

on the one hand, that they had no wish to infringe the most-favoured-nation principle, their efforts being directed solely towards securing a temporary and limited exception, which they claimed was urgently necessary.

The latter replied, on the other hand, that there were enough forces at work encouraging discrimination without the League lending a hand. The League must seek ever to secure equal rights for all and special privileges for none. It would be most unfortunate that the first efforts of that institution to help agriculture should be such as would divide agriculturists instead of uniting them. Further, security for the European food supply came from the overseas surplus-producing countries. The policy of discouraging overseas production might easily destroy such security.

As a result of this diversity of opinion, the Second Committee thought it preferable not to commit itself on the matter of preference for European-grown cereals. It decided simply to take note of the report drawn up by the Commission of Enquiry for European Union.

Similarly, when asked to implement the recommendation of the Commission for European Union that the possibility of extending preference to agricultural products other than cereals, such as tobacco, raisins, etc., should be considered, the Second Committee observed that the proposed extension had equally given rise to anxiety on the part of certain delegations.

Again, if the Committee agreed with the Economic Conference of 1927 and the Commission for European Union that the development of international agreements might reduce the risk of over-production and exercise a beneficial influence on the organization of industry, agriculture and trade, it took great care to point out that these agreements might, on the other hand, involve certain dangers. They might tend, for instance, to create monopolies and crystallize unsatisfactory existing conditions. The Committee therefore urged that the interests of consumers should not be disregarded nor States be left without means of protecting themselves against an influence which might become too powerful. Any combine should be able to improve its processes and give the economic life of the various countries legitimate scope for expansion.

In the discussion the following commodities were mentioned as being likely to fulfil most satisfactorily the conditions for the purpose of cartelization: cereals, wine, cork, hemp, coal, wood, paper, artificial silk, leather, hides and skins, electrical material, motor cars and chemical products.

The labour aspect of the crisis was not overlooked. The Committee thought it desirable, in order to lessen unemployment, to contemplate the execution, in the immediate future and on an international scale, of large public works. The problem, it noted, had already been approached by the Commission for European Union, and the competent organs of the League were dealing with it. The Assembly was invited to take the necessary steps with a view to examining the various programs submitted to it.

Realising the connection between economic policy and peace, the Committee expressed the view that the study of economic tendencies liable to influence world peace initiated by the Economic Conference of 1927 should be pursued, account being taken of the Soviet proposal for a Pact of Economic Non-Aggression.

As regards the proposals put forward in the Committee regarding the closer co-operation of national economic councils in the work of the League, the Committee noted a suggestion that this aim might be achieved by a suitable modification of the existing Economic Consultative Committee.

The Second Committee also approved the final draft of a Convention for the regulation of whaling. This Convention was immediately signed by South Africa, Australia, Canada, Great Britain, France, India, New Zealand and Norway. The entry into force of the Convention is subject to the ratification