

The three model treaties referring to Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance were discussed and adopted by the Committee. The treaty of Mutual Assistance, the agreement having the widest compass, combines non-aggression, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and mutual assistance. It does not, however, and in this way it differs from the Locarno Pact, provide for a guarantee by third States, or the maintenance of the territorial *status quo*. Some delegations, notably those of Roumania, of Poland and of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, maintained that the Treaty of Mutual Assistance erred in this respect, that it did not go far enough, and that an article similar to that contained in the Locarno Pact, should be added, providing for the case of flagrant violation. M. Paul-Boncour (France) agreed in principle with this view, but he did not press the point as, generally speaking, the Committee was not in favour of the inclusion of the Locarno Clause.

The collective and bilateral treaties of non-aggression are intended for States seeking further safe-guards in the matter of security, but unwilling to incur obligations of mutual assistance.

As a natural corollary to all of the above conventions and treaties, a resolution was passed inviting the Council to inform States that, if requested so to do by one of the parties to any of the agreements, it (the Council) would "be prepared to place at the disposal of the States concerned its good offices which, being voluntarily accepted by them, would be calculated to bring negotiations to a happy issue."

The Council subsequently gave effect to this resolution.

The Third Committee, realizing the importance of the security guarantee afforded by accession to the Optional Clause of Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, drafted a resolution, urging States to accede, with reservations if necessary.

The Canadian representative on the First Committee, Hon. R. Dandurand, went one step further and advocated the insertion, at the end of the proposed resolution, of a request to the States which have not yet acceded to the Optional Clause that they indicate the questions of international law, the elucidation of which would facilitate such accession.

The amendment proposed by the Canadian delegation was adopted.

(c) *The Study of Articles 10, 11 and 16 of the Covenant*

In September, 1927, the Assembly, when providing for the establishment of the Committee on Arbitration and Security, laid down as one of the tasks of the new Committee "the systematic preparation of the machinery to be employed by the organs of the League of Nations with a view to enabling the Members of the League to perform their obligations under the various articles of the Covenant".

The Committee on Arbitration and Security began with the study of Articles 10, 11 and 16, and M. Rutgers (Netherlands) was asked to prepare a memorandum, which was discussed in detail by the Committee at its second session, held in February-March, 1928.

Some of the conclusions of M. Rutgers' report follow:—

- (a) It would be inadvisable to draw up a rigid and complete code of procedure for the League in times of emergency but it is both feasible and desirable to indicate the possibilities offered by the different articles of the Covenant, and the ways they might be applied, without expressing any opinion as to the particular methods which might be required in a particular instance. The task of the League is primarily to maintain peace and *prevent* war. Hence the application of repressive measures should only take place after preventive measures have failed.