

already drawn attention to one of the great difficulties. The League had not intervened last year when the Greeks were victorious, which did not make it easy for the League to intervene now that the Turks were victorious.

Action must be left to the council. There was no desire that the council should take action which would add to the difficulties of the situation, and it was vital that the League should do nothing to injure its chances of success if, in the event of the failure of the present negotiations, it became the duty of the League to mediate. There was a phrase in the resolution presented by Mr. Fisher which was open to misconstruction, particularly by the Turks. It was said that the League should intervene at the request of the negotiating Powers. Was it intended that Turkey should be included among those Powers? The resolution would not be so understood. He could not admit the principle that the League could only act on the invitation of a group of Powers acting outside the League, and directing the League to take or refuse to take particular action. Such a principle was inadmissible on general grounds, and in this particular case would go far to destroy the League's chance of usefulness. The League should act as a great international body, independently and of its own initiative.

He did not consider that there was any objection to accepting the resolution of Dr. Nansen as it stood.

M. HANOTAUX (France) felt it was necessary to avoid the appearance of anticipating a failure in the negotiations which were then proceeding. The first results of the negotiations in progress had promised well for the future. It would suffice to lay down that the council should vigilantly watch the position, and hold itself ready to assist. For this reason he approved the proposal of Mr. Fisher.

THE MARQUIS IMPERIALI (Italy) said the discussion had shown that everyone was agreed on the substance of the question. He agreed completely with the formula submitted by Mr. Fisher and approved by the French representative. This formula brought the duties of the League of Nations into harmony with the requirements of the situation. It would facilitate the work of peace.

M. RADEFF (Bulgaria) said that Bulgaria was happy to see the sphere of action of the League of Nations enlarged and its prestige increased. He hoped that negotiations would be conducted in a way that would enable account to be taken of all the interests at stake. Bulgaria was particularly interested in the solution of the Eastern question, for there were Bulgarian elements in the regions whose destiny had to be decided, and Bulgaria, disarmed by the treaties, was a country adjacent to these regions, where war might at any moment break out. Whatever might be the course of events, Bulgaria would not depart from a loyal neutrality, but, as she was not in a position to compel respect for her neutrality, she was placed in an unhappy position. She hoped that peace would be restored, if necessary with the assistance of the council, whose intervention could not cause anxiety to anyone.

M. G. STREIT (Greece) pointed out that Greece had accepted offers of mediation in 1921, and proposals for an armistice in March 1922. Greece had kept faith at the cost of great sacrifices, because of her duty towards the Greeks, Armenians and all the oppressed populations of Asia Minor. He thanked his colleagues, particularly the delegates of Persia and South Africa, for their efforts on behalf of peace. The declarations of the representatives of the three Great Powers promised well for the future. Greece had confidence in the result of the negotiations, and in the possible intervention of the council.

VISCOUNT ISHII (Japan) noted that virtual agreement had been reached. There was no difference of opinion as to the object to be achieved, and the difference in regard to the steps which should be taken did not go very far. He thought that it might meet the various views which had been put forward if a sentence were added to the resolution submitted by Mr. Fisher, expressing confidence that the Council of the League would take all proper measures, justified by the circumstances, with a view to giving effect to the unanimous desire of the assembly for the prompt establishment of peace.

Mr. FISHER (British Empire) said he thought the committee were agreed that there should be no interference with the negotiations which were proceeding for the settlement of the Near East. There was, however, a desire that the League should intervene if it could usefully do so, either while the conference was in progress or if the negotiations should break down. There was a difference of opinion as to whether the League should await the invitation of the interested Governments. He agreed