

After two days' debate, the Italian representative, in support of his contention that the scheme put forward by the ex-neutral States was inadequate presented one of his own. The Italian proposal was that each Government should undertake for a period of one year dating from November 1st, 1931:—

(a) Not to increase the expenditure on *land forces* already authorized for the current financial year, and not to exceed the total of such expenditure during the next financial year until the expiry of the truce;

(b) Not to place any *warship* on the stocks, provided always that vessels under construction might be continued and completed;

(c) To suspend the construction of additional military *aircraft*, except to replace machines which are placed out of commission during the truce.

The Italian proposal contained a more precise idea than the neutral Powers' resolution. Its greater precision consisted in transforming the proposed recommendation by the Council into a definite declaration by the Governments, and in giving definite form to the limitation to be carried out in regard to the three kinds of armaments—air, land and sea.

In the ensuing discussion it became clear that some preferred the recommendation, while others preferred the declaration. Some desired a general form of obligation and others a precise and technical form of limitation.

The Canadian delegate, Senator Beaubien, endorsed the principle incorporated in the resolution of the five neutral states and the declaration proposed by Italy. In the circumstances, Canada was not committed to either of the proposed methods of effecting the suggested truce, but deeply concerned in disarmament, she was willing and anxious to help to its conclusion by all means at her disposal. "If the nations failed to stop the progressive increase of armaments," he asked, "how could reduction be envisaged as a possibility at the impending Disarmament Conference?"

Canada was very deeply concerned in this most vital problem of the League. Petitions already covered by hundreds of thousands of signatures actually were being circulated throughout Canada, requesting a limitation and reduction of armaments. These petitions would be presented to the Disarmament Conference.

The Committee strove to combine the advantages of the different proposals. This method proved successful, for, on September 28th, the Third Committee adopted unanimously a compromise text which the following day received similar approval from the Assembly.

The resolution adopted incorporates the idea of a truce—a truce in armaments for a period of one year—and the idea of a moral undertaking, to which all States will be invited to subscribe. The formula is sufficiently elastic to allow States to adapt these ideas to their own individual practice.

Certain delegates made a point of stating explicitly that they did not regard the normal carrying out of legal enactments relating to effectives, the regular execution of programs for the upkeep and renewal of land, naval, or air material, or fortifications and the constitution of the corresponding stocks as incompatible with their undertaking to accept a truce in armaments.

Improvement of Means of Preventing War

The Third Committee succeeded in establishing the final text of a Convention to improve the means of preventing war which are placed at the Council's disposal by the Covenant of the League of Nations.

In virtue of Article 11 of the Covenant, in the case of threat of war, the Council may take conservatory measures, but it can only take them by a unanimous vote of its members, and subject to the agreement of the parties to the dispute. While this condition of unanimity obviates the risk of a