

International Law Studies—Volume 21

International Law Documents

could be adequately considered and those which were adopted suitably expressed. There was not, however, the slightest objection to having the commission itself enlarged, if that would seem to be desirable. He had found, however, that when it came to a question of drafting rules, the fewer there were who were actually engaged in the work the better the prospect of success; and while each one charged with the responsibility should have all the information available and the aid of all the experts who could possibly throw light upon the subject, a very few men competent in drafting, associated together for that purpose, could accomplish much more than a large committee.

He also felt the force of the suggestion of limiting the scope of the inquiry. That was very carefully considered when the tentative agenda was suggested, and the proposal made to which Mr. Balfour had referred.

It seemed to the chairman that the question of the method of constituting the commission and the scope of the inquiry to be intrusted to it could well be committed to the consideration of the committee on draft and the committee could await their recommendation. If that was agreeable to the delegates, he would simply assent in principle to the constitution of a commission for the purpose of dealing with the subject of rules of warfare in the light of the developments of the recent war.

Mr. Balfour said that, while he was perfectly ready to have the matter referred to the drafting committee, he would like to have reservations limiting the scope of the drafting committee's work, and asked the chairman's advice as to how this result might be attained.

The chairman assumed that both of the suggestions Mr. Balfour had made should be deemed as referred to the subcommittee on drafting and that it would take those into consideration as well as others that might be advanced in the course of the discussion, and that the committee should bring in a recommendation, which could then be discussed in the light of the arguments advanced for its support.

Mr. Balfour said that would be satisfactory.

After a vote was taken the chairman announced that the suggestions as to the references to the drafting committee were unanimously approved.

Thereupon, the committee adjourned until Tuesday, January 10, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

---

#### NINETEENTH MEETING—FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1922, 4.15 P. M.

##### PRESENT.

*United States.*—Mr. Hughes, Senator Lodge, Mr. Root, Senator Underwood. Accompanied by Mr. Wright.

*British Empire.*—Mr. Balfour, Lord Lee, Sir Auckland Geddes; for Australia, Senator Pearce. Accompanied by Mr. Christie, Mr. Bajpai.

*France.*—Mr. Kammerer.

*Italy.*—Senator Schanzer, Senator Albertini. Accompanied by Marquis Visconti-Venosta, Count Pagliano.

*Japan.*—Baron Shidehara, Mr. Hanihara. Accompanied by Mr. Saburi, Mr. Tomita.

The secretary general. Assisted by Mr. Pierrepont and Mr. Osborne. Mr. Camerlynck, interpreter.

1. The Nineteenth Meeting of the Committee on the Limitation of Armament was held Friday, January 27, 1922, in the Columbus Room of the Pan American Building at 4.15 p. m.

2. There were present: For the United States, Mr. Hughes, Senator Lodge, Mr. Root, Senator Underwood; for the British Empire, Mr. Balfour, Lord Lee, Sir Auckland Geddes, Senator Pearce (for Australia); for France, Mr. Kammerer; for Italy, Senator Schanzer, Senator Albertini; for Japan, Baron Shidehara, Mr. Hanihara.

Secretaries and advisers present included: For the United States, Mr. Wright; for the British Empire, Mr. Christie, Mr. Bajpai; for Italy, Marquis Visconti-Venosta, Count Pagliano; for Japan, Mr. Saburi, Mr. Tomita.

The secretary general of the conference, assisted by Mr. Pierrepont and Mr. Osborne, was present. Mr. Camerlynck, interpreter, was also present.

3. The chairman (Mr. Hughes) called for any outstanding reports from subcommittees.

Mr. Root said he was instructed by the subcommittee, the five-power drafting committee, to report that they had agreed upon the following resolution:

*"Resolution for a commission of jurists.*—The United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan have agreed:

"I. That a commission composed of not more than two members representing each of the above-mentioned powers shall be constituted to consider the following questions:

"(a) Do existing rules of international law adequately cover new methods of attack or defense resulting from the introduction or development, since the Hague Conference of 1907, of new agencies of warfare?

"(b) If not so, what changes in the existing rules ought to be adopted in consequence thereof as a part of the law of nations?

"II. That notices of appointment of the members of the commission shall be transmitted to the Government of the United States of America within three months after the adjournment of the present conference, which after consultation with the powers



concerned will fix the day and place for the meeting of the commission.

" III. That the commission shall be at liberty to request assistance and advice from experts in international law and in land, naval, and aerial warfare.

" IV. That the commission shall report its conclusions to each of the powers represented in its membership.

" Those powers shall thereupon confer as to the acceptance of the report and the course to be followed to secure the consideration of its recommendations by the other civilized powers.'

The chairman asked whether discussion of the resolution was desired. No discussion being desired, the delegations were polled, each voted affirmatively, and the chairman announced that the resolution had been unanimously adopted.

The chairman then asked whether there was any further business.

Mr. Kammerer asked whether it would not be advisable to embody this resolution in the text of the agreement in regard to submarines and the use of poisonous gases in warfare.

Mr. Root said he thought Mr. Kammerer's suggestion might involve a little difficulty in procedure. Under the provisions regarding submarines and gas, the adherence of other powers was to be immediately requested. He thought that it would be unwise to complicate that with this other provision, under which there would be no adherence called for until after a report of the commission and the acceptance of it by the five powers, after which the adherence of other powers would be called for. Provisions which called for no adherence by other powers would thus be put into the treaty, together with provisions which called for immediate adherence.

The chairman said that, if there was nothing further to be done at the present time, and if agreeable to the committee, adjournment might be taken. Of course, as soon as the Naval Treaty was in readiness, the chairman would call a meeting of the committee.

The committee then adjourned, subject to the call of the chair.

---

#### TWENTIETH MEETING—TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1922, 3.30 P. M.

##### PRESENT.

*United States.*—Mr. Hughes, Senator Lodge, Mr. Root, Senator Underwood, Admiral Coontz. Accompanied by Mr. Wright, Mr. Clark.

*British Empire.*—Mr. Balfour, Lord Lee, Sir Auckland Geddes, Rear Admiral Sir E. Chatfield, Sir Robert Borden (for Canada), Senator Pearce (for Australia), Sir John Salmond (for New Zealand).