Annex I.

QUESTIONNAIRE PREPARED BY VISCOUNT CECIL AS PROGRAMME FOR THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION.

(a) Is it practicable to limit the ultimate war strength of a country, or must any measure of disarmament be confined to the peace strength?

(b) By what standards is it possible to measure the armaments of one country against the armaments of another, e.g., numbers, period of service, equipment, expenditure, etc.?

(c) On what principles would it be possible to draw up a scale of armaments permissible to the various countries, e.g., population(?) resources, geographical position, etc.?

(d) Admitting that disarmament depends on security, to what extent is regional disarmament possible in return for regional security; or is any scheme of disarmament impossible unless it is general? If regional disarmament is practicable, would it promote or lead up to general disarmament?

(e) Is there any and, if so, what device by which civil and military aircraft can be distinguished for purpose of disarmament? If this is not practicable, how can the value of civil aircraft be computed in estimating the air strength of any country?

(f) Is it possible or desirable to apply the conclusions arrived at in (e) above to parts of aircraft and aircraft engines?

Annex II.

MEMORANDUM PRESENTED BY M. PAUL-BONCOUR.

I. What is to be understood by the expression "armaments"?

(a) Enquiry into the various factors, military, economic, geographical, etc., upon which the power of a country in time of war depends;

(b) Enquiry into the various elements which constitute the armaments of a country in time of peace; the different forms of armaments; the methods of recruiting, training, etc., and their characteristics.

II. What is to be understood by the expression "reduction of armaments"?

The various forms which reduction may take in the case of land, sea and air forces; a critical examination of each form of reduction; the diminution of the larger peace-time units; the diminution of the forces composing them or of those available for military use; the diminution of the length of active service; the diminution of the quantity of war material in use or in stock; the diminution of the expenditure on national defence, etc.

III. For what defensive needs can the various armaments be used?

Length of maritime communications, vulnerable frontiers and great "vital" centres near the frontiers, etc.

Can there be said to be "offensive" and "defensive" armaments?

IV. Methods of estimating the effective strength in case of war of a country's peace armaments of all kinds, taking into account the necessary delays in transforming such peace armaments into war armaments.

The special case of States where there is a professional army.

The special case of agricultural States which do not manufacture war material.

V. Consideration of the prospects—thanks to the previous establishment of plans of action and of economic and financial assistance, in pursuance of Article 16 of the Covenant—of re-establishing a relative equilibrium between the different countries, as regards their means of industrial and economic mobilisation and the rapidity of such mobilisation.

VI. Examination of the principle according to which no Power should have the right to maintain armaments susceptible, in the event of its committing an act of aggression, of placing at its disposal forces superior to those which the State which was the victim of the aggression together with the League of Nations could unite in opposition to it, either by virtue of Article 16 of the Covenant or through the application of the regional agreements provided for in Article 21 of the Covenant.

Annex III.

LIST OF QUESTIONS ARISING OUT OF THE MEMORANDUM PRESENTED BY M. COBIAN.

(a) Definition of the term "armaments".

(b) Is it possible to establish a formula expressing the "level of armaments" of a State, including or excluding potential armaments?
(c) Has the idea "level of armaments" an absolute and general value, or merely a relative value depending on the conditions of the State concerned and on the general situation at the moment?

(d) Is there a method by which it would be possible to fix for each State limits within which its armaments might vary without prejudice to the interest of other States and without constituting a threat of the latter?

(e) Is there any method of ascertaining whether a certain force is organised for purely defensive purposes (no matter what use may be made of it in time of war), or whether, on the contrary, it is constituted in a spirit of aggression?

5.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE COUNCIL,

held at Geneva from December 7th to December 16th, 1925, under the Presidency of M. Vittorio Scialoja.

AND REPORTS BY M. BENES

ON THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AND ON THE LIST OF QUESTIONS TO BE EXAMINED BY THIS COMMISSION

adopted by the Council on December 12th, 1925.

THIRD MEETING (PRIVATE).

Held on Tuesday, December 8th, 1925, at 10 a.m.

Present: All the representatives of the Members of the Council, and the Secretary-General.


M. PAUL-BONCOUR, Rapporteur of the Committee of the Council, read and explained his report (C.761, 1925.IX — see 4 (a), pages 36 to 38).

On the proposal of Sir Austen CHAMBERLAIN, the Council decided that, when the Preparatory Commission convenes the Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the Technical Commission, these latter would express, not their personal views, but the views of their respective Commissions.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL asked the Council to decide whether the various members of the Committees of the League who would sit on the Joint Commission ought or ought not to present the views of their respective organisations. He thought that it would be difficult for these members to speak in the name of their organisations, for it would be necessary in that case for the Economic Committee and the Financial Committee, etc., to sit permanently during the meetings of the Joint Commission in order to be able to give instructions to their representatives.

The Council decided that members of the organisations of the League sitting on the Joint Commission would not be required to present the point of view of their respective organisations at that Commission.

M. HYMANS raised the question of the name of the Preparatory Commission. In the text of the report the phrase "Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments" was to be found. This was the correct expression, for it was the same as that used in the Covenant. He feared that the expression "Disarmament Conference" to be found in the title "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference" would give rise to a false interpretation, in view of the popular meaning of the word "disarmament".

M. BENES sympathised with the fears expressed by M. Hymans. The title "Preparatory Commission for the Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments" would be more exact, though it would be a somewhat lengthy one. Whatever were the title, it was obvious that the Members of the League of Nations would quite understand its meaning. Public opinion, however, should not be led into error.

M. PAUL-BONCOUR said that the observations which had just been put forward had already been made in the Committee of the Council. The Committee of the Council had decided in favour
of a "Disarmament Conference" because it had considered that there was a disadvantage in very long titles, and it was therefore necessary to choose an expression which would appeal to the imagination.

It would be for the Council to take a decision on the question.

Sir Austen Chamberlain, while not attaching great importance to the title, preferred the one proposed by the Committee of the Council.

He reminded the Council of a formula which had played a certain part in the discussions of the Assembly, and which was well known to the public, "Arbitration, Security and Disarmament". The more the title gave a certain picture to the public, the better it was.

M. Hymans said that the word "disarmament" was more high-sounding, but that the picture it presented was untrue. If the word "disarmament" were adopted, it would be necessary to explain continually that, when the League of Nations spoke of disarmament, it meant really the reduction and limitation of armaments.

The President said the official title ought to be correct, but that it would be impossible to prevent it being summarised, as in many other official titles, by a short formula presenting a picture of what was meant, though that formula might not be a very true one.

The question of the title was reserved.

M. Paul-Boncour drew the attention of the Council to a difficulty which had just been pointed out to him. The draft stipulated that "the Joint Commission may call in other experts under the same conditions as provided in the case of the Permanent Advisory Commission". This gave rise to a small difficulty of interpretation. Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Permanent Advisory Commission was as follows:

"The representatives laid down in Article 1 may be joined by such number of officers as assistants as may be necessary according to circumstances, and may also call in any Service or civil experts whose experience may be useful."

Obviously, the legal interpretation of Article 3 was that each Government delegate belonging to the Permanent Advisory Commission could call in the assistance of experts. The Council Committee had thought, however, that the Joint Commission itself would have the right to call in experts. There was therefore a point to be settled. Did the Council mean to accord to each member of the Joint Commission the right to appeal to experts, or did it wish to grant that right only to the Commission?

Viscount Cecil, who was attending as member of the Council Committee, pointed out that the Council Committee desired the Joint Commission to have the same rights as the Permanent Advisory Commission as far as recourse to the assistance of experts was concerned.

The Council decided that the Joint Commission itself would call in any experts it wished to consult. If a member of the Commission asked for an expert to be heard, it would be for the Commission to decide whether it would grant this request.
ELEVENTH MEETING (PUBLIC)

Held on Saturday, December 12th, 1925, at 11.30 a.m.

Present: All the representatives of the Members of the Council, and the Secretary-General.

1634. — Arbitration, Security and Reduction of Armaments.

(a) Reports of the Committee of the Council.

I. Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

M. Benes read the following report and resolution:

The Council has before it the report of our eminent colleague M. Paul-Boncour on the work of the Committee of the Council concerning the organ for the work of disarmament. As the report states, the mandate which the Committee received from the Council was to consider the observations made during the sixth Assembly on the constitution and working of the Co-ordination Commission and to submit definite proposals to the Council on this subject.

I am sure that I am expressing your feelings in thanking our Committee for its admirable work, resulting in the submission to us of proposals which will make it possible to organise on a sure and practical basis the important work which is to culminate in the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. These proposals are very skilfully designed to meet the requirement that the higher political direction and co-ordination of the preliminary work should be concentrated in the hands of accredited representatives of the Governments. In view of the very diverse features which the problem presents in different parts of the world and in order to meet the wishes of the Assembly, the scheme rightly provides for the extension of the leading organisation by adding to the representatives of States Members of the Council a certain number of representatives of other States which are in a special situation in regard to this problem. It also provides means of enabling States not directly represented to make their views heard, and it empowers this Commission of Government representatives to obtain the opinions of experts specially qualified to advise on particular questions. Another advantage offered by the scheme submitted to us is that it creates a well-defined, yet elastic, system of co-operation in the work of disarmament with the technical organisations of the League. For this purpose, there is a Commission of Government representatives described above would be assisted by the Permanent Advisory Commission in respect of questions relating to the military, naval or air aspects of the questions, and by a Joint Commission, composed of members of the various technical organisations of the League and Labour Office, in respect of the economic aspects of the problem of disarmament.

It is provided that this Joint Commission may call in other experts, under the same conditions as those laid down in Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Permanent Advisory Commission. The Council will, no doubt, agree with me that the Joint Commission and the Permanent Advisory Commission should each be further entitled, as a body, to call in the assistance of such experts as either of these Commissions may consider desirable and that any one of its members should be entitled to propose the exercise of this right in any individual case.

There are various provisions to make the working of this system as effective and rapid as possible. The Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, for instance, will be given permanent authorisation by the President of the Council to apply direct to the Chairmen of both the Technical Commissions requesting them to convene their respective Commissions on any given date. Similarly, the Preparatory Commission would have the power of summoning the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Permanent Advisory Commission and the Joint Commission to state the views of their respective Commissions. Lastly, it is provided that, when the Preparatory Commission calls in persons not belonging to the various organisations mentioned above, the Technical Commissions will be consulted in regard to the opinions which the Commission thus obtains.

The Committee of the Council left for our decision the question of the chairmanship of the Preparatory Commission. I venture to propose that the Council should refer this question to the Preparatory Commission itself; and, on the same principle, I propose that the Preparatory Commission and the Joint Commission should be left to choose their own Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen.

As regards the title which the Committee of the Council proposes to give the Commission, there is no doubt that the name proposed — "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference" — has the advantage of expressing briefly and clearly the duties which the Commission will be called upon to do, in accordance with Article 8 of the Covenant. There is one possible objection, however: namely, that the word "disarmament" means both reduction of armaments and abolition of armaments and might consequently lead to confusion.

After having discussed the matter with some of my colleagues, it occurred to me that this objection might be mitigated, if not entirely eliminated, by returning to a suggestion which had already been made — and which was, at one moment, adopted by the Council Committee — namely, that in all official documents the name of the Commission should be followed by an explanatory sub-title; the full title of the Commission would then be: "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, being a Commission to prepare for a Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments."
There are still two important questions to be considered:

The first is the selection of the States Members of the League which are to be associated with the States represented on the Council as members of the Preparatory Commission.

The second is the cooperation in this work of certain countries which do not at present belong to the League of Nations.

As regards the first of these points, I am happy to state that there was complete unanimity among my colleagues both as to the principle to be applied and the method of its application. The principle is that the Commission should be representative of the different situations of States as regards the disarmament problem. Without discussing in detail the considerations which guided us in drawing up the list based on the application of that principle, I desire to say that my colleagues were all agreed that the following States should be invited to be represented on the Commission:

BULGARIA,
FINLAND,
NETHERLANDS,
POLAND,
ROUMANIA,
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES.

As regards States which are not at present members of the League of Nations, we all attach great importance to the cooperation of GERMANY, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and the UNION OF SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS.

I accordingly beg to propose that the President of the Council should invite these three countries to appoint representatives on this Commission.

In conclusion, I propose the following resolution for adoption by the Council:

"The Council, in view of the report of M. Paul-Boncour on the work of the Council Committee regarding the permanent organ of the Council for work on disarmament,

"Decides:

"1. To adopt the scheme for the constitution of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference submitted by the Council Committee, as shown in the Annex to this report;

"2. To adopt the present report;

"3. To request the President to invite the Governments of the States named below to appoint representatives to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference:

BULGARIA,
FINLAND,
NETHERLANDS,
POLAND,
ROUMANIA,
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES;

"4. To request the President to invite the Governments of GERMANY, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and the UNION OF SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS to appoint representatives to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference;

"5. To request the Secretary-General to communicate the present report to all the States not represented on the Commission, and to draw their attention to the facilities provided for in the scheme for the organisation of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, which enable States not represented on the Commission to state their points of view, and to forward to them the list of questions to be submitted to the Commission, together with the report attached thereto."

Annex.

COMPOSITION AND WORKING OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.

I. Name.

The Commission will be entitled "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, being a Commission to prepare for a Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments".

II. Composition.

1. The Commission will consist of:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Council;

(b) Representatives of countries chosen amongst those which, by reason of their geographical situation, occupy a special position as regards the problem of disarmament and which are not otherwise represented on the Commission.
2. Any State not represented on the Commission shall be entitled:
   (a) To submit memoranda on matters in which it is specially interested;
   (b) To be heard in support of these memoranda.

3. Moreover, the Commission will always have the right, in the case of special questions, to call in the assistance of any State which, in the opinion of the Commission, may be particularly interested in these questions.

4. If the constitution of the Council is altered during the proceedings of the Commission, the Council may change the composition of the Commission in order to ensure the continuity of its work.

III. Working of the Commission.

1. The Preparatory Commission will decide on the proposals for the Conference on the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments to be submitted to the Council and will assure the control and co-ordination of the work preparatory to the Conference. For that purpose it will be empowered by the Council to obtain the co-operation and advice of the competent organisations of the League. The latter, in their turn, may submit to it on their own initiative any suggestion which they feel called upon to make with regard to the work in progress. This co-operation will be effected as follows:
   (a) With the Permanent Advisory Commission in the case of any questions relating to the military, naval or air aspect of the questions under consideration;
   (b) In respect of the economic aspect of these questions, with a Joint Commission, constituted as follows:
       Two members each of the Economic, Financial and Transit Organisations, to be appointed by the Council after consultation with the Chairmen of the respective Committees;
       Two members of the Employers' Group and two members of the Workers' Group of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office appointed by the Governing Body.
       The Joint Commission may call in other experts under the same conditions as provided in the case of the Permanent Advisory Commission.

2. Under the standing authority of the President of the Council, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission may request the Chairman of the Permanent Advisory Commission or the Joint Commission to assemble these Commissions on a given date.

3. The Preparatory Commission may at any time summon and hear the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Permanent Advisory Commission and of the Joint Commission to explain the views of their respective Commissions.

4. It may also summon and hear any persons whose special qualifications are calculated to facilitate its work on a given subject.

5. The authority referred to in sub-paragraphs 3 and 4 above is accorded to any Sub-Committees which it may establish within itself.

Sir Austen CHAMBERLAIN said that the English translation of the report had been very hastily drawn up and that it would be preferable to take the French version of the report as the basis of the present decision, in regard to which all the members of the Council were agreed. The English text would be revised by the Rapporteur and by Viscount Cecil 1.

The resolution was adopted.

II. Questions to be submitted to the Preparatory Commission.

M. BENES read the following report and resolution:

The report which M. Paul-Boncour has submitted to us with regard to the list of questions to be examined by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference states that the programmes of work presented respectively by the delegates of the British Empire, France and Spain have been amalgamated by the Committee of the Council in a single programme of seven questions. The Committee of the Council has not felt itself called upon to pronounce upon the respective merits of the two points of view expressed with regard to two of the questions included in the programme presented by the French delegate and has preferred to leave it to the Council to elucidate this question.

I feel sure that I am interpreting the view of everyone in expressing in our name the thanks of the Council for the successful result of the work of the Committee, which has been

---

1 The text given in the Minutes is the revised version.
able to draw up a unanimous programme on almost all the points submitted to it, notwithstanding the fact that it was dealing with a question which bristles with difficulties and which, by reason of its complex character, is difficult to express in formulas.

As regards the question which the Committee of the Council has left for our decision, certain opinions were expressed, in the course of the discussions, which it would seem useful to mention for future guidance in the preparatory work. In the first place, recalling the resolution of the fifth Assembly on the question of the reduction of naval armaments, the French, Italian and Japanese representatives stated on behalf of their Governments that they could not see their way to dissociate the various kinds of armaments—military, naval and air—and to consider them at separate conferences.

Secondly, a large number of delegates urged that it was impossible to deal with the disarmament question without reference to what has been called the potential war strength of the various countries—in other words, their population and their economic and industrial resources. As there could be no question of effecting a reduction in such factors, nor even of usefully examining them, they thought that it would not be practicable to find a fair basis for comparison between peace-time armaments properly so called: unless the potential war strength of various countries were made comparable by organising economic and financial assistance as provided in principle in Article 16 of the Covenant.

Again, the French representative laid great stress on the point that one of the essential objects of the reduction and limitation of armaments was to secure a position in which no country committing an aggression would be able to make head against the total forces which could be brought against it by the Members of the League acting conjointly in pursuance of Article 16 of the Covenant and of regional agreements as contemplated in Article 21.

Lastly, the British, French and Spanish delegates expressed the opinion that the question of an international supervision to ensure that the observance of limitation of armaments was being observed should be examined by the Preparatory Commission. The French delegate emphasised the necessity of such supervision, particularly during the period when the arbitration and conciliation proceedings provided for in the Covenant of the League of Nations and in the various agreements recently concluded were in progress.

Finally, I have to record the agreement which has fortunately been arrived at between the different points of view. A slight amendment in the wording of Question V has made it possible to include in the programme of work which we have to draw up for the Preparatory Commission some of the main ideas contained in the questions of the French delegate’s programme referred to above and in the questions proposed by the Belgian delegate. I would once more express my satisfaction with the happy results due to the spirit of conciliation which prevails in our discussions.

I therefore propose for your adoption, having regard to the conclusions of the report of the Preparatory Commission which I have just submitted to you, the following resolution:

"The Council,

"Having regard to the report of the Committee of the Council concerning the list of questions to be examined by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference,

"Decides:

"(1) To adopt the list of questions prepared by the Committee of the Council in the amended form in which it appears in Annex I of this report;

"(2) To refer this programme, together with the Minutes of the Session of the Committee of the Council and of the present Session of the Council relating to the problem of disarmament, to the Preparatory Commission, constituted by its decision of to-day;

"(3) To convene a meeting of this Commission on February 15th, 1926, at Geneva in order that it may be duly constituted and that it may engage in a preliminary exchange of views regarding the accompanying list of questions, and may refer, if necessary, to the Technical Commissions attached to it the examination of the military and economic aspects of the questions which it has to consider."

Annex I.

LIST OF QUESTIONS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION.

Question I.

What is to be understood by the expression "armaments"?

1 “The Assembly is of the opinion:

2 “2. That the question of naval disarmament should be discussed as part of the general question of disarmament to be dealt with by the International Conference proposed in the Resolution of September 6th, 1924, adopted by the fifth Assembly, and that it rests with the Council to set the programme.”

2 See Annex II (Note containing extracts from the Minutes of the Committee of the Council).
(a) Definition of the various factors—military, economic, geographical, etc. — upon which the power of a country in time of war depends.

(b) Definition and special characteristics of the various factors which constitute the armaments of a country in time of peace; the different categories of armaments — military, naval and air — the methods of recruiting, training, organisations capable of immediate military employment, etc.

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?

(b) What is to be understood by the expression "reduction and limitation of armaments"?

The various forms which reduction or limitation may take in the case of land, sea and air forces: the relative advantages or disadvantages of each of the different forms or methods: for example, the reduction of the larger peace-time units or of their establishment and their equipment, or of any immediately mobilisable forces: the reduction of the length of active service, the reduction of the quantity of military equipment, the reduction of expenditure on national defence, etc.

Question III.

By what standards is it possible to measure the armaments of one country against the armaments of another, e.g., numbers, period of service, equipment, expenditure, etc.?

Question IV.

Can there be said to be "offensive" and "defensive" armaments? Is there any method of ascertaining whether a certain force is organised for purely defensive purposes (no matter what use may be made of it in time of war), or whether, on the contrary, it is established for the purposes in a spirit of aggression?

Question V.

(a) On what principle will it be possible to draw up a scale of armaments permissible to the various countries, taking into account particularly:

- Population;
- Resources;
- Geographical situation;
- Length and nature of maritime communications;
- Density and character of the railways;
- Vulnerability of the frontiers and of the important vital centres near the frontiers;
- The time required, varying with different States, to transform peace armaments into war armaments;
- The degree of security which, in the event of aggression, a State could receive under the provisions of the Covenant or of separate engagements contracted towards that State?

(b) Can the reduction of armaments be promoted by examining possible means for ensuring that the mutual assistance, economic and military, contemplated in Article 16 of the Covenant shall be brought quickly into operation as soon as an act of aggression has been committed.

Question VI.

(a) Is there any device by which civil and military aircraft can be distinguished for purposes of disarmament? If this is not practicable, how can the value of civil aircraft be computed in estimating the air strength of any country?

(b) Is it possible or desirable to apply the conclusions arrived at in (a) above to parts of aircraft and aircraft engines?

(c) Is it possible to attach military value to commercial fleets in estimating the naval armaments of a country?

Question VII.

Admitting that disarmament depends on security, to what extent is regional disarmament possible in return for regional security? Or is any scheme of disarmament impracticable unless it is general? If regional disarmament is practicable, would it promote or lead up to general disarmament?

Annex II.

Note on the Statements Made at the Meetings of the Committee of the Council Regarding the Supervision of Armaments.

It will be seen from the Minutes of the Committee of the Council that on one highly important question — that of the supervision of armaments — no conclusions were reached, although certain delegations seemed to be in agreement on the subject.
The Minutes of the Fourth Meeting (Saturday, December 5th, 10.30 a.m.) contain the following statement by Viscount Cecil:

"One question would at any rate have to be added. The Preparatory Commission would have to enquire into the nature of the international supervision to be, if possible, established in order to make sure that countries kept within the limits of the scale of armaments which had been fixed for them. It might prove impossible to establish such international supervision, and countries might have, as at present, to rely on their military attachés, but this was a matter which the Preparatory Commission should investigate".

In the same Minutes we find the following statement by M. Paul-Boncour:

"If the limitation of armaments were not to have as a counterpart a general system of control, it would be equivalent to placing a premium on bad faith. If, however, only the visible disarmament in peace time were taken into account, this control could only be exercised over the actual troops in barracks and on the material of war in the magazines. On the other hand, were account to be taken of the potential war strength, it would have to be admitted that war material would have at the same time to be controlled and that control should be particularly active and vigilant during the period when the procedure of conciliation and arbitration was being applied. This procedure had just been defined by the recent agreements, which contained valuable promises of security".

Lastly, the memorandum submitted by M. Cobian mentions the idea of an "international organisation" set up to supervise the observance of limitations of armaments and "to take measures to prevent re-arming".

Sir Austen CHAMBERLAIN said that his observations in regard to the previous report similarly applied to the text which had just been presented.

The resolution was adopted.

M. BENES thought that the Joint Commission and the Permanent Advisory Commission should meet at the beginning of the meeting of the Preparatory Commission, which might have at once to consult the various technical organisations assisting it. He accordingly proposed to convene the Mixed Commission and the Permanent Advisory Commission for February 16th, 1926.

The proposal of M. Benes was adopted.

(b) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES: RESOLUTIONS OF THE SIXTH ASSEMBLY.

M. BENES read the following report and resolution:

The Council will remember that it was decided, at the meeting of September 26th, 1925, to consider separately certain questions which had come within the province of the First Committee of the sixth Assembly, particularly those arising out of the Preamble of the Spanish Resolution (A. 138. 1925. IX) and the resolution adopted on September 25th, 1925, on the proposal of the First Committee (A. 136. 1925. V) concerning the pacific settlement of international disputes.

The Council decided to adjourn until the present session consideration of these questions.

The resolution adopted on the proposal of the First Committee runs as follows:

"The Assembly,

"In view of the importance of making a thorough study of the views which have been expressed in the Assembly and the Council on the subject of the pacific settlement of international disputes;

"Convinced that such study will contribute to the development of a system of pacific settlement of international disputes:

"Requests the Council to submit to careful examination the proposals, declarations and suggestions made at the Assembly and the Council with a view to pacific settlement of international disputes, and to report to the seventh Assembly upon the progress which can be made in this matter."

Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the Spanish Resolution, which was adopted on the report of the First and Third Committees, run as follows:

"The Assembly,

..............

"Regards favourably the effort made by certain nations to attain those objects by concluding arbitration conventions and treaties of mutual security conceived in the spirit of the Covenant of the League of Nations and in harmony with the principles of the Protocol (Arbitration, Security, Disarmament);

1 The text given in the Minutes is the revised version.
"Records the fact that such agreements need not be restricted to a limited area but may be applied to the whole world;

"Recommends that, after these conventions and treaties have been deposited with the League of Nations, the Council should examine them in order to report to the seventh Assembly on the progress in general security brought about by such agreements."

It may perhaps be desirable for the Council to adjourn until March consideration of the exact form in which it desires to report to the Assembly. At that moment more elements for a general survey of the matter may be available.

I should, however, think it would be advisable to invite the Secretary-General now to prepare the necessary information for the Council, and, with this purpose in view, I therefore propose the following resolution:

"The Council,

Taking into consideration the resolutions adopted by the Assembly on September 25th, 1925, concerning arbitration, security and the reduction of armaments (A. 133. 1925. IX, and A. 136. 1925. V) and the report adopted by the Council on September 26th, 1925 (C. 573 (1). 1925. IX):

"Invites the Secretary-General to prepare in due time before the next ordinary meeting of the Council: (1) a complete exposé of all the proposals, declarations and suggestions made at the sixth Assembly and at the Council with a view to the pacific settlement of international disputes; (2) a systematic survey of the arbitration conventions and the treaties of mutual security which have been deposited with the League of Nations, in order to enable the Council to prepare a report for submission to the seventh Assembly on the progress which has been achieved and can be made in these matters."

The resolution was adopted.

THIRTEENTH MEETING (PRIVATE)

Held on Monday, December 14th, 1925, at 12.15 p.m.

Present: All the representatives of the Members of the Council, and the Secretary-General.

1643. — Preparatory Committee for the Disarmament Conference. Appointment of Certain Members of the Joint Commission.

M. Benes reminded the Council that the Joint Commission would have to comprise two members of each of the Economic, Financial and Transit Organisations, to be appointed by the Council after consulting the Chairmen of these Committees.

He asked the Council to authorise the Acting President to make these appointments if the Council itself found it impossible to do so before the end of the present session.

This proposal was adopted.