own countries, but the common aim of the stabilisation of peace, if they wish to dissipate the apprehensions of war in its worst forms hanging over humanity and to give satisfaction to the demands of the peoples in all countries in this respect, we shall not have to search about for compromises of the sort to which we are being prompted here, compromises based upon the preservation for one group of States of definite elements of war, in order that another group may preserve other elements of war of interest to it.

My Government, having in view not its own ends, nor those of any special category of States, but the general interests of disarmament and peace, is unable to feel indifferent towards any of the problems of disarmament, whether these concern land or sea Powers. The Soviet delegation will therefore continue to defend and support all proposals extending the scope of disarmament. The Soviet delegation considers the reduction of reserves as an essential and integral part of the real reduction of armaments. To renounce the principle of the reduction of trained reserves will mean the renunciation of disarmament in general, and the ruin of any hopes for any satisfactory solution whatsoever of the problem of disarmament by the Preparatory Commission and the coming conference.

The considerations I have just set forth have found formal expression in the amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation to Chapter I on Effectives, which amendment suggests the insertion in the draft Convention of special schedules for trained reserves of all classes and grades.

I may be told that the Preparatory Commission cannot force any State to go in for more disarmament than it wants to and that agreements are therefore only possible on the basis of a minimum disarmament programme, taking fully into consideration all objections and reservations from all Governments. The statement, however, of the impossibility of persuading these Governments to withdraw their reservations and objections, and, in the spirit of conciliation and agreement, to meet those States which are ready for greater reduction of armaments, ought hardly to arouse in us feelings of satisfaction. We ought rather, frankly and courageously, to express regret as to the Commission’s failure to achieve effective reduction of all kinds and elements of armed forces, regret for the necessity of compromise entailing the lowering of demands in the sphere of disarmament.

Frankly admitting that the leaving of trained reserves outside the Convention deprives the Disarmament Conference of the opportunity of solving the problem of disarmament in any satisfactory manner, we may yet hope that the Governments concerned will, under pressure of world public opinion, have changed their decisions by the time the Disarmament Conference is called, and will allow the latter to supplement the Convention by those clauses without which it can have no claim to the title of Disarmament Conference.

M. Sokal (Poland). — I have no intention of making a statement with regard to the limitation of effectives and of trained reserves in particular. The views of the Polish delegation are already known to the Commission as they have been developed at length on several occasions.

I should like, however, to remove a misunderstanding and to explain that it is hardly correct to say that countries which are to-day opposed to a limitation of trained reserves have not hitherto made any concessions. I would draw your attention to the fact that the draft Convention before us has been subjected to a first reading and that this first reading affords a striking proof of the conciliatory spirit shown by all States, including those which are now opposing the limitation of trained reserves. The draft Convention would not exist if no concessions had been made by those States.

As regards the limitation of trained reserves, I am personally of the opinion that the arguments submitted by certain delegations in favour of this limitation, while they are deserving of respect, are not all entirely logical. M. Litvinoff was perfectly logical; because, when he advocated the limitation of trained reserves, he was in a position to point to the Soviet draft, which in Article 5 provides what is, in fact, a complement to a limitation of trained reserves, namely, the strict prohibition of civil associations which give military training.

Article 7 of our draft Convention contains a similar provision, but, as you will remember, the question of what is understood by “formations organised on a military basis” was discussed at length, and many organisations which do in fact constitute trained reserves are not covered by this article.

We must do one of two things: we must either limit trained reserves in all their forms or not limit them at all.

It is not possible to limit athletic organisations whose members receive military training. It is not even possible to control them, and we all know that, in a large number of countries, there are vast organisations which receive military training and to which the provisions of the Convention can never apply. For that reason I think that the Soviet draft, though it is perfectly logical, remains theoretical and is incapable of any practical application.

This argument has, I believe, already been put forward, but I wished to emphasise it for the following reason: we all hope that the Convention will give us the maximum guarantees. It may not be an ideal Convention, but it is the first step, and we hope we shall go further in time. Our great desire is that this Convention should be perfectly fair to everybody. That is why we have always insisted on an organic connection between the various types of armaments, and I therefore maintain, in this particular case, that it is impossible to limit trained reserves without including athletic or other organisations whose members receive military training. Unless you take these organisations into account, the Convention would not be equitable, and
we think it is better to draw up an equitable Convention than to endeavour to introduce provisions which it is impossible to carry out or the application of which it is impossible to control.

I would refer to another point which is of some importance: those who are in favour of the limitation of trained reserves appear to forget that, by reducing effectives, you are indirectly reducing trained reserves. Since, for the reasons I have just mentioned, it is not possible to limit all trained reserves, let us confine ourselves for the present to limiting them indirectly by limiting peace-time effectives. By so doing we shall, I think, be taking the first step towards the goal desired by all countries. As Mr. Gibson rightly remarked yesterday, we must first of all reach agreement, because no Convention, not even a draft Convention, is possible without such agreement, and this would be the best proof of the conciliatory spirit by which we should all be inspired. I feel sure that public opinion will be content even with very small progress, and will be far more satisfied than if it were to learn that the Commission had broken down because it had not been able to settle this thorny question of effectives and trained reserves.

The Hon. Hugh Gibson (United States of America). — I am unwilling to interrupt the course of this extremely important debate, but at the same time I cannot refrain from rising to express my deep and very sincere appreciation of the friendly proposal which has been made by the honourable delegate for Czechoslovakia, as to the acceptance, with a certain interpretation, of the United States reservation in regard to forces organised on a military basis. This proposal is all the more gratifying because it was made on the spontaneous and helpful initiative of the honourable delegate for Czechoslovakia.

I shall not take up the time of the Commission with an argument on this point, but will make just one observation — that, if the proposal which has been made commends itself to the Commission, it will materially facilitate the position of the American delegation.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — At the head of the Chapter with which we are now dealing, on the right hand side of the page, is printed a reservation by the British delegation:

"The British delegation reserves the opinion of its Government as to the limitation of trained reserves.

But anyone who is interested enough to examine the reports of the debates which took place at that time will find that, while we reserved the opinion of our Government, we expressed very strong opinions that the system of limitation on which we were then embarking ought to include trained reserves. Why, then, when we expressed that strong opinion, did we reserve the opinion of our Government? I think the course of this discussion has explained and justified that action, and we are in very much the same position to-day as we were then.

The Commission may remember that some days ago I made a statement, in language very similar to that employed yesterday by the honourable delegate of the United States of America, in which I intimated in general terms that there were certain questions which were of special interest and importance to military Powers — of which my country does not pretend to be one — and that, although we retained the view which we had expressed in the past, I should be prepared, in the interests of agreement and in order to get something done, to make a concession from the opinions which we held.

It is quite clear, Mr. President, that a matter of this importance — the whole question of trained reserves — cannot be carried against the opinion of a substantial minority of this Commission. If we were to insist upon our view, together with other delegations who share that view, we could undoubtedly wreck this Convention; we could prevent agreement being reached, and we should then be in a position that we should have to report to the Council that we despaired of any result. We could do that, or, on the other hand, we could take the course I indicated the other day, and which Mr. Gibson indicated yesterday. We could say that we still think it is important, but we think it is still more important to get something done, and that is the attitude which I am taking up to-day. I want to insist that we have not changed our opinion, but I think it is not sufficiently realised, perhaps, that to include trained reserves is a system which cannot be combined with a system of conscription. I have thought a great deal over the matter and I see very great difficulties in grafting on to a system of conscription any effective limitation of trained reserves, as a matter of administrative difficulty. I am quite aware that this morning Count Bernstorff did intimate, or suggest, a scheme of different values for different classes of reserves, and he intimated the opinion that upon those lines it might be possible.

Without having had an opportunity of carefully considering what he said and the inference to be drawn from it, I think it would be very complicated and probably quite unsatisfactory to make any estimate of that sort, and, therefore, it seems to me that conscription and limitation of trained reserves are closely bound up one with the other. I need not say that Great Britain is opposed to conscription. We have never had it in our history, with the single exception of the emergency of the great war. Immediately the war was over, we went back to the voluntary system, and, of course, we naturally think that our system is the best. Not only do we think it is the best on all grounds, but it appears to me to be clear that you cannot have a really far-reaching and effective system of limitation and reduction of armaments combined with a system which enables a country to depend on the whole of its manhood at the outbreak of war. That is our view, but we realise it is one which does not largely prevail on the continent of Europe, and we are anxious to get something done. We do not want to run our heads against a brick wall, and, as Mr. Gibson, and, as I think, M. Rutgers, said this morning, we recognise that we should only be obstructive of real progress if we insist upon our view. But let me add...
that this is not, we hope and believe, the final work which will be undertaken in the direction of disarmament. Let us recognise that all we are doing now is laying the foundation. We are taking the first step in the direction of disarmament— an enormous movement—a movement that twenty or thirty years ago no one would have believed possible, in that all the nations of the world should be simultaneously gathered together to determine upon a system of disarmament. We cannot expect at the outset to obtain a complete system, to carry out the whole of our work and to reach the ideal we have visualised. We are making a first step, and we shall have plenty of room for improvement and progress as time goes on, and it is in that spirit, and that spirit alone, that I am consenting to give up a position which I think of importance, and which I believe will be some day reached as the ideal we have in view, but I am content to give it up in order to get something practical done in the meantime, and to get a good foundation on which we shall be able to build a more complete and ideal structure later on.

General Tschang Tsoping (China).—I wish to make clear the attitude of China in regard to trained reserves. Unlike the United States of America and Great Britain, China is a continental country of the Far East, with no trained reserves, and she could not conceive of a draft Convention for the reduction of armaments which failed to take account of trained reserves. The Chinese delegation believes itself to have furnished the key to the problem in its proposal tending to abolish compulsory military service. If we adopt this proposal, the question of trained reserves would, ipso facto, no longer arise. I reserve the right to put forward my arguments on this point later, when the Commission examines our proposal, and to indicate how this proposal is capable of facilitating the solution of the problem under consideration and of permitting our overcoming the difficulties which lie before us. I hope that this proposal will be received in the spirit of conciliation and concession which has been so happily expressed by Mr. Gibson and other delegates, a spirit which should reign supreme in this Commission.

The President.—I think we can now say that the Commission is agreed that the limitation of trained reserves shall not be included in the draft Convention. Some delegations have spoken against such limitation and others, in order to enable a first Disarmament Convention to be framed, have withdrawn their request for the limitation of trained reserves although they maintain their opinion in principle. In these circumstances it would appear—and I am sure that you will agree with me in this—that the limitation of trained reserves cannot be included in the text of the Convention.

As this question is settled, I propose that we should proceed to the next question—which is also a question of principle—embodied in the Chinese delegation’s proposal.

Count Bernstorff (Germany).—Mr. President, I assume what you have just said refers only to the general discussion—that it is now closed—and that in regard to this question, and to others, the Commission will later on decide how the conflicting opinions on these points are to be submitted in the report to the Council. Although certain delegations have made concessions on this point, many of the members of the Commission have stated that, in principle, they were opposed to the decision taken. The delegations which have expressed themselves in this sense represent practically one-half of the world.

The President.—I can only repeat what I said previously, that the methods of submitting the various observations and reservations to the Council will be considered later at the close of our proceedings.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics).—In view of the importance which the Soviet and other delegations, also the public at large, attach to the question of trained reserves, I think we ought to make it clear which countries oppose the reduction of trained reserves. I therefore suggest that a vote be taken on the general principle of trained reserves.

The President.—I can only say that it is impossible to compel the Commission to give a vote on matters of principle. All the delegations have had an opportunity of giving their opinions, but we can only take a vote after the final discussion on the text.

42. Discussion on the Chinese Delegation’s Proposal (Annex 3).

General Tsiang Tsoping (China).—After having heard the important general discussion and the many declarations made in which the spirit of conciliation has been much manifested—a good sign for the final success of our work here—I feel more than ever convinced that the Chinese proposal, for the abolition of the system of universal compulsory military service, is the only fundamental solution to the question of the reduction of efectives, which, owing to the divergencies of view regarding the question of trained reserves, is, if I am not mistaken, bound to come to a deadlock.

Before making a few explanations on the subject for which I have the honour to submit, on behalf of my Government, the proposal before this Commission, I beg first of all to assure this Conference that, in submitting this proposal, the National Government of China is actuated solely by the desire to contribute its share to the work of the Commission, and is anxious to co-operate with other Powers in tackling this great problem, in conformity with the principles of the Kuomintang and the political idealism of Dr. Sun Yat Sen.
The chief object of the League of Nations, according to the Covenant solemnly entered into by most nations of the world, is, or is supposed to be, the endeavour or attempt by collective efforts to bring about the establishment of a more enduring and, at the same time, less expensive peace by way of disarmament, or, at any rate, by reduction and limitation of armaments, in order to do away with the system of the so-called “armed peace”, which, as a result of the pre-League days, necessitated enormous armaments and inevitably encouraged the drift towards war of the armed nations. Ten years have now elapsed since the League came into being, and there has never been one year since with an international discussion of some kind on this subject; but, although important results have been achieved, thanks to the labour of my distinguished colleagues, who have taken part in such discussions, one can hardly say that our successes have been great.

It has been held by some that this failure or this delay in obtaining agreement on disarmament is due to the fact that, in spite of the existence of the League, we still have no security, and that this must precede disarmament.

But is it not that the reverse is also true? If you say that you have no security because your neighbour it still armed or is not yet disarmed, is it not equally legitimate for your neighbour to say exactly the same thing? The result is what Mr. Gibson, the honourable delegate of the United States, called a deadlock. Mr. Gibson, in his declaration which will go down in history as a great indictment of those who equivocate with this important question of disarmament, said the other day that the present deadlock could be broken only by the decision of the Powers possessing the greatest armaments, to initiate measures of reduction. Of course, when Mr. Gibson said this, probably he had in mind chiefly the question of naval disarmament. But I think his dictum could be applied equally, and perhaps with greater force, to the question of land disarmament. Factors of war, as far as land armament is concerned, consist of personnel and material. Although in modern warfare weapons of war play a very important part, nevertheless, the number and quality of the supply of personnel in a given place and at a given time in any land struggle are still the decisive factors, other things being equal. The factor of personnel in modern times, thanks to the system of compulsory military service — in which system short-term service, such as in the militia, is not included — is chiefly determined by population. In this respect, a major Power which has a natural advantage over a minor State, just as in the question of war material, a highly industrialised country has an advantage over a less industrialised one. We cannot, of course, limit or reduce the industrial capacity of development of any country, but we can certainly limit or reduce the number of war weapons in a certain way. In the same way, we can limit the war personnel, although we cannot pretend to restrict the growth of population of any country. As the requirements of national defence of any given country are relative, it is possible for neighbouring States to agree upon a formula whereby the relative size of the standing armies of the respective countries concerned may be fixed, provided all these countries give up the system of conscription, which gives the State that has a large population a preponderance, by enabling that State to use its power to exploit to the maximum its supply of effective at the outbreak of hostilities. In this respect you cannot have a compromise, as suggested by the German proposal, by graduating the trained reserves, etc.

The probability is, that, in the face of the menace of a major State — which, having conscription, is enabled with rapid mobilisation to put into the field at the outbreak of hostilities many more trained reserves than its standing army — the other States, especially those which have not adopted conscription — in order to offset the advantages which a conscript country has in trained reserves, in the number of instructors and long-service officers for the new recruits — would have to maintain a larger standing army than if its neighbours had not been conscript countries. For the number of the trained reserves of a conscript country is, as explained a moment ago, much less fixed by the number of the population. As the size of the army of a conscript country will largely be influenced by considerations which regard less the annual contingent than the number of the trained reserves and long-service officers of its neighbour which has conscription, a drastic cutting-down of the number of effectives all round would not be possible and, in consequence, a substantial reduction of armaments would be difficult so long as the system of conscription still exists in any country. Lord Cusshendun has just enunciated a very great truth. He said, in substance, that a real reduction of armaments is not compatible with the military system which is based on the conscription of the whole manhood of a country for military service. Further, so long as the major Powers will not give up their natural advantages in the interest of peace, the minor Powers must be compelled to maintain the same system, in addition to combining with or allying themselves to other major Powers for purposes of defence. The result is that we shall always have the deadlock unbroken, and indeed, a vicious circle which contracts as time goes on until peace is strangled.

So far, I have only dealt with the material aspect of the question, and have pointed out the physical impossibility of obtaining a thorough-going reduction of armaments until the conscription system is done away with. But there is another and more important consideration why the existence of such a system will be an obstacle to disarmament, and that is, that it tends to foster militaristic nationalism and aggression. Militaristic nationalism was the nineteenth, century spirit in the days of the doctrine of the balance of power, which created the phenomenon of a world armed to the teeth and divided into camps until it could arm no more, and so drifted into war. The growth and spread of such a spirit in the nineteenth century was largely due to the system of compulsory military service. Under this system, the youth of a nation, in years of great susceptivity, has to undergo a period of warlike training, and becomes imbued with the spirit of war and antagonism against its neighbours which are regarded as potential enemies. After having been brought up in such surroundings and atmosphere for a period sufficiently long to imbue him with a new conception of life and a new outlook on the world — by no means pacific, but, indeed, the negation thereof — it is difficult for a young man to think of international affairs in terms other than those of war, whatever his vocation in later life may be. If he emigrated, he would not make himself a welcome.
guest because he is a potential soldier. At the same time, as an immediate and constant supply of trained reserves, for large-scale military operations at the outbreak of war, is only possible for a country which has a system of conscription, there is every temptation for the Government of a country having such a system to abuse its superior force for the purpose of aggression. You might say that the number of the annual contingent, as well as the term of service, may be reduced, but the percentage of the military element in the population will always be greater in a conscript than in a non-conscript country. If the abolition of wars of aggression is to be the aim of our present work, the most practical and feasible way to attain it is, in my opinion, the abolition of the system of compulsory service, which will not only limit the possibility of large-scale aggression, but will also reduce and limit the spirit of war.

I have often heard the advocates of conscription in my country say that for a comparatively poor country it is a necessary evil, because this is the only way to keep a large standing army. But why must we keep a large standing army? If all major States agree — and the future Conference on Disarmament, let us hope, is going to make such agreement possible — to reduce their armed forces, the necessity of keeping a large standing army will, ipso facto, disappear.

Even from a financial point of view, it is doubtful whether the system of conscription is really an economical one. As Sub-Commission A has shown, it is comparatively inexpensive when the conscription system is based on short-term service. With long-term service it is just as expensive as a voluntary system. I know that, in spite of the desirability of the abolition of compulsory service some people would still be inclined to stick to it, simply because they have been brought up in it and are very much attached to it. I am realistic enough to be aware of the sentiment with which some people still cherish the old tradition. But are we going to keep it up simply because it is old?

It is contended that it is in keeping with the principles of democracy that all citizens should share equally the duty of defending their country. It may be true that the system of levée en masse might have had a patriotic beginning, but it is well known that the system was also developed in many autocratic — or at any rate less democratic — States throughout the nineteenth century, for purposes which have nothing to do with democratic ideas and institutions. Indeed, the fact that conscription does not exist in the very highly developed democracies of the Anglo-Saxon nations seems to indicate that conscription is not an inseparable concomitant, or even the sign, of democracy, still less the essence of it, and that its abolition cannot, therefore, be regarded as contrary to the spirit of democracy. On the other hand, a system which compels a person to do service, often against his conviction and conscience, is really restricting that individual liberty which is one of the essential features of a democracy. It is scarcely necessary for me to add that conscription is decidedly a great economic waste for a nation which must have the education or apprenticeship of the majority of its youth unduly interrupted for a comparatively long period of time for unproductive purposes, especially in times of war, when every male citizen — except the aged — is liable to be called up for service.

Lastly, since the conclusion of the Briand-Kellogg Pact for the outlawry of war, which can be truly regarded as the embodiment of the noble idealism of the statesmen of France and America, and which has been universally accepted by all the nations of the world, a new international order has emerged, an event not less important than the formation of the League of Nations itself. It is the conviction of the Chinese Government and the Chinese people that the time has come to deal once more with the practical problem which, in their opinion, should be the first and foremost problem in the sphere of disarmament.

(The Commission rose at 12.45 p.m.)

FIFTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held at Geneva, on Monday, April 29th, 1929, at 10 a.m.

President : M. LOUDON (Netherlands).


The President. — Last Saturday we heard the Chinese delegation’s statement regarding its draft amendment. Since the question of conscription has been discussed at considerable length at this and at earlier sessions, it would be better not to insist upon this amendment and to leave the bureau sufficient latitude to decide in what form the Chinese delegation’s proposal should be mentioned. Of course, the Chinese proposal and the discussions to which it has given rise will be embodied in the Minutes, which will be accessible both to the delegations and to the public in general. I would ask the Chinese delegation therefore whether it is prepared to accept this suggestion.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada). — The Canadian delegation, unlike most of the delegations on the Preparatory Disarmament Commission, has never had an opportunity of placing on record its point of view respecting universal compulsory military service. Canada, as you are no doubt
aware, was not a member of the Commission when the subject came up for discussion at its third session in 1927. For this reason, we hope that it will not be thought that the Canadian delegation is unduly detaining the Commission if we take the opportunity, afforded by the introduction of the resolution presented by the honourable delegate for China, to summarise briefly our point of view on this subject.

The Canadian delegation, representing as it does a people whose traditions, environment and practice are opposed to universal conscription and the kindred subject of trained reserves, would be recreant to its trust if it did not express its fullest sympathy with the principle underlying the Chinese resolution; i.e., the abolition of trained reserves. The acceptance and application of this principle, in the opinion of our delegation, would advance the nations further than any other step on the road to moral and material disarmament.

If the Canadian delegation had been present at the third session of this Commission in 1927, when conscription and the kindred subject of trained reserves were being discussed, we should doubtless have made the same reservation as the delegations of Great Britain, the United States of America, Sweden and the Netherlands, and we should have done then what we do to-day, i.e., try to make it clear that, if we are prepared to make concessions, it is solely because advancement towards the first Disarmament Conference appears possible only by their temporary abandonment. The Canadian delegation would like to see the principle underlying the Chinese resolution accepted by the Disarmament Conference. In agreement with the President of this Commission, it doubts very much, however, whether the Commission should adopt a resolution which lays down a definite prohibition in respect of a particular system of national defence at this stage of its work. This, in our opinion, is a matter for the Disarmament Conference.

The President. — I would ask the Chinese delegation to tell us whether it is able to accept the suggestion I made just now.

General Tsiang Tsoping (China). — The Chinese delegation has always been very ready to make concessions, but in a matter of such importance, which involves a question of principle, it cannot see its way to make concessions on this point. I understand that the bureau will consider whether the Chinese proposal shall be annexed to the draft Convention; until that point is decided, no purpose would be served by our saying anything further. As soon as the decision of the bureau is communicated to us, we shall be in a position to reply.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I am not quite clear whether the Chinese delegation intends to ask the Commission to vote on its proposal, but I think it is absolutely essential that the position of each Government should be perfectly clearly defined, and for that reason I wish to make the following statement.

The other day I stated here that I would withdraw my proposal for the abolition of compulsory military service, because I realised that the majority of the Commission would not accept my proposal and I was desirous of making a concession. Now that another delegation has moved the abolition of compulsory military service, I desire to say that I entirely associate myself with the arguments which have been advanced by the Chinese delegation, and, if the matter is brought to a vote, I shall give my vote for the abolition of compulsory service.

I have another reason for doing so, and that is that the abolition of compulsory military service is the system which was adopted in the Peace Treaties.

The President. — I assume that the Chinese delegation does not desire a vote and that it is prepared to leave the bureau sufficient latitude to decide on the manner in which the Chinese proposal should be mentioned.

General Tsiang Tsoping (China). — Mr. President, the Chinese delegation very much appreciates your remarks, and wishes to thank the representatives of Canada and Germany for their kind and courageous support, which we believe other delegates would also have given if circumstances permitted. I still believe that the Chinese proposal is the only way to a fundamental solution of the question of disarmament. Our proposal is not merely an exposition of principle; it is a practical plan for the work in hand.

However, as I told the Commission last Saturday, the Chinese Government, in submitting this proposal, was actuated purely by the desire to help the Commission to a successful result. I was very much moved the other day by the speeches of my honourable colleagues the delegates of Great Britain and the United States of America, who, while maintaining their points of view, appealed to all of us for a spirit of compromise.

That was a splendid example for all of us. Of course, the amendment I have had the honour of submitting to the Commission, or rather the underlying principle of it, is so important and valuable as a really thorough-going measure for the reduction of armaments that it is hardly possible for anyone to contemplate any concession without a particular reason. Nevertheless, I will not insist upon a vote, and we agree to reserve the matter for the final decision of the future Conference, in order that, between now and that Conference, the different Governments may have ample time for reflection and a re-examination of the problem, which for some countries would doubtless involve a far-reaching change in their national policy.

I therefore accept the President’s proposal, on the understanding that our proposition is annexed to the draft Convention.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I do not know whether I shall be in order in speaking on the Chinese delegation’s proposal. If I am not, I shall of course submit to the President’s ruling, but for my part I am quite prepared to express the opinion of my Government on this proposal, which is by no means unworthy of consideration and discussion, and I would not like to create the impression, by keeping silence, that we are opposed to the
proposal. It seems to be generally accepted here that, if a delegation does not speak on any proposal, it must, ipso facto, be against it. That is not so; I am not opposed in principle, though I would have to qualify my agreement. However, I will only speak if a discussion is allowed.

General Tsiang Tsoping (China). — Before we leave the subject, the Chinese delegation wishes to make a short statement. The Chinese Government believes that its proposal for the abolition of conscription should be accepted by the Commission at once as one of the primary conditions for real disarmament. In the light of the result of the present discussion, however, the Chinese delegation wishes to make it clear that it considers the abolition of the system of conscription necessary before any international agreement can be reached. The Chinese Government reserves its full liberty of action if the situation in future compels it to reconsider its attitude towards this question.

The President. — I would draw the Chinese delegation’s attention to the fact that I am using the word “annex” in a very wide sense. I ask that the bureau be empowered to submit at the end of our discussions a suggestion as to the form in which the Chinese proposal might be mentioned. In no circumstances, however, could it be embodied in the draft Convention.

General Tsiang Tsoping (China). — We shall have to refer the whole matter to our Government and we should like to see the decision of the bureau before making any reply.

44. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article A: Amendment submitted by the Soviet Delegation.

The President. — In the first paragraph of this article we have the following amendment of the Soviet delegation:

In Article A the words “agree to limit” should be replaced by the words “agree to reduce appreciably”.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I will be very brief on this subject, because we have had a similar discussion in regard to air armaments. I think I shall best serve my purpose by citing a speech of one of the honourable delegates here present, with his permission. The honourable delegate for the United States of America said in his first speech:

“In recent years the word ‘limitation’ has come to be used chiefly in describing agreements at existing levels or still higher levels, and is generally looked upon as having nothing to do with actual reduction. It is useless to attempt to correct this impression by explaining that limitation may be at any level, lower or higher than those existing. As a practical matter, it would seem to be best to accept the general public understanding of these terms. Let us, therefore, take the bold course and begin by scrapping the term ‘limitation’ in order to concentrate upon a general reduction of armaments.”

I apologise for using words which do not belong to me, but I think I have made the position quite clear. In our proposal we only suggest substituting for the word “limit” words which express our actual desire for considerably reducing armaments.

The President. — In reply to M. Litvinoff, I would say that I think there is a misunderstanding. The word “limit” can be taken in two different senses. Here it means fixing a maximum figure. In any case, if the Commission found it more convenient, we could replace the word “limit” by the words “fix the maximum effectives”.

M. Valdés-Mendeville (Chile). — My purpose in asking to speak is not merely to disagree with the Soviet delegation’s amendment. You yourself, Sir, very accurately explained what was meant by the word “limit”, and I entirely agree with you on that point. But, as I said, I do not wish merely to speak about the Soviet amendment itself, I think it is a good opportunity to say a few words regarding the declarations out of which that amendment arose — I mean what M. Litvinoff said the other day when he gave his view on the opinion submitted by the bureau. These declarations, I feel, raise very important questions of principle, and I should not like my silence to give cause for any misunderstanding as to the attitude of my delegation.

I therefore ask leave to “strike a balance”, as has often been felicitously said here, both legally and politically.

In regard to the legal aspect, the great majority of the delegations here present, as representatives of the States Members of the League, cannot depart from the principles of the Covenant and the terms of reference given by the Assembly, which stand for our constitution and our law. The Covenant makes the reduction of armaments dependent on the four following conditions: that it should be consistent with national safety, that international obligations should be enforced, and that the geographical situation and circumstances of each State should be taken into account. That is to say, it allows of a simple limitation in the sense you have just indicated for those countries whose armaments are too small in view of the circumstances referred to. The Assembly, having created the “Preparatory Commission for the Conference
for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments" (for which the name "Disarmament Conference" is merely an abbreviation), laid down last September, in very definite terms, that it was necessary to come to the end of the first stage in the reduction and limitation of armaments. For this first reason, which is a legal and a very important one, it seems impossible to reject the idea of limitation and consider only that of reduction of armaments—still less that of any appreciable or substantial reduction.

There are, further, very important political considerations which make it essential to avoid any excessively exclusive or rigid terms in the draft Convention.

We must never forget that the draft Convention we are preparing is not intended to become a Convention for one or two continents only, but a general Convention binding on the whole world. The Chilian delegation, and, indeed, the delegations of the Latin-American countries in general, have certainly never been in favour of this system of drawing up general Conventions. Since the already distant days of the Temporary Mixed Commission, the delegation of my country has always preferred the method of establishing Regional Pacts, and even after the famous Resolution XIV of the Third Assembly, which affirmed that no scheme for the reduction of armaments within the meaning of Article 8 of the Covenant could be fully successful unless it were general, the question was debated in our own Commission and in Sub-Commission A. After discussion, to which it is needless to refer now, the Commission pronounced exclusively in favour of the scheme of a general Convention, on which we are now working. My delegation associated itself with this view, because my country will always be found in the forefront of all efforts for the organisation of international peace, concord and co-operation, both in its own continent and in the world as a whole.

It must, however, be recognised that, with respect to these problems of the reduction or limitation of armaments, the Latin-American nations are, generally speaking, in a position appreciably different from that of other parts of the world, as has frequently been stated and demonstrated here, not only by Chilian delegates, but also in the past by the distinguished delegates of Brazil, and more recently by those of the Argentine Republic—those two great nations whose absence from our deliberations we so deeply deplore.

I fancy the Commission is unanimous in desiring that a large number of Latin-American delegations should be present at the future Conference. For my own part, I will merely say that I earnestly hope so, for otherwise the presence of a small number of them would give an entirely false impression of the cooperation of that vast and important part of the world in the termination of the first stage of our great work. To make their participation possible, however, it is essential that there should be no rigidity in the terms of the draft Convention, because it is a general Convention and we are preparing a draft that should be adaptable to the different situations I have referred to, with which you are all familiar from the documents before you.

I need hardly add, however, that, for the reasons I have just given, I am opposed to the adoption of the Soviet amendment, as I should be opposed to any other amendment of a like nature.

M. COBIAN (Spain).—I wish to emphasise the importance of the statement just made by the representative of Chile, so far as concerns the political bearing of his remarks; that is to say, so far as concerns the participation of the South American countries in the Disarmament Conference. The statements provide an additional reason for the Commission to bear constantly in mind the purpose before it, which is, the summoning of a Disarmament Conference. In my view, it is highly important that we should achieve that object. We have all proved our devotion to the cause of disarmament. We must make every concession that may be necessary, in order that the Conference may be summoned. We must remember that we are here as representatives of Governments. The work of this Commission is very different from the work of the old Temporary Mixed Commission, in which, I might mention, I had the honour to take a humble part. In those days I was always in favour of the most radical solutions, and I was always in a minority. Here, the question is presented in an entirely different form. We are Government representatives, and our sole duty is to prepare for the Conference. When the Conference is convened, I am firmly convinced that public opinion will bring pressure to bear on the various Governments, and that we shall then be able to come before the Conference in circumstances entirely different from those that exist at present.

Accordingly, if we were to represent our preliminary work by a certain figure, we have reason to hope that at the Conference, after public opinion has been brought to bear, we may achieve results that will be represented by a figure two or three times as great.

M. Hussein Khan ALA (Persia).—I desire to say that, for the reasons we have given in our statements and because the situation of Persia is very similar to that of the Latin-American countries, I fully associate myself, on behalf of the Persian delegation, with the views of the honourable delegate for Chile.

M. ROLIN JAEQUEMYNS (Belgium).—I am not quite sure whether I rightly understood the statement made by the President just now with regard to limitation of armaments. Does the President mean to say that the duty of the Commission is, in fact, only to prepare for a reduction of armaments with a view to the Conference, and not to deal with limitation properly so called? Should limitation be understood to mean that a reduction should necessarily be general, and that the reduced figures should subsequently be limited? If this is the idea, then I do not think that it is entirely compatible with our terms of reference. The instructions of the Preparatory Commission for the Conference were given to that Commission by the Assembly
which had approved the 1924 Protocol. In the terms of reference, as in Article 8 of the Covenant, only the words “reduction of armaments” are used. But the word “limitation” was added in consequence of a statement made by M. Lange, the Norwegian delegate, who pointed out that it would be a mistake to endeavour to treat all countries in exactly the same way, and to say, for instance, that there should be one universal coefficient of reduction. Some countries had not increased their armaments; others had already made very great reductions in their armaments, so that, if these reductions were intended, the countries would already have done as much as others which might make very considerable reductions.

As the representative of Belgium, I shall, perhaps, in the course of this discussion, have an opportunity of making known the very considerable reductions which we have already made, and which compel Belgium to consider that, so far as she is concerned, the limitation of armaments must be interpreted in the sense of maintaining the status quo—that is to say, maintaining the reductions which have already been effected.

I need not add that, in all the resolutions which have since been adopted by the various Assemblies, the word “limitation” has been used together with the word “reduction”. Referring to the last resolution, that of the 1928 Assembly, with regard to the Commission’s terms of reference I find that the words “reduction” and “limitation” are constantly repeated, and never the word “reduction” alone without a reference to “limitation”.

We therefore have a twofold object, viz., that the countries which have already sufficiently reduced their armaments should, for the present, be allowed to maintain that limit, without prejudice to any further reductions they might be able to effect, in their endeavours to achieve perhaps the abolition of conscription the object of the Chinese proposal, which I readily accept as an ideal for the future, although there is no possibility of it being considered at the moment.

The President. — I repeat that what I mean by limitation is fixing a definite limit, which does not imply a priori any reduction, nor does it preclude it. I insist on this point—that the text of the draft Convention allows of reductions wherever it is possible to effect them.

Baron Rolin Jaegemyns (Belgium). — I had had a slight doubt; but I am glad to see that the President’s reply confirms my interpretation.

M. Massigli (France). — We have just heard extremely interesting statements, but I have the impression that we are somewhat departing from the subject under discussion. The question which has just been discussed was already raised in connection with Chapter II, Section III, “Air Armaments”. The text said “air material shall be limited”; then it was proposed to put “a substantial reduction”. Certain speakers and our President answered that this was not our task, and that what we were called upon to do was to prepare the framework of the Convention, the figures of which would be fixed by the Conference. The question raised to-day is the same, and I do not see the use of discussing this point afresh.

As to the word “limitation”, that was clearly defined in the report of Sub-Commission A, page 62, where it is said that the limitation of armaments means “the fixing of the level of armaments which the countries undertake not to exceed”. We have been working on the basis of this definition for several sessions. I do not, therefore, understand the point of the present discussion. We have not been called upon to fix the figures. Reductions will be the eventual result of the difference between the limits fixed by the Conference and the armaments which the States had, or might have had, before the Conference.

The President. — I entirely agree with M. Massigli. In these circumstances, I ask the Commission whether any purpose can be served by continuing this discussion.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — That this is an important question is proved if only by the opposition with which so many delegations have met my proposal. I am really responding to the appeal made to the delegations to lay their cards on the table. I am asking the President and the Conference to lay their cards on the table of the negotiations, so that we fully understand the difference between limitation and reduction. To limit means to fix certain levels, which may be those which exist now or which may be even higher. I think the objections put forward by the Chilian and other delegations are belated. They ignore the fact that, since the meetings of Sub-Commissions A and B and other assemblies, a very important new fact has to be reckoned with, namely, the resolution passed by the present session of this Commission, which reads:

“The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference has been instructed by the Council not to effect the reduction of armaments, but to prepare a scheme for the reduction of national armaments to the lowest possible point, etc.”

There is no word about limitation. I look upon this resolution as being a very important step forward, and, when honourable delegates propose to scrap the word “reduction” and to substitute “limitation”, they are going back on a resolution of the greatest importance. It has been said that the Preparatory Commission may not recommend anything to the Disarmament Conference. If that be so, I fail to understand the purpose of this Commission. It is not a Drafting Committee but a Commission to prepare for the Disarmament Conference, consisting of representatives of twenty-eight States, and including the biggest Powers. My reading of the purpose of this Commission is that it is to find out on what principles of disarmament these twenty-eight States can now agree. If there are points on which they disagree, then those points can go before the Disarmament Conference, but the task of the Disarmament Conference would be considerably eased if we agreed here on certain principles. The matter of limitation...
or reduction is of the greatest importance, and, if it cannot be decided here, the Conference will have to occupy itself with the question whether it is going to reduce armaments or not. Public opinion believes that this question has already been settled, and will be greatly disappointed to learn that the proposal to insert the word "reduction" in the draft Convention has been rejected. Since, however, we are supposed to have entered the path of mutual concessions, I am also prepared to make a concession. Many delegations having insisted on the necessity of preserving the word "limitation", I will withdraw my objection to this word if you will insert also prepared to make a concession. Many delegations having insisted on the necessity of reducing armaments, the same levelling of armaments was demanded in the case of the naval Powers. These are prepared to make concessions, and we are impatiently awaiting the concessions which the great land Powers will be prepared to make.

I fully agree with the President that this question has already been decided, because we have agreed to draft a provisional Convention which will enable the Conference to reduce armaments. I shall always insist on this point, for it would be impossible for us to accept a situation under which the future Disarmament Convention would become a Convention for mutual protection against disarmament.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire).—In response to the President’s appeal I withdrew my request to speak on this point, but as two other delegations have not thought it necessary to respond to that appeal, I wish to be allowed to make the following observations.

It is quite true, as the French delegate has said, that this question of the distinction between limitation and reduction has already been discussed, and, I think, settled; nevertheless, it is a very important thing to bear in mind the distinction between the two, because, if we were to substitute reduction for limitation in this Convention, we might very well be going beyond the obligations of Article 8 of the Covenant. Article 8 lays it down that there shall be reduction to the level which is compatible with national safety. We cannot tell at the present moment what nations, if any, have already reduced to that level; consequently, if we were to insist upon reduction as well as limitation in the present Convention, we might very well be going beyond the obligations of Article 8, and, in this connection, I should like to say that the nation which I represent has carried out consistently for a good many years a continuous reduction of land armaments.

As is generally known, at the end of the war we had a very large military force, produced under the exceptional system, for us, of compulsory service. After the war we immediately returned to voluntary service, but even on the resulting small force — which, compared with the forces of conscriptionist nations is a "contemptible little army" — even on the basis of this small force we have been continually reducing. I should like to be allowed to give one or two figures in proof of that proposition.

As compared with August 1914, that is, the pre-war army, we have reduced nine cavalry regiments, twenty-one infantry battalions and sixty-one artillery batteries, and in the last five years we have progressively reduced our military budget. In 1925, our military budget was £36 1/2 million; in 1926 it was £34 1/2 million; in 1927, £33 1/3 million; in 1928, £32 1/4 million, and in the present year (1929) £32 1/2 million, so that during the last five years we have been continually and progressively reducing our military budget at the same time as we have carried out this progressive diminution of our land forces. Therefore, it is quite possible (I am not making any assertion) that, when the matter comes to be decided by the Disarmament Conference, it may appear that we have already reduced to the level required by Article 8 of the Covenant.

The President.—I notice that we are more and more straying into a discussion of figures. I ask the Commission to decide whether the Soviet delegation’s amendment should be considered out of order.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics).—The amendment presented by the Soviet delegation has been modified by me, and it is on this amended text that the Commission will have to take a decision. We do not propose to substitute one word for the other, but to include both “limitation” and “reduction”. This concession has been made to meet the objections of those countries which may, at the Conference, ask for exemption from reduction of armaments, on the plea of insufficient security, as, for instance, Persia and Great Britain.

The President.—We have then to decide a simple point of drafting. The proposal is to substitute the words “to limit and reduce” for “limit”. The effect of these two terms would be the same. The point is that a maximum must be fixed. It would, therefore, be much better to maintain the text which we have before us.
45. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article A: Amendment submitted by the German Delegation and Proposal by the Czechoslovak Delegation concerning the United States National Guard.

The President. — Two further amendments have been moved to Article A — one by the German delegation and the other by the British delegation.

The German delegation proposes to omit the following words in the 1927 text, “and who may for that reason be immediately employed without having to be mobilised” and to substitute the following: “… and also effectives available without mobilisation and reserves with military training entered on the registers and obliged by law to perform military service in case of war, liable to be called up without, or by, mobilisation order.”

The British delegation proposes that the words “… and who may for that reason be immediately employed without having to be mobilised” should be omitted.

Since the proposal is that one text should be replaced by another, and since the second part of the German amendment diverges most widely from the original draft, the German proposal should be discussed first.

This proposal, however, contemplates the limitation of the available effectives and the reserves with military training. The Commission has already settled that it does not intend to insert in the draft Convention any stipulation on the limitation of trained reserves. It would seem that the Commission should now be able to give a formal decision on the text of the amendment proposed by the German delegation.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I am quite well aware that a discussion on the question of principle took place the other day, but on the other hand I would observe that our proposal contains two parts. The first part refers to trained reserves, and the second part to effectives available without mobilisation. It would perhaps be preferable to divide the proposal into two parts for the purpose of voting. Later on, another question — that of the annual contingent — will be raised. For the moment we are considering the important question of effectives, and it is perhaps now that the great military Powers are thinking of making concessions. I should like to give them the opportunity of making those concessions now.

M. Massigli (France). — As I am most anxious to make concessions to Count Bernstorff, I should like to know what is the scope and purpose of his amendment. In that amendment the words “trained reserves” are omitted; that question has been settled and we are not going to discuss it over again. There remains the expression “effectives available without mobilisation”. I should like to know what Count Bernstorff means by that. I imagine he means something very general and applicable to every military organisation. If he only meant to refer quite specially to the French military system, I would point out to him that in France the trained reserves are trained reserves. They are reserves which can be called upon by special means, but they are trained reserves.

Another point; as Count Bernstorff is constantly throwing doubt upon my readiness to make concessions, I should also like to remind him that there are several Chapters in this draft Convention and many important questions to be discussed apart from Chapters I and II, and that in the course of the discussion I shall have opportunities of showing that I am not afraid of concessions.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I would reply to M. Massigli that I am never so personal as to refer intentionally to any particular Power; but, even if I had done so in this instance, it would only have been a tribute to the greatest military Power in the world.

I should like information as to whether — and I am expecting a decision from the Commission on this point — it is proposed to treat men available without mobilisation on the same footing as trained reserves or on a special footing. I feel that they ought to be treated separately. Officers and men available without mobilisation can be called up without a mobilisation order. Consequently, the Governments of countries whose laws provide that certain classes of men shall be available without mobilisation are in a position to make a large increase in the effectives with the colours, whenever they choose, without issuing a mobilisation order. For that reason I am of opinion that, in calculating effectives for the purpose of disarmament, the number of men available without mobilisation should be taken into account.

M. Massigli (France). — I am grateful to Count Bernstorff for this explanation, because, if what he means by men available without mobilisation is men who can be called up without a mobilisation order, I should therefore be very glad if it could be explained exactly what is meant; for, if we are to vote upon a text, it is essential that we should understand what it means. What is meant by men available to be called up without a mobilisation order?

The President. — I think the definition for which M. Massigli has asked is to be found in Note 2 at the end of Table 1 in the German proposal. It reads as follows: “Effectives available without mobilisation include men of the active army on leave until discharge and men who have completed their service with the colours but do not yet belong, under the laws of the State in question, to the reserve proper”.

M. Politis (Greece). — I am not quite sure that the question raised by M. Massigli has been properly answered by the reading of this note. For me, at least, it has thrown no light on the matter. I may perhaps be excused if I take example of a quite small country — that which I represent here. The military organisation of Greece is modelled on that of the great
Continental countries. When men or officers are placed *en disponibilité*, in the sense defined in Note 2, they do not cease to be part of the active army — they are not yet transferred to the reserve — so that, when we talk of limiting the active army, we include those men. If we make a separate category out of them, confusion is apt to occur. In the military organisation I am speaking of, there is no category halfway between the active army and the reserve — no category that could be described as “available for mobilisation”.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — After the observations of M. Massigli and M. Politis, I am bound to say that I no longer understand what is going on. M. Massigli has just told us that the men available without mobilisation form part of the reserve, and M. Politis has said that they are part of the effectives with the colours.

M. Politis (Greece). — What I said was that there was no halfway class in Greece.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I do not wish to dwell upon a purely technical point; technical questions will be dealt with at the Conference. In any case, I will not press my present point, because I know that my proposal will not be accepted by the Commission.

The President. — After what Count Bernstorff has said, I think we can vote on the German amendment as a whole. Before we do so, however, I will call upon Baron Rolin Jacqueynys and Mr. Gibson, who desire to make statements.

Baron Rolin Jacqueynys (Belgium). — I have no more intention than Count Bernstorff of entering upon a discussion on technical points. This does not seem to me to be the place in which to go thoroughly into such questions. I should like, however, to make a general statement on behalf of the Belgian delegation on the question of trained reserves.

 Nobody, I imagine, has any doubt of the profoundly pacific spirit which animates the Belgian nation, and the earnest desire of the delegation which represents the Belgian Government here to contribute to the utmost of its power to an agreement in this Commission on the question of the reduction and limitation of armaments.

We therefore listened with the keenest interest to the statement made here on April 26th by Mr. Gibson on behalf of the United States Government.

He begged us to make mutual concessions in order to reach an agreement, and he set an example by stating that his Government, in spite of the wishes it had previously expressed, would not press the point that “trained reserves” should be taken into account in the calculations for the purpose of reducing effectives.

Consequently, the Belgian delegation regrets all the more that the German delegation is continuing to maintain its amendment according to which reductions of effectives should apply also to trained reserves.

I must say that I cannot understand this persistence, especially as it does not seem to be the intention to ask that certain countries — including Belgium — should forthwith give up the system of universal service with an annual contingent, on which their military organisation is based.

As Lord Cushendun excellently said at our last meeting, it is not easy to see how the conscription system could be combined with an effectual limitation of trained reserves.

Under the conscription system it is perfectly simple to effect reductions by reducing the strength of the annual contingent and also reducing the period of service. Thus, in Belgium, before the war, the period of service was twenty-two months, and it has been brought down by successive reductions to only ten months. From next year onwards it will be eight months, except for some specialist troops in the fortress artillery, who will serve twelve months.

Certain regulations have also been made which will make it possible to effect a considerable decrease in the strength of the annual contingent.

Belgium has therefore anticipated the work of the Disarmament Conference by reducing both the annual contingent and the period of service, and this reduction is so appreciable that it seems really impossible for the present to go further.

But could we at the same time reduce our trained reserves — that is to say, the number of men who have received military training during their service in the army? I am really not sure whether that is what is proposed. If so, it is obviously materially impossible, because one cannot evade the fact that the men who have done their military service have received training.

If the proposal to reduce trained reserves is not going to be confronted by this material impossibility, I should like to know what the intention is, and whether it is not perhaps to induce various countries, including Belgium, to give up the whole system of conscription.

If that is the idea, I am sorry to have to say that, for the present at least, it is quite impossible, both from a social and from a military point of view, as M. de Brueckère said here in 1927.

If, on the other hand, this unacceptable suggestion were given up, I think it would then be easier to come to an understanding in the sense of a general agreement for the reduction of armaments, or, pending anything more satisfactory, for the limitation of armaments for countries like Belgium, which, in the most pacific spirit, have already done a great deal since the war in the way of reducing their military forces from every point of view.

The Hon. Hugh Ginson (United States of America). — The United States delegation will not be in a position to vote on this amendment, or on any other proposal involving the problem of mobilisation, until it is informed as to the point of view of the Commission on
the proposal put forward on Saturday last by the honourable delegate for Czechoslovakia. As I understand it, the honourable delegate for Czechoslovakia proposed that there should be inserted in the report of the Preparatory Commission a resolution or statement to the effect that the National Guard in the United States did not fall under the definition of formations organised on a military basis. I am not quite clear what happened after that proposal had been put forward, but it is my impression that there was no expression of opinion, although I heard no dissent. Obviously, if that proposal is acceptable to the Commission, our case would be fully met, and I should be able to deal with proposals such as that now before the Commission.

I suggest that our views would be met by the mere affirmation that this is the understanding of the Commission, and I should be glad if that point might be put, in order that I may be able to vote on the amendments before us.

M. FIERLINGER (Czechoslovakia). — I should like to explain the exact scope of the proposal which I put forward on Saturday.

As I see it, we have a perfectly specific proposal from the United States delegation relating to formations which have very little connection with our Convention. I hope that the United States delegation will be satisfied if we insert this specific reservation either in our Minutes or in the report.

I should also like to say a few words about the amendment proposed by the German delegation. Czechoslovakia has a military organisation similar to that of France. I think the measures contemplated by the German amendment should be considered in the light of Article E of the chapter we are dealing with, which may be described as the keystone of our whole edifice. If we seriously consider the logical connection between that article and the text of Article A, we shall find that effectives will be limited in an absolute manner, no distinction being drawn between effectives as defined in the German proposal and effectives reinforced by men available without mobilisation if the latter are recalled to the colours.

M. MASSIGLI (France). — May I ask you, Sir, whether you now propose to discuss the question raised by Mr. Gibson or whether we are to confine our attention to the German proposal? If you are going to put the question raised by Mr. Gibson after M. Fierlinger, I should like to say here and now that I find no difficulty in accepting the United States reservation in the terms in which M. Fierlinger formulated it the other day.

The PRESIDENT. — I think we had better settle this point at once. M. Fierlinger’s proposal, specifying that the Convention would not apply to forces controlled by the States of the Union, will, of course, appear in its proper place. Does that satisfy Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON (United States of America).— Entirely.

The PRESIDENT. — Then nobody objects to the proposal.

M. RUTGERS (Netherlands). — If I have understood rightly, the German amendment is to substitute another text for the text of Article A; but in my view there are certain differences between those two wordings. For instance, the German amendment omits the words “formations organised on a military basis”.

Again, the original text of the article contained the idea that effectives in service or formations organised on a military basis could be immediately employed without having to be mobilised. The German amendment, however, omits these words, but, on the other hand, it stipulates that these effectives available without mobilisation and reserves with military training can be called up with or without a mobilisation order. I do not quite understand what is meant by a “mobilisation order.”

In the draft Convention we have a definition of the word “mobilisation”, which covers all the measures required for passing from a peace-time footing to a war-time footing; but we do not know exactly what is meant by the expression “mobilisation order.”

Count BERNSTORFF (Germany). — I think M. Rutgers has made a mistake. The German amendment reads as follows:

“The High Contracting Parties agree to limit the effectives in service in their armed forces or formations organised on a military basis . . .”

M. RUTGERS (Netherlands). — Yes, I made a mistake, and my first remark was not justified. However, I maintain my second observation.

M. WESTMAN (Sweden). — I wish to refer again to the question raised by M. Politis. It is true that men available for service without mobilisation must be taken into account. I fully appreciate M. Fierlinger’s observation. If these men are called to the colours, they must obviously be counted among the average daily effectives. But if they are not called to the colours, the fact must nevertheless be taken into account that, in this way, certain Governments have thousands of men at their disposal who may be called to the colours in a few hours without mobilisation. Where shall these be put?

The PRESIDENT. — I propose that we vote on the question as to whether the Convention is to provide for limitation of the men available for service without mobilisation and in reserve.

Three delegations voted in favour of the German amendment.
Count BERNSTORFF (Germany). — If I have understood aright, we have not voted on the principle of the limitation of reserves. I know that several delegations have already made concessions in regard to this principle, while maintaining their original point of view on the question. The German delegation, however, does not consider itself to be in a position to make concessions.

46. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article A: Amendment by the British Delegation.

The President. — We have still the British delegation’s amendment to consider, which consists in the omission in Article A of the words “and who may for that reason be immediately employed without having to be mobilised”.

Lord CUSHENDUN (British Empire). — Our amendment is really little more than a drafting amendment for the removal of an ambiguity. It is not clear, at all events in the English text, whether these words “and who may for that reason be immediately employed without having to be mobilised” refer to both the classes mentioned in the earlier part of the paragraph; that is to say, whether they apply both to the armed forces and to the formations organised on a military basis. Therefore, we move to omit them in order to clear away that ambiguity. Also, as a matter of good drafting, I think they are not wanted, because they bring into this paragraph a definition which is not really required. The effectives in service in the armed forces are already defined in Article E and do not need to be defined here as well. The formations organised on a military basis are similarly defined in Article C. Consequently it would, I think, be in the interests of clarity and good drafting if we omitted these words.

General DE MARINIS (Italy). — I share the view of the British delegate and support his proposal.

M. MASSIGLI (France). — The French delegation would have preferred to retain the words under discussion in Article A, but, in view of Lord Cushendun’s explanations, it is prepared to accept the British amendment, especially since Articles C and E contain accurate definitions.

The British delegation’s amendment was adopted.

General DE MARINIS (Italy). — Before discussing this question, I should like to know what the exact text of Article A will be after the various discussions and amendments which have been made.

The President. — This is the text of Article A:

“The High Contracting Parties agree to limit to the effectives determined in the tables enumerated below and annexed to the present Convention the effectives (land, sea and air) in service in their armed forces or in formations organised on a military basis.”

(The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.)
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President : M. POLITIS (Greece).

47. Communication by the Vice-President.

M. POLITIS (Greece), Vice-President. — I regret to inform you that our President is suffering from a slight attack of influenza and is confined to bed. He has asked me to take his place. I hope that this will only be for a short time, and I am sure that all the members of the Commission will wish M. Loudon a speedy recovery.

48. Communications by the British and Canadian Delegations concerning Ratification of the Protocol in regard to Chemical Warfare.

The President. — Before dealing with the agenda, I will ask the British and Canadian delegations, which each desire to make a short statement, to address the meeting.

Lord CUSHENDUN (British Empire). — I have been authorised to state that His Majesty’s Government in Great Britain have decided to ratify immediately the Geneva Gas Protocol, subject to the following reservations:

1. His Majesty’s Government are bound by the Protocol only vis-à-vis those other States which have signed and ratified the Protocol or adhere thereto.
2. His Majesty's Government cease to be bound by the Protocol vis-à-vis any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies do not respect the Protocol.

I have also been asked to announce, on behalf of the Governments of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the Irish Free State, that they desire a similar declaration to be made on their behalf.

Dr. Riddell (Canada). — I am authorised by the Government of Canada to inform this Commission that my Government intends to recommend to Parliament the ratification, on a basis of reciprocity, of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

The President. — I thank Lord Cushendum and Dr. Riddell for their interesting statements, and hope that all the States signatories of the 1925 Protocol will before long be in a position to make similar declarations.

49. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article A (continuation).

The President. — We will now continue yesterday's discussion. You will remember that the Commission adopted a final draft of the first paragraph of Article A, omitting the words "and who may for that reason be immediately employed without having to be mobilised".

We will now proceed to examine the tables enumerated in Article A and the amendments submitted by the German and French delegations.

The question is very complicated, and therefore requires to be examined methodically, the difficulties being dealt with, one by one. I should be particularly grateful if the delegates would do their best to avoid making long speeches, and content themselves, as far as possible, with short and clear declarations, so that we may arrive at a result as quickly as possible. I venture to suggest that the best method would appear to be to decide first on the headings of the tables, leaving the details of their contents until later. These details would be settled as the result of the decisions taken later on with regard to the other Articles of Chapter I, especially Articles H, E and I.

I may remind the Commission that, in the draft Convention drawn up in 1927, there were ten tables, six for land armaments, two for naval armaments and two for air armaments. A number of reservations were made at the time, and these appear in the margin of the draft.

The French amendment proposes that the six tables of land armaments should be reduced to five, that the two tables of naval armaments should remain unchanged, and that air armaments should be dealt with on the same system — that is to say, with five tables — as land armaments.

The German amendment (Annex 9) is much more far-reaching. It is proposed to have four tables for land armaments, and one for naval armaments, and two for air armaments. Taking land armaments first, it is the German amendment that departs furthest from the 1927 Draft. According to this amendment, the essential distinction will be between home and overseas forces. In order to understand the precise effect of this distinction, it would seem necessary to examine first of all the definition of the expression "overseas forces", given by the German delegation in an amendment which it proposes to Article E. This amendment reads as follows:

"In drawing up the tables contemplated in Articles A, etc., by 'overseas forces' shall be understood the armed forces which each State undertakes to employ only for the defence of overseas territories and for Police service in those territories."

The French amendment draws the distinction between home and overseas forces on the basis of the stations of those forces. I think it is essential for the Commission to begin by making up its mind about this definition of overseas forces.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — We have already dealt with the question of overseas forces in the course of the discussion on air armaments at the meeting on April 26th. I accepted the principle put forward by General de Marinis, that "a contracting party will be justified in regarding the overseas forces of another contracting party as constituting a portion of the home forces of the latter party, when such a decision is justified by the proximity of the overseas territories in relation to the home territories of the two parties".

On the previous occasion, I accepted General de Marinis's proposal and I still accept it.

M. Massigli (France). — I should like to ask Count Bernstorff whether the statement he has just made means that he withdraws his amendment, or is it additional to the amendment?

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — My intention is to withdraw my amendment and to make the same reservation as General de Marinis.

M. Sato (Japan). — Regarding this definition of overseas forces, I desire to state that my delegation has no very definite view. We also possess colonies, but we send troops to them from the home country; we have no troops specially detailed to be stationed always in our
colonial territories. Consequently, we are anxious, on behalf of Japan, to retain as much flexibility as possible in regard to the stationing of troops, and it would therefore have been very difficult for me to accept the definition proposed by Count Bernstorff.

The President. — In that case we have only the French amendment to consider. If I have rightly understood, Count Bernstorff has withdrawn his amendment and is satisfied with the reservation already made by General de Marinis in respect of armaments of every kind.

General de Marinis (Italy). — As you have just pointed out, Sir, my reservation is a general one and applies to all armaments. Subject to that reservation, I have no objection to the French delegation's proposal. In view of the importance of the question, however, I think it would be as well that the Commission should come to a decision on the reservation so that we may know whether any other delegations will associate themselves with it.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — When I associated myself with General de Marinis's reservation, I was only thinking of land and air armaments. I imagine that the distinction between home and overseas armaments will not apply to naval forces.

The President. — You have heard what Count Bernstorff and General de Marinis have said. General de Marinis has asked whether any other delegations wish to make the same reservations. It is rather difficult for the bureau to force statements of this kind. No such statements have been made, and, failing any expression of opinion to the contrary, I am justified in concluding that there are no other delegations which wish to make the same reservations.

General de Marinis (Italy). — I should not like to prejudge such an important question by calling for a vote, especially since this reservation is based on the conception of the distance between overseas territories and the home countries, and I remember that, when we were discussing air armaments, certain delegations were prepared to agree with my view. At the same time, now that the question arises in connection with another case, I should not like the principle of it to be prejudged by a negative decision on the part of the Commission. If you do not think it is yet time to open a discussion on this question of distance, I will withdraw my request for a vote, which would not enable all the delegations to express, in a definite affirmative or negative, the whole of their views on this important question.

M. Rutgers (Netherlands). — To avoid any misunderstanding, I should like to say that I have no objection to the principle formulated in General de Marinis's reservation. In my opinion, however, it is not necessary to make any reservation on that principle, because it can be fully applied at the Disarmament Conference, even if no reservation is made.

The President. — After the exchange of views that has taken place and the long discussion at the thirteenth meeting on Friday, April 26th, I think that sufficient light has been thrown on the question. Every delegation has had an opportunity of determining its position, and the reservations and declarations that have been made will be of service for the future discussions in the Conference.

We have now, therefore, only one amendment before us — that of the French delegation, which is as follows:

"The headings of the various tables should be drafted as follows:

I. Land Armaments.

Table I. Maximum armed forces stationed in the home country.

Table II. (Optional.) Maximum armed forces stationed overseas.

Table III. Maximum of the total armed forces.

Table IV. Maximum of the forces belonging to formations organised on a military basis stationed in the home country.

Table V. Maximum of the forces belonging to formations organised on a military basis stationed overseas.

II. Naval Armaments.

No change (text drawn up at first reading).

III. Air Armaments.

Same tables as for land armaments."

I propose to begin with land armaments.

I may remind the Commission that, in the 1927 Draft provision was made for six tables. Tables I, II, III and V dealt with military forces, and Tables VI and VII with formations organised on a military basis.

The French delegation proposes to replace this nomenclature by five tables.

The Commission has therefore to decide whether this list of tables proposed by the French delegation is to take the place of the list of tables given in the 1927 Draft. Before we are in a position to come to a decision we, must, I think, examine in order the tables proposed by the French delegation.
... the high contracting parties, to propose tables which present the legitimate anxieties of the high contracting parties, to propose tables which present the

is a gap here, though in some quarters it may not be regarded as very serious: there is no table
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to overseas territories are determined by implication.

The drafting of the original tables I and II, however, may, we think, give rise to

a comparison between the old tables I and III clearly shows that the words "home forces" were not meant to refer exclusively to forces stationed in the home
country, but were also to include forces which, by the nature of their organisation, belong
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in our proposal.

I may add that, as regards the tables for naval armaments, I think it would be better
to leave the question over until the commission comes to deal with naval forces.

The Turkish delegation desires to state, in the first place, that it interprets these tables

as meaning that the contracting parties undertake not to exceed, either in their overseas

or in the home country, the maximum forces thus laid down. Secondly, it desires to

emphasise the fact that a limitation of the aggregate overseas forces is not sufficient. The

reasons which have justified the limitation of the forces which may be maintained in the home
country are equally effective arguments for specifying the maximum effects that may be

stationed in each overseas territory. If it be granted that a country which has several overseas
territories is entitled, in peace time, to concentrate all its overseas forces, or the better part

of them, in one of those territories, those contracting countries which are adjacent to that
territory will be obliged to contemplate the possibility that, at any given moment, they may

be confronted by very considerable forces. That being so, either they will refuse to accept

any limitation, or else the extent of the reduction or limitation that they will accept will be

appreciably less than that which could be secured if the forces to be allotted to the overseas
territory in question were fixed without possibility of variation.

For these reasons the Turkish delegation proposes that the maximum forces to be maintained

in each overseas territory should be shown in separate tables, and opposes any arrangement

not embodying such a compulsory allocation of forces.

The President. — The Turkish delegation’s reservation has been noted and will be recorded

in the Minutes.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I wish to associate myself with

the Turkish proposal. I would point out that the arguments presented by the Turkish

delation have already been put forward by the Soviet delegation in regard to air armaments.

I would also mention that for the same purpose the Soviet delegation proposes the deletion of

Article F, which deals with the right of redistribution of home and overseas forces. Conse-

quently, when we arrive at the discussion of that article, the same observations will be made.
The President. — The Soviet delegation's reservation will also be noted and its amendment regarding Article F will be examined when we come to discuss that article.

M. Sato (Japan). — I desire to explain the Japanese delegation's attitude towards the French amendment.

The Japanese delegation is prepared to accept the tables as proposed by the French delegation, provided that the Commission is prepared to accept at the same time the following interpretation:

Regarding Table I, "Maximum Armed Forces", we understand that the word "maximum" means the maximum of the forces which a country has at its disposal in the home country; that is to say, the summit level to which it can attain. It is possible that the actual effectives may not reach that maximum standard.

The full title of this table is "Maximum Armed Forces stationed in the Home Country". These last words imply that the forces in question are actually those which may be stationed in the home country.

If my interpretation is accepted by the Preparatory Commission, we are prepared to accept the French proposal.

We accept Table II, provided that it is optional, as proposed by the French delegation.

The President. — I think there will be no difficulty in accepting M. Sato's interpretation. A maximum is a maximum. I do not think that there can be more than one way of interpreting the tables submitted in the French delegation's amendment.

It would seem, then, that the Commission agrees, subject to the reservations which have been made, to accept the tables in the French amendment in place of the tables under Article A of the 1927 Draft.

The French amendment was adopted in regard to land armaments.

NAVAL ARMAMENTS.

The President. — It was proposed just now to adjourn the discussion of the tables relating to naval armaments. I do not know if the Commission desires to do so. I will only say that there might be certain difficulties; we should be unable to complete any text. We should always be deferring a portion of the text for later discussion, sometimes the whole text. It might be better, perhaps, to examine the whole of the nomenclature of the tables for the three categories of armaments.

Does the Commission agree to discuss the naval armaments tables?

The Hon. Hugh Gibson (United States of America). — Mr. President, with all deference to the reason put forward by you as to taking up naval effectives now, I venture to call attention to the reservation in the margin of Article A by the British Empire and the United States to the effect that we "only accept the limitation of naval effectives provided such limitation is generally accepted, and provided also that a satisfactory agreement is reached respecting the limitation of warships". For this reason, I think that the proposal made by the honourable delegate for France is the most practical, effective and expeditious way of dealing with the whole problem and will avoid going over the ground twice.

The President. — I had intended, if the Commission desires, to discuss the question of the tables relating to naval armaments, and to point out that this reservation had been made by the delegations of Great Britain and the United States. At the present moment, however, we are only dealing with the headings of these tables. Will these tables be definitely incorporated in the Convention? This will depend on the conditions under which naval armaments will be limited. If there is to be limitation, there will be tables; if there is to be no limitation, there will be no tables. If the majority of the Commission desire to adjourn the discussion even of the headings of these tables, we will of course do so.

M. Massigli (France). — Mr. President, it seems to me that there could be no objection to adjourning the discussion of the tables on naval armaments. We have embodied in the text of Article A, which we adopted yesterday, the principle of limitation as regards land, sea and air forces. Only headings of these tables still remain to be settled, and that question can be adjourned until the question of naval armaments has been dealt with.

The President. — Since M. Massigli's proposal for an adjournment is supported by other delegations, I think I shall be interpreting the wishes of the Commission if I decide upon this adjournment.

This decision was adopted.

AIR ARMAMENTS.

The President. — We now go on to the third category — "Air Armaments". The French amendment proposes that, instead of Tables X and XI, five tables should be inserted under the same headings as for the land armaments.

M. Sato (Japan). — I am prepared to accept the French amendment, subject to a slight modification. Our difficulty is that, in Japan, we have no air forces which could be distinguished
by their regional distribution. Our air forces are still in process of organisation and we have not yet determined how they are going to be distributed or stationed. In these circumstances, it would be very difficult to accept immediately any clause which was based on regional distribution. However, in order not to prejudice the acceptance by the Commission of the French delegation's amendment, and, in order to attempt to remove the objection which we might make, I should like to make a proposal.

When the Commission examined the question of air material, it accepted the French proposal. If it adopted for air effectives a decision similar to that taken in regard to air material, making the first two tables optional, the difficulties in the way of Japan's acceptance of the proposal would be removed.

M. MASSIGLI (France). - I understand that the effect of M. Sato's modification to the French amendment would be that the partial table which corresponds to Table I, under land armaments, would be optional, so that Tables I and II (Air Armaments) would be optional and Table III compulsory. If the Commission agrees to this view, I am prepared to accept this modification to our amendment.

General DE MARINIS. - The Italian delegation is prepared to accept the Japanese delegation's proposal.

The PRESIDENT. - The position therefore is as follows: the French delegation has proposed five tables for air armaments and desires that Table II should be optional. The Japanese delegation has now moved another amendment, to the effect that Table I should also be optional. This further amendment has been accepted by the French and Italian delegations.

If there is no objection, I will take it that the tables regarding air armaments presented in the French amendment, as modified by the Japanese delegation's amendment, are now accepted.

This proposal was adopted.

50. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article H.

The PRESIDENT. - We will now consider the reservations and amendments submitted regarding Article H.

Allow me to state what the position is in regard to this article, which reads as follows:

Article H.

The second paragraph "In order to prevent the number of officers, warrant-officers and sergeants from exceeding the legitimate requirements of each army, the tables relating to land armaments mentioned in Article A above shall indicate a maximum number of officers, warrant officers and sergeants which each High Contracting Party undertakes not to exceed. The delegations of the British Empire, Chile, Japan, and the United States of America do not accept the third paragraph.

As regards the first paragraph, there is no amendment, but certain reservations have been made at the first reading. The French and Italian delegations have stated that the provisions of the first two paragraphs must apply under the same conditions to the land, naval and air effectives, and that they would only accept them subject to that reservation.

As regards the second paragraph, apart from the reservation I have just mentioned and which applies equally to the second paragraph, it is noted that this paragraph was not discussed with reference to naval and air effectives. Moreover, the German delegation proposes that the words "whose period of service is longer than the longest period at present in force in the conscript armies of the High Contracting Parties" should be replaced by the following sentence: "who enlist for a period of service exceeding the period of active service prescribed by law".

In regard to the third paragraph, we have the reservations of the delegations of the British Empire, Chile, the United States of America and Japan, which have stated that they do not accept the third paragraph.

Finally, we have the Soviet proposal to add to Article H fourth paragraph worded as follows:

"The tables relating to air armaments mentioned in Article A above should indicate the maximum numbers of officers, pilots and other personnel employed on board aircraft ".
I think the best method would be to examine these paragraphs, one by one. First of all, we must discuss paragraphs 1 and 3. In regard to paragraph 3, it is obvious that, if the delegations which made the reservation in 1927 maintain that reservation, and if, on the other hand, the French and Italian delegations maintain their reservation to the effect that they cannot accept paragraphs 1 and 2 unless they are applied to naval and air armaments under the same conditions, the whole article falls to the ground. Paragraph 3 is really the pivot of the article.

M. Massigli (France). — This article is, indeed, extremely complicated, and raises a number of questions. In order to facilitate the discussion, I should like to make here a certain qualification to the reservation which the French delegation submitted in 1927.

At that time, the French delegation said categorically that absolutely the same system must be applied to the limitation of land, naval and air armaments.

In connection with the limitation of air armaments, I will consider what the position of the French delegation must be when I have ascertained the Commission's attitude with regard to the Soviet amendment. As regards the reservation in connection with naval effectives, I am anxious to facilitate the discussion by saying that we are prepared to withdraw at once the whole of that reservation, whatever may be the system applied to naval effectives. There is a difficulty, however. If naval effectives only consisted in what might be called the effective embarked in warships, i.e., crews of warships, there would be no difficulty, since the limitation of these effectives would be determined rather by the number of warships and their tonnage than by anything else. But there may be, and there are, so-called naval effectives which in reality are land effectives. This is the case in my country. In France, it is the navy which is responsible for coast defence, and the coastal defences are manned by naval effectives.

Therefore, in fairness, since I accept the same limitations for these troops as for land effectives, I would observe that it will be difficult to settle the case of naval troops on land independently of that of land effectives.

If some method can be found to distinguish between these two categories of naval effectives, i.e., the personnel which is embarked in warships and naval effectives which serve on land, I shall have no objection to withdrawing our reservations regarding effective embarked in ships.

General de Marinis (Italy). — As regards coastal defences, my country is in the same situation as France. For this reason we are bound to adopt the same attitude as the French delegation.

I take this opportunity of asking whether the discussion on Article A is closed. We have mentioned the headings of the tables, but we have not entered into the details of this question. Since the question has been raised of reserving certain words, the definition of which is given in Articles H, C, etc., I think that we should revert to the discussion of these tables.

The President. — I will reply immediately to General de Marinis's question. At the outset, I said that we would begin by the discussion of the headings of the tables. This has been settled. We would then proceed to discuss the various articles, and it is only on the basis of these articles that the standard tables can finally be established.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — It looks as if we are getting into a difficulty in regard to this discussion, because some delegates cannot decide what is to be done in regard to naval effectives, until it has been decided what is to be done with the rest of the effectives.

Owing to a motion made in connection with Article A, we have already adjourned consideration of the naval aspect of effectives, and, therefore, I suggest that it would save time if we were to postpone consideration of this Article H. We shall have to postpone consideration of the naval aspect of it, and that seems to involve the postponement of the rest, for the reasons I have already stated.

The President. — Lord Cushendun's proposal is to adjourn the discussion of Article H until a decision has been taken on the subject of naval armaments in view of the close interconnection there is between the various categories of armaments. If you agree to this proposal, the discussion of the composition of the tables will also have to be adjourned. That would seem to me inevitable.

M. Massigli (France). — I think that such an adjournment would be very unfortunate, and, in fact, I find the position rather embarrassing, because I think that my delegation's reservation might be regarded as partly responsible.

I should like entirely to withdraw this reservation, and to agree to the discussion of the question on its merits, whatever solution may be given to that of naval effectives. Could not Article H nevertheless be discussed from the point of view of land forces alone on the understanding — and on this point I am sure that the delegations of Great Britain and the United States will agree — that, when we come to discuss the article in regard to naval effectives, account will be taken, so far as possible, of what has been done with regard to land effectives, and that the same system will be applied, so far as possible, to naval forces as to land forces? Subject to these conditions, I might withdraw our reservation.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — I have no objection to that course, if it is thought practical to postpone the consideration of this article in regard to naval effectives and to proceed with the land forces, but I should think it would be difficult.

The President. — May I ask M. Massigli what aspect of the question we might examine now, leaving out naval questions?
M. Massigli (France). — We should discuss paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article H, which raise two questions. Is the professional personnel of whatever kind to be limited and what are the conditions of this limitation?

The President. — Then it would be understood that the French and Italian delegations would maintain their reservation, but would, in principle, accept paragraphs 1 and 2 subject to the reservations already made in 1927?

M. Massigli (France). — We will hold our reservation in abeyance and agree to the question of land effectives being discussed on its merits, and I will say at once, putting our cards on the table, as Mr. Gibson said, that if, when the naval question is discussed, it appears absolutely impossible to apply exactly the same system to naval forces as to land forces, I will not withdraw what I have agreed to in regard to land armaments.

General de Marinis (Italy). — I wish to explain the nature of the Italian reservation. Our reservation is not based on a question of principle. Its object is merely to make the tables clearer. There are, for instance, naval effectives employed in the defence of the coasts. When the question as to the maximum forces comes to be discussed, will these naval effectives have to be included among the land forces or the naval forces? This is a difficulty.

I would make it clear that this reservation does not represent an objection in principle. In other words, I share the point of view of the British delegation. When we have decided the question of naval reductions and limitations, we shall be in a position to determine the scope of this article. This is the meaning of my reservation.

The President. — Then we will note in the Minutes the interpretations which the various delegations have just given to the reservations they submitted in 1927.

Subject to these observations and on the understanding that the question of naval effectives is reserved, we can discuss and adopt the text of Article H after examining the various amendments which have been submitted.

We will first discuss paragraph 1. I think that we might adopt it, at least in so far as land armaments are concerned, for, if I have understood correctly what M. Massigli has said with regard to air armaments, this decision should be adjourned until a decision has been taken with regard to the Soviet amendment proposing that a fourth paragraph should be added.

The Hon. Hugh Gibson (United States of America). — I wish to offer a brief observation, which I think might appear in the Minutes, as to the very vague wording of this paragraph in the words “the legitimate requirements of each army”. I think the whole point hangs on these words.

When the tables submitted under this article are completed, I fear they will offer some rather curious contradictions, because the nations possessed of the most formidable standing forces may, and probably will, show a proportion of officers much smaller than will the nations of less military standing. This is the inevitable difference between conscript and volunteer armies, and the anomaly will arise from the fact that the countries which practise the volunteer system will in most cases have a far higher proportion of officers, in order to be prepared to meet an increase as a result of a national emergency. In the case of my own country, the picture presented in the tables under this article would certainly be no true interpretation of the real effective military forces which we are prepared to put into the field.

If we are to be entirely consistent, the only thing we could do would be so materially to increase our standing army as to give a proper proportion between officers and men; but, of course, we are not working in that direction.

The President. — I fully appreciate the importance of Mr. Gibson’s observations. I think that the opening words of this article might simply be omitted, since they are rather curious contradictions, because the nations possessed of the most formidable standing forces may, and probably will, show a proportion of officers much smaller than will the nations of less military standing. This is the inevitable difference between conscript and volunteer armies, and the anomaly will arise from the fact that the countries which practise the volunteer system will in most cases have a far higher proportion of officers, in order to be prepared to meet an increase as a result of a national emergency. In the case of my own country, the picture presented in the tables under this article would certainly be no true interpretation of the real effective military forces which we are prepared to put into the field.

If we are to be entirely consistent, the only thing we could do would be so materially to increase our standing army as to give a proper proportion between officers and men; but, on the contrary, we are not working in that direction.

The President. — Are there any further objections to the first paragraph?

M. Sato (Japan). — In this paragraph the establishment of a distinction between the number of officers, warrant-officers and sergeants and the number of other ranks is suggested. The Japanese delegation would propose that this provision should be still further simplified, and that only two categories be established: the first including officers and the second warrant-officers and sergeants and other ranks.

The reason for this proposal is simple. In certain countries the number of officers and of warrant-officers and sergeants is a very variable quantity. Indeed, the Japanese delegation would prefer that all these distinctions should be omitted, and that only the total number of effectives, including officers, warrant-officers and sergeants, should be given. It is aware, however, that this proposal is perhaps a little too radical, and it will not press for its adoption. Consequently, the Japanese delegation would propose that only two categories be established.

The President. — The Japanese delegation’s proposal therefore is that the words “and warrant-officers and sergeants” be deleted.
M. LITVINOFF (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I am unable to agree with the proposal of the Japanese delegation. Such a measure would, in our view, tend to facilitate mobilisation. It is evident that a large number of non-commissioned officers renders mobilisation more easy, not to mention the possibility of converting such non-commissioned officers into officers. I think that such a suggestion would considerably limit the scope of the reduction of armaments, and for these reasons the Soviet delegation is unable to accept the proposal.

The PRESIDENT. — In view of the opposition to the Japanese delegation's proposal, I shall put M. Sato's amendment to the vote.

I would, however, point out that the warrant-officers and sergeants omitted from the first paragraph would, nevertheless, appear in the second paragraph of the article, and those mentioned in the second paragraph are the very warrant-officers and sergeants who are destined to become officers. This is an argument in favour of the Japanese amendment.

A vote was taken on the Japanese proposal, which was adopted.

The PRESIDENT. — The first paragraph of Article II will therefore read as follows:

"The tables relating to land armaments mentioned in Article A above shall indicate a maximum number of officers which each High Contracting Party shall undertake not to exceed."

We will now discuss paragraph 2.

In view of the deletion of the first words of paragraph 1, the first words of paragraph 2, "similarly for the same reasons as those given above", should also logically be omitted. Paragraph 2 would then begin with the words: "the said tables . . . " This is only a point of drafting, regarding which there can be no difficulty.

In connection with paragraph 2, there is a German amendment. It is to the effect that the words "whose period of service . . . " should be replaced by the following: "should enlist for a period of service exceeding the period of active service prescribed by law".

Count BERNSTORFF (Germany). — Mr. President, our amendments and our tables were submitted before the Commission had decided by a majority not to insert trained reserves in the tables in the Convention. The majority has decided to proceed with disarmament without limiting trained reserves or at any rate without mentioning them. An indirect limitation may perhaps ultimately be effected, but for the moment there is no question of it.

In these circumstances, we leave the whole responsibility for this situation to the majority. We do not press our amendments. We are waiting with interest to see what the majority proposes to do in the situation it has created. It is now perfectly free to disarm in the way it thinks best.

You will remember the old Latin proverb, "Parturient montes". We now wait to see what the mountains will bring forth. But we take no responsibility in regard to the question of land armaments.

For this reason, with the exception of the two questions of the annual contingent and the duration of the period of active service, the amendments we have submitted are no longer of any importance to us. We merely wait to see what the majority will do. It has our best wishes as regards land disarmament, but the path it has chosen can, it seems to me, only lead to a deadlock. I do not think that a reduction of land armaments can be effected if the trained reserves are not limited.

The PRESIDENT. — Before calling upon other speakers, I should like to make an observation and to put a question to Count Bernstorff.

My impartiality as President does not allow me to discuss the pessimism shown by the German delegate. But I may say that more than once in the great international discussions which have taken place the same Latin quotation has been used. Criticisms have been formulated, not only before the conclusion of the work, but even after: it was said that the mountain had given birth to a mouse. Events, however, have proved that what seemed to be a mouse subsequently was revealed to be extremely important. It was a little lion cub which eventually became a great lion dominating public opinion.

I would ask Count Bernstorff whether I am to conclude from his observations that he withdraws his amendment to paragraph 2.

Count BERNSTORFF (Germany). — I only rise again to make my statement perfectly clear. I meant to say that we were interested in the tables which are before the Commission only in so far as annual contingents and the duration of active service are concerned, because we regard this as an indirect way of limiting trained reserves.

As regards the pessimism referred to by the President, it appears to me that it is he, and not I, who is the chief pessimist. I am still waiting to see what the majority is going to do, although I think that it cannot arrive at any good results. But I hope that the disarmament which the majority will provide for will turn out to be not a mere lion but a very elephant.

I merely wished to point out that, in our opinion, nothing can be done with the method you have chosen. If the majority proves the contrary and it succeeds in producing an appreciable reduction of land forces, I shall be the first to express my gratitude.

General DE MARINIS (Italy). — I greatly regret that Count Bernstorff has withdrawn the amendment submitted by the German delegation. I attach great importance to it.
It was stated just now that, if we were to abolish the words "warrant-officers and sergeants" in the first paragraph, they would reappear in the second paragraph, which refers to other ranks whose period of service is longer than the normal period.

But if it is merely stated that account must be taken only of the effects whose period of service is longer than the longest period at present in force in any conscript army of the High Contracting Parties, these warrant-officers and sergeants will not be taken into account.

Take the case of my own country. Our normal period of service is eighteen months. But there are a greater number of men who engage for a longer time, i.e., for twenty-four months. Before the completion of their service, these men are appointed non-commissioned officers. Accordingly, they will not be shown in these tables because there are some countries in which the normal period of service is three years, and effective whose period of service does not exceed three years will not be taken into account.

I do not know if I have succeeded in making myself clear on such a technical question, but I would draw my colleagues' attention to the fact that, if they leave this text as it stands, I would propose that it be simply deleted.

For these reasons I now adopt the German amendment as my own.

The President. — You have just heard General de Marinis's statement that he takes up on his own account the amendment withdrawn by Count Bernstorff. Does any other delegation support this amendment?

M. Westman (Sweden). — The Swedish delegation desires to support General de Marinis's amendment. In our opinion the only objective standard is the period of engagement. If a really accurate knowledge of the value of an army is to be obtained, you must take into account men who have engaged for a period exceeding the period of service laid down by law.

M. Sato (Japan). — In conformity with the Japanese amendment, the words "warrant-officers and sergeants" in the first paragraph have been omitted. It would, therefore, be desirable to be perfectly clear as to what is meant by "other ranks", which appears in the second paragraph. According to the original text, the term "other ranks" does not include warrant-officers and sergeants, and, in order that this paragraph should be clear, this passage in the second paragraph should be replaced by the words "the second amendment which I would submit to the Commission is more radical. To tell the truth, I cannot fully understand the scope of the second paragraph. If my colleagues do not attach special importance to this paragraph, I would propose that it be simply deleted.

M. Massigli (France). — This discussion and the diametrically opposite opinions which have been expressed by General de Marinis and M. Sato do not surprise me in the least, because this discussion is far from new. It has already been gone through in part at the first reading, and it was not by mere chance that the Commission arrived at what, I admit, is a compromise text.

General de Marinis proposes a radical solution. In every army, those men who remain in the service longer than the period laid down by law are to be regarded as professional soldiers. That means that, in an army in which the period of service is one year, those who remain in the service for periods between one year and eighteen months will be regarded as professional soldiers; and in an army in which the period of service is eighteen months, non-commissioned officers with between twelve and eighteen months' service will not be regarded as professional non-commissioned officers, while those who serve longer than eighteen months will be so regarded.

I am not at all sure that this is a fair system. Indeed, I am strongly inclined to think that — as M. Paul-Boncour demonstrated at the last session — it is unfair and perhaps dangerous. Consider what it will lead to. It will lead countries which have come to the idea of a very short period of military service — one year or less — to manipulate the number of non-commissioned officers, or to introduce a provision to the effect that non-commissioned officers shall remain longer in the service. They will try to avoid giving correct figures for the number of non-commissioned officers in the tables. What will happen will be that armies which have actually the same number of non-commissioned officers will appear in the tables with widely different figures, and figures which will not merely represent different in themselves, but will represent different values; for a non-commissioned officer with fifteen months' service does not represent the same value and importance from the point of view of mobilisation, in fact, as a non-commissioned officer with three years', or three and a-half years' service.

It was because the Commission felt this difficulty, and appreciated it, that it arrived at a compromise text which is not satisfactory on logical grounds but which renders it possible to make useful comparisons; and that is what we shall have to do at the Conference.

I therefore think that General de Marinis's proposal, though apparently logical, goes beyond the bounds of logic, and that we should do better to adhere to the existing text.

M. Sato goes further; I am afraid he goes too far, and I am not sure that it is really possible to abandon paragraph 2 altogether. Personally, I rather doubt it.

General de Marinis (Italy). — I am very sorry to have to speak once again. I do really think it necessary, however, looking at this question from an entirely objective point of view, that the Commission should consider the responsibility it will be taking if it keeps the text.
in its present form after cutting out the explicit reference to non-commissioned officers in the first paragraph.

There have been long discussions here, and especially in Sub-Commission A, in order to arrive at comparisons between conscript and voluntary armies. It has always been emphasised that voluntary armies have a much greater value than conscript armies, even though they are smaller, because the longer period of service makes it possible to train non-commissioned officers and men who can serve as a nucleus for the units which may be formed on mobilisation.

Now it appears that we are giving up this idea. We are to regard it as an unimportant question whether an army has a large or small number of effectives serving for a longer period than the normal.

Reference was made just now to professional soldiers. We are not concerned with professional soldiers. We are simply concerned to see that the real position of any army is shown in the tables.

Frequent allusions have been made here to public opinion. There is no doubt that public opinion is deeply impressed by statements that the normal period of military service has been reduced to a very short term. If my country, in which the term of service is now eighteen months, were to announce to the world that it was reducing that term by six months, it would make a great impression. If, however, while reducing the term of service by six months, it kept in its army 100,000 men who were serving for a longer period, you will realise that it would not be quite the same thing as simply reducing the term of service.

This is, in my view, a point of capital importance, and, let me repeat, I am looking at the question from an entirely objective point of view. I am quite willing to accept the observations which M. Massigli made just now. He said that it would not be fair to make only two categories — men who serve longer than the normal term and men who serve the normal term. I am willing to accept that observation, if M. Massigli is contemplating the possibility of showing in the table the number of men serving longer than the normal term — with separate columns for those serving six months longer, twelve months longer, eighteen months longer, and so forth. In that case, the tables would be quite clear and would enable the public in every country to obtain a good idea of the state of preparation of any particular army.

It is, I feel, the duty of all of us to reflect seriously on the arguments I have just set forth. If we keep the text as it stands, I think our Convention will be widely open to criticism. No well-informed expert could fail to observe the serious gap we should have left in the text. The particulars we should be called upon to give would be so vague, so indefinite, that I really do not see how they would serve our purpose, which is, to fix a situation for armaments on the basis of the real value of the military preparedness of each country.

M. MASSIGLI (France). — General de Marinis has just gone over the arguments he had already advanced at the first reading. I have opposed him with arguments which were also put forward at the first reading. This is a dialogue that may go on indefinitely if we do not try to find a solution. We must find one. The problem is extremely difficult. I can see the difficulties that General de Marinis raises, but I should like him, in his turn, to see mine. I do not know whether there is any solution. All I can say is that I am willing to look for one. I should not make the slightest objection if the bureau or a committee or a delegation were to lay before us at a later meeting a formula which would meet General de Marinis’s wishes.

General DE MARINIS (Italy). — I should like to thank M. Massigli for being prepared to meet my wishes by agreeing to establish a distinction between the different classes of effectives on the basis of the period of service.

I must also thank him for agreeing to try to work out a formula which will take account of my observations and his desires, and I am quite willing to accept his proposal that the bureau or a committee should be asked to find such a formula.

M. SATO (Japan). — I am in entire agreement with M. Massigli’s proposal that the Commission should adjourn the discussion of this question.

To tell the truth, so far as I am concerned, the difficulty is that I am not very clear about this question. General de Marinis has certainly made a most important statement, but I must confess that I have not entirely grasped its purport. I should therefore be very glad to have a little time to discuss the matter with General de Marinis and ask him for further explanations. In that way we might perhaps be able to reach an agreement.

The President. — In view of the desire that has been expressed by three delegations, we will adjourn the discussion of this question.

I would ask these three delegations, however, to discuss the matter among themselves and, if possible, to draw up a text that can be submitted to us at to-morrow’s meeting.

In this connection, I may perhaps be allowed to give you a piece of information that illustrates the difficulty of this question. I have before me the Armaments Year-Book for this year, and I see that in countries which have compulsory military service the term of service varies widely — it is anything from three months to four years. I think you should bear this point in mind in coming to a decision on this very difficult question.

Paragraph 2 is therefore held over.

We might now go on to paragraph 3, dealing with air armaments only, since we have agreed that the question of naval armaments is reserved.
Lord CUSHENDUN (British Empire). — I understand you to ask whether there will be any objection to accepting the third paragraph while postponing its application to naval armaments. We made a reservation as regards both naval and air armaments, and I could not, without a good deal of consideration, accept the third paragraph as applied to air armaments. There are some considerations in regard to it which I should like to put before the Commission.

M. SATO (Japan). — The Japanese delegation cannot accept this paragraph either as it stands. As I have already said, my country's air forces are in process of organisation, and we cannot rigidly fix the proportion of officers, non-commissioned officers and other ranks. It is therefore very difficult for us to agree to a distinction being drawn between officers and other ranks, including non-commissioned officers. We should prefer a limitation applicable to the aggregate effectives.

The PRESIDENT. — The hour is late, and I do not think we can begin a discussion now. I suggest, therefore, that we should adjourn this discussion until to-morrow morning.

Agreed.

(The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.).

SEVENTEENTH MEETING (PUBLIC).

Held at Geneva on Wednesday, May 1st, 1929, at 10 a.m.

President: M. POLITIS (Greece).

51. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives Article H, (continuation).

The PRESIDENT. — Gentlemen, you will remember that yesterday we were discussing the second paragraph of Article H. The French, Italian and Japanese delegations which had taken part in the discussion have, I am glad to say, reached agreement and the text proposed is as follows:

"The said tables shall also show the maximum figure which each High Contracting Party undertakes not to exceed in respect of other ranks, serving for a period longer than the longest period in force in the conscript armies of the High Contracting Parties, on the date of the signature of the Convention.

"As regards men whose period of service is longer than the legal period in force in their respective countries, but not longer than the longest legal period in force as specified above, their number shall be shown for each High Contracting Party in the annual statements to be prepared as provided in Article IA of Chapter V."

M. MASSIGLI (France). — I wish to explain the nature of the agreement which the Commission had requested us to seek.

As you see, the only changes made in the old paragraph 2 are of a drafting character. We found, indeed, that there was no way of avoiding the objections, to which the French delegation had drawn attention, arising from the inequality in the period of service in the different conscript armies. On the other hand, we all realised that the arguments advanced by General de Marinis were well founded and that some way must be found of showing in the tables professional soldiers who serve beyond the legal period in their own army, even though this period does not exceed the longest period in force in any conscript army. As we cannot limit this category — for this would be unjust to some armies — we had to seek a midway solution by means of publicity.

The Japanese delegation, which had evinced certain apprehensions in regard to the original text of paragraph 2, has accepted this text subject to an interpretation regarding which M. Sato will, I believe, give some explanations to the Commission.

M. SATO (Japan). — Yesterday the Preparatory Commission agreed, on my proposal, to delete in paragraph 1 of Article H the words "warrant-officers and sergeants", and as a logical result I then proposed the omission of paragraph 2.

My reason for making this proposal was that I did not wish the number of warrant-officers and sergeants who serve beyond the normal period to be limited separately. On the other hand, I thought that it should be possible to give very detailed information regarding the number and duration of service of this class of personnel. I thought that this was a question which the Commission might discuss.

In the course of my conversations with my honourable colleagues of Italy and France, it appeared to me that there was a tendency to wish to limit the number of these warrant-officers and sergeants. For the sake of agreement, I endeavoured to meet the views of my colleagues,
and I decided that I would be able to accept the text before us if the Preparatory Commission
puts the same interpretation upon it as I do. I mean an interpretation similar to that which
I gave yesterday concerning effectives, i.e., that the maximum number of warrant-officers
and sergeants, limited in this way, is not going to be regarded as a minimum ; the President
observed yesterday that a maximum could never be regarded as a minimum.

I wished to be allowed a certain latitude as regards the number of warrant-officers and
sergeants. The fact is, my country intends in a few years' time to alter the period of service.

If this period is reduced, it will be necessary to increase the number of warrant-officers and
sergeants ; to safeguard that possibility, I wished to fix the maximum which would allow a
certain latitude.

If my interpretation is accepted by the Commission, the Japanese delegation will have
no difficulty in accepting the text submitted by M. Massigli this morning.

General de Marinis (Italy). — I wish to express my satisfaction at the agreement which
has been reached between the French, Japanese and Italian delegations, and which I hope the
Commission will endorse. I should like, however, to give the Commission the reasons for my
attitude as regards this agreement.

Naturally, I would have preferred my amendment to be accepted; but I appreciated the
force of the observations made with regard to the difficulty of drafting a text taking into
consideration the different periods of military service in the various countries. It may be the
task of the Conference to arrive at some better wording, when all the countries of the world are
represented, and it is possible to take into account the situation of each one of them as regards
the duration of military service.

But, as you will have seen from what I said yesterday, my chief concern is not with
limitation but with publicity. I laid stress on the necessity of indicating what portion of
the annual contingent will serve beyond the legal period.

It is for that reason and in a spirit of accommodation that I accepted M. Massigli's proposal,
which, while retaining the text of the draft Convention, adds the obligation for the High
Contracting Parties to make known the number of soldiers required to serve beyond the legal
period. This text answers the greater part of the points which concerned me, and therefore
I am very glad to be able to accept it.

The President. — You have heard the explanations of the three delegations concerned,
which explain to us the scope of the new text proposed to replace paragraph 2. If no one
wishes to speak, I shall declare this text accepted.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — In my opinion, this wording is not satisfactory, but I
shall not oppose it.

Dr. Riddell (Canada). — I am sure it is a matter of great satisfaction to us all that the
tree delegations have reached an agreement, but I understand that we have a rule that before
considering — or at least finally accepting — any text, such text should be distributed, and
we should have an opportunity of considering it in writing. It is quite possible that this does
not affect us in any way so far as the matter under discussion is concerned, but I think we should
adhere to a rule of procedure already laid down.

The President. — The Canadian representative is quite correct. In this case, however,
the text under discussion was drawn up in 1927 and was debated at some length yesterday.
The text submitted by the three delegations is not, therefore, an absolutely new one. It
represents the terms of the old paragraph and adds an explanation. There was no time to
distribute the text before the present discussion. If the Canadian delegate insists, we can
postpone voting until the text has been translated and circulated.

M. Markovitch (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes). — I support the Canadian
delegation's proposal in connection with the application of the rules of procedure.

The President. — Then we will postpone voting on this text, which will be translated and
circulated as soon as possible. If it is ready before the end of the present meeting, we shall revert
to it then ; if not, it will be postponed until the next sitting.

Third Paragraph.

The President. — I must inform the Commission that we have before us an amendment
from the Japanese delegation proposing the deletion of the third paragraph.

M. Sato (Japan). — The reason for our amendment is perfectly simple. I have already
had occasion to refer to the difficulty with which my country has to contend. We are in the
middle of the process of organising our air force, and we cannot fix a rigid proportion between
the different classes of effective, officers, non-commissioned officers, pilots, etc. I imagine
other delegations will find themselves in a similar position for similar reasons.

The Japanese delegation does not wish, therefore, for a limitation of effective by classes,
and proposes that the third paragraph, so far as it relates to air forces, should be omitted.

The Hon. Hugh. Gibson (United States of America). — The United States delegation is,
of course, in full accord with the necessity of making returns of air effective, but we are faced by a
practical difficulty in making returns in the form suggested, because in my country there is no separate
air force — the army and navy each have their own air forces forming an integral part of these
organisations. We could not, therefore, as a practical matter, make the returns in the form proposed; but, as the clear intent of the tables is to secure an accurate return, I assume there would be no disposition to press for rigid adherence to tables which may not be applicable. We entirely agree to the fullest returns in the most precise manner possible being given, so far as is possible consonant with the form adopted; but, for the reasons given, the United States delegation would accept with great satisfaction the amendment proposed by the Japanese delegation.

M. MASSIGLI (France). — I should like to explain why the French delegation would find it very difficult to go so far as the Japanese delegation desires.

The discussion that has just taken place on the preceding paragraph of Article H has brought out the importance that the Commission attaches to the part played by professional soldiers in the formation and training of land forces; nevertheless, in a land army, professional soldiers represent only a comparatively small proportion, as compared with the annual contingent, when the army is based on conscription.

In the air force, the position is entirely different. The air force is a specialist arm, and the professional soldier can be more easily made into a specialist than other soldiers. If we tried to classify land, naval and air armaments in the order of importance of professional soldiers in these forces, I think we should very soon find that the order would be, first air forces, then naval forces, and lastly land forces. The logical conclusion is that professional soldiers should be limited at least as completely in the air force as in the land army, if not more completely.

I readily recognise, however, that in many countries the air arm is not yet fully organised. In some countries it is an independent arm, whilst in others it is merged in the navy or army. In some countries all pilots have to be officers, whereas in others the rank and file or non-commissioned officers may be pilots. This is a very genuine complication.

For my part, as I have said, I should find it very difficult to agree that the only limitation placed on air effectives should be the general limitation in the table in Article A.

On the other hand, could not M. SATO accept some other proposal, which I am quite sure that Mr. Gibson, for his part, could see his way to accept? We might have a limitation of the aggregate number of professional soldiers in the air force, without distinguishing, as we do in the case of land forces, between officers and other professional soldiers. That seems to me an acceptable solution. It is not consistent, it is true, with M. Litvinoff’s amendment, but I think it may enable the Commission to find a basis of agreement.

General de Marinis (Italy). — You will see from the text of the draft Convention before you that the Italian delegation is associated with the reservation made by the French delegation in the margin opposite to Article H.

A moment ago M. Massigli pointed out the difficulty his delegation would find in withdrawing its reservation, and emphasised the high importance attached by the Commission to the question of professional soldiers. It is unnecessary, I think, to explain again what importance I attach to that question. For that reason my delegation also could hardly agree to the complete withdrawal of the reservation in question.

I am, however, most anxious to reach agreement, and I should therefore be quite prepared to accept the proposal that has just been made by the French delegate, and I hope that everybody will agree to it.

The Hon. Hugh. Gibbon (United States of America). — I agree in principle with the proposal put forward by M. Massigli, but I find it rather difficult to commit myself to any rigid form of returns. I can assure him that we shall be disposed to adhere to these tables as far as is practicably possible, taking into consideration the peculiar organisation of our air forces.

The President. — Does M. SATO accept M. Massigli’s proposal, which has been supported by General de Marinis and agreed to in principle by Mr. Gibson?

M. SATO (Japan). — Before making a definite answer, I should like to know whether the French proposal is accepted by the majority of the Commission or not. My attitude will depend on that of the Commission.

The President. — My reason for asking M. SATO this question is that the Japanese delegation has proposed a far-reaching amendment, and, if we are to take a vote, I shall be bound to begin by putting the Japanese proposal to the meeting.

At the same time, I quite understand M. SATO’s wish to know what attitude the Commission is going to adopt towards the French proposal.

M. VALDES-MENDEVILLE (Chile). — I would remind the Commission that we associated ourselves in 1927 with the delegations which refused to accept the third paragraph of Article H.

In view of the fact that, making due allowance for the different proportions, the circumstances of my country are similar to those of Japan, I would agree in principle to the deletion of this paragraph. In a spirit of compromise, however, I am prepared to accept the intermediate proposal made by M. Massigli.

Lord CUSHENDUN (British Empire). — The difficulty in these proposals, as I see it, is to get any system which is common to us all. The Japanese delegate pointed out very truly just now that a great deal of reorganisation is going on in the air service — a very new service — and there
are great diversities between one nation and another in the matter of organisation. Recognising that, I was prepared to support the amendment proposed by M. Sato to omit paragraph 3.

A compromise has now been proposed by the French delegate, but I do not quite know how that compromise would work out; I should like to see it on paper and have an opportunity of considering it, because we want to compare like with like, and I am not at all sure that the proposal made by the French delegate would not work out rather inconveniently for some nations, and particularly for my own. As I understand his proposal, it is to have a limitation of the whole air force regardless of rank and, inside that, to have a limitation of what he calls "professional soldiers" engaged in the air service. I am not quite sure that I know what is meant in this connection by a "professional soldier". Of course, all our army and all our air service consist of what I suppose would be called "professional soldiers". They are all volunteers, they are all free from conscription or coercion of any sort, and they serve in a professional capacity; therefore, they are all professional soldiers. It seems to me that there would be a misconception. When you get the returns from various nations, unless you have uniformity of system, we should obviously appear to have a very bloated air service, because we should have to put down every man serving, since they are all professionals, whereas the French and other nations would make a discrimination and put down merely the professional soldier serving in the air force, which might constitute a comparatively small number. Unless, therefore, you can elaborate explain on every occasion the difference between the two systems, it would obviously suggest very false conclusions as regards the strength of the British air service.

For these reasons I personally should very much have preferred the Japanese amendment, to leave out this paragraph altogether. As it is, I should like to be much clearer as to how the French compromise would work out before I accept it.

M. Sokol (Poland). — In order to comply with M. Sato's request, I desire to state in a few words the point of view of my delegation.

We all thought that paragraph 3 expressed the fundamental principle of the parallelism between land, naval and air armaments. In these circumstances it would seem to me difficult to omit this last paragraph.

However, after Mr. Gibson's and Lord Cushendun's explanations, I think it might be modified in such a way as to be universally acceptable. I think that for this reason the French proposal deserves to be examined in detail; I agree, however, with Lord Cushendun that it would be desirable to see it in writing before it is put to the vote.

M. Massigli (France). — I admit that the explanation I gave just now is somewhat summary. If the Commission desires to consider the idea I have expressed, I should, perhaps, explain it rather more in detail.

My idea is that we should apply to aviation a system similar to that which is at present provided in paragraph 2 of Article H, with this difference, that no distinction would be made between officers and other professional soldiers.

I will endeavour to explain this. Article H provides for the limitation of the number of professional soldiers whose period of service is longer than the longest period at present in force in the conscript armies of the High Contracting Parties. The same regime would be applied to the air force. In the general table under Article A, the aggregate number of air effectives will be shown. This has already been decided upon. In the special table under Article H the aggregate number of air effectives whose period of service is longer than the longest period at present in force in conscript armies would be shown.

The amendment is really of particular significance only for conscript armies, in that it makes a distinction between two categories of soldiers. In the case of volunteer armies, if all the soldiers in the air force of the volunteer army are in fact serving for a longer period than the longest period at present in force in conscript armies, the two tables under Article A and under Article H will be the same. There can be no mistake about this. In the opposite case, Table H would only show a portion of the effectives shown under Table A. That is exactly the same system as that proposed for the land armies. The only difference would be that, in order to meet the apprehensions which have been expressed here, a distinction would not be drawn between officers and other professional soldiers.

The text would accordingly read as follows:

"The tables relating to air armaments referred to in Article A will show, in the form of an aggregate total, for the whole of the officers, non-commissioned officers, and other ranks, the maximum number, which each High Contracting Party agrees not to exceed, of men whose period of service is longer than the longest period at present in force in the conscript armies of the High Contracting Parties on the day of the signature of the Convention."

Under this system, the regime applied to the land army would, so far as possible, be applied to aviation with certain material attenuations, however. I wish to make a further observation. Stress has been laid on several occasions during this discussion on the fact that air forces are in process of reorganisation, and that, consequently, it would be necessary to foresee more elasticity and less division into categories. I admit that this is so. I must point out, however, that land forces are also in process of reorganisation. Many countries are experimenting in the mechanisation of their land forces. Nevertheless, we have accepted more numerous limitations for land forces. I ask that account should be taken of these concessions and that an effort at conciliation be made in the direction I have indicated.

The President. — Before calling upon the other speakers who notified me that they have observations to make, I think that, in view of the complexity of this question, it is essential that the
rules should be strictly applied. I think this text should first be translated and distributed, and the vote postponed to a subsequent meeting.

I wonder whether the system which we applied yesterday, and which has proved so successful, might not be applied in this case also. That is to say, the representatives of the principal delegations which have taken part in the discussion should be asked to meet in the interval between the two meetings in order to reach an agreement, either on the text proposed by M. Massigli, or on any other similar text.

M. FERLINGER (Czechoslovakia). — I should like to add a few words to M. Massigli’s statement, which is very clear. I think it is impossible to compare aviation, which is an essentially technical arm, with the other arms, and to apply to it the tables provided for the land forces.

On the other hand, I agree that it would be impossible to abolish all distinctions between specialists and non-specialists. The specialists will always be officers in the sense of the first paragraph of the article, and the non-specialists will simply consist of the hands which every air force requires.

I think that we might accept the compromise proposed by the French delegation.

M. LITVINOFF (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — It will be obvious from the amendment presented by the Soviet delegation, which prescribes the same descriptive details for air forces as do our other amendments for other forces, that the Soviet delegation is opposed to the amendment of the Japanese and the French delegations. The object of dividing land forces and air forces into various categories is to limit the possibilities of deploying large armies, which demand certain numbers of specialists. The more specialists we have, the larger armies we can develop. From this point of view, a distinction should be made not between professional and non-professional soldiers — non-professional soldiers can be used for simply cleaning the aeroplanes; anybody can do that — but between those who have and those who have not specialised in certain technical branches of aeronautics.

I think, therefore, that, unless the Soviet amendment, which provides for a special table of the number of pilots and other specialists, is accepted, it makes no difference whether we adopt the French proposal or not. We can only limit the possibility of converting air forces into large fighting forces if we single out specialists.

The PRESIDENT. — I think that this question will have to be adjourned, and that it would be as well if a certain number of delegations would examine the text proposed by M. Massigli, which might be amended so that agreement could be reached.

We have now to deal, therefore, with the Soviet delegation’s amendment. Does the Soviet delegation wish for an immediate discussion of its proposal, or would it prefer to wait and see what comes of the French proposal?

M. LITVINOFF (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I do not mind one way or another, but it seems to me that, if we discussed the Soviet proposal, it might influence the drafting of the new proposals.

The PRESIDENT. — M. Litvinoff’s remark is perfectly reasonable, and I will therefore open the discussion on the Soviet delegation’s amendment.

This amendment is to add to Article H a fourth paragraph, the text of which is as follows:

“The tables relating to air armaments mentioned in Article A above should indicate the maximum number of officers, pilots and other personnel employed on board aircraft.”

The amendment is completed by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Non-commissioned Officers</th>
<th>Other Ranks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilots...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personnel employed on board aircraft..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before we begin the discussion I would like to observe that, in my opinion, the value of this amendment is that it draws a distinction between two classes of personnel — personnel serving on board aircraft and ground personnel.

M. LITVINOFF (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I consider there is no necessity for me to add to the arguments in its favour presented by the President.

The PRESIDENT. — I did not offer any arguments. It is not my business to offer arguments; I merely gave an interpretation.

M. LITVINOFF (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I accept the President’s interpretation.
The President. — Very well. I would ask the Commission to decide whether, in the tables relating to air forces, which will be annexed to Article A, a distinction should be drawn between personnel employed on board aircraft and ground personnel.

On a show of hands the Commission rejected the Soviet delegation’s amendment.

Second Paragraph and Third Paragraph.

The President. — The text of the amendment proposed by the French, Italian and Japanese delegations has now been distributed, and we can resume consideration of the question which had to be adjourned. (See beginning of this Minute.)

Dr. Riddell (Canada). — Do I understand that this applies only to conscript armies?

M. Massigli (France). — It quite clearly applies by definition to all armies; but it is of no importance except for conscript armies. In the case of voluntary armies, there will simply be an additional return partially reproducing information already given. It is essential, however, that a general return applicable to all armies should be prepared.

M. Rutgens (Netherlands). — I think it would be desirable to specify in the first paragraph what period is referred to. Presumably, it is the first period of service; but does this text apply to all the cases at present existing in land armament?

If, at the time of the Conference, the position should have changed, we should have to see what it was best to do in consequence; but at the moment no land army seems to have a legal period of service exceeding three years.

The Hon. Hugh Gibson (United States of America). — Merely from the point of view of information, I beg to repeat that one of our fundamental ideas on the subject of reduction of armaments lies in the fullest measure of publicity and the most accurate details. But I confess that, when I read this text, I have not the slightest idea what sort of tables will be required. I should like some information as to how this text would apply in the case of a voluntary army. It might be applied to a voluntary army also, because, in their respective countries. I understand how that applies to a conscript army, but not how it applies to a voluntary army. It might be applied to a voluntary army also, because, in their respective countries. I understand how that applies to a conscript army, but not how it applies to a voluntary army.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — When I signified just now that I should like to speak, Mr. President, I did not know that the United States delegate was going to say what I wanted to point out. I do not understand how this article, as now drafted, applies to a voluntary army, and I should like to be sure before we consent to accept it. The second paragraph of the amendment speaks of “men whose period of service is longer than the legal period in force in their respective countries”. I understand how that applies to a conscript army, but not how it applies to a voluntary army. It might be applied to a voluntary army also, because, in their respective countries. I want to know what is to happen with regard to these men. The article as a whole does not seem to have any application to them. The French delegate says are the only armies in regard to which it is of any importance.

M. Massigli (France). — I am very sorry that I cannot associate myself with the idea Lord Cushendun has just put forward. If we took that line, we should end by drawing up a Convention applicable to conscript armies alone and that I could not accept.

The proposal that I have made tends to amend an article that has already passed its first reading, and of which the principle has been accepted. No substantial change is made in it.

As to the significance and the application of this proposal, I think it is perfectly clear. The article appeared of special importance with regard to conscript armies, but a voluntary army can give the same information. Our difficulty is due to the fact that no precise period has been specified in the article, but that we have used the expression “the longest period”. As a matter of fact, the longest period is three years.

The conscript armies will publish the number of men who are serving for more than one year (I imagine the case of an army in which the legal period of service is one year) and less than three years, and will limit in accordance with the Convention the number of men serving
more than three years. For other armies, that is to say, voluntary armies, the procedure will be exactly the same. The number of men serving, I suppose, less than three years will be shown in the tables and the number serving more than three years will be limited. This limit, however, will of course be fixed much higher because the greater part of the men serve in these armies longer than three years. I do not see that there is any difficulty.

I would add one point, which should, I think, satisfy Lord Cushendun. The second paragraph proposed — the paragraph about publicity — could only affect conscript armies, because, obviously, there is no legal period of service for voluntary armies. I therefore think we could agree to accept the first paragraph as it stands, since it lays down a principle, and to state that the next paragraph, which concerns publicity, applies only to conscript armies.

General de Marinis (Italy). — I have no objection to the application of the second paragraph being confined to conscript armies.

The Hon. Hugh Gibson (United States of America). — I am quite in agreement on the point of applying the second paragraph to conscript armies, but the same difficulty still remains as regards the first paragraph. As I understand it now, it would preclude an enlisted man in the voluntary army from re-enlisting. Under our system an enlisted man has the privilege of re-enlisting, and this would be a provision by which we should limit the number of men who might avail themselves of that privilege.

M. Massigli (France). — That is not at all the case.

The President. — I am following this very complicated discussion in the hope of finding, if possible, a formula which will state the Commission's view more clearly. I think, however, that the danger Mr. Gibson suggests is not a real one with the text we have before us.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — Mr. President, I have listened to the explanation given by the French delegate, but I cannot see the slightest reason for applying the article in the way he describes, because the form which will state the Commission's view more easily. I think, however, that the danger Mr. Gibson suggests is not a real one with the text we have before us.

M. Massigli (France). — I think that there is some misunderstanding about the reason for this paragraph, which was introduced in order to bring out the importance and the rôle which is played by an essential element of all armies, that is, the professional element. It has been said that conscript armies are generally larger and that therefore it is necessary to show the number of their effectives and to limit them. I agree. Nevertheless, no matter whether a man is serving under a voluntary engagement or under some system of compulsory service and of subsequent re-enlistment, the essential point is that, after a period of service of, say, three years, he becomes possessed of special value. That was the reason why it was considered necessary to limit the number of soldiers serving for long periods, and that was certainly the Commission's intention when it considered these texts at the first reading. There does not seem to be any reason why the number of these effectives should only be limited in the case of conscript armies, since in the case of voluntary armies their number is generally even larger.

The President. — It seems to me that there is more than a misunderstanding; I think that this text cannot possibly cover all the cases under consideration. The difference, for instance, which M. Massigli is endeavouring to establish in a voluntary army between men who have already served for a long period and the others is not covered by this text. It would be preferable to redraft it.

In these circumstances, I propose that the discussion of this question be adjourned and that the principal representatives of the two systems should be asked to meet and to agree upon a new text to be submitted at to-morrow's meeting.

M. Sato (Japan). — I must request you to give me a few day's grace. Before accepting a text relative to air effectives, I must ask for instructions from my Government, and I cannot have an answer under two days.

The President. — In these circumstances the question of air effectives is adjourned until the delegations concerned are able to submit a text; we hope, however, to be able to examine to-morrow a new draft of the second paragraph and of the new third paragraph.

This proposal was adopted.
52. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article C.

Article C.

By "formations organised on a military basis" shall be understood police forces of all kinds, gendarmerie, Customs officials, forest guards, which, whatever their legal purpose, can be used without mobilisation, by reason of their cadres, establishment, training, armament or equipment, as well as any organisation complying with the above condition.

The President. — I note that there are no amendments in substance to this article. I only mention a reservation by the Soviet delegation, which reads as follows:

"The Soviet delegation reserves the right to submit a proposal to the Disarmament Conference concerning formations organised on a military basis by public associations."

I would, however, suggest that a slight textual modification be made in the article.

In the fourth line the words occur: "... leur armement et leur équipement ..."

The word "et" seems to me to have been introduced inadvertently, and should be replaced by a comma.

M. Rutgers (Netherlands). — I notice that the French text contains the word "et" while in the English text the word "or" appears. Should this "or" in the English text be struck out?

The President. — These two words should be deleted, at any rate the "et" in the French text. As regards the English text, I leave it as a matter of English drafting.

M. Rutgers (Netherlands). — I do not know whether the omission of this word "et" will not change the meaning of the article.

This article mentions five conditions, and, if the conjunction is maintained, the meaning will be that all five conditions are compulsory. The English text, however, which says "or" does not appear to imply compulsion in respect of more than one of the conditions.

I think, therefore, that this question is important. If the paragraph is to mean that all conditions must be fulfilled if the definition is to be applied, I think that in the English text the word "or" should be replaced by the word "and".

The President. — In my opinion all five conditions provided for in this article are compulsory. If, however, the conjunction "et" is maintained between "armement" and "leur équipement", a twofold condition is implied, and the text might give rise to misunderstandings. If, however, a comma is put instead, all conditions are on the same plane.

M. Sokal (Poland). — This question appears to me very important. If the conjunction is omitted, the text clearly means that all five conditions must be fulfilled at the same time. Now, we had understood that each of the conditions was sufficient by itself.

M. Markovitch (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes). — I agree with M. Sokal's interpretation.

We had understood that this article meant that the formations organised on a military basis mentioned in this article represented the police forces which could be used without mobilisation by reason either of their staff of officers or establishment or training or armaments or equipment.

This was the original interpretation which we consider should be retained.

The President. — I do not think that the interpretation which has just been given is a possible one. For a mere question of equipment, an organisation might fall under the terms of the article. I had always understood that this article implied that all five conditions must be present. If one of them were left out, the case which the article is intended to cover would not be present.

M. Massigli (France). — I would draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the wording of this amendment was deliberately left somewhat vague, so as to show that this was a body of conditions. It will be for the Conference to decide what formations organised on a military basis should be included in these tables. I think that the convenience of the conjunction is that, for instance, if a formation fulfilled all the conditions concerning cadres, establishment, armament, training, etc., but showed a difference from a regular force in a small matter of equipment that formation might not be included in the formations organised on a military basis. If for the word "et" a comma were substituted, it is quite clear that it becomes a body of conditions in regard to which the Conference will decide.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — It seems to me that the word "or" should not be used because it might lay the text open to the interpretation that some force which possessed cadres but was without equipment or armaments would come under the terms of the article.

The President. — I think that the question is now clear. We are all agreed as to the meaning which should be attached to Article C. If that is so, I may take it that the proposal which I made concerning a question of drafting, i.e., to replace the word "et" in the French text and "or" in the English by a comma, will be accepted.
M. Sokal (Poland). — In order to be entirely clear, this trifling amendment should be adopted, subject to M. Massigli’s interpretation.

The President. — That was my interpretation. M. Massigli took it up and Count Bernstorff confirmed it.

M. Sokal (Poland). — I should like a further explanation. I understand that M. Massigli’s proposal should be interpreted as follows:

“ The Conference must decide which condition or conditions must be taken into account in order to determine the nature of a formation organised on a military basis.”

The President. — Subject to this observation, I think we might now pass on and not waste any more time on discussing the question of a comma.

M. Rutgers (Netherlands). — I accept the amendment as interpreted by the President.

The amendment was adopted.

53. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article D.

Article D.

By “mobilisation” within the meaning of the present Convention shall be understood all the measures for the purpose of providing the whole or part of the various corps, services and units with the personnel and material required to pass from a peace-time footing to a war-time footing.

The President. — In connection with this article, we have an amendment submitted by the German delegation, proposing to add, at the end of the article, the following words:

“ It shall also include the organisation of the reserve units and services.”

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I withdraw this amendment.

54. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article F.

Article F.

Each of the High Contracting Parties may, within the limits fixed by the tables relating to land armaments in Article A, and, should the conditions affecting its security so require, modify the distribution of the said forces between its home territories and overseas territories. Any modification in this distribution shall be shown in the annual statements of particulars, the preparation of which is provided for in Article IA of Chapter V below.

The President. — In connection with this article, we have a radical amendment submitted by the Soviet delegation, proposing that the entire article be omitted.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — This amendment was explained on a previous occasion, when we were dealing with the question of dividing forces between home countries and overseas territories. It was then pointed out that the security of countries adjacent to various overseas territories demands that forces stationed in such territories should be fixed and that no redistribution of those forces should be allowed. Otherwise, countries which are adjacent to overseas territories would find themselves in a very disadvantageous position. They would have their numbers limited without the possibility of changing those limits, while adjacent overseas territories could at any moment have their numbers increased. It is for this purpose that we have proposed the deletion of Article F, thus preventing Colonial Powers from redistributing their forces between the home country and overseas territories.

I think the proposal also meets the desires expressed by the Turkish delegation.

Munir Bey (Turkey). — I associate myself with the Soviet amendment for the same reasons as those which I gave in connection with the distinction between home forces and overseas forces.

I would add that cases in which security necessitated a certain redistribution of forces might be provided for in Section III, concerning exceptions.

The President. — I think that, in view of the adoption of the headings of the tables referred to in Article A, there is no object in retaining Article F, and we might meet the wish of the Soviet delegation by omitting it altogether.

If there is no objection, I shall assume that the Commission agrees to delete this article as superfluous.

This proposal was adopted.
55. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article E.

Observations and Reservations.

This Article has not been discussed in connection with naval and air effective.

"When drawing up the tables mentioned in Articles A (Chapter I) and IA (Chapter V):

(a) By 'effectives in service in the armed forces' shall be understood the average daily effectives reckoned by dividing the total number of days' duty by the number of days in the budgetary year;

(b) By 'effective in service in the formations organised on a military basis' shall be understood the actual effectives, e.g., the actual number of men shown up to the time of their discharge from active service or during their periods of training, in the statement of effectives which determines grants of every kind for these effectives, including men who, for any reason whatever, are absent from the units to which they are allocated."

The President. — In the text which we adopted at the first reading, there is a note in the margin saying:

"This article has not been discussed in connection with naval and air effectives."

In view of the fact that the question of naval effectives has been postponed and that of air effectives has been reserved pending agreement which we are expecting at an early date, we can only discuss Article E in relation to land effectives.

In regard to this article, we have before us a proposal submitted by the British delegation to replace the whole of the text by a new draft, with the object, I understand, of omitting the distinction between effectives in service in the armed forces and the effectives in service in the formations organised on a military basis.

The text proposed by the British delegation is as follows:

"When drawing up the tables mentioned in Article A (Chapter I) and IA (Chapter V), by 'effectives in service in the armed forces' and 'effectives in service in the formations organised on a military basis' shall be understood the average daily effectives reckoned by dividing the total number of days' duty by the number of days in the budgetary year."

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — I should like to explain that my main reason for wishing to make this change is that in the English text — I do not know whether this is the case in the French text — sub-paragraph (b) is entirely unintelligible; it would, I think, in any case be better drafting to combine the definitions in the way I propose. There is no reason why the two classes should not be combined in one sub-paragraph, and subjected to the same definition.

General De Marinis (Italy). — The Italian delegation entirely agrees with the views of the British delegation and considers that there is no reason to provide two definitions. It would observe, moreover, that the second definition is somewhat confused, whereas the first is very clear, and, if the first is sufficient for armed forces, it should surely be sufficient for forces organised on a military basis.

M. Massigli (France). — I am prepared to accept the British amendment, but must maintain one provisional reservation until the question of the methods of calculating air and naval effectives has been finally decided.

The President. — This reservation is of course implied. The same applies to Article H. This article has been accepted by the delegations which had made reservations at the first reading, on the understanding that their consent remains subject to an agreement on naval and air effectives.

M. Sokal (Poland). — I am not opposed in principle to the British amendment, but I am bound to say that the system of calculating the effectives in service in the armed forces and the effectives in service in the formations organised on a military basis err on the side of simplicity. The Polish delegation can accept this method of calculation, provided that there is an opportunity of comparing the various systems of military organisation, which differ from the general system on which this distinction is based, i.e., the normal system of conscription. I suppose such an opportunity will arise during the Conference itself. In the case of conscript armies organised according to the methods generally accepted, this very simple method of calculation may be adopted without much difficulty and without producing misleading results. But we must recognise that there are other organisations which depart considerably from the normal system and in respect of which any calculations based on the formula provided in Article E might give absolutely erroneous results.

For the present I will say no more. When the Conference meets, we shall have an opportunity of comparing the various systems and of arriving at practical conclusions.
The President. — The observations of the Polish delegation will appear in the Minutes.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I should like to ask a question in order to be perfectly clear as to the scope of Article E. In calculating the number of effectives in service according to the proposed formula, will the effectives who are en disponibilité and the reserves in training be included when calculating the average daily effectives? It appears to me that effectives who are in reserve and undergoing their period of training are effectives in service during the period referred to. I think that the Commission should register a decision on that point.

M. Massigli (France). — I have not the least difficulty in giving satisfaction to Count Bernstorff on this point. There is no doubt whatever that men who are undergoing training of any sort, even if they are only undergoing twenty-four hours’ training, must be reckoned among the average effectives.

In this connection, I would observe that, if in the earlier discussions more consideration had been given to this fact, we should have attached less importance to the question of trained reserves; we did not wish to limit the number of reserves, but there is no doubt that the trained reserves called up for a period of training will be limited by the operation of this article.

The President. — I think the explanation given by M. Massigli will allay all doubts regarding the true meaning of this article, which is really perfectly clear, since it makes no distinction between the various categories.

If there is no objection, I will regard the British amendment as adopted.

M. Westman (Sweden). — Are officers included among the effectives in service in the armed forces?

The President. — We adopted yesterday the new nomenclature proposed by the French delegation. Henceforth, therefore, there can be no doubt as to the meaning of this revised Article E.

The British amendment was adopted.

The President. — Before going on to the next article, I should remind you that the German delegation proposed an amendment relating to the definition of the expression “overseas forces”. This amendment has already been discussed in connection with Article A, and, as the Commission came to a decision on the subject, I see no reason why we should revert to it now.

56. Discussion on Chapter I, Effectives, Article I.

Article I.

Observations and Reservations.

This Article has not been discussed in connection with naval and air effectives.

The delegation of France declares that the clauses of this Article must apply in the same conditions to land, naval and air effectives.

The President. — In regard to this article, I should like to make the same general remark as in connection with Article E. It was not discussed at the first reading with reference to naval and air effectives, and from that point of view it must be reserved until those two questions have been settled. We will therefore consider it only so far as it concerns land forces.

M. Massigli (France). — Anxious though I am to facilitate the discussion, I feel in regard to this article, which deals with a general principle, that it is absolutely impossible to discuss the article as it affects land forces without bringing in naval and air forces. The article must be discussed as a whole. We can postpone the discussion if you prefer it, but I do not think we can partially settle a question of this kind. We must have a complete solution applicable to all effectives. Personally, I am not prepared to discuss the matter at present, unless it is to be discussed as a whole.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I had something to say about the annual contingent, but, if you decide to postpone the whole discussion, I will make my statement later. It is, of course, for you to decide. I understand that M. Massigli has proposed that the whole discussion should be adjourned.

M. Massigli (France). — I proposed either that it should be taken as a whole now, or else that it should be adjourned, but that in any case it should be taken without reservations.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — Referring to what I said yesterday, I should like to remind you that, as the name of the Commission implies, we are concerned with purely preparatory work for the Conference, which we desire to see convened as soon as possible. At the same time we must not forget that we ourselves have decided that our work must be such as to
enable the Conference to make appreciable reductions. We leave to the majority the complete responsibility for the preparatory work, but that work must not be of such a nature as to exclude the possibility of appreciable reductions. It is for that reason that I wished to speak on this article.

In Article I, it has been laid down that, in each country having the conscription system, the total period of service which the annual contingent is compelled to serve shall not exceed the figure accepted. There we are mentioning two essential factors in disarmament — the duration of service and the annual contingent.

May I remind you of what Baron Rolin Jaequemyns said on April 29th? "It is quite possible, under the system of conscription, to effect reductions by diminishing the annual contingent and at the same time reducing the length of service." I am in agreement with the principle put forward by Baron Rolin Jaequemyns, and I should like to explain my view of the question in detail.

The reduction of the period of service cannot in itself be regarded as an effective means of reducing armaments. If you continue to give military training to all the able-bodied men in a country, the number of trained men who are available in case of war is in no way reduced by any reduction in the period of service. It will always be necessary to consider whether the reduction of the period of service produces such an effect on training that it is possible to speak of an effective reduction in the value of the training given.

That idea was spoken of on March 26th, 1927, by the British delegate. He said:

"If you are going to say that your forces will still be thoroughly efficient fighting machines, you will not have done much in the direction of disarmament by that means alone."

I entirely agree with that view. The fact that, for instance, there is only one class with the colours instead of perhaps two as formerly cannot be regarded as a serious step towards disarmament. This reduction of the effectives with the colours can, to a great extent, be compensated for by increasing the number of persons who are engaged for a longer period than the legal period of service, and by replacing all soldiers who are employed in administrative duties, etc., by civilian employees. In that way, all the men can be used for actual military service alone.

The value of the training given is influenced, to a certain extent, by the reduction of the period of service, but only if the latter is brought below the period necessary for elementary training. Apart from the increase in the intelligence of recruits, the extent of the pre-military training of young men, and the continuation training after the end of their service with the colours, are factors of decisive importance. If you wish to judge the effect of the reduction of the period of service as a step towards disarmament, you must always ask yourselves how far the disadvantages due to the reduction in the period of service have been compensated for by special measures. In attempting to decide whether the reduction of armaments has taken place, I can only regard as decisive factors the number of effectives with the colours and the length of the period of service.

I would like to say here and now that, in this connection, the German Government will also attach the greatest importance to the question of material. If the actual reserves are not to be directly reduced, then it is possible to reduce the material, which is an essential condition for the utilisation of reserves at the opening of a war. We shall return to this point when Chapter II comes to be discussed.

The decisive factor for the reduction of the armaments of an army having compulsory military service is the size of the annual contingent. I was glad, therefore, to hear Baron Rolin Jaequemyns, when speaking of the possibility of disarmament for an army with compulsory service, refer in the first place to the reduction of the annual contingent.

If any real reduction is to be made in the armaments of armies with compulsory military service, I think it is essential that there should be a material reduction in the annual contingent, and that the figures laid down for that purpose should not be exceeded by the contracting parties.

For that reason I propose that paragraph 1 of Article I should read as follows:

"In each contracting State having the conscription system, the annual contingent and the total period of service which the annual contingent is compelled to serve shall not exceed the figure accepted by each of the High Contracting Parties."

I have also proposed that the length of the period of service with the colours and the length of the periods of training should be shown separately. I think that is necessary because the training given to the annual contingent depends on the duration of the period of service with the colours, whereas the perfecting of the training of the reserves depends on the duration of the periods of training. The following is the text I submit:

"For each man the total period of service shall be the total number of days of active service and of days of service during the periods of training which he undergoes. The period of active service shall be shown separately."

"No register shall be kept of persons whose military obligations are terminated."
It would seem that he and I are agreed on the principle that, under the conscription system, reductions can be effected both in the contingent and in the period of service. Count Bernstorff goes further, however, and concludes that a State with a conscript army which has adhered to the Convention would not be free to reduce either the duration of service or the size of the annual contingent without reducing, ipso facto, the effective calculated in accordance with the Convention, i.e., the number of "ration days", as M. de Brouckère expressed it.

Obviously, if a State with a conscript army desires that reductions should be made, both in the contingent and in the period of service, it can do it, but the undertaking resulting from the Convention is quite definite and concerns the number of days served with the colours.

If, at a given time, we should reduce the period of service, that does not mean that this internal measure in any way affects the undertaking we have given under the Convention. It is possible that, without wishing to reduce the strength of our army, we might decide by a purely internal measure to reduce, for instance, the period of service, but at the same time to increase the number of men with the colours. The total number of days served with the colours would remain unchanged, and we should be adhering to our engagement.

If, on the other hand, after a certain time, we wished to go farther — to go beyond our undertaking — we could always do so, but in my view it is unnecessary and indeed irrational for the signatory Powers to be bound to do so under the Convention.

The President. — The exchange of views on Article I clearly shows what a complicated question this is. We have been asked to adjourn consideration of this article until it can be dealt with in relation both to land forces and to naval and air forces.

I think that, for the sake of getting on with the work, it would be well to agree to this request for an adjournment; otherwise there is some danger that we may waste a lot of time without reaching agreement.

If nobody objects, therefore, I shall decide that the discussion on Article I as worded in the draft Convention, with the amendment proposed by the German delegation, is adjourned until the question comes to be dealt with as a whole. I should add that there is the following Article J, submitted by the Soviet delegation:

"The High Contracting Parties agree to reduce appreciably in each class the number of persons with military training and of officers who have received their military training either in the army or outside it."

Agreed.

57. Discussion on the Future Work of the Commission.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — It is true we had submitted an additional Article J, dealing with reserves, but this has already been disposed of.

I should like, however, to turn to a point of procedure. At the beginning of this session we were informed by the President that an agenda consisting of fourteen points had been drawn up by the bureau. It has been agreed that the order of the items may be changed in the course of our work. So far, we have more or less adhered to the order in the agenda. I should like to know if we are going to exhaust the whole of the agenda or whether any points will be left out, to get an approximate idea of how long we may have to stay in Geneva.

Then we have adopted a procedure for presenting amendments in writing. It will be necessary for us to know beforehand which items will come up at the next few meetings, in order that we may prepare amendments on the chapters to be discussed, otherwise we may prepare amendments which will not be discussed until a later session. Will the bureau inform us of the order of the work — at least for the next two or three meetings?

The President. — M. Litvinoff's question anticipates what I was intending to say, and I propose to announce the order of our work for the immediate future. We are now at the end of the second reading of Chapter I. We have still two paragraphs of Article H to deal with. I hope that the second paragraph may be discussed to-morrow; the question is whether the amendment submitted by the French, Italian and Japanese delegations can be accepted or further amended by other delegations, notably those of the United States and British Empire. When this question is settled, we shall still have paragraph III of Article H, which, in accordance with the wishes of the Japanese delegation, has been adjourned to next Friday's meeting. When that is done with, we shall have finished with Chapter I, as Article I is adjourned to a later date. We shall then go on to Chapter II, Section I, "Land Armaments", on which we shall have to discuss the very important question of material in stock. Then we shall go on to Section II, "Naval Armaments". I do not know whether this section will give rise to lengthy discussions, but, in any case, we must expect a certain number of statements to be made. After that we shall hardly be able to go any farther, because we should still have to deal with Chapters III and V, and the bureau estimates that we should require at least ten meetings for these chapters.

Accordingly, it seems more sensible not to prolong the present session of our Commission, but, after dealing with the chapter on Naval Armaments, to adjourn the session to a later date.
In any case, the bureau contemplates summoning another session of the Commission before this year's Assembly, but on this latter point certain delegations may wish to make proposals as to the choice of a date. The essential point I want you to realise is that the bureau thinks that, after we have gone into the matter of material and, as far as is at present possible, into the question of naval armaments, the present session ought to be adjourned to a later date.

That being so, we should to-morrow come to the end of our study of Chapter I and go straight on to Chapter II, which deals with material.

Before closing the meeting, I have some information to give you. You will remember that a few days ago we left it to the bureau to find out how satisfaction could be given to the various delegations which had made proposals or reservations. This applied particularly to the Chinese delegation in connection with its proposal for the abolition of conscription. The bureau has gone into the matter and is of opinion that the best way of satisfying everybody would be this. A report will be produced, as was done at the third session in 1927. The report will consist of three parts. First, there will be the text as it comes through the second reading; next there will be an analysis of our work to show what was the intention in amending or adding to certain texts; and, lastly, there will be a third part stating the reservations and declarations made by the delegations, so that everybody will be put on an absolutely equal footing. This arrangement should satisfy all concerned.

Lord Cushendun (British Empire). — You have been good enough to give us a rough outline of the procedure for the continuation of this session and for future sessions. I suppose we can take it that this is entirely provisional? It occurred to me that there were one or two suggestions which you put forward which would require a great deal of preparation and possibly discussion, and I venture to express the hope that the bureau will not come to any fixed decision without taking the Commission into their confidence.

The President. — In reply to Lord Cushendun I should like to say that my remarks just now were merely suggestions on the part of the bureau. It is understood, naturally, that no final agenda will be fixed for our future work until the Commission has been given an opportunity of expressing its views.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — I was going to ask you, Mr. President, the same question as Lord Cushendun, but you have answered my question in advance.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics). — I should like to know in what form the Soviet draft Convention is going to be referred or submitted to the Disarmament Conference.

The President. — I think I gave an adequate reply to that question just now, when I explained the lines on which, subject to the Commission's approval, the bureau proposes to draw up the final report on our work. The report will consist of three parts. The first part will be the text of the draft Convention as adopted after the second reading; the second part will be a summary of our work to show the intention of such changes as have been made in the 1927 text; and the third part will contain the reservations and declarations made by the various delegations. No distinction will be made among the delegations; they will all be placed on an absolutely equal footing.

(The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.)
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58. Discussion on Chapter I, Effective, Article H (continuation).

The President. — You will remember that yesterday we reserved Article H, paragraph 2, in regard to which certain delegations were to agree upon and submit a new text. A new text for Article H, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, has been proposed by the delegations of the United States, the British Empire, Canada, France, Italy and Japan. It reads as follows:

"The said tables shall further fix a maximum number of soldiers, other than officers, who may have completed more than 2 years of actual service with the colours.

1 This figure will be determined by the duration of the longest period of actual service with the colours which is in force in the conscript armies of the High Contracting Parties at the time of The signature of the Convention."
“The number of men of the class mentioned in the preceding paragraph who are actually with the colours shall be shown annually for each High Contracting Party in the statements for the preparation of which provision is made in Article IA of Chapter V.

“In conscript armies the number of men whose service exceeds the legal period in force in their respective countries but is less than 3 years, shall be shown for each High Contracting Party in the annual statements for which provision is made in Article IA of Chapter V.

I think that, after the long discussions which took place yesterday and the very fortunate agreement which has been reached between a number of delegations, the Committee may accept this text without discussion.

Count Bernstorff (Germany). — In view of what I have said during the past few days, I will not attempt to prevent the majority of the Commission from settling this question as they think fit. Pending the decision, however, I will merely repeat that, while I do not oppose this settlement, I still maintain that the only equitable solution would be to define the long-service effectives by the laws of each individual country; that is to say, to regard as such the effectives who engage for a period of service longer than that laid down by law in the country in question.

The President. — Count Bernstorff’s statement will, of course, be recorded in the Minutes. If there are no further observations, I shall consider that the Commission accepts the text proposed.

The proposal was adopted.

M. Massigli (France). — Before we close the discussion of Article H, I should like to propose an additional clause of an optional character. As the text has not yet been circulated, I will not ask the Commission to vote on it immediately if there is any opposition, but I trust my proposal will meet with none.

The discussions which have taken place during the past few days have shown the great importance attached to the separate classification of men who, through their long period of service, have acquired special military value. We have even classified, from the point of view of military returns, another category of soldiers who have served for longer than the period prescribed by law.

In order to ascertain the military situation of a country, there is another category of men whom it is important to classify. I refer to men who, according to the laws and regulations of the various countries, are not yet trained soldiers. These recruits, of course, come under the general limitation prescribed in Article A. There is no question of their escaping limitation; nevertheless, it may be desirable, for purposes of information and publicity, to show the number and size of these special categories. For that reason I propose the following addition to Article H:

“Every country will be entitled, if it desires, to show, for purposes of information, in a separate column of the publicity Table IA of Chapter V, the number of untrained recruits under the terms of the national law who are included in the effectives of its armed forces.”

I repeat that this clause would be optional; nobody would be bound to give this information. The clause affects almost every army, especially conscript armies, in which the proportion of recruits is higher.

The President. — In the interests of the good order of our proceedings, I would observe that the proposal in question will be distributed very shortly, and not until then will the Commission be asked to examine it in detail and take a decision.

General De Marinis (Italy). — Although you have said, Sir, that it would be preferable to wait until this text has been distributed before entering into a detailed discussion, I am prepared to give my own view about it immediately.

I personally think that this is a perfectly reasonable proposal. If it were accepted, our publicity tables would reflect the true position as regards the military strength of a country. Moreover, the proposal is entirely consistent with the ideas I put forward the other day, and I therefore gladly accept it.

Since I am addressing the meeting, I should like to make a request to the bureau. It has always been the custom in our Commission to distribute the texts accepted by the Commission to the delegations as and when they are adopted. They can, of course, be found in the Minutes; but it would be better to have a complete text, as has always been done.

The President. — I may say in reply to General de Marinis that his wishes are entirely in conformity with the intentions of the bureau. The reason why the texts have not hitherto been distributed is that the discussion has been a very complicated one and a considerable number of texts have not passed the stage of drafts. Very few of them have been finally accepted. There is, however, nothing to prevent our having a statement drawn up of those texts which have been discussed, showing those which have been finally adopted and those which are still held over. This will be done immediately and the statement will be distributed to delegations.

1 See Footnote on preceding page.
59. Discussion on Chapter II, Material Section I, Land Armaments.

The President. — Gentlemen, we have for the present finished with Article H, and accordingly with Chapter I. I would point out that we shall be obliged to return to Article H to take up again the text which has just been proposed by M. Massigli and supported by General de Marinis; after which we will resume consideration of the former paragraph 3, as soon as the Japanese delegation informs us that it is in a position to discuss it.

We now pass to Chapter II, Section I, Land Armaments, the text of which is as follows:

**Observations and Reservations.**

The delegation of the United States of America makes a general reservation on the failure to include provisions for the limitation of material both in the hands of forces serving with the colours and reserve material of land and air forces.

**CHAPTER II. — MATERIAL.**

**SECTION I. — LAND ARMAMENTS.**

The delegation of Italy and Japan make a general reservation as regards limitation of material proposed in Article TA (German draft).

The High Contracting Parties agree to limit the maximum material of their land forces in service and in reserve to the figures fixed in Table... annexed to the present Convention.

**Article TA.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(German Draft.)</th>
<th>(French Draft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The delegation of Italy and Japan make a general reservation as regards limitation of material proposed in Article TA (German draft).</td>
<td>In each of the Contracting States, the total expenditure on the upkeep, purchase and manufacture of war material in the strict sense of the term, for the duration of the present Convention, shall be limited for the land, naval and air armaments to the respective sums fixed in Columns X, Y and Z of Tables 1. ... (Home forces and formations of the home country organised on a military basis) and ... (Overseas forces and their reinforcements and overseas formations organised on a military basis) annexed to the present Convention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The said sums shall be divided by the number of years for which the present Convention is to remain in force, and, in each of the Contracting States, the annual expenditure on the upkeep, purchase and manufacture of war material in the strict sense of the term shall not exceed the figure laid down for each year; nevertheless, sums not expended during one year may be carried forward to the following year and added to the sums fixed for that year.

1 The tables referred to correspond to the model statements provided for in the report of the budgetary experts. Their definitive form depends on the final conclusions of these experts.

As you see, they take the form of two different proposals, one submitted by the German and the other by the French delegation.