

made that the sanctions provided for in the first three paragraphs of Article 16 should be applied against the Soviet Union, and all the speakers who referred to these provisions held that these clauses relating to sanctions were inoperative in present circumstances. Although the exclusion of a Member State is a matter for the Council alone to decide, any delegation was free to express their opinion of what the Council's decision ought to be.

Before the meeting of the Assembly the Foreign Ministers of Argentina and Uruguay had telegraphed to the Secretary-General taking the position that the Soviet Union should be expelled. On December 13 the Argentine Delegate, M. Freyre, gave at a Plenary Session of the Assembly a lengthy review of the attitude of his Government. After declaring the continued faith of the Argentine Government in the ideals of the League and referring to the position which they had assumed in other cases of aggression, he said that, though the League had lost all coercive force, there was still one gesture which it could not refuse to make unless it was prepared to resign its functions in a spirit of suicidal defeat—that gesture was the exclusion from its midst of a Member who had repudiated without the slightest scruple the essential principles of the League. He concluded by stating that the Argentine Republic could no longer consider itself a Member of the League as long as the Soviet Union was able to claim that title.

#### *Adoption by Assembly of Special Committee's Report*

The report of the Special Committee was considered by the Assembly at a Plenary Session on December 14. The first speaker was *M. da Matta* (Portugal) who strongly condemned the Soviet action in Finland and previous Soviet activities in Spain and Poland; he supported the position taken by the Argentine delegate and expressed the hope that the Council would expel the Soviet Union from the League.

*M. Tello* (Mexico), after expressing the sympathy of his Government with Finland, said that he supported the report of the Special Committee and the draft resolution but could not approve the expulsion of the U.S.S.R. from the League; he regarded this as an extreme sanction which had not been applied in previous cases of aggression; its adoption would prevent a settlement later being reached within the framework of the League.

*Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan* (India) in an eloquent speech gave a careful review of the history of the dispute stage by stage and noted that not one word had been said during the proceedings in defence or mitigation of the action of the Soviet Government; paying a tribute to the Finnish people, he pointed out the moderation of the Finnish request for assistance even in the time of her anguish; he urged the passage of the resolution.

The Delegate of Ecuador also spoke in favour of the adoption of the resolution.

*M. Rappard* (Switzerland) read a declaration of the Swiss Federal Council expressing sympathy and admiration with Finland and stating that the Swiss delegation would abstain from voting on the resolution solely because of the decision of the Council in May, 1938, recognizing the complete neutrality of Switzerland within the framework of the League. *M. Rappard* added that the Swiss delegation was convinced that the assistance of the technical services of the Secretariat in the organization of assistance to Finland would not involve any activity incompatible with Swiss neutrality.

*M. Champétier de Ribes* (France) said that *M. Paul-Boncour* would speak in the Council on the Finnish question and its relation to the general situation