

Opinions of a similar nature were expressed by other speakers, but the main interest centered on the speeches of the Austrian and German delegates on the one hand, and the French and British on the other. The burden of Mgr. Seipel's remarks was that the method of dealing with the question had shown the inadequacy of the means at the disposal of the League. The Peace Treaties, which had forced some countries to disarm, had also promised general disarmament; owing, however, to the great development of the technical resources available for fighting, the general state of armaments was at the present time much more formidable than that which existed before the war, and this constituted a permanent danger. He would ask the Assembly not to be satisfied with dilatory resolutions, but to take a step forward, so that the prestige of the League would not be lowered.

The German Chancellor, Herr Müller, protested that, although the Preparatory Commission had been meeting for nearly three years, it had not yet been possible to tackle seriously the work assigned to it. He pointed out that a disarmed Germany was particularly affected by any discussion on disarmament; that the German people were often reproached, on the slightest pretext, with threatening the peace of the world while other nations continued to increase their armaments without opposition or hindrance. He pleaded that the nations fulfill the promises made when it had been agreed that the disarmament of Germany should be followed by a general disarmament, and he urged the Assembly to decide definitely to convene a Disarmament Conference to complete the work of the Preparatory Commission.

To the two preceding speeches both M. Briand and Lord Cushendun replied. M. Briand pointed out that, while Germany had disarmed, she still had an army (numbering 100,000) of a special kind, composed largely of officers, which formed a *cadre* for a much larger army, and that, in the face of this, disarmament could not be said to be complete. Moreover, Germany was a highly industrialized country, and industrial equipment might well be employed for war. While not wishing to imply that any one had doubts of Germany's will for peace, he did not wish to preclude the question whether her special talents, her remarkable resources and her constructive genius would suddenly vanish into thin air if they had to be applied to armaments. As an example of the injustice of the charge that France along with other countries had not made progress in disarmament, the French Foreign Minister mentioned the agreements made at the Washington Naval Conference, the Franco-British naval accord, and the reduction to eighteen months (with a probable future reduction to one year) of the term of military service in France.

Lord Cushendun, while sympathizing with the German Chancellor, thought that the latter had failed to appreciate the difficulties before the Preparatory Commission. It was impossible to express in terms of military value the respective power of troops, ships, and aircraft; and in addition each State had special interests; while the differences in constitutional development and geographical situation added to the difficulties. Further complications arose if one considered the enormous increase in the use of aircraft and gas for commercial purposes, so that the problem was by no means a simple one. The fact that the British Navy had decreased its strength by some 43,000 men, had scrapped 239 warships, and had closed two arsenals was sufficient answer to the charge of increased armament. Lord Cushendun also referred to the Franco-British Naval agreement.

Mr. Mackenzie King referred to Canada as a land of reconciliation in which two races who had fought on the plains of Abraham were now living together in perfect harmony with each other and with their neighbour to the south. By means of the agreement concluded in 1818, competitive armament had been