time, had he not felt himself supported by the friendly attention of all the members. He had endeavoured to be clear and he had almost succeeded in being brief.

France did not cling to a position of negation. She brought solutions. She supplied a method. She submitted to the Conference a programme of work. He hoped, especially after the statements he had heard and in view of the attitude of a very large number of delegations, that the draft resolution would receive the General Commission's acceptance. He even ventured to hope, for he was an optimist, that that acceptance would be unanimous. In any event, his colleagues would have a true appreciation of what he had attempted to do if they all understood that the object of the French draft resolution was co-operation, as sincere and as vigorous as possible, in the work of the Disarmament Conference, or, to put it more briefly and decisively, in world peace.

Mr. Eden (United Kingdom) said that the resolution presented by the French Foreign Minister was the outcome of a sincere, and, he hoped the General Commission would agree, a not unsuccessful effort to reconcile divergent points of view. He wished to express his thanks—and they were sincerely offered—to his friends and colleagues, M. Barthou and Mr. Norman Davis, whose joint and willing collaboration had made that agreement possible.

He was particularly grateful for the comments that M. Barthou had just made upon the relations of the United Kingdom and France. The friendship of those two countries was an important element in the peace of Europe. The resolution before the Commission was further evidence of its strength and reality. He welcomed such evidence cordially, and he thanked the distinguished representative of France who had made its realisation possible.

It was unnecessary for him to weary the General Commission by any reiteration of the United Kingdom Government's attitude to the present position of the Conference. That had been fully set out only a few days ago in a speech by Sir John Simon.1 The United Kingdom Government could not agree to the indefinite continuance of vague and inconclusive discussions, but its desire to secure an agreement upon the vexed subject of armaments was deep and sincere. It was in that spirit that the United Kingdom Government was prepared to agree to the resolution, which in itself represented a step towards each other on the part both of the

1 See Minutes of the eighty-third meeting of the General Commission.
United Kingdom and of France. It was a balanced agreement which, they hoped, might aid the immediate future of the Conference and assist, therefore, to the final and universal agreement sought by all.

Every delegate present must, he feared, admit that the Conference was at present working in conditions of immense difficulty. The last two days had illustrated that fact only too clearly. That difficulty was due in a large measure to the absence of a great Power, whose co-operation was essential, and he took the opportunity of stating that the United Kingdom Government had in no way modified the view it had taken, in conjunction with the Conference as a whole, last October, of the German Government's action in leaving the Conference. The cause of disarmament, and, indeed, of international understanding, had suffered from that decision ever since. He would express the hope that, in the improved atmosphere which might surely be expected as a result of the agreement which the General Commission was recording to-day, and to which all nations had contributed, the German Government would see its way to play its part and thereby enable the Conference to conclude the work on which it had been engaged for more than two years.

It was in that hope that he commended to the General Commission the resolution so eloquently moved by the representative of France.

Mr. Norman Davis (United States of America) wished first to express his appreciation of the most generous appraisal of such contribution as he had been able to make to the work during the past few days. Having taken part in some of the discussions that had resulted in an agreement upon the text of the resolution submitted in the name of the French Government, he wished particularly to pay the highest tribute to the fine spirit and breadth of view in which the delegates of France and the United Kingdom had endeavoured to reconcile their differences, which alone had made it possible to reach the agreement contained in the resolution before the Commission.

While that resolution might not cover all the questions involved in just the way that some of the delegations would have preferred, and while it was a compromise, he felt that it actually did provide for a programme of work by which it was possible to proceed usefully towards the achievement of an ultimate agreement for a reduction and limitation of armaments. It had at least changed the atmosphere of the Conference from one of despondency to one of real hope. He felt, therefore, that the resolution signified more than its actual words would indicate. Its greatest value, in his opinion, was the fact that two great nations, without whose co-operation it was not possible to achieve the aims for which the Conference was striving, had agreed upon a programme upon which they might co-operate to that end.

That was not only a distinct contribution to the success of the Conference, it was a distinct contribution to peace in Europe. He was therefore happy to vote for the resolution.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not know how far the resolution before the Commission would take it. He could not profess to be delighted with the resolution. He could hardly be expected to be fully satisfied with any resolution that might be passed at Geneva—at any rate, with any resolution which did not provide for such tempo as people were used to in his country. But when he was asked whether he was against the French delegation's resolution, his answer was certainly in the negative, for there was nothing in the resolution that the Soviet delegation had ever opposed or was at present opposing. Indeed, the Commission was asked to invite the Bureau to seek a solution of the outstanding problems. That was the purpose for which the delegations had come to Geneva, which was their work, and, if the Bureau could be helpful in that matter, they would certainly be grateful to it.

Nor could there be any opposition on the part of the Soviet delegation to Germany's return to the Conference, which might be achieved—as some people believed—by private conversations. His delegation had never been very much concerned with the question whether the absent were always wrong or always right, for there were some absent who were present and some present who were absent. But he would point out that the Soviet delegation had, without any resolution, done more than any other to bring back Germany to the Conference and perhaps to other international organisations.

As to the proposal for a renewed discussion of air armaments and the manufacture of and trade in arms, if there were people who believed—he was not himself one of them—that the resumption of the Conference's work, so far unsuccessful, might be assisted thereby, that those items might be conducive to a Convention on disarmament, he would do nothing to discourage them provided the discussion on those points did not take the place of work to which he attached more importance and which would, in his view, correspond more nearly to the international needs of the moment.

Happily, in the French resolution, marking out the General Commission's programme of work, a very prominent place was reserved for the problem of security, which formed one—a very substantial one—of the Soviet delegation's two proposals. True, he had suggested that normally regional pacts should be discussed, but also the problem of the definition of aggression; but one question would logically bring the other in its train. Indeed, it would be very difficult to solve the problem of international pacts, the problem of security, without solving the problem of the definition of aggression if the work were to be thoroughly performed.

There remained the Soviet delegation's other proposal—to provide for a permanent peace conference. According to the French resolution, that proposal was to be forwarded to the
Governments. He had nothing against that procedure, but he hoped that the proposal would come back to the Conference and that it would not remain in the archives of the Foreign Ministries. He hoped that the question would be seriously studied by the Governments and that the necessary instructions would be given to the delegates when they met again at Geneva, so that they might be able to take it up there and discuss it, and eventually adopt his proposal.

He could not imagine any careful study of that proposal, or of the present international position, without the conclusion that something more than discussions on the trade in arms or any other small matter could really bring about that security, that guarantee of peace, which all desired. As time went on, the dangers which the Soviet delegation had often pointed out in the Commission were not diminished. Account must be had to a new phenomenon in international life—the very important part that military armies were playing in the destinies of nations and of States. He did not know whether there would be need of the permanent peace conference advocated by the Soviet delegation. He was afraid that for a long time to come he might bring about quite unexpected consequences and confront it with new problems. He was afraid that for a long time to come there would be need of the permanent peace conference advocated by the Soviet delegation.

He was glad to state that, during the discussions in the General Commission, he had been able to notice that a good many delegations, a good many responsible statesmen, shared the Soviet Government's apprehensions, that they were aware of the dangers to peace and were able to notice that a good many delegations, a good many responsible statesmen, shared his country were the most peaceful men in the world. The Conference should not, however, leave this new phenomenon out of consideration; it might bring about quite unexpected consequences and confront it with new problems. He was afraid that for a long time to come there would be need of the permanent peace conference advocated by the Soviet delegation.

He was glad to state that, during the discussions in the General Commission, he had been able to notice that a good many delegations, a good many responsible statesmen, shared the Soviet Government's apprehensions, that they were aware of the dangers to peace and were as eager as was the Soviet delegation to do everything they could to avert those dangers. That, for him, was the most satisfactory result of his work during the General Commission's present session. For his part, and speaking in the name of his Government, he assured the Commission that, both inside and outside the Conference, they would go on working for peace, general peace, the peace of every nation and every people, as indeed they had done up to now.

M. Sandler (Sweden) said that it gave him pleasure to note, on behalf of the six delegations, that agreement had been reached between certain Powers for the purpose of preventing the Conference from failing at that moment.

The six delegations did not feel that they should oppose the draft resolution. In its general structure, an important place had been found—as was right—for security, though sufficient emphasis had not been laid upon the decisive importance of disarmament questions. They would, in fact, have liked the future work of the Conference to be based on a programme ensuring a better balance between the two important questions which dominated the whole of its work—security and disarmament. In that connection, the six delegations maintained the principles which they had had occasion to put forward both in their memorandum of April 14th and in their joint declaration of June 1st. They therefore reserved their right to put forward their points of view during the future work of the Conference, anxious as they were that the main object of the Conference—namely, the reduction and limitation of armaments—should not be neglected.

The six delegations would not go into the details of the draft resolution and would refrain, for the moment, from any criticism, although they had observations to submit on more than one point in the proposed programme of work.

They also considered that the document represented a political compromise offering further possibilities of arriving at a Convention and, in particular, would enable the Conference to proceed towards the solution of a preliminary political problem, the importance and urgency of which could not be disregarded.

General Tánczos (Hungary) desired, as the General Commission was invited to express its views on the draft resolution moved by the French delegation, to recall the point of view adopted by the Hungarian delegation from the beginning of the Conference's work and to make the following declaration:

"The Hungarian delegation regrets that the draft resolution submitted to the General Commission is not such as to enable the Conference to achieve practical and tangible results, within as short a period as possible, in the real sphere of the Conference—namely, in material disarmament."

"So far as security and the question of guarantees of execution are concerned, the Hungarian delegation continues to believe and to affirm that it is the unilateral disarmament States in particular, which, deprived of all means of defence, are in a state of insecurity that cannot be prolonged indefinitely."

Consequently, the Hungarian Government would not abandon the point of view it had always adopted with regard to disarmament, a point of view based on the specific provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The justification for its point of view had, moreover, also been recognised in the declaration of the five Powers on December 11th, 1932. Only on that basis, in the Hungarian delegation's view, could that relative security be assured.
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which Hungary believed she also had the same right as any other sovereign State. Moreover, only in that way would it be possible to remove the insecurity and distrust between nations, which was the inevitable result of the present state of inequality in the matter of armaments.

With regard to air forces and the manufacture of and trade in arms, General Tanczos desired to say that the Hungarian delegation envisaged such arrangements only within the framework of a general Convention dealing at the same time with all the other disarmament questions.

In submitting these observations, he believed that the Hungarian delegation would be failing in its duty if it did not take advantage of the opportunity offered to say that, for as long as fifteen years, Hungary, disarmed by the Treaty of Trianon, had awaited the fulfilment of the promises made to her in that Treaty with regard to general disarmament.

In view of that fact, and in view also of the logical connection between the obligations laid down in Part V of the Treaty of Trianon, on the one hand, and the general disarmament promised in Article 8 of the Covenant, on the other, Hungary was entitled, after waiting for so many years, to ask that all the cognate obligations imposed on the heavily armed States should be loyally executed.

Hungary therefore expected the Conference to fulfil the tasks arising out of Article 8 of the Covenant and, by removing the unfair inequalities that still existed, to put into effect as soon as possible the principle of equality of rights to which it had been solemnly recognised that Hungary was entitled.

M. DI SORAGNA (Italy) pointed out that the President of the Conference had just said that two delegations had made reservations on the draft resolution recommended by the Bureau to the General Commission. One of those delegations was the Italian delegation. Put briefly, that reservation was as follows:

As it had stated in the Bureau, the Italian delegation based its attitude on the principle that the Conference could not resume its work until a favourable solution had been found for certain fundamental political problems. It had added that, that being so, it followed that the Italian delegation could accept no draft resolution that did not embody that principle.

As the draft resolution which the Bureau had submitted to the General Commission was not, in the Italian delegation's opinion, in harmony with that principle, it would unfortunately be unable to range itself beside the delegations that would approve it.

He desired to add that, apart from questions of formula and method, Italy was always ready to continue with complete goodwill to co-operate—as she had shown on so many occasions and so clearly in the past—for the pacific and complete settlement of the very serious international problems with which the Conference was inevitably faced.

M. MIKOFF (Bulgaria) desired to express his readiness to accept the programme of work submitted for approval to the General Commission by the head of the French delegation, and to make the following brief declaration:

The gravity of the situation with which the Disarmament Conference is faced, a situation which, after two years' laborious work, prevents it from drawing up a general Convention, has deeply impressed the Bulgarian delegation. The latter is glad to see the Conference emerging from a situation which many delegations regarded as hopeless. This is due to the efforts that have to-day resulted in a common programme of work which has been set out in the draft resolution submitted to the General Commission for approval.

The Bulgarian delegation has always very loyally contributed its modest support to all the efforts made to conclude a general Convention in accordance with the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant, on the basis of the principle of equality of rights, which was confirmed in the declaration of December 11th, 1932.

In supporting the draft resolution before the Commission, the Bulgarian delegation expresses the earnest hope that the proposed programme of work will enable a definite beginning to be made and will shortly lead to the conclusion of a general Convention, confirming in practice the principle of equality of rights with security for all, a Convention which would be the keystone in the construction of lasting peace in the world.

M. PFLÜGL (Austria) said that, as the representatives of two disarmed States had already spoken, he would refrain from repeating their remarks which related to conditions that were more or less common to all three countries, and which were well known to all the members of the Conference.

Were he to attempt to say how much he regretted the difficulties that were besetting the Conference, he would have to make a long speech. He would therefore confine himself to appealing, on behalf of his country, to all the members of the Conference to do their utmost to put an end, as soon as possible, to a state of affairs which was as prejudicial to the interests of his own country as to renewed tranquillity and peace in Europe.

Count RACZYŃSKI (Poland) pointed out that some members of the General Commission, who had attended the meeting of the Bureau held before that of the General Commission, had already heard the statement he had had the honour to make with regard to the text before the meeting. He was not giving away a very great secret, therefore, in saying that one of the
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two delegates who had made reservations with regard to it was the Polish representative. He would immediately add that that reservation related only to certain passages of the resolution, that it was a reservation on procedure, and that its aim was to prevent any misunderstanding as to the interpretation of the text before the General Commission.

Before reading the text of this reservation, Count Raczynski was glad to welcome the progress which the Polish delegation thought was apparent chiefly in the less constrained atmosphere of the present meeting. It had found expression in many of the statements made by the previous speakers, with which statements he associated himself. He ventured to express the hope that further progress would be achieved and that it would lead to comprehensive solutions acceptable to all States, without exception.

The text of the Polish reservation was as follows:

"While not entering into the substance of the questions dealt with in the documents mentioned in the preamble to the resolution—those questions not having been discussed in the General Commission—the Polish Government considers that the reference to these documents cannot in any event be interpreted to mean that the Conference accepts them as a basis for its future discussions. For its part, the Polish Government is obliged fully to reserve its attitude in this connection."

M. TAQUIZADEH (Persia) said that, as one of the Members of the League of Nations, and desiring to remain loyal to the Covenant, Persia could not accept any resolution that could be given any interpretation inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the Covenant, particularly Articles 10 and 16. Consequently, the Persian delegation must make every reservation with regard to any resolution that might weaken those provisions or prejudice them, either directly or indirectly, by restricting the general assistance to be given by all the members against an aggressor or by replacing it by regional agreements. At the same time, the Persian delegation would have no objection to the study of other means of security in addition to the guarantees provided by the Covenant of the League of Nations, so long as they did not weaken the Covenant. It could only accept the draft resolution, therefore, provided this point was definitely made clear.

The President said that, as there did not seem to be any further reservations to the draft resolution, he took it that the resolution, with the reservations that had been expressed, was adopted.

The draft resolution presented by the French delegation was adopted.

The President said that a meeting of the General Commission would be held on Monday, June 11th, at 3.30 p.m., to take into consideration how best the programme of work just accepted by the Commission could be put into operation.

EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING.

Held on Monday, June 11th, 1934, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. A. HENDERSON.

159. EFFECT TO BE GIVEN TO THE PROGRAMME OF WORK ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL COMMISSION ON JUNE 8TH, 1934: APPOINTMENT AND COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES.

The President said that the business of the present meeting was to consider how best to give effect to the resolution adopted by the General Commission on June 8th, 1934. The immediate programme of work agreed to therein contemplated four committees to deal with the important questions of (1) Security, (2) Guarantees of Execution and Supervision, (3) Air Forces and (4) Manufacture of and Trade in Arms.

1. **Security.**

The basis for the work of the Special Committee on Security was provided by the following decision in the resolution of June 8th:

"(a) Since the results of the earlier work of the Conference have enabled certain regional security agreements to be concluded in Europe during the past year, the General Commission decides to appoint a Special Committee to conduct such preliminary studies as it may consider appropriate in order to facilitate the conclusion of further agreements of the same nature as those already negotiated outside the Conference. It would be for the General Commission to determine the relationship, if any, of these agreements to the General Convention."
He would suggest that the General Commission's task at the present meeting might be confined to setting up the Special Committee and entrusting it with the carrying out of its mandate, leaving it to the Chairman of the Special Committee to decide when his committee would begin work.

Once the Committee had carried out its mandate, it would be the task of the General Commission to determine the relationship, if any, of the regional security agreements to the General Convention.

With regard to the Chairmanship of the Special Committee on Security, there would, he thought, be a unanimous opinion that it could be in no abler hands than those of the Vice-President of the General Commission, M. Politis. As to the composition of the Special Committee, he would suggest that it be composed more especially of the countries most immediately concerned. He would return to that point later.

Here he would venture again to remind the General Commission of the duties of the Special Committee on Security: “To conduct such preliminary studies as it may consider appropriate in order to facilitate the conclusion of further regional security agreements which may be negotiated outside the Conference”. Though the Committee on Security, on the basis of the work laid down for it, was to deal only with regional pacts, these pacts would be an important contribution to a solution of the problem of security, provided that they were inclusive of all the nations in an area to be covered, and were based on the principle of equality. If the Conference could not agree upon a complete European Pact of Mutual Assistance and Non-Aggression, or, better still, upon a world scheme of security as defined by the President himself to the General Commission on May 29th, it must make the best of the idea of regional pacts of a more limited character, provided that in no circumstances should these be in conflict with the principles set out in the Covenant of the League.

2. Guarantees of Execution.

This important question must be regarded as being closely related to the question of security. It would be recalled that the Commission had decided “to appoint a Special Committee to study the question of guarantees of execution, and to resume the work relating to supervision”. Though the resolution referred to the appointment of a Special Committee, it would appear to the President to be of some advantage if the General Commission were to decide that the execution of this mandate should be entrusted to the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions, so ably presided over by M. Bourquin. The members of that Committee were: Argentine, Austria, United Kingdom, France, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey, United States of America and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It might be considered advisable to increase the number of members on the Committee in view of the importance of the question of guarantees of execution. He proposed adding the Netherlands, and it might be found desirable to add the names of other countries. He would suggest that, should M. Bourquin deem it useful to secure the collaboration of other States in the work of this Committee, he should be empowered by the General Commission to do so.

The next two Committees proposed were in a somewhat different position as there already existed an Air Committee and a Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War.

3. Air Forces.

With regard to air forces, the General Commission would recall that it “instructed its Air Committee to resume forthwith the study of the questions mentioned in its resolution of July 23rd, 1932, under the heading: "I. Air Forces”.”

The President suggested that the question referred to should be sent en bloc to the Air Committee, presided over by M. de Madariaga, with M. Lange as Vice-President.

The following were members of the Committee: Argentine, Belgium, United Kingdom, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia.


The resolution of June 8th provided that the Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War should “resume its work forthwith and, in the light of the statements made by the United States delegate at the meeting of May 29th, 1934, report to it as early as possible on the solutions it recommends”.

The Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War was presided over by M. de Scavenius, and its Vice-President and Rapporteur was M. Komarnicki. The members of the Committee were as follows: Belgium, United Kingdom, China, Denmark, France, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Persia, Poland, Spain,
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Turkey, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Union of South Africa.

The President would propose that to this list the Commission add Switzerland, and it might be found desirable to add other countries. In this case, too, the Chairman of the Committee might be empowered to suggest any additional members whose collaboration he considered would be useful to its work.

As provided in the resolution, these four Committees would carry on their work on parallel lines, and it would be co-ordinated by the Bureau before being transmitted to the General Commission for consideration.

Lastly, in accordance with the resolution of June 8th, the President intended immediately to send the Soviet delegation's proposal that the Conference be declared a permanent institution under the title of the Peace Conference, to the Governments of all countries represented at the Conference, with a covering letter requesting that he be advised of their conclusions on the matter in order that he might make them known to the General Commission. He proposed to circulate to the members of the General Commission the answers of the Governments on this question as they arrived.

The time and date of the convening of the four Committees might, he suggested, be left to their respective Chairmen to decide.

1. Special Committee on Security.

The President observed that the proposal before the Commission was that the Special Committee should consist of all European countries.

General Tánčzos (Hungary), while thanking the President for the honour he had just done the Hungarian delegation in desiring that it also should serve on the Special Committee appointed to conduct preliminary studies in order to facilitate the conclusion, outside the Conference, of certain European regional security agreements, desired to draw attention to the principle which the Hungarian delegation had consistently adopted with regard to that question since the beginning of the Conference.

The General Commission would certainly still have in mind the declaration General Tánčzos had made a few days previously when he had said, in explaining the Hungarian point of view with regard to the draft resolution of June 8th, that, to his delegation, the best guarantee of general security lay in the equalisation of the armed forces which, moreover, should be the main object of the Conference's work.

On that point, General Tánčzos referred also to the statement of the Hungarian delegate at the meeting of the Political Commission on March 7th, 1933, which had made it quite clear, in connection with the principle of mutual assistance, on the one hand, that a universal solution must be found for the problem of organising peace, and, on the other hand, that partial or limited solutions in this matter would not create an atmosphere of confidence, but would inevitably lead to the old system of alliances incompatible with the idea of the League Covenant and with peace organised internationally.

In these circumstances—and in the future also—the Hungarian delegation could only continue on the same lines. General Tánčzos was of opinion that, especially at the present stage of the Conference's work, when an endeavour was still being made to find a solution for the principal problems still outstanding, the Hungarian delegation could not take an active part in the studies with which the Special Committee would be entrusted.

For all these reasons, the Hungarian delegation could only serve on the Special Committee on Security as an observer, and General Tánčzos asked the President to be good enough to take into account the considerations he had just advanced in fixing the composition of the Committee.

M. DI SORAGNA (Italy) said that, as the Italian delegation had not formed part of the majority that had voted for the resolution approved by the General Commission a few days previously, its representatives on the Committee on Security would have to act as observers only. That being so, he asked the President to release the Italian delegation from the mandate he had intended to confer on it.

Mrs. CORBETT-ASHBY (United Kingdom) wished, on behalf of the United Kingdom Government, to make the following statement:

"It will be understood that the United Kingdom, in consenting to contribute a member to the Committee on Security, is not contemplating that the further agreements of the nature of regional security agreements to be concluded in Europe would be agreements to which the United Kingdom is a party. The United Kingdom has already become a party to the regional security agreement of Locarno, and understands that the agreements now contemplated for other parts of Europe would be between other parties. On this understanding, the United Kingdom is quite willing, if desired, to contribute a member to the Committee."
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M. Massigli (France) said that, for its part, the French delegation was willing to serve on the Committee proposed by the President, and he would not have spoken in order formally to say so, if some of the declarations just made did not call for certain observations.

He was not referring to the statement of the United Kingdom representative. The French delegation was aware of the position of principle and doctrine adopted by the United Kingdom on this point, and was aware that, at the present time, the only contribution that could be expected of the United Kingdom in that connection was friendly—though, at the same time, useful—cooperation.

Nor was he referring to the statement of the Italian delegate, because his attitude was consequent upon a position of principle with regard to the whole of the Conference's work at the present time and because it did not, in substance, prejudge the position which the Italian delegation might later take up.

He desired, however, to say a few words with regard to the Hungarian representative's statement. For what, in fact, was the situation with which the European States were faced at the present time? The universal organisation of security? Everybody desired that. M. Massigli recalled the 1924 Protocol. Everybody knew that it had failed. The European organisation of security? That had been sought, but unsuccessfully. It had been explained that regional organisations were required. Such organisations had been recommended. When therefore it was said that what was wanted at the present time was not regional but universal organisations, M. Massigli was entitled to fear that that really meant that no organisation was wanted. That was unfortunate. It was unfortunate because, whether one wanted it or not, there existed a movement towards European organisation. It was gradually extending, and in so far as the delegations desired, or many desired, or all desired, that it should not, as the French representative had said a few days previously, assume the character of an organisation directed against someone, in so far as it was desired to avoid encirclement, it was to be hoped that all the European States would show the same goodwill. M. Massigli therefore hoped that, in this matter also, the position adopted by the Hungarian delegate was provisional and that the observer would be convinced of the usefulness of the Conference's work and would become the active collaborator that all the delegations desired.

General Tánczos (Hungary) said that the French representative's courteous interpretation of his declaration was somewhat mistaken. Hungary's point of view was, in particular, that it desired a general Disarmament Convention with security organised also on the universal plane.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to say a few words with regard to the interpretation of the resolution concerning the scope of the work of the Committee on Security. It was clearly stated in the resolution that the immediate question to be dealt with was provisional and that the observer would be convinced of the usefulness of the Conference's work at the present time and because it did not, in substance, prejudge the position which the Italian delegation might later take up.

The proposal of the President was adopted, M. Politis, Vice-President of the General Commission, being elected Chairman of the Special Committee on Security.
2. Special Committee on Guarantees of Execution.

The President supposed that M. di Soragna's observation with regard to the Special Committee on Security applied to this Committee also.

The proposal of the President with regard to the composition and chairmanship of the Special Committee on Guarantees of Execution was adopted.

3. Air Committee.

The proposal of the President with regard to the Air Committee was adopted.

4. Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War.

The President supposed that the reservation put forward by the Italian delegation applied to this Committee also.

M. Castillo Najera (Mexico) understood that the Venezuelan delegation would like to take part in the work of this Committee. He therefore proposed that Venezuela be added to the list of members of the Committee.

The proposals of the President and of the Mexican representative with regard to the Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War were adopted.

160. PUBLICITY OF EXPENDITURE ON NATIONAL DEFENCE: RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCE EXPENDITURE COMMISSION.

The President read the following letter and draft resolution which he had received from M. de Vasconcellos, President of the National Defence Expenditure Commission:

"You will remember that, on June 8th, 1933, the General Commission unanimously adopted the principle of publicity of expenditure on national defence and requested the Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission to prepare the necessary draft articles with annexes to give effect to this decision.

"The draft adopted unanimously by the Technical Committee (document Conf.D./C.G.160) was transmitted to you on January 17th, 1934, by M. de Modzelewski, Vice-President of the Technical Committee.

"Although it might be premature to begin the discussion of the substance of the above-mentioned draft, I feel it my duty to call your attention to the fact that the budgetary documents at the disposal of the Technical Committee refer back, for a considerable number of countries, to the years 1929 and 1930. The eventual application of a system of publicity necessitates a certain continuity in the sending in of information. In these circumstances, it seems to me that it would be very useful to recommend the various States to furnish a more recent documentation.

"Further, these preparatory measures are, in my opinion, of much value if it is wished that the convention on publicity of expenditure on national defence should take practical effect rapidly after signature.

"It is with this object that I submit the enclosed draft resolution and I request you to put it before the General Commission at its next meeting:"

"1. The General Commission recalls its resolution of June 8th, 1933:

"(a) Approving unanimously in principle a system of publicity of national defence expenditure drawn up in accordance with the recommendations of the reports presented by the Commission of National Defence Expenditure (documents Conf.D.158 and 161);

"(b) Entrusting to the Technical Committee of the Commission of National Defence Expenditure the task of elaborating draft articles of convention with their annexes requisite to implement the above decision.

"2. The General Commission takes note of the draft instruments necessary for the application of a system of publicity of national defence expenditure (document Conf.D./C.G.160) adopted unanimously by the Technical Committee and communicated to the General Commission in January 1934.

"3. While reserving its right to examine this draft in detail on a later occasion, the General Commission recommends to Governments, with a view to the future application of the system prescribed, that they should transmit to the Technical Committee, before October 15th, 1934, to the extent they are able, the various documents scheduled in the above draft relating to the last budgetary year for which these documents can be furnished."

---
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M. DE VASCONCELLOS (Portugal) pointed out that the resolution of June 8th, 1933, with regard to publicity of expenditure on national defence had been adopted unanimously by the General Commission, which had instructed the Technical Committee to prepare the necessary instruments for carrying it out. The Technical Committee had prepared those documents. They also had been drawn up unanimously. The General Commission had received them. It was now necessary to assume, as the President had just said, that there was a General Disarmament Convention. In that case, whatever that Convention might be, the section relating to publicity of expenditure would be a fundamental part of it. Preparations must therefore be made with a view to a Convention, and it was essential that that section should be ready. If the General Commission did not adopt M. de Vasconcellos' draft resolution, the Technical Committee would be unable to prepare that section, or, at any rate, would require considerable time for the work, whereas, if the Committee were provided with the information for which the Governments were asked in the draft resolution, it could prepare the necessary texts immediately after the Convention had been adopted.

M. MASSIGLI (France) said that the position adopted by the French delegation with regard to national defence expenditure was well known. If, therefore, the consequence of the proposed resolution was to prevent the Conference from taking a decision later on with regard, not to publicity, but to the limitation of expenditure, he would be unable to adopt it. But, in fact, that was not the case. On the contrary, there was nothing to prevent the necessary instruments for the application of the system of publicity, as was said in the somewhat esoteric language of the National Defence Expenditure Commission, from being utilised immediately it was decided to limit expenditure. In those circumstances, the French delegation willingly supported the proposal and thought it would be very valuable if the documentation already collected were kept up to date.

Mrs. CORBETT-ASHBY (United Kingdom) said that the proposal made by M. de Vasconcellos and supported by the French delegation seemed to her to be a useful one. Great credit was due to the President of the National Defence Expenditure Commission and to its Technical Committee for their unremitting work which had resulted in the production of the draft Instruments for the Application of a System of Publicity of National Defence Expenditure, now before the General Commission. Those who considered that such a system of publicity of expenditure would be an essential element in any Convention for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments would regard the text submitted by the Technical Committee as marking an important step forward towards the goal sought by all. She thought that it would probably make for the prompt and effective working of the system, when eventually introduced, if States would meanwhile endeavour, so far as circumstances permitted, to furnish the documents and returns for which the draft instruments provided. And she was sure that the experience thus gained would be helpful when the Conference came, on a later occasion, to examine the text of the instruments.

The President said that, if there were no further observations, he would assume that the resolution just submitted to the Commission was not only accepted unanimously, but that the Governments would respond by sending the information which the National Defence Expenditure Commission desired.

The draft resolution was adopted.

161. PARTICIPATION OF DELEGATIONS NOT MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU IN CERTAIN PARTS OF THE BUREAU'S WORK IN WHICH THEY HAVE A SPECIAL INTEREST.

M. FOTITCH (Yugoslavia) said that items I and III of the resolution adopted by the General Commission on June 8th, 1934, entrusted a very important and very wide task to the Bureau. In this connection, M. Fotitch expressed the hope that the Bureau would avail itself of the co-operation of those delegations not at present represented on it whose help would appear to it to be useful in carrying out its task.

Cemal HÜSNÜ Bey (Turkey) supported the Yugoslav representative's statement.

The President pointed out that he had already given the assurance that delegations would be invited to attend meetings of the Bureau especially when questions in which they were particularly interested were being discussed. That had been the rule for some time, and he took the opportunity to repeat it.

---
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