

disarmament did not represent supplementary proposals to the Convention, but were designed rather to replace those in the Draft in many decisive points. And he made this statement because the terms of the resolution by which the Draft Convention was accepted were not entirely satisfactory to the German Government, though Herr Nadolny did, after discussion, give it his support, at the same time making it clear that the Draft, as a framework, could not be considered a rigid one.

The resolution in question was proposed by Sir John Simon, and read :—

“The General Committee resolves to carry on its discussions within the framework of the Draft Convention, full liberty being reserved to all delegations to develop their own proposals in subsequent debate, and to move their amendments in the form of modifications, additions, or omissions at the appropriate point.”

This resolution was adopted unanimously, but it should be added that the Soviet delegate also made it clear that he did not consider the Convention as entirely satisfactory. M. Litvinoff complained, in fact, that as a framework it was not wide enough, while some of its parts would have to be removed and new ones put in.

The Soviet delegate had given notice, on the day the general discussion ended, of his intention to bring forward a resolution aimed at forcing the Conference to face the question as to whether it was really going to discuss disarmament or not. He wished to have it made clear, once and for all, whether the other Governments represented were for disarmament or not, and on the following day, February 25th, he moved in the General Committee that the Conference should “base its work on the principle of general and complete disarmament.” Only the Turkish and Persian delegates supported him, however, and after an unsuccessful attempt at intervention by the Spanish delegate (with a view to reconciling Sir John Simon’s and M. Litvinoff’s motions), the Committee came back to the British delegate’s original formula, which was adopted, as already described.

Of more importance was the next move made by M. Tardieu, and it was quite unexpected. On the appointment of the General Committee the election of a Chairman was proceeded with, the two candidates being Mr. Henderson and M. Politis, who was put forward by the delegations of France and the Little Entente. On Mr. Henderson being elected M. Tardieu at once proposed that there should be a separate Committee to deal with political questions. It had been generally expected that the semi-political problems, such as security and arbitration, would be debated in the General Committee, and it was now also objected that discussions of these questions might be duplicated if the French Premier’s proposal were adopted. Sir John Simon stated, however, that he would agree to the appointment of a political committee provided this did not mean that political questions would be transferred from the General Committee, and he eventually persuaded Herr Nadolny not to