

(b) Should the application of the Convention be linked up with and be dependent upon the general Disarmament Convention?

Practically all Delegations were unanimous in agreeing that it would not be practicable to endeavour to put into force the plan for financial assistance until a general Disarmament Convention had been concluded. As a matter of fact, as pointed out above, general and unqualified support was not given to the financial assistance proposal, and it appeared that in some cases Delegations insisted upon linking it up with the general Disarmament Convention, in order to shelve it at least for the time being.

M. Munch (Denmark) believed that an essential condition for the putting into force of the draft Convention was that the reduction of armaments, contemplated in Article 8 of the Covenant, should be carried out in a satisfactory manner. If the Committee wished to adopt the Convention immediately as it stood, the Danish Delegation would raise no objection, but would be unable to sign it until it formed part of a series of agreements giving effect to the stipulations of Article 8 of the Covenant and thus increasing the guarantees of a lasting peace.

Lord Cecil did not think that the British Government would be prepared to take part in the Convention unless its coming into force were made dependent on the adoption of a scheme of reduction and limitation of armaments.

(c) For what decisions under the Convention is the unanimous vote of the Council necessary, and for what decisions does a majority vote suffice?

In general, the Delegations favoured the unanimity rule in all decisions falling under Article 1 of the Convention, that is, the actual giving of financial assistance to States victims of aggression.

Lord Cecil thought that this rule of unanimity was one of the best safeguards against the misuse of the Convention.

The draft Convention proposed to exclude from the vote of the Council the representatives of States "involved in the war or threat of war". This latter disposition raised strong protest. M. Lange (Norway) wondered what States would not be involved in a threat of war, and insisted that the suspension of the right to vote would have to be limited, in conformity with the rule laid down in the Covenant, to Members who were actual parties to the dispute: this view was accepted by everybody.

(d) What authority is to settle disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention?

Various proposals were submitted, in an attempt to solve this question. The draft Convention suggested that "any dispute as to the interpretation, or as to the method of application of the present Convention shall be settled by a decision of the Council of the League of Nations." M. Lange, discussing this text, said it was contrary to all principles to make a party judge in any dispute in which it was itself involved. The Norwegian, Netherlands and Portuguese Delegates proposed that disputes should be referred to the Court of International Justice for settlement by summary procedure—with the exception, of course, of decisions taken under Article 1 involving the putting into operation of financial assistance. The Portuguese Delegate suggested, in addition to the Court of International Justice, the reference of disputes to the decision of the Assembly, but he received no support, as it was realized that the Assembly did not meet often enough and in any case was too unwieldy a body for this purpose. The Chairman of the Financial Committee, in reply, stated that the Financial Committee had not considered an appeal to the Permanent Court of International Justice because it