

# THE PEACE CONGRESS

## A Tentative Constitution for a League of Nations Agreed Upon --Other Proceedings

**T**HE proceedings of the opening session of the Peace Congress, held at the Quai d'Orsay in Paris, Jan. 18, 1919, were recorded in the preceding issue of CURRENT HISTORY MAGAZINE. At that session the regulations governing the Conference proceedings were adopted—in sixteen sections. The following were the regulations regarding the composition of the Congress:

### MEMBERSHIP

The belligerent Powers with general interests—the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan—shall take part in all meetings and commissions.

The belligerent Powers with particular interests—Belgium, Brazil, the British Dominions, and India, China, Cuba, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Serbia, Siam, and the Czechoslovak Republic—shall take part in the sittings at which questions concerning them are discussed.

The Powers in a state of diplomatic rupture with the enemy powers—Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Uruguay—shall take part in the sittings at which questions concerning them are discussed.

The neutral Powers and States in process of formation may be heard either orally or in writing when summoned by the Powers with general interests at sittings devoted especially to the examination of questions directly concerning them, but only so far as these questions are concerned.

### REPRESENTATION

The representation of the different Powers was fixed as follows:

Five for the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan; three for Belgium, Brazil, and Serbia; two for China, Greece, the King of Hedjaz, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Siam, and the Czechoslovak Republic; one for Cuba, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, and Panama; one for Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Uruguay.

The British Dominions and India shall be represented as follows: Two delegates each for Australia, Canada, South Africa,

and India, including the native States; one delegate for New Zealand.

Although the number of delegates may not exceed the figures above mentioned, each delegation has the right to avail itself of the panel system. The representation of the Dominions, including Newfoundland, and of India, may be included in the representation of the British Empire by the panel system.

Montenegro shall be represented by one delegate, but the rules concerning the designation of this delegate shall not be fixed until the moment when the political situation of this country shall have been cleared up.

The conditions of the representation of Russia shall be fixed by the conference at the moment when the matters concerning Russia are examined.

### SECRETARIAT

The provision regarding the secretariat was as follows:

A secretariat, appointed from outside the plenipotentiaries, composed of one representative of the United States of America, one of the British Empire, one of France, one of Italy, and one of Japan, will be submitted to the approval of the Conference by the President, who will be the controlling authority responsible for its operations.

This secretariat will be intrusted with the care of drafting the protocols of the meeting, of classifying the archives, of providing for the administration and organization of the Conference and generally of insuring the regular and punctual working of the service intrusted to it. The head of the secretariat shall have charge of and be responsible for the protocols and archives.

The archives will always be open to the members of the Conference.

### PUBLICITY

The publicity of the proceedings shall be insured by official communiqués prepared by the secretariat and made public. In case of disagreement as to the drafting of these communiqués, the matter shall be referred to the principal plenipotentiaries or their representatives.

A provision was made that all questions to be decided upon should be subject to two readings. The following pro-

gram regarding resolutions was agreed to:

#### DECISIONS

A committee shall be formed for drafting the resolutions adopted. This committee shall concern itself only with questions which have been decided. Its sole duty shall be to draw up the text of the decision adopted and to present it for the approval of the Conference.

It shall be composed of five members not forming part of the plenipotentiary delegates and composed of one representative of the United States of America, one of the British Empire, one of France, one of Italy, and one of Japan.

#### THE SUPREME COUNCIL

The Supreme Council, consisting of the two ranking delegates from each of the five chief Powers, held its first session after the adjournment of the Plenary Council on Jan. 20, and devoted the session to consideration of the Russian situation. The meeting was addressed by Joseph Noulens, the French Ambassador, who had recently returned from Russia. The session on the following day also was devoted to Russia, and M. Scavenius, Danish Minister to Russia, was heard. At the session of the council on Jan. 22 the decision was announced by which all Russian factions were invited to a conference at Princes' Islands, Sea of Marmora. The text of the announcement and other details appear elsewhere in this issue of CURRENT HISTORY MAGAZINE.

At the meeting of the Supreme Council on Jan. 23 an order of business was announced for a plenary meeting of the Conference on Saturday, Jan. 25. The following questions were considered for this purpose:

First—International legislation on labor.

Second—Responsibility and punishments in connection with the war.

Third—Reparation for war damage.

Fourth—International régime of ports, waterways, and railways.

In addition, the meeting began consideration of the procedure to be adopted with regard to territorial questions.

#### SUPREME WAR COUNCIL

At the meeting on the 24th the Supreme Council first met as the Supreme War Council. Not only were there present President Wilson and the Premiers, and Foreign Ministers, but also Marshal

Foch, Field Marshal Haig, General Pershing, General Diaz, and the Generals of the Versailles War Council, including Generals Wilson, Belling, Bliss, and Robilant.

The council conferred with Marshal Foch and the other military experts as to the strength of the forces to be allowed to the various allied Powers on the western front during the period of the armistice. It was decided to set up a special committee composed of Mr. Churchill, Mr. Loucheur, Marshal Foch, General Bliss, and General Diaz to examine the question.

The Supreme War Council also agreed to recommend for the approval of the Governments concerned the issue of an identic medal and ribbon to all the forces of the allied and associated Powers who had taken part in the war.

#### WARNING TO FACTIONS

After the Supplementary Council, the President of the United States of America and the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the allied and associated Governments, with the representatives of Japan, held a short meeting and agreed to the publication and transmission by wireless telegraphy to all parts of the world of the following communication:

The Governments now associated in conference to effect a lasting peace among the nations are deeply disturbed by the news which comes to them of the many instances in which armed force is being made use of in many parts of Europe and the East to gain possession of territory, the rightful claim to which the Peace Conference is to be asked to determine.

They deem it their duty to utter a solemn warning that possession, gained by force, will seriously prejudice the claims of those who use this means. It will create the presumption that those who employ force doubt the justice and validity of their claims, and purpose to substitute possession for proof of right, and set up sovereignty by coercion rather than by racial or national preference and natural historical association. They thus put a cloud upon every evidence of title they may afterward allege, and indicate their distrust of the Conference itself.

Nothing but the most unfortunate results can ensue. If they expect justice they must refrain from force and place their claims in unclouded good faith in the hands of the Conference of Peace.

At a meeting of the council the same day the mission of the Allies and associated great Powers to Poland was discussed, and it was agreed that M. Pichon, the French Foreign Minister, should prepare draft instructions to the mission for the approval of the representatives of the powers. It was agreed that one press representative for each of the five great Powers should be permitted to accompany the mission.

THE QUESTION OF TERRITORIAL SETTLEMENTS in connection with the conquest of the German colonies was then taken up. Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada; Mr. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia; General Smuts, representative of General Botha, the Prime Minister of South Africa, and Mr. Massey, Prime Minister of New Zealand, were present and explained the particular interest of the respective dominions in regard to this question.

## Second Plenary Session

### Preliminary Steps for the Organization of a League of Nations

THE second plenary session of the Peace Conference, held on Jan. 25, 1919, with Premier Clemenceau in the chair, was marked by the adoption of the plan for a League of Nations. The plan was accepted unanimously, the principles upon which it was based being emphasized and firmly supported by the representatives of the allied Powers. After having called the delegates to order, M. Clemenceau read the resolution on the creation of a committee on the League of Nations, the text of which follows:

It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement which the associated nations are now met to establish that a League of Nations be created to promote international obligations and to provide safeguards against war.

This League should be created as an integral part of the general treaty of peace and should be open to every civilized nation which can be relied on to promote its objects.

The members of the League should periodically meet in international conference and should have a permanent organization and secretaries to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the conferences.

The Conference therefore appoints a committee, representative of the associated Governments, to work out the details of the constitution and the functions of the League and the draft of resolutions in regard to breaches of the laws of war for presentation to the Peace Conference.

That a commission, composed of two representatives apiece from the five great Powers and five representatives to be

elected by the other Powers, be appointed to inquire and report upon the following:

First—The responsibility of the authors of the war.

Second—The facts as to breaches of the laws and customs of war committed by the forces of the German Empire and their allies on land, on sea, and in the air during the present war.

Third—The degree of responsibility for these offenses attaching to particular members of the enemy's forces, including members of the General Staffs and other individuals, however highly placed.

Fourth—The constitution and procedure of a tribunal appropriate to the trial of these offenses.

Fifth—Any other matters, cognate or ancillary to the above, which may arise in the course of the inquiry, and which the commission finds it useful and relevant to take into consideration.

### PRESIDENT WILSON'S ADDRESS

After the resolution had been read, the Chair recognized President Wilson, who made the following address to the assembly:

Mr. Chairman: I consider it a distinguished privilege to be permitted to open the discussion in this conference on the League of Nations. We have assembled for two purposes, to make the present settlements which have been rendered necessary by this war and also to secure the peace of the world, not only by the present settlements but by the arrangements we shall make at this conference for its maintenance.

The League of Nations seems to me to be necessary for both of these purposes. There are many complicated questions connected with the present settlements which perhaps cannot be successfully

worked out to an ultimate issue in the decisions we shall arrive at here. I can easily conceive that many of these settlements will need subsequent consideration; that many of the decisions we make shall need subsequent alteration in some degree, for, if I may judge by my own study of some of these questions, they are not susceptible of confident judgments at present.

It is therefore necessary that we should set up some machinery by which the work of this conference should be rendered complete.

We have assembled here for the purpose of doing very much more than making the present settlements that are necessary. We are assembled under very peculiar conditions of world opinion. I may say, without straining the point, that we are not the representatives of Governments, but representatives of the peoples. It will not suffice to satisfy Governmental circles anywhere. It is necessary that we should satisfy the opinion of mankind.

The burdens of this war have fallen in an unusual degree upon the whole population of the countries involved. I do not need to draw for you the picture of how the burden has been thrown back from the front upon the older men, upon the women, upon the children, upon the homes of the civilized world, and how the real strain of the war has come where the eyes of the Government could not reach, but where the heart of humanity beats.

## PERMANENT PROCESSES NEEDED

We are bidden by these people to make a peace which will make them secure. We are bidden by these people to see to it that this strain does not come upon them again. And I venture to say that it has been possible for them to bear this strain because they hoped that those who represented them could get together after this war and make such another sacrifice unnecessary.

It is a solemn obligation on our part, therefore, to make permanent arrangements that justice shall be rendered and peace maintained. This is the central object of our meeting. Settlements may be temporary, but the action of the nations in the interest of peace and justice must be permanent. We can set up permanent processes. We may not be able to set up a permanent decision.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must take as far as we can a picture of the world into our minds. Is it not a startling circumstance, for one thing, that the great discoveries of science, that the quiet studies of men in laboratories, that the thoughtful developments which have taken place in quiet lecture rooms have now been turned to the destruction of

civilization? The powers of destruction have not so much multiplied as they have gained facilities.

The enemy whom we have just overcome had in his seats of learning some of the principal centres of scientific study and discovery, and he used them in order to make destruction sudden and complete. And only the watchful and continuous co-operation of men can see to it that science, as well as armed men, is kept within the harness of civilization.

In a sense the United States is less interested in this subject than the other nations here assembled. With her great territory and her extensive sea borders it is less likely that the United States should suffer from the attack of enemies than that other nations should suffer. And the ardor of the United States—for it is a very deep and genuine ardor—for the society of nations is not an ardor springing out of fear or apprehension, but an ardor springing out of the ideals which have come in the consciousness of this war.

## AIMS OF THE UNITED STATES

In coming into this war the United States never for a moment thought that she was intervening in the politics of Europe, or the politics of Asia, or the politics of any part of the world. Her thought was that all the world had now become conscious that there was a single cause of justice and of liberty for men of every kind and place.

Therefore, the United States would feel that its part in this war should be played in vain if there ensued upon it abortive European settlements. It would feel that it could not take part in guaranteeing those European settlements unless that guarantee involved the continuous superintendence of the peace of the world by the associated nations of the world.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must concern our best judgment in order to make this League of Nations a vital thing—a thing sometimes called into life to meet an exigency, but always functioning in watchful attendance upon the interests of the nations—and that its continuity should be a vital continuity; that its functions are continuing functions that do not permit an intermission of its watchfulness and of its labor; that it should be the eye of the nations, to keep watch upon the common interest—an eye that does not slumber, an eye that is everywhere watchful and attentive.

And if we do not make it vital, what shall we do? We shall disappoint the expectations of the peoples. This is what their thought centres upon.

I have had the very delightful experience of visiting several nations since I came to this side of the water, and every time

the voice of the body of the people reached me, through any representative, at the front of the plea stood the hope of the League of Nations.

Gentlemen, the select classes of mankind are no longer the governors of mankind. The fortunes of mankind are now in the hands of the plain people of the whole world. Satisfy them, and you have justified their confidence not only, but have established peace. Fail to satisfy them, and no arrangement that you can make will either set up or steady the peace of the world.

You can imagine, I dare say, the sentiments and the purpose with which the representatives of the United States support this great project for a League of Nations. We regard it as the keynote of the whole, which expresses our purposes and ideals in this war and which the associated nations have accepted as the basis of a settlement.

### THE PEOPLE'S MANDATE

If we returned to the United States without having made every effort in our power to realize this program, we should return to meet the merited scorn of our fellow-citizens. For they are a body that constitute a great democracy. They expect their leaders to speak; their representatives to be their servants.

We have no choice but to obey their mandate. But it is with the greatest enthusiasm and pleasure that we accept that mandate. And because this is the keynote of the whole fabric, we have pledged our every purpose to it, as we have to every item of the fabric. We would not dare abate a single item of the program which constitutes our instructions; we would not dare to compromise upon any matter as the champion of this thing—this peace of the world, this attitude of justice, this principle that we are the masters of no peoples, but are here to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters and govern its own destinies, not as we wish, but as they wish.

We are here to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of a small coterie of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were the aggression of great Powers upon the small. Those foundations were the holding together of empires of unwilling subjects by the duress of arms. Those foundations were the power of small bodies of men to wield their will and use mankind as pawns in a game. And nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace.

You can see that the representatives of the United States are, therefore, never

put to the embarrassment of choosing a way of expediency, because they have had laid down before them the unalterable lines of principles. And, thank God, these lines have been accepted as the lines of settlements by all the high-minded men who have had to do with the beginning of this great business.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, when it is known, as I feel confident it will be known, that we have adopted the principle of the League of Nations and mean to work out that principle in effective action, we shall by that single thing have lifted a great part of the load of anxiety from the hearts of men everywhere.

We stand in a peculiar cause. As I go about the streets here I see everywhere the American uniform. Those men came into the war after we had uttered our purpose. They came as crusaders, not merely to win a war but to win a cause. And I am responsible for them, for it falls to me to formulate the purpose for which I asked them to fight, and I, like them, must be a crusader for these things, whatever it costs and whatever it may be necessary to do in honor to accomplish the object for which they fought.

I have been glad to find from day to day that there is no question of our standing alone in this matter, for there are champions of this cause upon every hand. I am merely avowing this in order that you may understand why, perhaps, it fell to us, who are disengaged from the politics of this great Continent and of the Orient, to suggest that this was the keystone of the arch, and why it occurred to the generous mind of your President to call upon me to open this debate. It is not because we alone represent this idea, but because it is our privilege to associate ourselves with you in representing it.

I have only tried in what I have said to give you the fountains of the enthusiasm which is within us for this thing, for those fountains spring, it seems to me, from all the ancient wrongs and sympathies of mankind, and the very pulse of the world seems to beat to the fullest in this enterprise.

### SECONDED BY BRITAIN

President Wilson was followed by Premier Lloyd George, who made the following speech in support of the resolution:

Mr. Chairman: I rise to second this resolution. After the noble speech of the American President, I feel that no observations are needed in order to commend this resolution to the Conference, and I should not have intervened at all had it not been that I wished to state how emphatically the people of the British Empire are behind this proposal.

And if the national leaders have not been able during the last five years to devote as much time as they would like to its advocacy, it is because their time and their energy have been absorbed in the exigencies of a terrible struggle.

Had there been the slightest doubt in my mind as to the wisdom of this scheme, it would have vanished before an irresistible appeal made to me by the spectacle I witnessed last Sunday. I visited a region which but a few years ago was one of the fairest in an exceptionally fair land. I found it a ruin and a desolation.

I drove for hours through a country which did not appear like the habitation of living men and women and children, but like the excavation of a province, shattered and torn. I went to one city, where I witnessed a scene of devastation that no indemnity can ever repair—one of the beautiful things of the world disfigured and defaced beyond repair.

And one of the cruelest features to my mind was what I could see had happened—that Frenchmen, who love their land almost beyond any nation, in order to establish the justice of their cause had to assist the cruel enemy in demolishing their homes, and I felt that these are the results—only part of the results.

Had I been there three months ago, I would have witnessed something that I dare not describe. But I saw acres of graves of the fallen. And these were the results of the only methods, the only organized methods, that civilized nations have ever attempted or established to settle disputes among each other. And my feeling was: Surely it is time that a saner plan for settling disputes between peoples ought to be established than this organized savagery.

I don't know whether this will succeed. But if we attempt it, the attempt will be a success, and for that reason I second the proposal.

### SUPPORTED BY ITALY

The Italian Premier, Signor Orlando, was next recognized by the Chair, and he expressed his support of the plan in the following words:

I wish to express fervent adhesion to the great principles which we are asked to consecrate, and I think by doing this we shall only fulfill the most solemn obligation we have undertaken toward our people. We asked them to make immense efforts and the counterpart of the responsibility we took was for them sacrifices, unnamed sufferings and death.

We are only doing our duty by keeping our sacred promise, and we must therefore bring into this full consent of mind, and if I may say so, purity of soul. No

people is more ready to accept in its entirety this principle. It is with no feeling of vanity that I shall now recall the great juridical tradition of the Italian people. The principle of law is not only the principle of protection and of justice against violence—it is the form guaranteed by the State of what is a vital principle to humanity—social co-operation and solidarity among men.

The plan which will be laid before us must give us not only guarantees against future wars, but must secure co-operation between nations. This is a great historical day. Today the right of peoples is born. It is only just that it should be born in this generous country of France, which has fought so well by her genius and by her blood to insure the triumph of the rights of man, and this is a happy omen in the beginning of these debates.

### ATTITUDE OF FRANCE

Leon Bourgeois, a French delegate, then expressed his adherence to the plan. He said:

I express my gratitude to the President of the republic who appointed me to speak on this great occasion. Was it because of his memory of the part I took in The Hague Conference? Whatever the reason, half of the honor now given to me must go to those of my colleagues present who were at The Hague with me.

The strong expression used by President Wilson—that we are not only the representatives of Governments, but the representatives of peoples—is something we must reflect upon. What do the free peoples of the world wish for? They wish that the terrible experience of the last four and a half years should never be renewed; they wish for the thing so deeply desired by all the victims of this war, all those who died for freedom and the right—the men who died fighting, not only for their country, but as true crusaders for the liberty of the world.

The striking picture drawn by Mr. Lloyd George of what he saw in one of the devastated parts of France is only one instance of a great fact. The devastating effect of an international conflict cannot now be limited to the place near where the conflict started. There is now no possibility of limiting any conflict of this sort. It cannot happen anywhere without putting the whole world in mortal danger. The whole world is interdependent economically, morally, and intellectually.

Another reason makes it impossible for us to face the renewal of such a war. It is the great progress and the great future progress of science which—against its object, which is all for the benefit of

mankind—will be used as it has been used, if we do not find some way out of the difficulty, for purposes of wholesale destruction.

## SAFEGUARDING THE FUTURE

By thinking of what has been done during this war we can imagine what will happen if another war takes place in another forty or fifty years. We have the right to say that the problem before our consciences—how to assure the future of our own country and the future of our common motherland, the world, while making superior its interest—is the problem of general peace. We can remember the scruples which at The Hague were felt even by the representatives of the most free and most peaceful countries, when they said that they were obliged to limit the stipulations to what would preserve the honor and vital interests of their respective countries.

At present the vital interest of all countries is for a universal peace, based upon the relevance of right, and the rights of all our countries separately are dependent upon it. How can we make a reality of what was thought to be a dream of yesterday? How is it that practical statesmen are now around this table with the common thought that will certainly be expressed by your unanimous votes on what we thought only yesterday to be Utopia?

If we look backward to the history of the last thirty years—and, especially, if I am permitted to refer to it again, The Hague Conference—we can see that, in spite of the disappointment we have suffered, such meetings as that of The Hague Conference had results. Such a dangerous conflict as that between France and Germany at the time of the Casa Blanca incident could be solved by a decision respecting the honor of both countries by a process of arbitration.

Why was it not possible to apply the same proceeding to the terrible conflict which has caused the world so much suffering? There are two causes for it, one of which you will deal with presently. It is because the map of the world did not show a state of things in conformity with the principles of right. It was impossible for Frenchmen not to remember that some of their old countrymen were under foreign rule. It was impossible for Italy to forget that some of the fair provinces of Italy were not yet members of their own mother country, and there were many other questions I need not mention now.

## THE SITUATION CHANGED

How can you organize international peace by suppressing a just claim for unredeemed countries and populations? This could not be done. But after you have arrived at a settlement in conformity

with the principles of right and the wishes of populations themselves, then you will have a firm basis to build up what The Hague Conference was unable to establish.

The second difference between that time and the present time is that you will be able to sit and establish a system of punishments. At The Hague it was impossible because of the division between nations there, and that division showed already the same classification which had been shown in this war. The same group of nations was then adhering to every proposal against a peaceful settlement which we have seen since destroying the peace and happiness of the whole world. At present we are in a position not only to lay down the principles but also to establish a system of penalties.

By this you will be able to do a lasting work, and you will be able to enter with a serene mind into the temple of peace. In the name of the Government of the republic, it is my duty to say that we are ready to attempt and to lend our earnest will to everything that can bring us as far as possible on the road which has been pointed out by President Wilson's speech. You will see what measures have to be taken, but you can be certain that it is with a deep and sincere fervor that the whole of France will join in the efforts.

President Wilson said this question is in the heart of all mankind. Well that a united mankind is born, and we greet its birth.

## VIEWS OF OTHER NATIONS

The Chinese delegate, Lou Tseng Tsiang, stated that he wished to give absolute support to the plan in the name of his Government, declaring that China associated herself entirely with the high ideals embodied in the resolution.

M. Dmowski, the Polish delegate, gave expression to his support in the following declaration:

I wish to express our deep gratitude for this great initiation, and I am speaking for a nation that has suffered very much in the past and hopes that such sufferings will be the last, and that what has not been destroyed during the past centuries and during the present war shall now be preserved for future generations. I am now speaking for a country where the danger is greater than elsewhere, and a danger that is permanent, because the war has not yet come to an end in Poland; because danger and fighting continue there on three different sides. If institutions can be established giving to the world guarantees of a general, permanent peace, danger to which Poland is now exposed would not exist. I

for the existence of those where the League of Nations is most needed.

M. Hymans, the delegate from Belgium, after stating that his country adhered whole-heartedly to the principles involved in the plan, requested an explanation of the paragraph of the resolution which said: "The Conference shall appoint a committee representative of the associated Governments to work out the constitution of the League." Premier Clemenceau replied as follows:

If you will let me speak you shall be satisfied. It has been decided that the committee for the League of Nations should contain two representatives for each of the five great Powers, and that five be elected by the other Powers. The delegates nominated by the five great Powers are, for the United States of America, President Wilson and Colonel House; for the British Empire, Lord Robert Cecil and Lieut. Gen. J. C. Smuts; for France, M. Bourgeois and M. Larnaude, Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Paris; for Italy, Signor Orlando and Senator Scialoja, and for Japan, Viscount Chinda and M. Ochiai.

It has been decided that the five delegates shall be elected by the other Powers, who will present them to the committee. I suggest there should be a meeting of all Powers interested here on Monday to elect their five representatives, and as the same principle is intended to apply to the election of the other committees it might be done at the same time.

M. Clemenceau then said that unless objections were heard the session could assume that the resolution enacting the League of Nations was adopted unanimously, and likewise that the other resolutions were accepted. The record showed unanimous approval.

### BELGIAN REPRESENTATION

The Chair then gave the floor to the Belgian delegate, M. Hymans, who brought before the body the question of representation on the committee for the smaller nations, expressing his opinion with regard to Belgium in the following statements:

What has just been said by the Chairman puts before us the whole question of how those committees are to be formed. The system adopted, except for the Committee on War Damages and Reparations, which is on a different footing, is to give two delegates apiece to each of the

great Powers and five to the whole of the nineteen Powers which are conveniently called "Powers with Special Interests." I have no authority to speak except for my own country, Belgium.

The only committee on which Belgium has representation is the Committee on Reparation of Damages. There Belgium, Serbia, Rumania, and Poland are allowed two delegates, but in all other committees the nineteen Powers I have referred to will nominate five delegates among themselves, and it is not said what system they should adopt. Our desire in speaking for Belgium alone is that Belgium should have representation in the Committee on the League of Nations, and in the Committee on Labor Legislation, for on the League of Nations Belgium has evidently something to say because of her special international situation, and also because of her historical and geographical position.

M. Hymans went on to give reasons why Belgium should have representation on these and other committees, and ended with an appeal to the conference's sense of fair play.

### CLAIMS OF OTHER NATIONS

M. Calogeras, the Brazilian representative, declared that the formation of committees seemed to have been undertaken without any of the most responsible interests having been heard, stating that with regard to the question of the League of Nations Brazil had a particular right to be heard, since the principle that no war of conquest could be sanctioned by its Parliament had been laid down as an absolute clause in its Constitution.

Sir Robert Borden, representing Canada, while admitting the difficulty of having too large a committee, reminded the assembly that in matters where all delegates were concerned it would be more appropriate to have any definite conclusions arrived at by the assembly as a whole in accordance with rules that had been adopted. Mr. Trumbitch, the delegate for Yugoslavia, seconded the claims of the Belgian delegate, declaring that the kingdom of the Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes expected the same rights of representation.

Premier Venizelos, the Greek delegate, supported the claims of Belgium without claiming the same position for his own country. He reminded the delegates,



however, that between 300,000 and 400,000 people of Greek nationality had been killed in the Turkish Empire during the war and that it would be but fair to accord Greece one delegate on a committee inquiring into the responsibility for crimes committed during the war. He also claimed a representative for Greece on the Committee on Ports, Waterways, and Communications, not only because of the position of Greece as a maritime country, but because some of the points of Greek territory are of international importance.

M. Benes, the delegate for Czechoslovakia, claimed representation for his country on committees dealing with the matter of reparation, transportation facilities in the way of railways and waterways, and with regard to the League of Nations. M. Bratiano, the Rumanian delegate, speaking in support of M. Hyman's declarations, claimed representation for Rumania in the matter of international communications, since the Danube, the great waterway for Central Europe, had its source in Rumanian territory. He also declared that the interest taken by Rumania in the furtherance of the scheme for a League of Nations justified her direct participation in the work of preparing the plan. Both the Siamese representative, Bidadh Kosha, and the Chinese representative, Lou Tseng Tsiang, brought forward claims touching the matter of representation on the Committee on the League of Nations and on economic committees. M. Dmowski, speaking for Poland, supported the claims made by the various other smaller nations and claimed representation for Poland on all such committees as interested her directly.

### M. CLEMENCEAU'S REPLY

Premier Clemenceau made reply to the claims put forward for greater representation with the following speech:

I shall try to justify the action of the bureau and of the Chair. If we ever had thought that it was possible to give satisfaction to every one, that illusion would have vanished by this time. Sir Robert Borden expressed the reproach that we had decided upon certain questions. Well,

yes, we decided for instance, that all the nations represented here should come to this Conference.

There is no mystery about the meetings now taking place between the representatives of the five great Powers. Mr. Borden knows probably more than most people of those meetings, since only yesterday he was present there putting before us the special views of Canada about some colonial questions.

The five Powers are obliged to say that they are in a position to justify their attitude. At the time of the armistice they had together 12,000,000 men under arms on the battlefields. Their dead can be counted by millions. If the great idea of a Society of Nations did not shape the whole of our work here, it would have been possible for us five great Powers to consult only ourselves in the settlement.

That would have been, after all, our right. Well, that has never been our thought. We have asked all the nations interested in a settlement to meet with us here. We have asked them to give us their co-operation and their help.

### EFFICIENCY THE OBJECT

Now, what about the method? Mr. Lloyd George, in very kind words at the opening of these meetings, reminded me that I was not quite young. I entered the French Parliament in 1871, and since that time I have seen a great many committees, and have been present at work on more than one. Now, my constant observation has been that the more numerous the members on those committees were, the less work was done and less facility there was for coming to conclusions. Now, conclusions are what we want. We have behind us the great force to which we owe consideration and respect—the force of public opinion. But public opinion expects us to do things. What they will ask of us is whether we have been arriving at conclusions.

Take the question of the great Society of Nations. They are listening to our debates most anxiously. They hope to hear that something has been done toward what they consider to be one of their most desired goals. What is our desire?

We have said that each of the five Powers intended to nominate two delegates to sit in these committees. Well, let us examine the question in its narrow form. In the observations that have been made really the question now before you has been more or less exceeded. We have nominated two delegates each, and we propose that five should be nominated by the other Powers. That is not enough, we are told from all sides. Well, then, I suppose I should propose that each Power should be represented in each committee. That would satisfy every one,

but would be the means of never arriving at any conclusion.

### COMPLAINTS NOT VALID

The great complaint has been, as we have heard repeatedly from one country after another, that a country would not have a chance to be heard on the questions vitally interesting her. Now this cannot happen. You will have full right to attend, that is, to be present at the deliberations of any committee you choose. Those committees are entirely open to you; they are not created for any other purpose. **You have the right to be fully heard whenever you please by any committee, and when you have been heard there, and when that committee has made its report and drafted something, you have the right to be heard again before this full sitting of the delegates, where you will be present yourself and will have the right to speak.**

If we follow what has been suggested by M. Dmowski, then you are going to make proposals in writing. Well, that will come to the meetings of the five Powers. There should be no discussion about this; there should be no deliberations or discussion about the points of procedure when what is urgently required from us by public opinion is that we should pay less attention to form and deal with the substance of things. What they expect is to see our work taking material form and materializing. They wish that all those millions who are still mobilized should be enabled to return to their homes. These are the questions that interest public opinion. If we delay the vital discussion of things for an interminable debate on a question of procedure, we will, in a fortnight's time, still be at the same place from which we started.

M. Dmowski suggested that these questions should be put before the committee. I insist those questions should be put before your bureau, and to give my reason frankly, it is because I could not, we could not, accept that any commission should have the right to dictate to the five great Powers.

### DESIRE TO BE FAIR

Now, I ask simply that our resolution, as drafted, should be accepted with, of course, the right to modify and to improve it later on. If we go out of this room with your vote, these committees will be established immediately. They will be able to work tomorrow. Our only preoccupation is to organize as soon as possible and to go to work without delay.

Who would take the responsibility of adding to the delays? I suppose none of us. But if any delegates think, after the names of the members of each of the

committees are known, that an important addition should be made, that some country's or some man's presence is vital, they will have the right to say so, and there's no reason why we should consider our resolution sacred or unchangeable.

But we must get to work as soon as we can. Think of the immense work before us. President Wilson, in his speech to our body today, had honorable words for those men who came here as crusaders, not to win the war, but to win a cause. Well, it is of the cause that we must think, and we must do our best, whatever procedure we adopt, to make it better as we go along. But let us go to work at once.

As for myself, I have come here ready to sacrifice many of my opinions in order to conciliate, in order to reach the conclusions we all wish for, and I have already sacrificed some of them, done it with joy for the great common cause which has united us here. I hope we all will be inspired by the same spirit. Your Conference officials, in the decisions which they have arrived at and which they have submitted to you, have no desire to be unjust to any one. They do not wish to be unjust to Belgium, or to Bohemia, or to the Serbians, Croats, Slovenes, or any of those who have expressed their opinions here. They simply wish to devise a procedure that will lead to immediate, speedy, useful work. And this is the only conclusion they can arrive at.

### NEW COMMISSIONS CREATED

The following resolution in regard to reparation was adopted by the conference:

That a commission be appointed, which shall comprise not more than three representatives apiece from each of the five great Powers and not more than two representatives apiece from Belgium, Greece, Poland, Rumania, and Serbia, to examine and report:

First—On the amount of reparation which the enemy countries ought to pay.

Second—On what they are capable of paying, and,

Third—On the method, the form, and time within which payment should be made.

A resolution in regard to international legislation on industrial and labor questions was passed. It reads:

That a commission, composed of two representatives apiece from the five great Powers and five representatives to be elected by the other Powers represented at the Peace Conference, be appointed to inquire into the conditions of employment from the international aspect and to consider the international means necessary to secure common action on matters affect-

ing conditions of employment and to recommend the form of a permanent agency to continue such inquiry and consideration in co-operation with and under the direction of the League of Nations.

This resolution was adopted regarding international control of ports, waterways, and railways:

## Staff Personnel of the Conference

### Members and Committees

**T**HE personnel of the Peace Conference as finally perfected was announced Jan. 29 as follows:

Besides Georges Clemenceau, the French Premier, as President, and Secretary Lansing, Premiers Lloyd George of Great Britain, Orlando of Italy, and Saionji of Japan as Vice Presidents, the members are:

Secretary General—M. Dutasta, France.

Secretaries: For the United States—Joseph C. Grew, Minister Plenipotentiary; Leland Harrison, and Colonel U. S. Grant, 3d. For the British Empire—Lieut. Col. Sir Maurice Hankey, Herman Norman, and Eric Phipps. For France—M. P. Gauthier, Minister Plenipotentiary, and M. Debearn. For Italy—Comte Aldrovandi, Marquis Charles Durazzo, and M. G. Brambilla. For Japan—Sadao Saburi.

Committee on Verification of Powers—Henry White, United States; Arthur Balfour, British Empire; Jules Cambon, France; Marquis Salvago Raggi, Italy, and K. Matsui, Japan.

Committee on Drafting—James Brown Scott, United States; Mr. Hurst, British Empire; M. Fromager, France; Ricci Busatti, Italy, and H. Nagosaka, Japan.

### THE COMMITTEES

Premier Clemenceau on Jan. 26 announced the following committees in conformity with the action of the conference:

Responsibility for the War—Great Britain, Sir Gordon Stewart; France, Captain André Tardieu and Ferdinand Larnaude; Italy, Vittorio Scialoja and Deputy Raimondo; United States, Robert Lansing.

Reparation—United States, B. M. Baruch, John W. Davis, and Vance McCormick; Great Britain, William Morris Hughes, Sir John Simon, and Baron Cunliffe; France, L. L. Klotz, L. P. Locheur, and A. F. Lebrun; Italy, Antonio Salandra and General Badoglio; Japan, Baron Makino and Baron Nobuaki.

International Labor Legislation—United States, E. N. Hurley and Samuel Gom-

That a commission composed of two representatives apiece from the five great Powers and five representatives of the other Powers be appointed, to inquire and report upon the international régime for ports, waterways, and railways.

After the adoption of these resolutions the session adjourned.

pers; Great Britain, George Nicoll Barnes and Ian Malcolm; France, M. Colliard and L. P. Locheur; Italy, Signor Des Planches and Signor Cabrini; Japan, M. Otichian and M. Oka.

Regulation of Ports, Waterways, and Railroads—United States, Henry White; Great Britain, Sir John Simon; France, André Voiss and Albert Clavelle; Italy, Signor Grespi and Signor de Marino; Japan, M. Yamakawa and Colonel Sato.

The representatives of the nineteen small Powers met on Jan. 27 and gave full adhesion to the organization formulated by the five great Powers. Jules Cambon, French delegate, and former Ambassador to the United States, presided. The following appointments were made to the various committees:

### LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Belgium, Paul Hymans.  
Brazil, Epitacio Pessoa.  
China, Wellington Koo, Plenipotentiary.  
Serbia, M. R. Vesnitch.  
Portugal, Jaime Batalha Reis, Minister Plenipotentiary.

### RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE WAR

Belgium, (not yet appointed.)  
Serbia, Slobodan Yovanovitch.  
Rumania, Mr. Rosenthal.  
Greece, M. Politis.  
Poland, (not yet appointed.)

### INTERNATIONAL LABOR LEGISLATION

Belgium, M. Vandervelde and M. Mahaim.  
Cuba, A. S. Pustamante.  
Poland, (not yet appointed.)  
Czechoslovak Republic, M. Benes.

### REGULATION OF PORTS, WATERWAYS, AND RAILROADS

Belgium, (not yet appointed.)  
China, H. E. Thomas and C. T. Wang, Plenipotentiary Delegate.  
Greece, M. Coromilas.  
Serbia, M. Trumbitch.  
Uruguay, Carlos Blanco.