

The two above agreements, one positive, the second negative, were due largely to the fact that the Delegations of Great Britain and the United States announced that, as they were not particularly interested in land armaments and, by implication, in land armies, they would leave the solution of these problems to the nations which considered these armaments and armies of vital interest to their national safety.

When the Third Committee met it found itself called upon to express an opinion upon the work of the Sixth Session of the Preparatory Commission. Lord Cecil, representing the British Labour Government, disagreed entirely with the decisions taken by the Preparatory Commission in the matter of trained reserves and the limitation of land armaments, and it was evident, from the very outset, that he would do all in his power to have the discussion reopened before the Preparatory Commission.

France, Italy, and Japan were satisfied with the *status quo*, and would have preferred that the Third Committee express approval of what had been done already and that, when the naval problem had been elucidated by conversations or a Conference, the Preparatory Commission should meet again to dispose of naval armaments and other pending matters, but not to go over the ground already traversed.

Lord Cecil, in search of a solution, decided to present a resolution, the effect of which was to centre the attention of the Third Committee on the moot points and ultimately, he hoped, to have these points reconsidered by the Preparatory Commission. As practically the whole of the discussion before the Third Committee centered round Lord Cecil's resolution, it is given here in full:—

“The Assembly,

“Being convinced that a progressive and general reduction of armaments is urgently needed throughout the world.

“Expresses the hope that the Preparatory Commission will finish its labours at the earliest possible moment.

“And considers that in completing the Draft Disarmament Convention it should consider how far the following principles have been or ought to be adopted:—

“(a) The application of the same principles to the reduction and limitation of personnel and material whether in land, sea or air forces.

“(b) The limitation of the strength of a force either by limiting its numbers or its period of training or both.

“(c) The limitation of material either directly by enumeration or indirectly by budgetary limitation or by both methods.

“(d) The recognition of a competent international authority to watch and report upon the execution of the treaty”.

It is curious and worthy of note that the representative of one State, by submitting a resolution, can sometimes impart to deliberations, the special tone and character which he wishes: before the Third Committee the matter of disarmament in general was not discussed *per se* but always in relation to the Cecil resolution. It was difficult, if not impossible, for Lord Cecil to propose something the effect of which would have been to nullify the Preparatory Commission's decisions. Indirectly, however, he hoped to succeed by enumerating certain general principles which, according to him, could be considered in completing the draft Disarmament Convention. Sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) above would have permitted the re-opening of the whole discussion on trained reserves and the limitations of land armaments. France, Italy and Japan were strongly opposed to this course: among other Delegations which joined forces with them were the Netherlands, Poland, Roumania and Jugoslavia. The following, however, were favourably disposed towards the Cecil Resolution: the German, Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, Hungarian, Austrian, Chinese and Canadian Delegations.