

of the Levant had been found to be impracticable as a result of political developments which nobody could foresee when the plan had been adopted in September 1935.¹ Speaking in his personal capacity as United Kingdom representative, he also wished to express the particularly keen disappointment which His Majesty's Government felt at the fact that once more, despite all the efforts of the Council Committee, under its distinguished and indefatigable Chairman, M. Lopez Olivan, a scheme which had bid fair to solve this most difficult and persistent question should have to be abandoned.

At the same time, after studying the Committee's report, and in particular the very frank explanation which the French Government had been good enough to afford, the President felt no doubt at all that, in the very difficult circumstances with which it was faced, the Committee had taken the wisest decision. Speaking for the United Kingdom Government, Mr. Eden added that it had always recognised the difficulties which would inevitably have had to be overcome in carrying out the complicated plan for settling the Assyrians in the Ghab area, but, at the same time, it realised that the scheme possessed many advantages and that it offered the only apparent solution of the Assyrian question, in offering the Assyrians the chance of a new home in a part of the world which would suit their requirements and in material circumstances which would give them every chance of a prosperous and happy future.

It would serve no useful purpose at the present time to dwell upon the past. It was necessary to concentrate on the future and on making yet another effort to find a lasting and satisfactory solution of what had been rightly described as a "work of appeasement and humanity"

Mr. Eden was therefore particularly glad to note from the Committee's report that, so far from allowing itself to be discouraged by this latest check after nearly three years of strenuous efforts, the Committee intended at once to set about finding another solution for the problem. He was particularly glad to learn that M. Lopez Olivan proposed to continue to act as Chairman of the Committee, and would express to him, on behalf of the Council, its gratitude and continued confidence in his able leadership.

The President was sure that the Council would agree to extend the mandate it had given to the Committee, and that he would be interpreting the feeling of the Council in expressing the confident hope that the Committee would be ultimately successful in its most difficult task. It was necessary, unfortunately to resign oneself to yet another period of delay in the settlement of this problem. Meanwhile, he had been very glad to hear the remarks which the representative of Iraq had made with regard to the position of the Assyrians in Iraq. He was sure the Council could rely on the Iraqi Government to guarantee the security of those Assyrians and to continue to use its best efforts to secure their welfare and contentment as far as possible.

M. BARCIA thanked the President and the other speakers for their kind remarks regarding his fellow-countryman, M. Lopez Olivan, and was glad that, through him, Spain had been able to make a contribution to this difficult task.

The resolution was adopted.

Sabih Bey Najib withdrew

3770. Free City of Danzig Situation at Danzig Report by the High Commissioner, dated June 30th, 1936.

M. Greiser, President of the Senate of the Free City of Danzig, and Mr. Lester, High Commissioner of the League of Nations, came to the Council table.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council would have studied the clear and precise report submitted by the High Commissioner in Danzig on recent events in that city (Annex 1610, page 895). His colleagues would, he was sure, share his gratification at the statement made by Mr. Lester in that portion of the report dealing with the internal affairs of the Free City and the fact that a dangerous crisis in internal order had been averted. He was confident that, given wholehearted co-operation by the Government of the Free City with the League High Commissioner, the internal situation would speedily be restored to normal.

As regarded the question dealt with in the latter portion of Mr. Lester's report, Mr. Eden had little to add to the substance of the resolution which he had the honour to submit to his colleagues. The question was clearly one of an international character, and thus fell within the sphere of responsibility undertaken by Poland in accordance with the relevant treaties. He had reason to believe that the resolution in question met with the agreement of the Polish representative.

The text of the resolution was as follows:²

" The Council,

" Having taken into consideration the report furnished to it by the High Commissioner of the League of Nations in Danzig, dated June 30th, 1936, on the subject of an incident which occurred in connection with the recent visit to that port of the German cruiser *Leipzig*,

" Has reached the conclusion that the incident in question is of an international character.

¹ See *Official Journal*, November 1935, page 1169.

² Document C.285.1936.VII.

“ Having regard to the fact that, in accordance with the Statute of the Free City Poland has undertaken the conduct of the foreign relations of Danzig,

“ The Council decides to request the Polish Government to deal with the matter on its behalf through the diplomatic channel, and to furnish the Council at its next ordinary session with a report on the results of the action which it may have been found possible to take.”

M. BECK said that, in conformity with its obligations and with the appeal made to it by the Council, the Polish Government declared its willingness to proceed, through diplomatic channels, to a study of the question referred to in the resolution. The Polish delegation would duly inform the Council of the results of its efforts.

M. GREISER, President of the Senate of the Free City of Danzig, said that, having just arrived from Danzig by air, it was only at this moment that he had had an opportunity of seeing the Council resolution. He therefore could not give any opinion on it at the moment, but would observe that the question had been placed on the agenda in such great haste that the Danzig delegation had even been momentarily refused admission to the hall, although it had duly applied for tickets. He would, therefore, reserve the right to return to the resolution itself in detail on a later occasion.

When he had learnt, during the night of Thursday to Friday last, that the League High Commissioner had asked for the settlement of Danzig questions to be placed on the agenda of the present session of the Council, he had been exceedingly surprised, and his surprise had certainly been shared by the whole population of Danzig whom he had the honour to represent before the Council. It was the first time in the history of the relations between the Free City of Danzig and the League that such questions had been so hurriedly placed on the agenda of a session, and what seemed most peculiar was that the Danzig opposition Press had known of the High Commissioner's report even before the Danzig Government had done so. In those circumstances, the Council would not be surprised if, as had already been the case previously public opinion had an impression that the purpose of the discussion of these Danzig questions was once again to distract attention from the settlement of other disagreeable events.

Unfortunately M. Greiser had not seen the High Commissioner's report until he had reached Geneva, and it had surprised him even more than the Council's decision. He was thus to some extent obliged to make an extempore statement on that subject, and he desired to say before the public opinion of the world that his speech would be based, not so much on considerations of law and of international law as upon the deepest feelings of the honest people of Danzig, whom fate had given him the proud duty of governing.

M. Greiser found the High Commissioner's report surprising, in the first place, because a few days previously in the course of a conversation in the presence of witnesses, Mr. Lester had expressed his satisfaction on learning that the Government had taken the only action which, in Mr. Lester's opinion, could ensure the maintenance of peace and order in Danzig. The situation in Danzig had not changed in any way since that conversation. Danzig citizens were going about their normal business, and the weather at the Baltic watering-places was so beautiful that they had little interest in politics.

The report stated that the commander of a German warship had refused to call upon the High Commissioner. M. Greiser quite understood that that incident had been mentioned if it was of interest to the Members of the League Council, he himself and the whole of the Free City had also taken a great interest in it, but it seemed quite irrelevant to attempt to establish any connection between that incident and the President of the Senate or the Government of the Free City. As head of the Danzig Government, M. Greiser felt that the Council should address its expressions of surprise on the subject to another address, which it would be easy to find in Berlin.

As a National Socialist and a German, M. Greiser was bound in honour to point out that, after the lack of tact shown by the High Commissioner on the occasion of the last visit of a German warship, in the previous year, it was scarcely surprising that the commander of the cruiser *Leipzig* should have refrained from calling upon the High Commissioner.

It was natural enough that an attempt should be made to find out the reasons for the incident; but, just as the Danzig Government had allowed the parties which adopted a negative attitude in that respect adequate freedom to express their views in public, so it must naturally allow Gauleiter Förster, the political head of the National-Socialist Party which, constitutionally supported the Danzig Government, to give expression to the indignation which had long been felt by the vast majority of the population of Danzig. If that freedom of speech and writing which had so often been mentioned in the Council was to have a democratic meaning, then it must be noted that, in that particular case, the League's demand that the Danzig Constitution be observed, not merely in the letter, but also in the spirit, had been fully conceded.

For the second time in a single year, the Danzig Government had been sent for to Geneva to give a public explanation, and M. Greiser therefore thought it his duty to go thoroughly once for all, into all the questions affecting Danzig.

As a matter of conscience, he was obliged to speak, not as the defender of theoretical documents and paragraphs which were a dead letter, but as the governor of 400,000 Germans,

who did not wish their destinies to be eternally linked with the League of Nations; who, in the last resort, did not understand the ideals of that institution, and whose hearts, united to the German people by ties of blood and racial affinity spoke a different language from that which it was sought to impose upon them by a Constitution that remained alien to them.

The Danzig population shared M. Greiser's view that the city of Danzig had not been severed from the mother-country for the reasons that had always been publicly stated. Why had that separation taken place? The Republic of Poland had to have free access to the sea, and that was provided through the port of Danzig. The new Poland had obtained that free access to the sea, and M. Greiser wished to say emphatically and clearly that, in his view the Polish people were perfectly entitled to demand it. At the same time, if that had been the object in view it was not necessary to separate Danzig from Germany. Since, notwithstanding those reasons, Danzig had been made into a so-called free State, it might almost be supposed that the object of the separation had been merely to create in Eastern Europe a permanent focus of trouble and friction between Germany and Poland. Not only was Danzig deprived of numerous sovereign rights belonging to an autonomous State, but the League had so far neglected to offer the Free City any practical help whatever. Neither politically nor economically had the people of Danzig obtained any advantage from the League. On the contrary they had to pay several million Danzig gulden every year on account of financial transactions between the League and the Free City. Moreover, Danzig public opinion found it intolerable that the salary of the League's High Commissioner, which he drew in gold and foreign currencies, should be in such flagrant contrast with the poverty of the mass of the population and the fact that half of it was paid by the Polish Republic did not make the position any easier.

The Danzig Government had not yet noticed any action by the League to abolish unemployment. He himself, much as he regretted it, had not observed that the League had done anything to combat the economic depression and poverty or to give Danzig any advice with a view to bringing about an economic recovery.

All those anxieties fell exclusively upon the shoulders of the Danzig Government, and it was to that Government alone that the population appealed for work and bread. During the last three years, the National-Socialist Government had done everything in its power to overcome those difficulties, and had succeeded as far as was possible. It could probably have done much more for the population as a whole had it not been constantly diverted from that important duty by Mr. Lester's activities.

At home, the Free City which was the smallest State in Europe, had been threatened with economic collapse during the years of depression abroad, disputes with Poland had been constantly on the agenda of the sessions of the League Council until the present Government had come into power. The Free City had been looked upon as a ferment of discord, and had been described in League circles as the powder-magazine of Eastern Europe. A tiny spark would have been enough, not merely to blow up that magazine, but to cause conflagrations serious enough to shake Europe once again to its foundations.

For years past the League of Nations had been endeavouring—unfortunately in vain—to find some means of avoiding the explosion of the Danzig powder-magazine. It had needed the appearance of two men, who, through their personality their authority and above all the greatness of their loyal determination, had quickly succeeded in eliminating all the elements of conflict, restoring order and peace, and ensuring future security. Those men were Adolf Hitler, the acknowledged leader of the German people, and Marshal Pilsudski, the great and venerable marshal of Poland—both soldiers, and both men of absolute impartiality and rectitude. Indeed, those two men occupied so high a place among the great men of the world that it was easy to understand how other peoples might envy those two countries their leaders.

It was hardly surprising that the Germans of Danzig, who, far from disputing the greatness of Poland, proclaimed it, should have found the best means of eliminating all those difficulties and lightening that atmosphere of gloom. M. Greiser was proud to remind the Council and the world at large that it was the National Socialists of Danzig who, at the wish of their leader, Adolf Hitler, without the intervention of any High Commissioner or any international authority, had, by open and direct negotiation with Poland, restored a peaceful atmosphere and quickly and definitely eliminated that ferment of discord, that powder-magazine in Eastern Europe.

Thanks to the activity of the National-Socialist Government, agitation had given place to peace, and that was an example of what could be achieved when international understanding was genuinely desired. The Council should be grateful to the Danzig Government for having for ever extinguished a focus of discord which might have caused the League serious trouble.

All the High Commissioners who had served in Danzig before the present representative of the League would certainly acknowledge that the relations between the Free City and Poland had very often caused them grave anxiety. To spare the League and the High Commissioner that anxiety was the first duty of the Danzig Government, which, as everyone was aware, had loyally undertaken to respect all treaties. With the best will in the world, however, the people of Danzig could not understand how anyone could fail to honour so lofty an obligation.

M. Greiser regretted to have to point out that, during the past two years, instead of the Danzig Government being supported in its efforts to maintain and enhance international understanding, there had been a constant and careful search for any grains of explosive matter that could be exposed to the heat of public opinion and made to flare up before the Council of the League.

It would surely have been better to throw a little water on that explosive matter and render it harmless.

Considering recent events, it was not surprising that the Government of the Free City should have found itself obliged to defer to the imperative wish of the population, who, in view of the persistence of such methods, had demanded a re-examination of the relations between the Free City and the High Commissioner.

A National-Socialist majority had been in power in Danzig for over three years, and the public confidence in it had twice been asserted by a constitutional and secret vote. The Members of the Council recognised the laws of democracy and M. Greiser also appealed to democracy in the true sense of the word. The meaning of democracy was that the will of the majority should be carried out, within the limits of morality and the laws in force. The will of the majority had twice been clearly and unequivocally expressed in favour of the German National-Socialist Party. Yet the High Commissioner's attitude tended to ignore those democratic principles, and to allow a minority—a divided and torn minority—to terrorise the constitutionally established majority. The Government of the Free City was entitled to say that it had always deferred to the Council's wishes and decisions, even when they ran counter to its convictions and shocked the common sense of the people of Danzig. It could not be shown that on any occasion M. Greiser had disregarded the Council's decisions or even its recommendations.

The smallest State in Europe, which M. Greiser represented, and which was exposed to the harsh glare of the searchlights of public opinion, had done what it could, and even more than it was obliged to do. It had always hastened to prove its desire to maintain good relations with the League. In support of that statement, M. Greiser could appeal to the testimony of numerous witnesses from all over the world, but he would only mention two by whom he set particular store—the Government of the German Reich, which had officially authorised him to quote its opinion, and the Polish Government.

None the less, when the National-Socialist majority which supported the Danzig Government, saw that, with the conscious or unconscious help of the High Commissioner, a minority was arrogating to itself the right to terrorise a constitutional majority it was not surprising if even the simplest mind became convinced that, on that point, the fundamental law of democracy had been violated. It was perfectly natural that the National-Socialist majority should defend itself against the terrorism of the minority and that attitude would be understood by all who knew and loved the people of Danzig. As head of the Government, M. Greiser could not, after all, be expected to put down a movement that supported him, or to allow the partisans of that movement to be punished when they were acting in self-defence. Such things did not happen anywhere. Self-defence was every man's right, and therefore it was the right of the National Socialists. The minority however, always rushed to the High Commissioner to complain. The High Commissioner sent to Geneva reports which were not shown to the Danzig Government, but which were drafted under directions from the opposition and were published in the opposition Press. It was the Danzig National-Socialist movement that was accused, but it was a remarkable thing that it was precisely among the adherents of that movement that deaths and serious injuries occurred.

From the newspapers it appeared that there were disturbances in many States, and M. Greiser honestly admitted that he had the greatest respect for all statesmen, whatever their political opinions, who found suitable means of putting down the disturbances occurring in their countries. The Danzig Government had confined itself to nipping in the bud the beginnings of disturbances provoked by the opposition in Danzig, and it had employed for this purpose methods of which the High Commissioner had approved. As thanks for this, M. Greiser was dragged away from his peaceful work and summoned once more to Geneva. The Danzig population could not understand such methods on the part of a High Commissioner, and had reacted against this high-handed procedure. The Council should see the innocent victims of the terrorism of this opposition minority supported, consciously or unconsciously by the High Commissioner. Having fought in the great war as well as in favour of the National-Socialist ideal, M. Greiser had seen many dead and wounded, but he would never have thought possible the mutilations of all kinds suffered by the victims of a criminal minority. If those victims came before the Council table, the Council would realise the methods of fighting tolerated by the High Commissioner, and which were no contribution to appeasement. On the contrary the tactics followed by the High Commissioner had aroused against him opposition for which the Danzig Government was not responsible, but for which Mr. Lester was himself to blame, for he did not understand the mentality of the German population and did not even speak its language.

If the Council did not believe what he had just said in all frankness and sincerity as a Danzig citizen, he was ready to provide conclusive proof by organising very quickly, in the Free City of Danzig, a plebiscite in which the population, by an absolutely free and secret vote, would show whether it approved or not the activities of the representative of the League of Nations at Danzig.

M. Greiser did not wish, however, to confine himself to describing to the Council the desires and anxieties of the Danzig Government and of the population of the Free City without being able to propose a way out of the situation. Solutions might be sought in different directions. The Council might, for example, send a new High Commissioner to Danzig, instructing him, like all the former High Commissioners, to refrain from any interference in internal politics and to devote

himself entirely to his province of foreign policy. M. Greiser was authorised to state officially, on behalf of the Danzig Government, that, in the event of such a reorganisation, all the rights enjoyed by the Polish minority in the territory of the Free City of Danzig in virtue of treaties and agreements, and all the rights of the Polish State, would be respected.

Another solution which might be considered would be that the Council, in view of the imminent reorganisation and reform of the League of Nations, should decide no longer to send a High Commissioner to Danzig. The League of Nations could continue to implement its guarantee through the President of the Senate and Head of the Government, who would be responsible to the League of Nations. In this way order and peace would be assured for ever in Danzig both in home and foreign affairs.

M. Greiser recalled that his intervention was not based on legal considerations or considerations of international law but that he spoke as the representative of 400,000 living Germans. To-day it was not paragraphs but living men who had spoken. At Danzig, the observance of the letter of the texts had already done sufficient harm and had suffered sufficient setbacks, and, if the opinion was expressed in some quarters that the League of Nations had lost some of its prestige, M. Greiser had shown a way of greatly contributing to the restoration of that prestige in the world.

Such a resolution would constitute an historic fact of the greatest importance, and, if the Council made that gesture, not only the population of Danzig, but the whole world would be grateful to it.

The PRESIDENT observed that, as the Assembly had been called for 6 o'clock, it would be necessary to adjourn the debate before he called upon the High Commissioner and the members of the Council who had asked to speak. Before adjourning the meeting, however, Mr. Eden had two comments to make. It was as a matter of courtesy that the President of the Danzig Senate had been invited to attend the present meeting of the Council, and not with the purpose of calling in question the action of the Danzig Government. The League of Nations was not responsible for the setting up of the regime of the Free City. The League of Nations had accepted the functions laid upon it by the Treaty in the interests of the Free City and of Poland.

He added that the Polish representative had asked to be allowed to make a short statement before the meeting was adjourned.

M. BECK observed that the Council had before it a draft resolution referring to a particular case, the special case of an incident which had occurred during the visit of a German warship to Danzig. That draft did not raise the general problem, nor questions relating to the domestic policy of the Free City.

M. Beck felt bound to observe that the Rapporteur, as was shown in the draft resolution, had tried to find the simplest and most practical solution likely to settle the incident without causing unnecessary complications. It was in that sense that M. Beck had interpreted the approval expressed by the other members of the Council of the draft text before them. He felt that, in those circumstances, it would be unfair to accuse the Council, or the Rapporteur in particular, of any partiality in the matter.

In connection with the various ideas and observations of a general nature not connected with the immediate subject of the discussion, M. Beck reserved the right to express his views when the Polish Government considered the moment suitable.

(The meeting of the Council was adjourned at 6.10 p.m. and resumed at 8.15 p.m.)

M. Greiser, President of the Danzig Senate, and Mr. Lester, High Commissioner of the League of Nations in Danzig, resumed their seats at the Council table.

Mr. LESTER, High Commissioner of the League of Nations in Danzig, said he did not propose to speak at the same length as the representative of the Danzig Senate and that he could not speak with the same eloquence. He had followed M. Greiser's speech with the greatest interest, and had since read a translation of it. President Greiser seemed to have been under one or two misapprehensions. A great deal of his annoyance seemed to be due to the fact that he thought Mr. Lester had come to Geneva and put a question on the agenda of the Council without giving him any notice. That was a point on which M. Greiser had based a great deal of his complaint. It was not the case, as the Council was aware.

Mr. Lester wondered if President Greiser had had an opportunity of reading the High Commissioner's report since he had made his speech. Mr. Lester was afraid that, with his hurried journey he had not had that opportunity before making his speech. M. Greiser had complained a great deal about the report presented by the High Commissioner to the Council. The members of the Council who had read it might perhaps share some of Mr. Lester's astonishment at what it would seem to have provoked, if the report was the reason for the speech which President Greiser had made. Did President Greiser object to the description at the beginning of the report of the period of co-operation for which he had been responsible in the first few months of this year? Had he appreciated that the first page of the report described a situation in which—though it was not wholly satisfactory—there was a tendency to carry out the instructions and the desire of the Council that there should be co-operation between the Senate and the High Commissioner to enable the latter to carry out the duties which the Council had entrusted to him?

It was true that the report would not have been before the Council had it not been for the incident connected with the visit of the German warship. That, as was said in the report, was inexplicable to Mr. Lester, unless it was connected with the duties of his office. No one would be surprised that the incident should be brought to the notice of the members of the Council, or that the High Commissioner should feel it his duty to report on the incident. But he could not regard it merely as an incident "in the air" or as an incident completely isolated from events in Danzig. He had therefore felt it his duty to give the Council a very brief survey of the somewhat serious situation which had existed in Danzig up to about three days before the warship arrived.

President Greiser had expressed his astonishment that the report should have been sent to the Council because, at his last interview with Mr. Lester, the latter had declared how satisfied he was at the action which the Government had finally found itself in a position to take; but, if President Greiser had had an opportunity to study the report, he would have seen that that interview and that conversation had been faithfully reproduced in it.

President Greiser's speech to the Council raised many important questions. Among all those points, Mr. Lester wished to draw the Council's attention to the facts—they had already been before the Council in the article written by M. Forster, the Leader of President Greiser's party—put forward in explanation and justification of the action of the German warship's Commander. Mr. Lester had, in his report, mentioned and drawn attention to those suggestions, and had said there that it was not for him to discuss amendments to the Statute of Danzig proposed by M. Forster. He did not think it was his duty now to make any reference to the formal proposals made by the representative of the Danzig Senate.

President Greiser had said that he was speaking from a full heart and was not taking account of the legal situation, nor of the various legal documents which constituted the Statute of Danzig. But President Greiser should understand—for Mr. Lester had often explained it to him—that he could not take that view. He could not take that view when he had to carry out duties connected with the maintenance of the various articles. Whether those articles were regarded in some quarters, to quote President Greiser, as a "dead letter" or not, Mr. Lester's duty to the Council involved the protection of the actual paragraphs and other things to which reference had been made.

In his last words before the adjournment of the meeting, the President of the Council had mentioned that the League of Nations had no responsibility for the creation of the Free City. It seemed that some people thought the present High Commissioner had. In the course of the meeting, various charges had been made against him in his official capacity. Mr. Lester did not propose to answer any of them at the present time. The Council had entrusted him with a rather difficult mission in Danzig nearly three years previously. He was sure the Council had known—and Mr. Lester had certainly known—that it was not going to be a pleasant one. He had hoped to do, and had done, his best to make it as pleasant as possible; but he was afraid that the speech that had been delivered that day would give the Council some idea of what its representative at Danzig was exposed to.

M. BECK recalled that, in his short speech during the first part of the meeting, he had tried to keep the subject of the discussions in line with the text of the resolution before the Council, and had reserved completely his Government's point of view on the general problems raised before the Council.

He wished to add, however, that, even though the President of the Senate of the Free City had thought it necessary and opportune to raise problems quite beyond the scope of the discussion, nothing in any case justified the attacks made on the representative of the League of Nations in the discharge of his functions, and that representative was entitled to expect the full support of the Council of the League of Nations.

M. DELBOS would observe that moderation which was essential in international relations, and especially at a meeting such as the present one, but he wished to make a few brief remarks.

Danzig was placed by the Treaties under the authority of the League. The League was represented at Danzig by a High Commissioner, whose duty it was to ensure that the provisions of the Treaties were carried out, and that the reciprocal rights of Poland and of Danzig were observed. He must also ensure that the Constitution of the Free City and the freedom it guaranteed to all the citizens, was respected.

The High Commissioner, Mr. Lester, had rendered inestimable services. His devotion to his task, his high sense of duty and his tact were well known. He should have the entire confidence of the Council, and it was not remarks such as those the Council had just heard that would cause it to change its opinion. They would only enable it the better to gauge the difficulties of his task.

As regards the question which had given rise to the discussion, M. Delbos fully approved the proposal of the Rapporteur, and he trusted to the Polish Government to bring to a successful conclusion the mission it had agreed to undertake.

M. BARCIA associated himself fully with the observations of the representative of France, and approved the conclusions of the Rapporteur.

The PRESIDENT said it was now his duty as President, to make certain observations. All his colleagues would regret, as he did, the tone of the speech made by the President of the Danzig Senate, more particularly in view of the circumstances in which the Council had been convened. It would not be right to say that the President of the Senate of the Free City had been summoned

to attend the Council. The Council was dealing, as had been explained by the High Commissioner and others, with a matter which concerned the external relations of the Free City of Poland was entrusted with the care of the external relations of the Free City and, as the Council was aware, the Polish representative had undertaken to discuss the matter through the diplomatic channel, in the normal way with the German Government. That was the issue before the Council, and that was the issue which was dealt with in the resolution which, as Rapporteur, it had been the President's duty to submit to the Council.

It was clearly he thought, the opinion of his colleagues that, whatever the merits of the case put forward by the President of the Senate, the Council could not allow a personal reflection to be made on its representative in the Free City. He considered that the correct reply to the remarks which the President of the Senate had seen fit to make in regard to Mr. Lester's personality would be an expression of the Council's confidence in him and its entire satisfaction with the way in which he was carrying out his arduous duties.

The President was sure, after hearing his colleagues' remarks, more particularly those of the representative of Poland and of the representatives of France and of Spain, that he was voicing the unanimous feeling of the Council in asking Mr. Lester to accept this assurance of its confidence and of its thanks for his untiring efforts.

Mr. Eden did not propose, any more than did Mr. Lester himself, to deal with matters which had been raised before the Council but which did not concern the resolution he was asking the Council to adopt. There was one charge, however, which had been brought against the High Commissioner that he could not pass over in silence. That charge was that Mr. Lester had asked for the inclusion of this item in the Council's agenda. That was not so. As the members of the Council were aware, it was only as a result of a unanimous decision of the Council, taken on the previous Thursday evening after the consideration of Mr. Lester's report, that the question was included in the agenda of the Council. Mr. Lester would have been perfectly within his rights in asking the Council to consider the matter but the fact was that he had not done so. The Council had taken a free and unanimous decision on the merits of the case.

As Rapporteur on the Danzig question, the President wished to add one word in respect of the Council's position in relation to Danzig. He had already explained that it was not the League of Nations which had created the Free City. It was certainly not the High Commissioner—nor was it the Council's Rapporteur! In view of the arduous character of the duty which had been imposed upon the Council—not at its own initiative—it was, he thought, entitled to ask, if it were to continue with the performance of that duty for courteous treatment from all concerned.

As regards the proposals put forward by the President of the Senate respecting the regime of the Free City it was obvious that the Council could not take those proposals into consideration at the moment. They raised wide issues which none of the members of the Council would wish to discuss without deep reflection. The representative of Poland had said that he reserved the right to return to those proposals at an opportune moment. The Council would, Mr. Eden thought, be content to leave the matter there for the present but, in view of the importance of the present discussion, he felt entitled to ask his colleagues to be good enough to signify whether they agreed with the course he had proposed, with the resolution he had put forward and with the words which, as their President, he had thought it his duty to use.

The President added that notification of the present meeting had, of course, been conveyed, as he had already explained, to the representative of the Senate of the Free City in order that he could attend if he so wished.

M. RUSTU ARAS associated himself with the observations Mr. Eden had made, both in his capacity as President and as Rapporteur.

Mr. BRUCE associated himself with the President's remarks. He had listened to the speech made by the President of the Senate of Danzig, and for his part desired to leave no misunderstanding. In his view that speech had been couched in language and delivered in a manner which showed anything but the courtesy that should be extended to the Council of the League of Nations. He would go further and say that he believed it would do very little to assist the prestige of those in control of Danzig in the eyes of the nations of the world.

The President had indicated that certain questions had been raised in that speech. The only matter before the Council, as Mr. Bruce understood the position, was the one question concerning the visit of the German warship. Any other matter that had been raised was quite apart from the question with which the Council was concerned, Mr. Bruce certainly was not prepared to consider any questions relating to Danzig that had been raised in the speech made that afternoon. He would at any time be prepared to examine any matter concerning the Free City of Danzig which might be before the Council if it were raised in the proper manner, but he had felt it necessary to express that view as a member of the Council.

The PRESIDENT expressed the desire to be assured that the words he had used on behalf of the Council met with the approval of all his colleagues.

The members of the Council signified their approval.

M. GREISER said that he had not expected the Council to express any other opinion, nor, in view of the slowness of the League's methods, had he expected a resolution to be taken immediately on the proposals he had submitted. Nevertheless, he regarded the observations he had made at the present meeting as a first offensive in favour of a revision of the relations between the League of Nations and Danzig.

M. Greiser expressed his thanks to the Rapporteur, Mr. Eden. The latter had said that he proposed to keep to the points actually on the agenda, but that, if circumstances appeared oppor-

tune, he would revert to M. Greiser's statement later. M. Greiser therefore understood that Mr. Eden was considering the possibility of studying the Danzig Government's proposals subsequently and he wished to thank him most particularly for that.

If to-day M. Greiser had opened a first offensive in favour of a revision of the relations between the League of Nations and the Free City of Danzig, if he had done so in public and before world opinion, he wished it to be understood that he had done so, not only on behalf of the Danzig population, but on behalf of the whole German people. In the coming months the German people expected of the League of Nations resolutions which would make it possible for the President of the Senate of the Free City of Danzig not to have to appear again before the League of Nations.

The PRESIDENT repeated that the Council was dealing with its agenda and nothing else.

The resolution was adopted.

M. Greiser and Mr. Lester withdrew

3771. Application of the Principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations: Recommendation adopted by the Assembly on July 4th, 1936 Inclusion of this Item in the Agenda of the Session.

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Assembly had just adopted¹ a recommendation which implied certain action by the Council. He proposed that the following question, "Application of the Principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations" should be added to the agenda of the present session, and, further, that, in accordance with Rule 3, paragraph 7 of the Rules of Procedure, the Council should proceed to the discussion of this question at the present meeting.

The President's proposals were adopted.

3772. Application of the Principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations: Action to be taken on the Recommendation adopted by the Assembly on July 4th, 1936.

The PRESIDENT read the text of the recommendation of the Assembly:²

"The Assembly recommends that the Council.

"(a) Should invite the Governments of the Members of the League to send to the Secretary-General, so far as possible before September 1st, 1936, any proposals they may wish to make in order to improve, in the spirit or within the limits laid down above, the application of the principles of the Covenant;

"(b) Should instruct the Secretary-General to make a first examination and classification of these proposals;

"(c) Should report to the Assembly at its next meeting on the state of the question."

The Council instructed the Secretary-General to give effect to the above recommendation.

3773. Date of the Next Session of the Council.

The PRESIDENT reminded the members of the Council of the Assembly's decision that its next meeting would be held on Monday September 21st, 1936. The Council would doubtless agree that, in consequence of that decision, the ninety-third ordinary session of the Council would open, not, as foreseen, on Friday September 4th, but on Friday September 18th, 1936.

The President's proposal was adopted.

¹ See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 151.

² See Circular Letter 124.1936.VII.