

Dr. Dollfuss (Austria), who was received with a spontaneous outburst of applause, spoke on Austrian independence with a calm deliberation that expressed his determination to preserve it. Austria was determined to follow the path of independent existence and economic development, counting on the friendly co-operation of the other Powers and appealed to the League to encourage her efforts by its high moral authority. This involved not merely the economic consolidation of Austria, but the economic reconstruction of the Danube Basin.

The Hon. R. J. Manion, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, made a plea for greater speed in the work of disarmament. He did not wish to minimize the accomplishments of the League of Nations in various fields of international co-operation; but it was important to distinguish between its primary and secondary functions, as contemplated in the Covenant. The main objective of the League was to preserve peace among the nations of the world and, at the present time, the conclusion of a disarmament convention was the most important aspect of this task. In this connection, every effort should be made to dissociate armament making and private profit. The question should also be considered whether there had not in the past been too much insistence on security as a preliminary to disarmament, and whether, if an advance could be made in the direction of disarmament, progressive security would not follow. In any case, until the nations accepted in principle and adopted in practice the view that war as a method of settling international disputes should be outlawed and such disputes settled by pacific means, civilization would be in danger of complete destruction.

Sir Brojendra Mitter (India) drew attention to the League's achievements during the year, referring particularly to the undramatic but beneficent work of the Health Organization at Singapore, the expert assistance to Siam in connection with the development of its harbours, and the League's co-operation in technical matters with the Chinese Government. He alluded to the increasing boldness of the League's detractors but thought their criticism would carry more weight if they had any alternative machinery to suggest.

A sense of disillusionment in the efficacy of the League as a certain factor in the preservation of peace pervaded the speech of Dr. Wellington Koo (China). The events in Manchuria were evidently the prime cause of this disillusionment. Dr. Koo feared that so long as "this glaring case of Covenant breaking" was not settled in accordance with established principles of international law and existing treaty obligations, it would remain a stumbling block in the path of new international agreements for economic and military disarmament.

Jonkheer de Graeff, the Netherlands delegate, referred to the problems presented by the large number of German nationals who had during recent months taken refuge in neighbouring countries and were adding to local unemployment. Without interfering in German domestic matters or inquiring into the reasons why these German citizens had fled, he urged that it was a problem which fell within the province of the League. He therefore proposed a resolution requesting the Council to take the necessary measures for instituting a system of international collaboration.

It seemed to M. de Madariaga (Spain) a sign of political anarchy that, while the Council and the Assembly had been trying to settle grave dissensions and the Disarmament Conference had been trying to bring about a reduction in armaments, arms had been supplied to the countries in conflict. The value of arms exported in the world between 1920 and 1930 had amounted to \$616,000,000. Critics said the League had failed, but it had not yet been tried. It was necessary to return to its essential principles.

Replying to M. Mowinkel, M. Paul-Boncour (France) said the peoples had suffered so much from the effects of force that they would trust the League if the League had confidence in itself. Not force, but the procedure of the League