

be operated in normal times on an intensive scale, and this was hardly possible for the League to achieve under present conditions.

The second idea was that the station should be under dual control. The League and the Swiss Government should construct a station jointly, sharing the expense. This station would be operated in time of peace by the Swiss Government, and in time of emergency by the League of Nations. This scheme would be cheaper than the first scheme.

Then the third project, which is strongly put forward by the Swiss Government, had its strength in the fact that Switzerland had already built a station. The Swiss delegate strongly urged that this *modus vivendi* would not cost the League more than one-tenth of the expense of the second scheme.

Finally, M. Cassin, representing France, the Rapporteur on this subject to the Assembly, prepared a report which was a careful retrospect of the whole matter from its inception, and recommended to the Assembly the adoption of the following resolution:—

“The Assembly, desiring that the League of Nations should have means at its disposal and under its direct management, at any rate in times of crisis, for independent radio-telegraphic communication with as many members of the League as possible, and, being desirous of facilitating at all times relations between the League of Nations and its members, more particularly those at a distance from the seat of the League, instructs the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps for the provision, as early as possible, of a radio-telegraphic station, comprising in any case a post with a world-wide radius, so far as this may be technically possible, in conformity with the proposals submitted to the Assembly by the Communications and Transit Committee.

“The Swiss Government can be represented at this station by an observer, whose duties would be as laid down in the Council’s resolution of March 9th, 1929.

“The Assembly declares that the use of this station by the League of Nations in times of crisis can in no case be invoked against Switzerland as affecting her international responsibility.”

This was carried unanimously.

DRAFT CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES THREATENED WITH AGGRESSION.

The Third Committee dealt at length with this vexed question. A proposed treaty or convention (Document A. 10) had been drawn up. This complete Draft Convention on Financial Assistance had been framed by the Finance Committee in the recess. It was apparent that the committee had given most careful attention to the subject, and had done exceedingly valuable work. The system of financial assistance proposed consists, in a word, in the guaranteeing by other States of a loan to be issued on behalf of a country which is attacked or which is threatened with war.

For several days the proposed treaty was discussed, nearly all the representatives speaking on the subject. Most of the speakers were representatives of small Powers. They agreed with the principle of the proposed treaty, but all suggested amendments. The Danish representative stressed that his Government could only support the scheme, provided it were treated as one item of a general scheme including disarmament and control of private manufacture and trade in arms. Lord Robert Cecil, the British delegate, whilst strongly urging the desirability of approval of the treaty, agreed with the Danish delegate’s reservations on these points. He thought that the rule requiring unanimous decision of the Council, combined with the well-known prudence of the Council, provided sufficient guarantees against the treaty being rashly invoked.

The following day the discussion principally concerned the advisability of restricting the scope of the convention by striking out the words “threat of war,” thus making the scheme applicable only to a state of actual war. It was urged—(1) That if assistance were provided immediately on a threat of war the Council would be unable to fulfil its proper role as mediator just at the moment when mediation might prove most useful; (2) that the knowledge that the Council had given such a decision in its favour might make the Power thus designated as the victim of aggression unconciliatory or even provocative; (3) that while the position was still only that of a “threat of war” it would be almost impossible to decide which members of the Council should be debarred from voting, as there would be uncertainty as to which States might ultimately be involved; (4) that it would be very difficult to define a “threat of war” or to decide when it existed.

Various amendments to and observations regarding Article 1 of the convention were circulated (see A. 111/4, 111/5, 111/6, 111/7, 111/12, 111/14), and it was eventually decided to set up a small Drafting Committee to co-ordinate, as far as possible, the various amendments proposed to this and other articles, in order to present a definite text for the consideration of the committee at its next meeting.

Sir George Foster said that the Canadian point of view was that the proposed convention was approaching the subject from entirely the wrong angle, and that much more fruitful results could be obtained by the various Powers agreeing to refuse to supply any financial or material aid to States which went to war in defiance of their obligations under the Kellogg Pact. But this attitude did not receive any support.

As it became quite evident that, despite the efforts of the sub-committee to secure at least some measure of agreement regarding Article 1, which deals with the question of “threat of war,” the British and French views remained quite unreconciled, while the German, Danish, and other delegates held views which did not altogether coincide with either the British or French points of view, it was decided to request the drafting sub-committee to prepare alternative texts of Article 1, embodying the various views, and meanwhile to pass on to consideration of the remaining articles of the draft convention. Regarding these, numerous amendments and suggestions had been put forward by various States, and it was obviously impossible to reach finality upon them all in the committee.