

The debate, which began on the 5th September, may be followed in the *Journal*. It was of a general character, and did not give rise to any arresting speeches, as did last year's motion regarding the Protocol of Geneva of 1924. There were references to the Paris Peace Pact, which some speakers contended deprived war of its legality. M. Politis, delegate for Greece, to whom the Assembly always listens with marked attention, maintained that the Pact strengthened the League and completed the Covenant, particularly those provisions directed to the maintenance of peace. He contended that it filled the gap in Article 15 of the Covenant, and embodied the essential principles of the Protocol of Geneva outlawing wars of aggression, although it was true it did not render arbitration compulsory. The Lithuanian delegate, however, maintained that the Peace Pact made it incumbent on the members of the League to amend the Covenant, or, in his words, "to adapt the Covenant to the present conditions of positive international law." To this end he introduced the following motion, consideration of which was postponed to the next Assembly:—

"The Assembly—learning with deep emotion that the United States of America and several States members of the League of Nations signed a Pact for the renunciation of war on August 27th, 1928, in Paris; noting that several other States members or non-members of the League of Nations have already acceded to the said Pact; recognizing that the acceptance of the Pact for the renunciation of war by the members of the League of Nations goes further than their obligations in this respect contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations and supplements them, thus necessitating changes in the fundamental provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations; recalling the Assembly resolution of September 24th, 1927, condemning wars of aggression—requests the Council to initiate an inquiry into the amendments which should be introduced into the Covenant of the League of Nations on the above-mentioned lines, and to submit these amendments to the Assembly at its next ordinary session."

Mr. Mackenzie King emphasized the good will existing between Canada and the United States, which eliminated fear of aggression, and permitted the common frontier to remain undefended.

In regard to disarmament, on the other hand, many speakers were pessimistic, although the Netherlands delegate thought that the naval understanding between Great Britain and France would facilitate the work of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission.

A tribute was paid to the Economic Committee for the way in which it had approached the consideration of certain tariff questions raised as a result of the Economic Conference: it was clear that the Committee realized that tariffs were a national and not an international matter. In this connection one speaker protested against the attitude on tariffs adopted at the Economic Conference, the principles of which, in his opinion, made no differentiation between a high- and a low-tariff country. He also protested against the outlook which favoured the present geographical distribution of industry, leaving to countries not industrially developed the task of producing food.

As is usual, a number of motions were introduced in the course of the debate: one from the Portuguese delegation, referring to the Sixth Committee the annual reports of the Mandatory Powers and other documents dealing with mandates distributed since the Assembly of 1927; one by the Dutch delegation, referring to the Third Committee that part of the report and of the supplementary report of the work of the Council and of the Secretariat which deals with the question of the reduction of armaments; one (subsequently referred to the First Committee) standing in the names of several delegations, having as its object the revision of the Statute of the Court of International Justice (Document A. 48); one (also referred to the First Committee) introduced by the Swiss delegation, recommending the Council to consider whether it would not be desirable to submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion the question whether the Council or the Assembly can by a simple majority request an advisory opinion under Article 14 of the Covenant; and yet another, introduced by the delegation of Salvador, expressing the hope that the Council would exert its influence with States members of the League with a view of facilitating the holding of a Conference in the spring of 1929 regarding the supervision of the private manufacture and publicity of the manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war.

The debate closed on the 11th September with a speech by Lord Cushendun, the British representative, devoted to disarmament. He began with a sympathetic reference to the observations of those who had deplored the slowness of the progress made by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, but pointed out that a resolution of the Assembly could accomplish nothing, for, since there could be no method of disarmament common to all, progress could only be made by a discussion of difficulties and of the efforts for reconciliation on points of difference. Further, he emphasized the point that the Covenant left to the judgment of individual States the level at which national armaments should suffice. In this connection he laid stress on a condition of things which was not appreciated as it should be: with the old implements of warfare one knew where one stood—they were designed for war and for nothing else; but nowadays one had to cope with aircraft and chemicals, both of which played their part in peace, but could, unfortunately, be adapted for fighting purposes. Was it, however, desirable to restrict their production for peace purposes?

Although the Preparatory Commission had not made the progress hoped for, in spite of agreement on many points, it did not follow that disarmament was stationary. In support of this he quoted sets of figures for July, 1914, and the present time, showing very considerable reductions in the personnel and tonnage of the British Navy. He alluded to the efforts to reconcile the British and French points of view regarding the limitation of naval armaments, which had resulted in an agreement. He deplored the attitude of those critics who imputed to countries motives which existed only in the minds of the critics themselves—motives founded on suspicion and distrust—and he asked nations to display greater confidence in one another. He concluded with a happy reference to the Kellogg Peace Pact as being in harmony with the work of the League, and as representing the faith of to-day and the hope of to-morrow. The Pact, in his opinion, opened up a new era of hope, although he felt it necessary to utter a warning that nations should not give way to disappointment if the results of the signing of that Pact were not immediate or spectacular.