

than had been accomplished in the Committee on Arbitration and Security. Before the Committee on Arbitration and Security several Delegations, including the French, Polish, Roumanian, Czechoslovakian, Yugoslavian and Chinese, insisted that their Governments could not promise to carry out blindly the Council's instructions and recommendations unless a complete and definite system of supervision and of sanctions was incorporated in the Convention, the object of which would be to ensure that other States also obeyed the Council's injunctions, whether of a civil or military character. These Delegations considered not only that supervision and sanctions were essential but, moreover, that the Convention should enumerate the consequences which a transgressing party would incur if it violated the measures recommended by the Council and went so far as to assimilate such violation to an unprovoked aggression involving recourse to war under Article 16 of the Covenant. Other Delegations—notably the British, Italian, Japanese, German and Dutch—did not favour an obligatory imposition by the Council of supervision and sanctions.

The same deadlock occurred in the Third Committee.

The German and British Delegations, sponsors of the scheme, were anxious to produce a Convention, but the general atmosphere was not conducive to success.

The Delegate of France repeated the position taken up by the French Government since the beginning of the discussion on this question. The French Government had always believed that no measures of the sort provided for in the Model Treaty would be effective unless it were possible to supervise their execution, and to declare that the State which omitted to carry them out was to be regarded as an aggressor. All measures would be executed by the country which was acting in good faith, but its opponent would be able to profit by those very measures and continue to arm and to manoeuvre, whilst the country which acted in good faith would be unable to resist and might meet certain defeat because it had obeyed the recommendations of the Council.

The Canadian Delegate (Sir Robert Borden) was not sure that this country would be heartily in accord with the Convention. Canada would be prepared to undertake not to take prejudicial action during the Council's mediatory action, and she would rejoice indeed to see other Members of the League give similar undertakings. But he was not anxious to increase the measure of sanctions. He thought that the value of the League of Nations to the world rested on something transcending any effort to provide sanctions. He would not be prepared to give assent to the proposal involving strict supervision and sanctions. On the other hand, he did not see that there was any ground for criticism of the other proposal, although even in respect of that proposal he would find it necessary to reserve the right of the new administration, which had just come into power in Canada, to consider carefully all its effects. In short, he did not think that Canada would desire to become subject to any contractual or moral obligation not already set forth in the existing Covenant to undertake the enforcement of sanctions.

The British Delegate (Lord Cecil) expressed disappointment at the French expression of opinion and appealed to the Delegation to soften its attitude towards supervision and sanctions.

It was decided finally to appoint a special Committee composed of the Chairman, the Rapporteur and the Representatives of Great Britain, France, Germany, The Netherlands and Czechoslovakia, in order to see if it would not be possible to conciliate the divergent views. This special Committee met and discussed the problem, but no appreciable advance was made towards a solution.