

limited in some way or another the disarmament treaty would be very little better than a sham. He thought that very largely the object which the British Government had in presenting the resolution to the Committee had been attained, as the subject had been ventilated. Fair warning had been given to everybody of the British Government's attitude in these matters. In the circumstances he did not think it would be right to press his motion to a division. M. Politis thought that the resolution would be defeated, but as to this, he was not sure. He thought that he might win, but what would be the use of winning by a narrow majority? He did not think that relations would be embittered as a result of a vote favourable to him, but relations would certainly not be improved. Under the circumstances he withdrew his resolution and accepted M. Politis' resolution.

When the resolution was being discussed later before the Assembly, Lord Cecil, who was the only speaker besides the Rapporteur, took occasion again to make his attitude clear. The British Government's critics had attributed strange motives to his action in submitting that resolution. Some had maintained that its purpose had been to delay disarmament, others, to injure certain military Powers. Both charges, equally inconsistent, were equally far from the truth. They were hysterical nonsense. Lord Cecil's object in moving his resolution had been plain and open. He had desired to draw the attention of the Preparatory Commission to certain principles on which disarmament ought to proceed. Lord Cecil referring more particularly to the question of material stated that the next war would be almost, if not quite, as fatal to victors as to vanquished. But no permanent form of peace would be possible unless armaments were reduced and limited. That was the attitude of the British Government towards the Assembly and towards the peoples of the world.

Later the Council instructed the Secretary-General to communicate the resolution to the Members of the Preparatory Commission together with the minutes of the plenary meetings of the Assembly and those of the Third Committee at which the question of disarmament was discussed.

The present outlook for future disarmament appears to be as follows. After the Naval Conference which will take place in London during January, very probably the Preparatory Disarmament Commission will be convened to meet sometime before the Eleventh Assembly. If an agreement is reached in the Preparatory Commission, it will be possible for the Assembly to set the date of the Disarmament Conference for some time in 1931. In addition, the Committee on Arbitration and Security will meet, at a date not yet fixed, in order to dispose of the following questions which were referred to it by the Assembly: financial assistance to States victims of aggression, Model Treaty to strengthen the means of preventing war, communications affecting the working of the League in times of emergency, and the facilities to be granted in times of emergency to aircraft engaged in transport of importance to the working of the League.

2. Draft Convention for Financial Assistance to States Victims of Aggression.

At the request of the Ninth Assembly, the Financial Committee prepared a complete and detailed draft Convention, which was examined, with great thoroughness, by the Third Committee. In fact, the Committee devoted much more time to this subject than to the debate on Disarmament and the Work of the Preparatory Commission.

There are two distinct aspects to Financial Assistance, one financial, the other political. Sir Henry Strakosch, a member of the Financial Committee, in his pamphlet, "A Financial Plan for the Prevention of War," has explained in such clear and brief terms the purpose, the structure and the application of