

necessary to examine the whole matter with technical assistance. They, therefore, intended asking the Council to defer its study of the general part of the report until its next session (in May).

Sir John Simon concurred. The proposal for financial assistance to Austria and Hungary raised questions of great importance and the Government could not go to Parliament and ask for powers without being first convinced that further loans were really the most desirable way of meeting the difficulties.

Herr von Bülow argued that distressed countries should be made independent of foreign aid. He considered the difficulties in London had been grossly exaggerated and he wished to refute this.

THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.

April 11th.—The Conference resumed its work and in the General Committee, before beginning the discussion of Article 1 of the Draft Convention, Mr. Henderson made a statement reviewing the progress made up to the adjournment in March. He enumerated the Governments which were in favour of the abolition of submarines, heavy artillery, tanks and other aggressive weapons, and said there seemed to be a general desire for the prohibition of chemical warfare.

Mr. Gibson made a statement in which he asserted that the question of security was founded on fear of invasion, and security could not be restored until defence regained the superiority over attack which it possessed in former times. He accordingly moved that tanks and mobile guns of over 155mm. (6.2 ins.) should be prohibited altogether and the use of gases abolished. He also pointed out the financial saving which would result, as heavy guns cost about £90,000 each.

Sir John Simon welcomed the proposals, but noted that they were limited to land warfare. Corresponding questions in the range of naval and air armaments would have to be considered, and when questions of air bombardment came up it would be important to determine whether the practical course was to direct attention to the machine or to the act, and whether they might not have to consider bombing from the air as a suitable object for international regulations in view of the difficulties in classifying machines. He concluded by saying, "Remove these instruments of attack and you remove fear which is the parent of insecurity."

The German and Italian delegates welcomed the American proposal, but M. Tardieu claimed that the French plan had gone much further. It was difficult to study such a proposal by itself, owing to the interdependence of all armaments. Nor had any provision been made for supervision or sanctions. He accordingly proposed that as the Committee was at present only concerned with procedure the American resolution should be referred to the Bureau of the Conference and dealt with later in conjunction with all the qualitative proposals.

April 12th.—Continuing his examination of the American proposal, M. Tardieu said that the Preparatory Commission had declared that all arms could be used for an offensive. A State attacked must pass to a counter-offensive to defend itself effectively and it must possess technical means of offence, otherwise the victory would remain with the aggressor. Even the American proposals needed control and sanctions to remove all doubt as to their being observed. Neither capital ships nor heavy artillery had existed in Europe in 1905, but there was no feeling of security then. The French proposals had been more thoroughly studied and were more effective than suppression pure and simple. France would agree to the "humanisation"