

of action taken by the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property to secure (1) deposit of ratifications and (2) accessions to the convention before the closing-date, 1st July next. The Council approved the Secretary-General's suggestion (see Document C. 141, 1938) that he communicate with the States concerned.

CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

The question at issue was the fixing of a date for the meeting of the Bureau of the Conference which has not been called together since May, 1937. On the recommendation of the Rapporteur, the representative of Iran, the Council decided that the Bureau should meet in September next during the session of the Assembly. For further information I refer you to the report, Document C. 167, 1938, IX.

APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE COVENANT.

This matter has been dealt with so fully on past occasions that any lengthy account of the proceedings in the Council during its one hundred and first session is unnecessary. Representatives of Chile have always taken a prominent part in debates on the subject and they have been persistent advocates of the elimination of certain Articles of the Covenant which they have described as "dead flesh needing surgical operation," and of the need for universal membership of the League. The representative of Chile, M. Edwards, was invited to the Council table when the matter came before the Council in public session on the morning of the 11th May. As is known, certain reports of the Committee set up by the 1936 Assembly to deal with the Application of the Principles of the Covenant are to be considered by the next Assembly, and therefore it was difficult to suggest what action the Council might appropriately take. Between now and September the atmosphere may clear and it may then be possible to make some progress on a matter which has been under consideration for nearly two years.

M. Edwards delivered a long speech, which is fully reported in the minutes, the closing passage of which I will quote as an indication of the attitude of his country, and, I believe, of other South American Republics:—

"We do not know what attitude the Council will adopt, and we await its decision with impatience before determining our own.

"If our ideas are not shared by others and do not meet with the response for which we hope, we shall withdraw from the discussion without any feeling of bitterness, conscious that we have done our duty courageously and quite frankly to an institution in which we have collaborated to the full extent of our pacific ideals, an institution that we now see coming to an end in its present form with regret as great as our pleasure and satisfaction when it appeared on the international horizon like a rainbow marking the end once and for all of the settlement of international disputes by the cruel and brutal force of arms."

M. Edwards was not followed by any other speaker, and the President promised to make at a later date suggestions as to further procedure.

This item was again considered by the Council on the afternoon of the 14th May, when the Chairman opened the debate by making the following statement:—

"I beg leave to make in the name of the Council some brief observations. The Council, having heard the observations of the representative of Chile, as recorded in the minutes of the third meeting of the present session, is bound to point out that, the Assembly being seized of the position, it is not possible to discuss the substance of the question therein set forth. The question of the application of the principles of the Covenant is included in the agenda of the Assembly, which will have before it the report of the special Committee of the Assembly on the subject.

"It appears to be of the utmost importance that delegations to the Assembly should be furnished with the requisite instructions to enable them to give thorough discussion to the important problems raised, and steps will be taken to communicate to members of the League of Nations the declarations made to the Council by the representative of Chile."

This, however, did not satisfy M. Edwards, who challenged the view that the matter was within the competence of the Assembly only, quoting paragraph 4 of Article 5 of the Covenant in justification of his contention that the Council was able to deal with the matter; although at the same time he claimed that his Government would have been satisfied with a general statement as to the immediate urgency of consideration being given to reform, the study of which might have been entrusted to an organization set up to deal with it in detail and to make a report to the Assembly in September. Time was short, and members evinced no desire to be drawn into a long debate. But I think it appropriate to remark that if the progress made by the Committee on the study of the Covenant (which has been in existence since 1936) is any criterion, very little could have been expected from a Committee set up now with instructions to report in September next. We can only assume that the Government of Chile had made up its mind that if it could not obtain what it wanted (and a little reflection would have convinced it that it was very unlikely to obtain it) it would expose its hand. Well, the result came up to expectations. Towards the close of his statement M. Edwards notified that his country would leave the League, although it would be prepared to continue active collaboration with the Permanent Court of International Justice, the International Labour Office, and the various technical organs of the League. It is some consolation to know that Chile values association with the League and recognizes the uses to which the League can be put even although it will not be prepared to share in its political work.

Representatives of other Latin-American States followed M. Edwards, and he received some support and much sympathy from them, but I am afraid there was a feeling that something in the nature of a threat had been made.