

Powers must come to an agreement. It was his intention to ask the Governments of France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan and the United States to instruct their representatives to meet him shortly in Paris or elsewhere, in order to discuss this important problem before the next meeting of the Preparatory Commission. He undertook not to delay in summoning the new session as soon as an agreement had been reached after this private conversation with the representatives of the five naval Powers, but he could not venture at the present moment unless instructed by the Assembly, to convene another session of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission.

Lord Cushendun expressed grave doubt as to the acceptance by his government of M. Loudon's suggestion of a private meeting of the great naval powers, as it seemed to propose that the reconsideration of the Washington Conference set for 1931 should be antedated. All the Powers mentioned by M. Loudon were signatories of this Convention.

The consensus of opinion was in favour of leaving to the President of the Preparatory Commission the responsibility for fixing the date of the next meeting of the Commission, and a wish was expressed that such meeting might take place early in 1929.

(b) *Pacific Settlement of International Disputes: Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance*

One of the duties of the Committee on Arbitration and Security was to enquire into the various means of "promoting, generalizing and co-ordinating special or collective agreements on Arbitration and Security." It was felt that such agreements, if signed, would constitute a safeguard which would engender a feeling of security, and that, as a consequence, nations might consent more readily to disarm.

The Arbitration and Security Committee, after three sessions, the last of which was held from the 27th June to the 4th July, 1928, presented to the Assembly drafts of Conventions for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, and of Treaties of Mutual Assistance and Non-Aggression. These Conventions and Treaties were discussed by the Third Committee and also by the First Committee, to which they were referred for an opinion on their legal aspect.

Of the six model Conventions dealing with the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, three were general conventions, and three bilateral.

It had always been considered that a link between the three general conventions was indispensable, but a decision as to the method of connecting them was deferred. A joint decision was reached by the First and Third Committees in September, when it was decided to draft a General Act, embodying the three former General Conventions. In this General Act there are four chapters. The first three reproduce the distinctive features of each of the former General Conventions to which they correspond, while the last comprises the general provisions of all three Conventions.

The General Act has been made as elastic as possible. It may be acceded to as a whole or in part: signatory States may make reservations and limit the extent of their obligations. Moreover, generous allowance is made for denunciation, complete or partial. As soon as it is accepted by two States or more, it will take on the nature of a General Convention which will remain open indefinitely for future accessions.

The three model Bilateral Conventions for Conciliation, Arbitration and Judicial Settlement were also retained. In this way no preference was expressed for either of the two tendencies shown in the Committee on Arbitration and Security, where some delegations favoured general, while others advocated particular conventions.