

of the world; he only wished to say in the Assembly that the French delegation supported the resolution and to pay a tribute to the spirit of collaboration and understanding shown in framing it.

*Mr. Butler* (United Kingdom) said that the report and resolution had the full support of the United Kingdom delegation; they contained practical suggestions for aiding Finland, and set forth the guilt of the aggressor in an indictment which could not be more formidable or more conclusive. The sober narrative of the report provided an interesting contrast with the propaganda spread about in certain countries, the technique of which was becoming as familiar as the technique of aggression. The aggression against Finland was the latest link in the chain of aggression in Europe, following the German attacks on the Czechs and Poles. It had aroused the indignation of almost every country in the world; it was significant that the resolution authorized the Secretary-General to enlist the co-operation of Non-Member States. That part of the resolution promising aid to Finland followed the principles advocated at the last Assembly by the United Kingdom delegation, that there should be no automatic obligation to apply sanctions even when a breach of the Covenant had been established; the obligation would remain, however, to consult with other Members and to take what steps were possible to aid the victim, each State being the judge of its own participation. Mr. Butler assured the Assembly that the Government of the United Kingdom, despite the heavy burden imposed on them by the war, would not excuse themselves from helping Finland as much as possible; certain steps had already been taken to provide the Finnish Government with material. The second part of the resolution invited the Council to draw the obvious conclusions from the report. The Soviet Union had openly flouted the Covenant. Although the integral fulfilment of the obligations of the Covenant was made difficult by the absence of important States, the Members remained the guardians of its principles and standards to the fullest extent in their power.

*Mr. Gralinski* (Poland) said that his country had a special right to make her voice heard. The Poles and the Finns had fought a bitter struggle for freedom. Finland was an example of a well-governed country and a model member of the international community. She was now the victim of barbarous aggression. Poland, which was the first country to have the courage to oppose the march of terror and destruction, could not fail to sympathize deeply in the time of her own martyrdom. The Polish Government supported the resolution and had no doubt that the Council would refuse to tolerate the presence of the Soviet Union in the League. The help of free nations for Finland would be help in the continuing struggle against aggression and barbarism.

The delegates of the Netherlands and Belgium declared their understanding that the authorization given in the resolution to the Secretary-General to lend the aid of the technical services of the Secretariat to help in organizing aid for Finland should not be considered as a collective action of the League of Nations; subject to this observation they would vote for the resolution.

*Mr. Unden* (Sweden) made a declaration on behalf of the Swedish, Danish and Norwegian delegations. He stated that these countries had collaborated closely with Finland in a firm resolution to keep apart from all alliances and groups of great powers. The aggression against Finland had nowhere aroused deeper emotion than in the other Northern countries, which could confirm that part of the report setting forth the efforts of Finland to avoid a dispute with the Soviet Union. The three delegations declared that they made every reservation in so far as the resolution involved any measure coming within the scope of the system of sanctions. They expressed the profound conviction that Finland would regain peace with her independence and liberty unimpaired.