

of the Commission. Referring to point (a) of the resolution, he considered that the same principles had been adopted, as regards personnel, for land and air forces, and he had no doubt that the Preparatory Commission would adopt the same conditions for the limitation of naval effectives when that chapter was reached. As regards material, he could not follow Lord Cecil. The three categories of material—land, naval and air—had appeared hitherto to be too different to be governed by the same principles. Referring to point (b), he said that limitation by numbers had been adopted, but that it had seemed difficult to the Preparatory Commission to limit the periods of military service without also limiting the periods of service in the naval and air forces. That point would be dealt with, he thought, at the next meeting of the Preparatory Commission. M. Loudon appreciated Lord Cecil's motives in submitting point (c). At its meeting of the 4th May last, after considerable discussion the Preparatory Commission had adopted by twenty-two votes to two, with one abstention, a draft Resolution submitted by the Delegations of France and the United States of America, to the effect that the "limitation and reduction of material must be sought by means of publicity". This decision, born of a spirit of accommodation on the part of States which originally favoured diametrically opposed solutions, could not be discarded without re-opening a discussion which was bound to revive differences of opinion: it would be perilous to follow such a course unless all States were now in agreement, which did not seem to be the case. Point (d) dealt with the creation of a competent international authority which would supervise the execution of the Convention: this question had not been disposed of by the Preparatory Commission, which meant to treat the matter at its next Session.

M. Massigli (France) agreed with M. Loudon, and reminded the Committee that the Preparatory Commission had already settled some of the points raised in Lord Cecil's resolution: there was a mountain of minutes to prove it, and the recommendation was therefore pointless. The texts drawn up by the Commission were compromise texts, framed after long discussion, and then recast and reshaped. The Commission had decided eventually to accept them because in the present state of affairs they seemed to be the only texts that might lead to a solution. In answer to Lord Cecil's appeal for France's co-operation, he reminded Lord Cecil of what he (M. Massigli) had done before the last Session of the Preparatory Commission. He had made an appeal for budgetary limitation of material, but his lead had not been followed. Should he then have said, "There is no agreement, so we must stay where we are?" He had compromised, and he thought that the Commission had realized the spirit in which he had done so. It was quite true that since then one of the Governments (the British) represented on the Commission had changed its attitude, but was that a sufficient reason for asking the Commission to reopen the whole question? It would be a very dangerous precedent to set, because no Government was eternal.

Count Bernstorff (Germany) shared Lord Cecil's opinion, and thought that the nations were dissatisfied with the progress made in disarmament. He recalled his statement that there seemed to be no disposition to reduce land or air forces, and that a Convention established on this basis would only afford an illusory solution which the German Government could not accept. The type of Convention recommended by the Preparatory Commission would really resolve itself into a Convention of mutual assistance against disarmament for ten years (or whatever number of years was set for the duration of the first convention). Germany was of the opinion that a convention worthy of the name should deal with four points: effectives with the colours, effectives in reserve, material in service, and material in stock. The German Government did not see why trained reserves should be left out of account in a disarmament convention, nor why the total duration of military service could not be reduced, the number of reserves limited, and their period of training shortened.