

agree. As time went on there would perhaps have to be some method of adopting progressive sanctions from time to time, but surely there was something—perhaps with regard to a financial sanction or the arms embargo—that could be announced to the world tonight in order that it might be known that the League was taking some action.

M. MOTTA (*Switzerland*) could associate himself on behalf of his country with the statement made by the Argentine representative. M. Titulesco however had objected to that view of the matter. It was important to avoid any misunderstanding. M. Motta was aware that several delegates considered that the 1921 resolutions no longer had the importance which they were intended to have because they had been drawn up in relation to certain amendments which had not been accepted. The 1921 resolutions would thus remain a dead letter.

It was true that, on October 4th, 1921, the Assembly had had before it certain amendments concerning the economic weapon. Certain countries had accepted them, while others had opposed them. Consequently those amendments had not come into force, but, on the other hand, the resolution interpreting Article 16 was intended to remain as a guiding rule for the Assembly and the Council. It had been devised precisely to fit the case of the amendments not coming into force. It should not be said, therefore, that the one depended upon the other, but that a choice must be made between them.

Everyone realised that Article 16, as it stood in the Covenant, was full, as it were, of explosive material. The 1921 Assembly had endeavoured to render the application of that Article more reasonable. The resolutions adopted by it were not, of course, absolutely binding on the Members of the League, but there was no doubt that they alone could provide the guiding line for the action to be contemplated by the Committee. That interpretation was confirmed by a draft circular letter reproduced in Document A.14. of 1927, in which it was stated that those guiding principles held good provisionally, i.e., so long as no change was made in Article 16 in the form of an amendment.

M. TITULESCO (*Roumania*) failed to see the practical purpose of the present discussion. If the 1921 resolutions held good, the Committee need express no opinion on them, and if they had ceased to exist, practical work must not be impeded by a discussion for the formulation of the rules to be followed. Each country could be guided in its action by its unfettered sovereignty and by the 1921 resolutions if they still existed.

The CHAIRMAN read resolution No. 1, adopted on October 4th, 1921, the text of which was as follows:

"1. The resolutions and the proposals for amendments to Article 16 which have been adopted by the Assembly shall, so long as the amendments have not been put into force in the form required by the Covenant, constitute rules for guidance which the Assembly recommends, as a provisional measure, to the Council and to the Members of the League in connection with the application of Article 16."