

he thought, to get all the Members of the League to agree that in the case of any violation they would not allow the aggressor State to obtain, within their territories, cash, credit, war material or the other elements necessary for the carrying on of war. This was a somewhat different plan from that before the Committee, and it did not involve the difficulties which had arisen during the discussion of the draft Convention now before them.

Sir Muhammad Habibullah (India) stated that the Indian contribution towards the expenses of the League was large, and hoped for the day when it might be reduced. He made it plain that, if India assented to the draft Convention, it would be on the distinct understanding that any contribution she might be asked to make should not be based upon her contribution at the time of her entry into the League, but on the actual contribution she might be paying at the time the liability arose.

M. Sandler (Sweden), although favourable in principle to the draft Convention, believed that in the case of a general conflagration the ingenious machinery of the draft would not work.

General Tanczos (Hungary) stated that Hungary could only continue to balance the budget so long as her financial position did not become worse. For that reason the Hungarian Government could not for the time being accept any Convention that might involve her in additional commitments.

Sir Granville Ryrie (Australia) was the only Delegate to say categorically that he was opposed to all financial assistance, both in the case of war, and in the case of threat of war.

In addition to the general discussion, which is summarized above, some of the points of political interest which held the attention of Delegations were:—

- (a) Should financial assistance be given only in case of war, or in case of threat of war as well? Should the Council be empowered to make the Convention operative without consulting the other signatory States?
 - (b) Should the operation of the Convention be linked up with, and be dependent upon, the general Disarmament Convention?
 - (c) For what decisions, under the Convention, is the unanimous vote of the Council necessary, and for what decisions does a simple majority suffice?
 - (d) What authority is to settle disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention?
- (a) Should financial assistance be given only in case of war, or in case of threat of war as well? Should the Council be empowered to make the Convention operative without consulting the other signatory States?

Most of the Delegations, among which were the Japanese, German, Danish, Norwegian and Hungarian, were opposed to the application of financial assistance in cases of threat of war: only the British and Netherlands Delegations favoured the extension of the plan to a threat of war.

M. Munch (Denmark) thought it would be difficult for the Council to surmount the difficulties raised by the operation of the Convention in the case of such a threat. He need not stress the difficulty, so often discussed, of deciding which of the States in conflict threatened the other. There were other difficulties. If the Council in such a situation declared that one of the parties to the dispute was threatened by the other, and must be helped financially, it would obviously lose the possibility of mediating between the States in question. If, on the other hand, the Council first tried to reconcile the two States and only applied financial assistance after mediation had failed, this financial help would by then have lost a great deal of its value.