

# LEAGUE OF NATIONS

*Official Journal*

---

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT N° 81

---

## RECORDS

OF THE

TENTH ORDINARY SESSION

OF THE

ASSEMBLY

---

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEES

---

MINUTES

OF THE

SIXTH COMMITTEE

(POLITICAL QUESTIONS)

GENEVA, 1929

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE . . . . .	5
AGENDA . . . . .	7
FIRST MEETING, September 3rd, 1929, at 10 a.m. :	
1. Election of the Vice-Chairman . . . . .	7
2. Publicity of the Meetings . . . . .	7
3. Adoption of the Agenda . . . . .	7
4. Appointment of Rapporteurs . . . . .	7
SECOND MEETING, September 5th, 1929, at 4 p.m. :	
5. Slavery Convention : Annual Report by the Council . . . . .	7
THIRD MEETING, September 12th, 1929, at 10 a.m. :	
6. Addition of the Mandates Question to the Agenda . . . . .	12
7. Supplementary Credits . . . . .	13
8. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees . . . . .	13
FOURTH MEETING, September 13th, 1929, at 10 a.m. :	
9. Slavery Convention — Annual Report by the Council: Report of the Sub-Committee appointed on September 5th, 1929 . . . . .	16
10. Mandates . . . . .	18
FIFTH MEETING, September 14th, 1929, at 10 a.m. :	
11. Mandates ( <i>continuation</i> ) . . . . .	22
SIXTH MEETING, September 16th, 1929, at 3.30 p.m. :	
12. Question of accelerating the Work of the Committee : Letter from the President of the Assembly . . . . .	28
13. Mandates ( <i>continuation</i> ) . . . . .	28
SEVENTH MEETING, September 18th, 1929, at 3.30 p.m. :	
14. Slavery Convention — Annual Report by the Council : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	30
15. Mandates : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	31
16. Settlement of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	32
EIGHTH MEETING, September 20th, 1929, at 3.30 p.m. :	
17. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	32
18. Close of the Session . . . . .	33

## ANNEXES.

1. Slavery Convention — Annual Report by the Council : Report by the Sub-Committee appointed on September 5th, 1929, presented by M. Palacios (Spain) . . . . .	35
1a. Slavery Convention — Annual Report by the Council : Draft Report by the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by M. Palacios (Spain) . . . . .	36
2. Mandates : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by Dr. Nansen (Norway) . . . . .	37
3. Settlement of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by Dr. Nansen (Norway) . . . . .	38
4. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by Mrs. Hamilton (British Empire) . . . . .	39

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE.

---

*Chairman* : His Excellency M. Paul E. JANSON (Belgium).

*Vice-Chairman* : His Excellency M. J. C. Franco FRAZÃO, Count DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal).

*Members* :

- Abyssinia* : Lidj ANDARGUÉ MASSAI.  
Ato EFREM TWOLDE MEDHEN (Substitute).
- Albania* :
- Australia* : Major-General the Honourable Sir Granville de Laune RYRIE, K.C.M.G.,  
C.B., V.D.
- Austria* : His Excellency M. MENSENDORFF-POUILLY-DIETRICHSTEIN.  
Dr. LEITMAIER.  
Dr. F. MATSCH.
- Belgium* : His Excellency M. Paul E. JANSON (Chairman).  
M. O. LOUWERS.
- Bolivia* :
- British Empire* : The Rt. Hon. The Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD.  
Mrs. SWANWICK, M.A.  
Mrs. Mary HAMILTON, M.P.
- Bulgaria* : His Excellency M. A. BOUROFF.  
M. D. MIKOFF (Substitute).
- Canada* : Mr. Walter A. RIDDELL, M.A., Ph.D.
- Chile* : His Excellency M. J. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE.
- China* : His Excellency General TSIANG TSO-PING.  
M. DEKIEN TUNG (Substitute).
- Colombia* : M. R. Bernal JIMENEZ.  
Dr. Victor V. OLANO (Substitute).
- Cuba* : M. R. Hernández PORTELA.
- Czechoslovakia* : His Excellency M. Zdeněk FIERLINGER.
- Denmark* : The Rev. Th. POVLSSEN.  
Miss Henni FORCHHAMMER.
- Dominican Republic* :
- Estonia* : His Excellency M. Jaan LATTIK.  
General J. LAIDONER.
- Finland* : His Excellency M. Hj. J. PROCOPÉ.  
His Excellency Baron Aarno YRJO-KOSKINEN.  
M. G. SCHAUMAN (Substitute).  
M. A. VUORIMAA (Substitute).
- France* : M. Lucien HUBERT.  
M. Robert SÉROT (Substitute).  
M. Louis AUBERT (Substitute).
- Germany* : His Excellency Dr. C. VON SCHUBERT.  
M. FROHWEIN (Substitute).
- Greece* : M. R. RAPHAËL.
- Guatemala* :
- Haiti* :
- Honduras* : M. Froylan TURCIOS.
- Hungary* : His Excellency Count A. APPONYI.  
His Excellency M. L. GAJZÁGÓ (Substitute).  
M. Joseph VÉSZI (Substitute).
- India* : His Highness the MAHARAJA OF KAPURTHALA, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.B.E.  
Syed RAZA ALI, C.B.E. (Substitute).

- Irish Free State* : Mr. Sean MURPHY.
- Italy* : His Excellency Count BONIN-LONGARE.  
His Excellency M. E. ROSSONI (Substitute).  
His Excellency M. Augusto Rosso (Substitute).
- Japan* : His Excellency M. T. MATSUDAIRA.  
His Excellency M. K. HIROTA (Substitute).
- Latvia* : His Excellency M. BALODIS.  
His Excellency M. V. SCHUMANS (Substitute).  
Dr. Paul SCHIEMANS (Substitute).
- Liberia* : Dr. A. SOTTILE.
- Lithuania* : His Excellency Professor A. VOLDEMARAS.
- Luxemburg* : His Excellency M. Joseph BECH.  
M. Gaston DIDERICH (Substitute).
- Netherlands* : His Excellency M. Hendrik COLIJN.  
His Excellency Jonkheer J. LOUDON.  
Raden Adipati Ario Achmad DJAJADININGRAT (Substitute).
- New Zealand* : The Hon. Sir James PARR, K.C.M.G.  
Mr. C. B. BURDEKIN (Substitute).  
Mr. C. KNOWLES (Substitute).
- Nicaragua* :
- Norway* : Dr. Fridtjof NANSEN.  
M. Rolf ANDVORD (Substitute).
- Panama* : His Excellency M. J. D. AROSEMENA.
- Paraguay* : His Excellency Dr. Ramon V. CABALLERO DE BEDOYA.
- Persia* : His Highness Mirza Mohammed Ali Khan FOROUGHI.  
Colonel Ali Khan RIAZI (Substitute).
- Peru* : His Excellency M. Mariano H. CORNEJO.
- Poland* : His Excellency M. Miroslaw ARCISZEWSKI.  
M. Adam TARNOWSKI (Substitute).  
M. Léon CHRZANOWSKI (Substitute).  
M. Anatole MUHLSTEIN (Substitute).
- Portugal* : His Excellency M. J. C. Franco FRAZÃO, Count DE PENHA GARCIA  
(Vice-Chairman).  
His Excellency Dr. Vasco DE QUEVEDO.  
M. Antonio GOMES D'ALMENDRA (Substitute).
- Roumania* : M. V. MARC.  
M. Basile STOICA.  
M. Victor CADERE (Substitute).
- Salvador* : His Excellency M. Francisco A. LIMA.
- Kingdom of the Serbs,  
Croats and Slovenes* : His Excellency M. Voïslaw MARINKOVITCH.  
His Excellency M. Iliá CHOUMENKOVITCH (Substitute).
- Siam* : His Excellency M. P. Vijitavongs VUDHIKRAI.  
Luang Jamni KOLAKARN (Substitute).
- South Africa* : Mr. E. H. LOUW.  
Mr. R. WEBSTER (Substitute).  
Mr. J. DU RANDT (Substitute).
- Spain* : His Excellency M. L. PALACIOS-MORINI.  
M. Juan DE LAS BARCENAS (Substitute).
- Sweden* : His Excellency Dr. T. M. HÖJER.  
Baron H. G. BECK-FRIIS (Substitute).
- Switzerland* : M. Camille GORGÉ.  
M. William RAPPARD (Substitute).
- Uruguay* : M. José G. ANTUNA.
- Venezuela* : His Excellency Dr. José GIL-FORTOUL.  
M. Enrique GIL-FORTOUL (Substitute).
-

SIXTH COMMITTEE OF THE TENTH ORDINARY SESSION  
OF THE ASSEMBLY.  
(POLITICAL QUESTIONS)

---

AGENDA

1. SLAVERY CONVENTION : ANNUAL REPORT BY THE COUNCIL.
2. RUSSIAN, ARMENIAN, ASSYRIAN, ASSYRO-CHALDEAN AND TURKISH REFUGEES.
3. MANDATES.

---

FIRST MEETING.

*Held on Tuesday, September 3rd, 1929, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

1. **Election of the Vice-Chairman.**

COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA was elected Vice-Chairman.

2. **Publicity of the Meetings.**

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, *the Committee decided that its meetings should be held in public.*

3. **Adoption of the Agenda.**

*The Committee adopted its Agenda, which comprised the following items :*

1. Slavery Convention (Annual Report by the Council) ;
2. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees : Report of the Advisory Commission attached to the High Commissioner.

4. **Appointment of Rapporteurs.**

*The Committee decided to postpone the appointment of Rapporteurs.*

---

SECOND MEETING.

*Held on Thursday, September 5th, 1929, at 4 p.m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

5. **Slavery Convention : Annual Report by the Council.**

VISCOUNT CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) said he spoke under considerable difficulties because he had not known until an hour before the meeting that there was any probability of the Committee's sitting that afternoon. Still less did he know that it was going to deal first with the question of slavery. Slavery was a somewhat complicated and difficult matter, and there were a certain number of observations he would like to submit to the Committee. He hoped, however, that in the circumstances the Committee would extend to him its best consideration.

The Convention, as everyone knew, had been drawn up about three years previously ; it had been ratified by a certain number of States and had been put into operation. He hoped that it had not been without effect. He thought that some progress had been made and that the evil of slavery and its accompanying evil of forced labour had been diminished, though they had not been extirpated from the world. That was satisfactory, but he was bound to add that there were still some aspects of the question which gave the British Government anxiety.

In the first place, there was the question of ratification. The Convention had been ratified or acceded to by twenty-eight States, but, in addition to those twenty-eight States, seventeen had signed but not ratified.

He was not sure that he had the list of those States, and he did not know that it would be very desirable for him to read it, but it was evident that, in a matter of this kind, the effect of the Convention depended largely upon its being universally signed. If the evil were extirpated in one country while it continued to exist in a neighbouring country, it was evident that the remedy was insufficient.

He would like to read Article 7 of the Slavery Convention. It was as follows :

“The High Contracting Parties undertake to communicate to each other and to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations any laws and regulations which they may enact with a view to the application of the provisions of the present Convention.”

It had been hoped that, not only would that information be communicated, but that any general information in the possession of the States on the subject would also be communicated. It was

a lamentable fact that the number of States which had been able to give any information on the subject to the Secretary-General of the League was exceedingly small. Apart from the British Empire and States under the control of the British Empire, only four States—Abyssinia, Italy, Spain and Portugal—had, at any time, given any information at all.

It was difficult for him to believe that in no other State in the world was there information available. There were, in fact, at least two States on the borders of parts of the British Empire—he forbore from mentioning their names—which unquestionably had slavery questions very acutely present in territories under their dominion. He was not making any charge against them. It was the result of a long tradition and they had not yet been able, as the British Government had only recently been able, if it had been completely able, to extirpate slavery and slave trading. There were at any rate those two States, and he thought there must be other States in the world with information which might be communicated and which they had not communicated to the League.

He wished to refer to a still more delicate matter. It happened to be within the knowledge of British officials that a considerable amount of slavery and slave trading undoubtedly still went on in certain States. He was quite sure that, where it existed, it existed in defiance of the Government and owing to the impossibility—the very-well-understood impossibility—of fully carrying out the excellent laws which, no doubt, existed on the subject. Still, it did exist. To give one instance, there was undoubtedly still a certain amount of slave trading across the Red Sea. British officials believed—as he would presently show in a paper—that slavery had diminished considerably, that the wholesale trade in slaves had practically been stopped. The considerable amount of slave trading which had existed in the past might have stopped, but single dhows still carried a considerable number of slaves.

As the Committee was no doubt aware, the British and French Governments, and he thought the Italian Government, all had small ships of war, sloops, assigned to the prevention of that trade, but it was evident that it was not very easy in narrow waters to stop every dhow that went by night, it might be, from one side to the other. He knew that the British vessels did their best, and he was sure the vessels of other countries did so also, but some slave trading still went on. He had seen estimates of the volume of the trade, but they were so varied that he did not think it would be of any value to the Committee to mention any particular figure. All he could say was that the number certainly exceeded several hundreds a year.

Such a situation could only exist because there were two territories which were combining to carry on the trade. There must be a *terminus a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*. The *terminus a quo* was Africa and the *terminus ad quem* was Arabia as far as the slave trade crossing the Red Sea was concerned.

He confessed that he viewed with some anxiety the state of affairs in certain districts of Africa. He was quite aware that all the Governments concerned had avowed—and, no doubt, perfectly sincerely—their utmost determination to put a stop to the slave trade. He was also quite clear from the information received from British officials that, in certain of those countries, a very considerable amount of slave trading still went on, not only across the Red Sea, but by the capture of slaves in one part of the country and their removal to another. It happened that the British Empire had territories bordering on that part of the world in Kenya and in the Sudan, where they were jointly interested with Egypt, and in both of those territories there were, from time to time, raids by evilly-disposed persons who captured mainly women and children and carried them off into their country of origin. In addition to that, there was a certain amount of enslavement going on in the territories themselves.

There was also reason to believe that in another very different part of the world—in Asia—a certain amount of slavery existed, because records had been given privately of legislation on the subject, though, as far as he knew, no such records had been delivered to the League.

Viscount Cecil hoped the Committee would acquit him of any desire to make an attack on any particular country. That was far from his object. Indeed, so far as possible, he had avoided mentioning any particular country. He thought the question was becoming a very serious one and would ask whether, in view of the fact that all the countries in question were, he thought, Members of the League, some enquiry on the subject ought not to be instituted, not with a view to convicting them, but merely with a view to finding out whether the Convention was in fact being effective. If it were not, some change in it ought to be recommended.

He would like, therefore, to lay before the Committee—he would not put it in the form of a definite resolution, because he would like to know the opinions of his colleagues first—the suggestion that the Slavery Commission, from which the whole of the work on slavery had sprung, might be revived. He was afraid that owing to deaths it would be impossible to have exactly the same members on that Commission. Still, as far as the members were alive and capable of assisting, he would like them to give their help because they knew the state of affairs from which a start had been made, and they would be able to say whether there had been any progress. If the Slavery Commission were revived, it would be asked to report generally on the execution of the Convention, and particularly on the question why so many ratifications were still outstanding. It would be useful also to know why so very few countries had been able to give information and, most of all, whether there was any reason to suppose that a considerable amount of slavery and slave trading still existed, and, if so, whether any remedies could be applied in order to prevent it.

Viscount Cecil ventured to make that suggestion for the consideration of the Committee and would be extremely grateful to any of his colleagues who felt able to express any opinion upon it, either at that or any future meeting of the Committee.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway), in supporting Lord Cecil's proposal, thought it was time to examine what had been done by the League in connection with this very important question. The impression given to the world by the reports received was that British territory was the only territory in which there was much slavery. He was convinced that that impression was not correct.

There was much information to hand which it would be difficult to discuss in public. He proposed, therefore, that a Sub-Committee should be first appointed to discuss the question and prepare for the final consideration of Lord Cecil's proposal. Such a Sub-Committee could effectively discuss many delicate matters which were hardly suitable for consideration in a full Committee.

M. PALACIOS (Spain) in his turn supported the proposal put forward by Lord Cecil, to whom honour was due as having been, to a great extent, the author of the draft Convention. The signatory States must honour their signatures and must therefore supply the League of Nations with all possible information as to the methods to be adopted to put an end finally to slavery. The question was a very delicate one and was engaging the close attention of public opinion. In his work "Slavery or Sacred Trust", Mr. John Harris estimated at three millions the number of slaves in Africa.

The Spanish delegate paid a tribute to the quite remarkable work done by the Temporary Slavery Commission, and thought that the latter was particularly qualified to resume and carry through the task undertaken.

In conclusion, he said that he preferred Lord Cecil's proposal to that of Dr. Nansen if it were found, though he did not think it would be so, that they were incompatible.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) said he represented a country which had co-operated in framing the Convention, which had ratified it, and which had supplied the League of Nations with all possible information on the question. He emphasised the unanimity of public opinion in favour of the total abolition of slavery, which for so long past had been outlawed by civilisation but which unfortunately had not yet been completely eradicated.

He thought that the delay in the ratification of the Convention in certain countries could not be taken to imply any sympathy with an evil which everyone wished to extirpate.

While having no objection to Lord Cecil's proposal, which he approved in principle, Count Bonin-Longare was convinced of the necessity of studying carefully the delicate problem which would be referred to the former Slavery Commission reconstituted with fresh members. He therefore supported Dr. Nansen's proposal, since, far from being in contradiction to the previous one, it completed it. The small Sub-Committee proposed by Dr. Nansen would have, amongst others, the task of determining the new framework of the activities of the Slavery Commission, reconstituted according to Lord Cecil's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN noted that there was no contradiction between Lord Cecil's proposal on the one hand and Dr. Nansen's complementary proposal on the other.

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) had no objection to the question's being referred to a Sub-Committee if the Committee thought it desirable. But would not that procedure result in an unnecessary duplication of the enquiries? The Assembly would ask the Council to reappoint the Commission. If the Council decided to reappoint it, it would give whatever directions it thought fit to the Commission. The Commission would then carry out an enquiry and the question would come back to the League and be again examined by the Sixth Committee. At the end of that period something would be done. He was not quite clear what function the Sub-Committee suggested by Dr. Nansen would perform.

He had drafted the resolution he would recommend as follows :

"Considering the importance of the general ratification of the Slavery Convention and the desirability of placing at the disposal of the League the fullest information on the subject of slavery and forced labour ;

"Anxious to complete the abolition of the slave trade and slavery in all its forms :

"The Committee recommends to the Council the reappointment of the Slavery Commission to report on the above matters".

Though very roughly drafted, he thought it represented fairly closely the views that had been expressed. If Count Bonin-Longare and Dr. Nansen still desired that the matter should be referred to a Sub-Committee, he would not oppose that procedure, though he did not quite know what a Sub-Committee would do.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that, if Lord Cecil's proposal were adopted, he was willing to withdraw his own. But if it were thought necessary to examine the question further, he adhered to his own proposal. The question was very delicate in many respects and, though he was very much in favour of publicity where possible, it was sometimes difficult to discuss delicate matters in public. It was more important to have them considered by a small group of people.

Count DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal) asked what had been the real results of the 1926 Convention. A large number of countries had signed and ratified that Convention. From the documents which had been received, unfortunately in rather too small numbers, it could be concluded that the evil of slavery was not as universal and considerable as might have been feared. Even in certain British colonies where slavery still existed it was less severe in character than formerly. The British documents proved that after the application of the Slavery Convention a certain number of the former slaves, having become free, now worked for their old masters. The change had been largely a legal one.

The second observation to be made was that a certain number of countries which might have sent documents had not done so, and this was regrettable.

The Slavery Convention endeavoured to solve the problem of slavery proper, and the much more complicated problem of "analogous conditions". These were very difficult to define as the analogy might exist, even at the present time, in the most civilised countries. In this connection, Portugal had had to draft, a considerable time ago, several legislative documents for its colonies with a view to improving the conditions of labour and health in general, in cases where there was forced labour in the sense of an obligation. In so doing, it had accomplished a work which was in keeping, not only with its colonial history, but still more with its modern colonial policy, to which it had devoted over £200,000,000, several thousands of human lives sacrificed to disease and the climate, and a great deal of thought and labour. This modern colonial policy of the Portuguese Government was based on the fact that there were much more effective means of combating slavery and "analogous conditions" than conventions — namely, railways, motor-cars, roads, improvements in conditions of production — in a word, civilisation.

Lord Cecil's proposal should be examined. The League of Nations, always prudent in its methods, had undertaken the study of these questions of compulsory labour in the colonies and even of native labour in general. At a certain stage it had been decided to entrust this study to the International Labour Office. But this year it seemed that the International Labour Organisation's intervention had raised a certain amount of disquiet. While the International Labour Office was the most competent body to deal with all main labour problems, especially in industrial matters, native labour was quite another matter. When it had been proposed to apply to native labour certain rules which were perfectly just and normal in the case of industrial labour, the failure to understand the special conditions of the natives and of native labour had given rise to a certain anxiety in colonial circles.

It should also be remembered that the League of Nations always endeavoured to obtain unanimity in its decisions ; hence, it could only ask its organs to examine general questions concerning all countries and regarding which every country could assume the same responsibilities.

A scientific institution of great value, the International Colonial Institute, had expressed the opinion that, in this question of native labour, the general conditions were not such as to make it possible at the moment to draw up an international convention. Even if a convention were found to be desirable, it could only be effectively concluded between the colonial Powers.

The Portuguese delegate thought that these were points deserving of serious consideration, since it was in everyone's interest, when a convention was signed, that it should be genuinely effective and operative.

As regards Lord Cecil's idea of reconstituting the old Slavery Commission, or some other organ, it should be studied in detail in accordance with the procedure suggested by Dr. Nansen.

Syed RAZA ALI (India) said that, as the representative of a country that was deeply interested in the abolition of slavery and forced labour and all forms of compulsory labour, he could not record a silent vote. He thought that, in the draft which Viscount Cecil had read to the Commission, he had made his point quite clear. The important and essential point, so far as slavery was concerned, was not only that it should be abolished in those areas where it still existed, but that a very serious effort should be made by the League to strike at the root of the system which sanctioned any form of compulsory labour, because, so far as he had been able to study the matter, the system that sanctioned slavery on the one hand and the system that sanctioned forced labour on the other differed only to a very small extent. He therefore wholeheartedly supported the proposal of the British delegate that the League of Nations should undertake an examination of the whole question.

He wished to make a few observations on the remarks made by the delegate of Portugal. He begged the Committee not to make any difference between the question of native labour and that of non-native labour. While the conditions of labour in general varied considerably from country to country, and while what was true of one country was not true of another, yet these differences should not be based upon the fact that certain labour was drawn from a particular class, nor should any distinction be made regarding the colour of the labourers. He believed that, generally speaking, what applied to labour conditions in certain European countries also applied to similar conditions in Asia and Africa.

Referring to the remark of the Portuguese delegate to the effect that the evil of slavery was not so great as was feared by many people, the speaker thought that this was a matter for congratulation, but in that case the proposal made by Viscount Cecil was quite harmless. If the evil were not so great as had been feared, there could be no harm in an enquiry being made regarding its magnitude, as there would be no need for any very drastic action. On the other hand, many people who were keenly interested in the question believed that the system of slavery did exist in certain countries and amounted to a most objectionable abuse ; there could be no reason why an opportunity should not be given to those people to prove their contention.

He personally was of opinion that it would be advisable to appoint a Commission to deal with the whole question and submit a report to the League of Nations which, in its turn, would analyse and examine it. Such a system would avoid delay, for although the League of Nations, having regard to its composition, was a unique body, it was slow to move, and if a Sub-Committee were appointed it might give rise to the objection in certain countries—particularly in Asia and Africa—that the question was being shelved.

While, therefore, the Indian delegate was willing to support either suggestion, he believed that the fairest way of dealing with the question would be to appoint a Commission immediately with



power to conduct an exhaustive enquiry into the matter and, if necessary, to visit certain countries on the invitation either of the people of those countries or of powerful and influential organisations.

The British Empire had nothing to fear from such an enquiry, as was shown from the fact that the proposal had been made by the British delegate. So far as India was concerned, he did not wish the question to be prejudged. Let the Commission be appointed, let it go into the matter in India, as in other countries, and he thought that an examination of the conditions existing in India would not show that those conditions were detrimental to that country.

In conclusion, the Indian delegate heartily supported the proposal made by Viscount Cecil for the appointment of a Commission.

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) asked Lord Cecil what would be the work of the Commission he had proposed.

M. HUBERT (France) recalled that France had begun the campaign against slavery on the day on which she had begun the work of colonisation, for the best method of combating slavery was to colonise. France had arrived in countries where chaos and slave traders reigned supreme. She came, she established what might be called "the French peace"; nomadism had stopped and stability had been introduced.

Slavery was an obsolete form of organising labour against which no country had fought more strenuously than his own. Many of its citizens had done imperishable work in this connection.

The problem, however, became a delicate one when an attempt was made to deal with the questions of forced labour and compulsory labour. Forced labour might be said to exist in every civilised country and was known as labour payments, services imposed by the law, etc. It was necessary to develop, throughout all these countries, a greater willingness to work, and every possible means should be employed except compulsion, which was contrary to justice.

In conclusion, M. Hubert wished to ask a question. He understood that there had been a Temporary Slavery Commission which had drawn up the Convention at present before the Governments. He asked Lord Cecil if the Commission he wished to form was the same, and if it would be a temporary Commission to be appointed by the Council.

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire), in reply to the enquiry of the delegate of Liberia, explained in a few words what would be the object of the Commission he had suggested. Three years ago, at the instance of the League of Nations, a Convention dealing with slavery had been prepared. It had not been ratified by so many countries as had been hoped and the information that it had elicited had been very meagre. These were two regrettable circumstances, and those who were anxious to push the matter forward would like to know the reasons for these relative failures on the part of the League.

What was much more serious was that information had been received that there were still considerable regions where slavery and slave trading still existed. It would be well to have that information investigated, to find out whether it was correct, and whether, if so, the present position was due to any fault in the Slavery Convention or whether other measures might be taken to put the evil right. A Commission such as he had suggested would therefore have to enquire into the large question of the continuance of slavery in certain districts and the relatively smaller questions of the ratification of the Convention and the supply of information.

In reply to the French delegate, Lord Cecil asked to be allowed to give a short history of what had actually occurred.

At one session of the Assembly, a Member of the League had submitted a motion which was not unlike the one which Lord Cecil was now making. As a result of that motion, the Council of the League had appointed an extremely able Commission to enquire into the question of slavery. The Chairman had been an able Belgian, M. Gore, and the Commission had included a number of eminent men who knew a great deal about the subject. The British representative had been Lord Lugard, who had passed his life in tropical countries.

The Commission had produced an extremely able and comprehensive report and had made a number of proposals for the improvement of the international laws against slavery. The British Government had taken that report into consideration and had drawn up a draft Convention for the examination of the League, embodying a great number of the Commission's proposals. That draft Convention had been examined with great care by two successive Assemblies of the League and had eventually been accepted. It was the Convention now before the Committee.

That was past history. When Lord Cecil had made his proposal for a revival of the Commission which had done such admirable work, Dr. Nansen had very properly said that the suggestion was a new one and would have to be carefully considered. It would be necessary to decide what should be the terms of reference of the Commission and what recommendations, if any, should be made as to the composition of the Commission. He had therefore suggested, not for the purpose of enquiring into slavery itself, but for the purpose of drawing up a definite proposal for the consideration of the Sixth Committee, that a small Sub-Committee should be appointed. This was a method of procedure which was commonly adopted in the League and which he thought, on reflection, was justified in the present case. Lord Cecil would therefore support Dr. Nansen's proposal that a small Sub-Committee not exceeding seven members—he would prefer a smaller number—be appointed and that the Bureau be asked to nominate that Sub-Committee in the ordinary course.

The CHAIRMAN outlined the position of the question. Lord Cecil had put forward a proposal, the text of which he had read; Dr. Nansen suggested that this proposal should be referred to a Sub-Committee appointed by the Bureau. This Sub-Committee would make a report on the basis of which the discussion would continue.

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) supported Dr. Nansen's proposal. He wished at the same time to revert to what Lord Cecil had said when referring to countries in which there were still traces of slavery and forced labour. He presumed that the representative of the British Empire was speaking generally, but he desired to take this opportunity of explicitly stating, as he had done at the last International Labour Conference, that for some years past Liberia had been the victim of a campaign of slander.

Both the Press and more or less serious books stated that slavery and forced labour existed in Liberia, whereas slavery had been abolished since 1847 and forced labour was also prohibited. It was true that breaches of the law sometimes occurred, but was the law always respected by all citizens without exception in every country of the world? Apparently, when a case of slavery was found in Liberia, this meant that slavery still existed there. The speaker repeated that forced labour and slavery were prohibited by law in Liberia and this could easily be proved.

After the last International Labour Conference, and in the face of a most malicious Press campaign against the Liberian Republic, the Liberian Government had decided to set up an International Commission of Enquiry to ascertain on the spot whether slavery and forced labour existed in Liberia. This Commission, to which reference had already been made in a British newspaper and in the Swiss Press, would be composed of a representative of the United States, a representative of the League of Nations and a representative of Liberia.

This International Commission would begin its work as soon as the Liberian delegation had submitted the proposal to the Secretary-General of the League and obtained the nomination of the representative of the League. This was a proof of the sincerity of the Liberian Government's sentiments.

The speaker wished to point out, however, that his Government would never tolerate the investigations of a League commission of control. On the other hand, it would give every assistance to an international commission of enquiry appointed at its request and invited to ascertain whether there were still traces of forced labour and slavery in Liberia.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the discussion should provisionally be closed and the Sub-Committee appointed as follows: the delegates of the British Empire, France, Norway, Italy, Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, Siam.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) thanked the Chairman for having given his country a place in the Sub-Committee and proposed the addition of the representative of Belgium, a country which enjoyed universal sympathy and was at the same time a great colonial Power.

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) said he would also like to have an opportunity of taking part in the Sub-Committee's debates.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Count Bonin-Longare and thought that the Committee would also accede both to his and to the Liberian delegate's request.

*(Agreed.)*

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) thanked the Committee.

Lidj ANDARGUÉ MASSAÏ (Abyssinia) emphasised Abyssinia's interest in this question and hoped he would have an opportunity of speaking in the Sub-Committee.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee would also agree to Abyssinia's being represented in the Sub-Committee.

*Agreed.*

*The Sub-Committee therefore comprised the following eleven members:*

Abyssinia,	The Netherlands,
Belgium,	Norway,
British Empire,	Portugal,
France,	Siam,
Italy,	Spain.
Liberia,	

The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Sub-Committee to agree immediately on the date of their first meeting.

---

### THIRD MEETING.

*Held on Thursday, September 12th, 1929, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman: M. JANSON (Belgium).*

#### 6. Addition of the Mandates Question to the Agenda.

The CHAIRMAN announced that on September 10th, 1929, the Assembly had referred a third question to the Sixth Committee—that of mandates,—which had therefore to be placed on the agenda.

## 7. Supplementary Credits.

The CHAIRMAN reminded his colleagues that the reports of Committees regarding supplementary credits appearing in the supplementary budgets could this year be sent to the Supervisory Commission up to September 18th.

## 8. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) remarked that, at the last session of the Assembly, the Council had been asked to appoint a Refugee Advisory Commission. This Advisory Commission, composed of the representatives of a large number of Governments, had met in May and had thoroughly examined the question. It had come to the conclusion that a solution of the problem could not be obtained by the radical means which had been suggested, that was to say, by the repatriation of refugees or by their assimilation in the countries at present offering them shelter. It had therefore recommended that the High Commissariat should be maintained for a period not exceeding ten years.

The Advisory Commission had also considered that, in order to place the international activity of the High Commissariat on a more regular basis, its services should be incorporated in the Secretariat of the League in the form of a temporary department.

The Supervisory Commission, having had this question referred to it, met in June. It came to the conclusion that it could not accept the last of the recommendations mentioned above, in view of the facts that the High Commissariat had always pursued its own policy in the refugees questions, that the funds placed at its disposal came not only from official sources, but also from private organisations independent of the League, and that it would be difficult for the administration of these funds to be effectively supervised by the Secretariat.

He had not had the opportunity of discussing this question personally with the Supervisory Commission, but, after hearing the proposals he was now able to make, he hoped that a different point of view might prevail.

At a meeting attended by representatives of about forty organisations working for refugee relief, a resolution had been drawn up supporting the point of view of the Advisory Commission.

The High Commissioner had never taken any important step without reference either to the Council or to the Assembly of the League, or without reporting to those bodies as to the methods by which the various tasks should be achieved.

He could not accept the Supervisory Commission's point of view that the League would not be responsible for the measures adopted by the High Commissioner, for the financial plans and for the various schemes drawn up to solve the refugee problem. The funds were subscribed for this purpose with the idea that the League would be responsible in the matter. The High Commissioner could not carry on his task if any doubt about this existed. He hoped that the Sixth Committee would take this view.

There were two basic problems in the organisation of the Refugee Service.

The Supervisory Commission had recommended that the High Commissariat should be an autonomous organisation working under the auspices of the League of Nations, but not directly connected either with the League or with the International Labour Office.

It was impossible for the High Commissioner to accept this point of view and it was constitutionally very difficult to defend. If, for example, he were travelling in a distant country, he could not exercise the necessary daily supervision. Therefore, he urged that the Refugee Service should become an integral part of the Secretariat. He also asked that all financial operations, including those concerned with the acceptance and administration of funds contributed from outside sources, should be conducted in accordance with the Financial Regulations and the resolutions of the Assembly.

If the Fourth Committee were prepared to approve of such an arrangement, he understood that the Secretary-General saw no objection to it.

He also proposed that the Assembly should nominate Mr. Lodge, of Paris, as his representative, who would either accompany him or represent him at meetings of the Advisory Commission. He laid stress on the important services which Mr. Lodge had already rendered in connection with the repatriation of the prisoners of war.

With regard to the programme of work, he asked that the Assembly should approve the report drawn up by the Advisory Commission at its first session, in order that the Government representatives on the Commission might feel that they had the confidence of the Assembly. The Commission's programme was based on the principles laid down by the Assembly itself and, since its work was beginning, it seemed desirable that the Assembly should ensure its continuance on the lines proposed.

Mrs. HAMILTON (British Empire) said that the British delegation urged the Committee to accept the proposal made by Dr. Nansen and so carry out the very strong and clear recommendations of the Advisory Commission, whose report was based on a most careful study of all the facts. She pointed out that there was a very heavy obligation in this matter on every State, dating back to 1921. Since then, the Assembly, at one session after another, had reiterated that responsibility, although the burden of meeting it had been thrown mainly on Dr. Nansen, to whose loyal and, indeed, heroic service she desired to pay a tribute, since he had indeed saved the credit of the League so far as the refugee service was concerned. In the early days, the British Government had contributed generously and, throughout, British public opinion had been deeply stirred regarding this matter. As an indication of the attitude now taken, she was able to report that the British Government had asked to be represented on the Advisory Commission. It was also favourably considering the application of the Nansen stamp scheme.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) remarked on the great interest with which Germany had always followed the work of the League in regard to refugees. The German Government viewed with satisfaction the fact that the Advisory Commission, at its meeting in May, had laid a firm and equitable foundation for the League's future work in that field. He was particularly glad to note that a time-limit had been fixed for the completion of the High Commissioner's work, and he hoped that the desired result would be attained even before the end of the ten years. That period he regarded as the maximum. The undue prolongation of an exceptional situation with regard to refugees resulting from the world war was undesirable both from the social and the humanitarian point of view.

While recognising, from a material standpoint, that the objections raised to the incorporation of the High Commissariat in the Secretariat of the League were, to a certain extent, well founded, he concluded by recommending the adoption of the High Commissioner's solution.

A great deal of gratitude was due to Dr. Nansen for his devotion and energy, and he ought to be helped in his work by having the League organisations at his disposal when he so desired. Moreover, the administrative expenses would certainly be much greater if the High Commissioner were obliged to establish a separate and independent service.

With regard to the difficulties mentioned by the Supervisory Commission, it would be an easy task to satisfy the doubts which had arisen in the Commission itself by asking the Fourth Committee to deal with the financial aspect of the question, and in that way an agreement would probably soon be reached with the Supervisory Commission.

M. HUBERT (France) supported the observations made by his German colleague. France desired that a speedy solution should be found for these problems, which were not normal factors in the life of the peoples.

Accordingly, the French delegation maintained the decision which it had taken last year, when it proposed that the work should be continued provisionally. It considered that Dr. Nansen and his assistants should do all they could to bring the work to an end. Only two solutions were possible: the return of the refugees to their homes, which was undoubtedly far from having been achieved, and mass assimilation, which could not take place everywhere.

The question should be treated on the lines followed by Dr. Nansen and his assistants. France had proved that its attitude in the matter of Armenian refugees in Syria was inspired by the highest moral considerations. The French Government had this year lodged with the Chamber a request for a credit of three million francs to assist these refugees.

The speaker welcomed the entry of Great Britain into the Advisory Commission, and he proposed that Mrs. Hamilton should be appointed Rapporteur on the question of refugees.

Mlle FORCHHAMMER (Denmark) regretted that it appeared necessary to give up the scheme for settling the Armenians in a national home. This was a scheme which many of them had hoped to see realised. If, however, it were dropped, she hoped Dr. Nansen would watch the situation to see whether there might not later be some possibility of carrying out the scheme.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that he did not wish to add to the discussion by giving too many details. Mr. Johnson, who had been specially occupied with the question of Armenian refugees, would give the Committee all the explanations it wanted or, if the Committee thought better, a report on this particular point could be distributed.

With regard to Mlle Forchhammer's second question, it would be better to deal with it separately as it would have to form the subject of a special resolution.

The CHAIRMAN thought that a memorandum should be distributed on the question of Armenian refugees.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) supported the very interesting proposals of the German delegate. He was glad to see that the British Government would henceforth be represented on the Advisory Commission and that Mrs. Hamilton, its representative, had been appointed Rapporteur.

He was very anxious that some definite decision should be taken on the question of refugees. Ten years was a rather long time and an endeavour must be made to reduce the period.

The financial difficulties could be settled as soon as the opinion of the Fourth Committee had been obtained, and it was only then that the Sixth Committee's decisions could become operative.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee must first decide whether refugee work was to be continued and whether a time limit should now be fixed for the final completion of this work. Once this question was settled, the Committee could consider the future organisation of the High Commissioner's Office.

The first question had formed the subject of conclusions reached by the Advisory Commission and which appeared in the report to the tenth session of the Assembly.

The Commission had considered it desirable to fix a maximum period within which the High Commissioner's Office should be closed down. The High Commissioner had said that a period of ten years was indispensable and sufficient. If it should be possible to reduce this period, the Advisory Commission would only be too pleased.

The Sixth Committee must therefore first decide whether the refugee work was to be continued. On this point it would certainly take a unanimous and favourable decision.

As regards the time limit, the Committee had heard the observations of the German delegate, which had been supported by the delegate of Italy. As the Advisory Commission had provided for a maximum period of ten years, the Chairman asked whether it was necessary to introduce a definite amendment.

M. HUBERT (France) was not opposed to the work being continued. When the French delegation last year used the term "*provisoire*", it had not meant the word to be understood in the sense of the French proverb : "*Le provisoire est ce qui dure le plus longtemps*". It was using the word "*provisoire*" in its real sense.

He was not opposed to fixing a period of ten years, although he thought it was difficult to fix a limit in such a matter. The best way of achieving speedy success was to manage these affairs in the spirit of Dr. Nansen and his assistants.

M. ARCISZEWSKI (Poland) wished to join in the tribute paid to Dr. Nansen for the admirable work he had already done. It could be assumed that the bulk of the work was now accomplished and that the High Commissioner's Office was entering upon its closing stages, since of the million refugees of ten years ago there now only remained about one hundred thousand to be settled.

A period of ten years was being asked for the completion of the work. Supposing, however, that, thanks to Dr. Nansen's efforts, the High Commissioner's Office came to the conclusion, in a few years, that the work could be finished in less than ten years, would not the commitments already entered into or which might be entered into make it difficult to wind up the office before the ten years had expired.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that as soon as ever his Office found that the work could be finished in two or three years, he could make the necessary arrangements for it to be wound up without difficulty.

The question of loans would raise no particular difficulties and the complete liquidation of the work might be entrusted to a small organisation created for the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to adopt the Advisory Commission's conclusions concerning the continuation of the work and the maximum time-limit to be laid down for its completion. He noted that no amendment had been proposed to the period of ten years, but the Rapporteur would, of course, mention in her report the feeling of the Committee, namely, that the time-limit laid down for the completion of the High Commissioner's work should be as short as possible.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) did not press for a shortening of the ten-years limit to be mentioned in the draft resolution to be submitted to the Assembly. He would be content if a recommendation were made that the term of ten years should, if possible, be shortened. A recommendation of this kind would constitute one more weapon in Dr. Nansen's hands to bring to a successful conclusion the enterprise in which he has already worked so hard and so successfully.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) agreed with the proposals of the Chairman and Count Bonin-Longare. He, too, thought that Dr. Nansen should be left entirely free to complete the work as soon as possible by whatever measures he thought necessary.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee agreed to adopt the conclusions of the Advisory Commission on this matter. It now remained to discuss the question of the future organisation of the High Commissioner's Office. He explained the two systems proposed ; in the first place, the Advisory Commission had suggested that the High Commissariat should be incorporated within the Secretariat of the League ; the Supervisory Commission, on the other hand, proposed to create an independent organisation for refugee work.

He recalled the proposal made by Dr. Nansen on this point. If the Committee accepted that suggestion, the Chairman would propose the following procedure : The Committee would authorise its Chairman to forward the Nansen proposal to the Fourth Committee for its opinion ; this opinion seemed essential owing to the financial consequences inherent in the proposal. Further, in his letter to the Fourth Committee, the Chairman of the Sixth Committee would mention that Dr. Nansen and the Rapporteur were ready to furnish any explanations it might desire.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) pointed out a difficulty in the procedure suggested by the Chairman. The Fourth Committee's function was to see whether proposals by other Committees were compatible with its desire for economy, whereas the Sixth Committee was proposing to ask the Fourth Committee to pronounce on the excellence of Dr. Nansen's scheme. The Fourth Committee would reply that it wanted to know whether the Sixth Committee had any preference, and, when in receipt of the reply to that question, the Fourth Committee would say whether its financial scruples permitted it to adopt the Nansen scheme or not.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) pointed out that to incorporate the High Commissariat in the Secretariat would mean a saving of money, whereas the proposal of the Supervisory Commission to set up an autonomous body without increasing the budget would mean seriously hampering the work of the High Commissariat.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to M. Rappard's objection, thought that the Chairman of the Sixth Committee would mention in his letter to the Fourth Committee that his colleagues were in favour of adopting the Nansen proposal, but that, before taking any final decision, they considered it necessary to ask for the Fourth Committee's opinion.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) agreed.

In accordance with the proposal already made, Mrs. HAMILTON (British Empire) was appointed Rapporteur.

Mrs. HAMILTON (British Empire) thanked the Committee for the great honour it had paid her, and particularly the representatives of France and Italy, at whose instance it had been paid. It was characteristic of the generosity of France, which had already done so much with regard to the refugee question.

The CHAIRMAN said that there were certain other questions raised in the Advisory Commission's report. Perhaps the best procedure would be to ask the Rapporteur to examine these points. The Committee would discuss them, if necessary, when it had received Mrs. Hamilton's report.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) desired again to say a few words on the Armenian refugee question.

The Council, having undertaken the problem of the Armenian refugees, had asked him if he would deal with it. He had seen that great difficulties would arise and, fearing that he might be unsuccessful, had at first refused. Finally he had yielded and had gone to Armenia.

There he had found that there was plenty of highly fertile land which could be made productive if an efficient irrigation scheme were introduced. He had gone into the matter and had concluded that a loan of about £900,000 to the Republic of Armenia, secured by guarantees from certain Governments, was necessary; those Governments would actually run only nominal risks, as the scheme was sound.

This scheme had not received general approval. Faced with the impossibility of obtaining the funds, he had reduced the amount to £300,000, a sum which represented the cost of putting the land in question under cultivation and settling upon it 50,000 Armenian refugees who were for the most part in Greece. Others living near Constantinople could not be settled, as they were too numerous. What the French Government had been good enough to do for them was known.

The Armenian Government had replied favourably to his appeal for a loan of £300,000. But it had been found impossible to raise this sum, as the German Government alone had responded to the Council's appeal and pledged itself to give credit for £50,000, two or three other Governments having offered smaller sums. At his request, the League had found the expenses of administration (50,000 francs). However, the Armenian Government could not accept the loan offered, as the sum was too small. Under the circumstances, he thought, the scheme should perhaps be abandoned.

Mlle FORCHHAMMER (Denmark) expressed her gratitude to Dr. Nansen for the work he had done. As a friend of Armenia, she regretted the disappointing situation outlined by Dr. Nansen. A great number of Armenians had looked forward to the achievement of this scheme and to the establishment of the national home which they had so often been promised. It would be painful for them to have to abandon this hope.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that once already he had advised the Council not to continue with the Erivan scheme. The existence of a great deal of unemployment in many countries showed that the situation had not changed for the better. He regretted his inability to go further with a task which had been very dear to him. However, the temporary abandonment of this question did not mean that it would disappear completely from the horizon. He would not lose sight of the problem and would take it up again if there was a hope of any result being obtained.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dr. Nansen for his explanations. He added that the Erivan question would be brought up again at a later meeting, when Dr. Nansen was able to make definite proposals.

---

#### FOURTH MEETING.

*Held on Friday, September 13th, 1929, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

#### 9. Slavery Convention — Annual Report by the Council : Report of the Sub-Committee appointed on September 5th, 1929.

M. PALACIOS (Spain), Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee, commenting on the report (Annex 1), pointed out that, in view of the divergent opinions disclosed, the Sub-Committee had adopted a compromise solution: the British proposal, supported by Spain, India and Norway, had not been rejected, but merely postponed until next year. The Sub-Committee further agreed unanimously that the Secretariat should be requested to urge the Governments to collect information on the question of slavery with a view to the consideration of the British proposal.

As requested, the Rapporteur stated that he would amend the paragraph beginning "The report submitted in 1925. . ." to read as follows:

"2. The report submitted in 1925 by the Temporary Commission on Slavery may be said to have exhausted the investigation of the problem of slavery, but the Sub-Committee considered that, having regard to the information which the League had received since the Convention on Slavery was approved, there might be some reason to believe that the Convention is not producing the results that were anticipated when the resolution of the seventh Assembly was adopted in 1926. . ."

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) apologised for taking up some of the Committee's time to explain the attitude of the Liberian delegation to the creation of the Commission on Slavery, as demanded by the British delegate, and to elucidate one point in the Liberian delegate's declaration of Thursday last.

If the Liberian delegation had raised objections to the creation of the Commission on Slavery, it was not because it had anything to conceal. On the contrary, the Republic of Liberia was the

first and the only country which had, since last June, spontaneously and loyally decided to submit to an international Commission of Enquiry the problem of investigating whether slavery or forced labour existed in the country or not.

His Government proposed that an international Commission of Enquiry should be set up consisting of three members: one appointed by the Government of the United States, one by the League of Nations, and a third by the Government of Liberia.

According to information which he had just received, the United States had already acceded to the proposal. M. Sottile informed the Committee that he had been instructed by his Government to request the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be good enough to appoint a competent official of known impartiality and discernment who would, as a member of this Commission of Enquiry, visit the country.

The Liberian delegation had raised objections to the creation of the Commission on Slavery because Liberia could not accept or agree to any outside control of her internal policy, except when she herself, as in the present case, took the initiative of asking for an international investigation.

Liberia was the only and the first country which had, ever since it first came into existence in 1847, solemnly condemned slavery. The charter of independence, drawn up by the founders of the Liberian Republic, opened with the motto: "The abolition of slavery and the love of liberty brought us here".

In its declaration of independence of 1847, Liberia solemnly proclaimed the abolition of slavery and this principle had always formed the basis of the Government's policy and of all social life in Liberia.

It was, however, comprehensible that a deeply rooted scourge could not be eradicated in the course of a few years. The Liberian Government had started prudently by condemning and declaring illegal slavery of every kind and decreeing severe punishments.

Thanks to the steps taken by the Government during the past twenty-five years, slavery in every form had considerably diminished and at the present moment was non-existent. It was strictly forbidden, severely punished, and deprecated by public opinion. The international Commission of Enquiry would be able to verify the truth of these statements.

It was undeniable, however, that some isolated cases of slavery might, from time to time, occur in Liberia, but these violations of the law did not by any means prove that slavery, as a system, existed in the country or that the Government tolerated it.

As far as the geographical situation of the country permitted, the Liberian Government had always done its best and taken all possible steps to eradicate entirely the scourge of slavery, more particularly since signing the 1926 Convention.

It should, moreover, be remembered that Liberia had no railways and hundreds of square kilometres of territory where communications were extremely difficult and slow, so that official control and supervision were handicapped, and a few isolated cases of infringement of the laws prohibiting slavery might well occur. He did not, therefore, dispute the fact that, as in other countries, there might be some cases of slavery in Liberia, but he did emphatically deny that slavery was still permitted or tolerated by his Government.

With reference to forced labour, the delegation had had the honour of making precise declarations at the last International Labour Conference.

There were only two questions to which he had still to reply: Why had no information been sent to the League of Nations? What was the reason for the delay in ratifying the 1926 Convention?

His Government had not, on its own initiative, sent the information required because the solemn condemnation of slavery in Liberia was well known and the legislation sanctioning such abolition equally so. His Government had not, perhaps, volunteered information, but it had done more. It had proposed to submit to an international Commission of Enquiry the problem of investigating the conditions of slavery and forced labour in Liberia.

The Liberian delegation was, moreover, prepared to furnish the fullest information and, in order to comply with Article 7 of the 1926 Convention, it had prepared a memorandum which it would transmit to the Secretariat on the following day or the day after.

The Republic of Liberia had been one of the first countries to sign the Convention. It had done so with joy and gratitude. No statesman or diplomat could be surprised if a Convention signed in September 1926 was not yet ratified in 1929, bearing in mind especially how dilatory Parliaments were, particularly in Africa. The Liberian delegation wished solemnly to assure the Committee that ratification would not be delayed: it would very probably take place before the end of the year, certainly as soon as Parliament opened in October next.

In conclusion, the speaker felt it to be his duty to make a protest to the Committee and the League of Nations against certain publications regarding his country. For some years past the Liberian Republic had been subjected to a campaign of calumny on account of a few isolated cases of violation of the laws abolishing slavery and forced labour. Certain publicists had, without any sort of proof, disseminated the most odious and unfounded slanders. In view of such proceedings, his Government had decided to resort to an impartial means of controlling the allegations in question, namely, to set up an international Commission of Enquiry, which would give entire satisfaction to the League of Nations and to the world and would raise the prestige of the League, particularly in Africa.

In submitting the above remarks, the Liberian delegation agreed in principle to the resolution proposed.

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) said he had been glad to hear that the Liberian Government had decided to appoint a Commission of Enquiry. This indicated a real desire to bring all the facts before the world, and if the enquiry were exhaustive—as he was sure it would be—the results could only be beneficial to all concerned.

He wished to correct one misapprehension. He had never intended proposing the creation of a League Commission to investigate indiscriminately. Such a thing would be contrary to the constitution of the League itself. Any such Commission could only make investigations in a specific country with the agreement of that country. The Liberian delegate had stated that his Government had signed the Slavery Convention with joy, which he, Lord Cecil, fully appreciated.

The British Government was still of opinion that it would have been preferable to have appointed a Commission, which could have acted with greater authority and vigour than the Secretariat itself and could have penetrated to the root of the evil.

A compromise had been reached, for which the Committee owed a great deal to the French delegation, and he did not propose to re-open the matter, but he hoped that the Secretariat would devote all its energy to the enquiry, and that next year the results would be satisfactory enough to make further enquiry unnecessary. If, however, this should not prove to be the case, the British Government retained full liberty to raise the question afresh.

M. HUBERT (France) thanked Lord Cecil for his kind allusion to the French delegation's action. The result attained proved that, when the spirit of co-operation was given free play, agreement could always be reached.

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) said that he would be very glad to communicate to his Government the British delegate's declarations.

M. GORGÉ (Switzerland) recalled that the resolution adopted by the Assembly last year expressed the hope that all States *concerned in any way with slavery* should ratify the Convention. This resolution therefore did not refer to Switzerland. The draft resolution which would be submitted to the Assembly, on the other hand, provided that an invitation should be sent to all States, without exception, to adhere to the Convention. This resolution would, refer therefore, to Switzerland also.

The attitude of the Swiss Government toward this matter was known. It had the utmost sympathy with the movement in favour of the suppression of slavery, which was still an open wound from which humanity suffered, and would be one of the first of the States to rejoice in the complete success of the efforts of the League of Nations. The Swiss Government did not see at present, however, that its accession to the Slavery Convention could be useful or desirable, but, if the Committee considered that Switzerland could help in the full execution of the 1926 Convention, the Swiss Federal Council could scarcely hesitate to consider favourably the question of its accession to the Convention.

Count APPONYI (Hungary) supported the Swiss delegate's statement.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) thought that the support of two States like Switzerland and Hungary would have great moral value which would be much appreciated. It was for that reason that he expressed the wish that those Governments should accede to the Convention.

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) thought that the Chairman of the Sixth Committee would be interpreting the feelings of all his colleagues if he were to inform the Swiss delegation that the members of the Committee unanimously endorsed the remarks made by Count Bonin-Longare.

His Highness Mohammad Ali Khan FEROZKOHY (Persia) said that the Secretariat had already been informed of the reasons why Persia had not yet been able to accede to the Convention on Slavery.

Persia could not accept paragraph 2 of Article 3 referring to a future general Convention on the slave trade which created rights and imposed obligations of the same nature as those in the Convention of June 17th, 1926, concerning the International Traffic in Arms. The Persian Government had not signed this latter Convention as it considered that certain of its provisions would be prejudicial to national sovereignty.

That, however, did not prevent Persia from fulfilling her duty from the humanitarian point of view. For some time past she had put an end to the slave traffic in her territory. According to the provisions of the Constitution of 1926, all the inhabitants were placed on the same footing under the law, and in 1929 the Persian Parliament had passed a law declaring free every slave who reached Persian territorial waters or set foot on Persian soil.

M. CATASTINI, Director of the Mandates Section, drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the adoption by the Assembly of the resolution proposed by the Sub-Committee would mean an increase in expenditure of about 6,000 francs. Under the terms of the most recent financial regulation, all resolutions necessitating expenditure for which provision was not made in the budget must, before being submitted to the Assembly, be referred to the Fourth Committee, where the increased expenditure involved must be approved by a two-thirds majority.

*The report and proposals of the Sub-Committee were adopted.*

M. PALACIOS (Spain) was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly.

#### 10. Mandates.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) expressed the regrets of the Committee at the recent death of General Freire d'Andrade, who had been a member of the Permanent Mandates Commission from its origin and who had given it the support of his authority and of his great experience in colonial matters.

He also expressed regret at the cruel loss which the Committee had sustained in the person of Mr. Grimshaw, representative of the International Labour Office on the Commission, who had



worked from the beginning with energy and intelligence for the welfare of native peoples. Mr Grimshaw had died literally from overwork for the cause which he had served so well. He thought it was fitting that the Committee, by a resolution which might be adopted by the Assembly, should testify to the importance of the great loss which it had suffered, and should express its sympathy with his family.

Dr. Nansen then made a brief statement on the mandates questions and on the progress made since last year.

The Committee would note with great satisfaction that the mandatory Powers had more and more made a practice of being represented at the deliberations of the Mandates Commission either by the Governors of the mandated territory in question or by high officials.

The Mandates Commission had examined fifteen annual reports, and four High Commissioners or Governors and five other high officials had been present at the examination. Dr. Nansen said that this was a matter for congratulation.

The representative of Finland on the Council had referred in his report in regard to mandates to the question of sovereignty, which had already given rise to numerous controversies. It would be remembered that about two years ago the Council had adopted a report in which the question had, in his opinion, been definitely settled. That report established that a mandatory Power could, under its mandate, have no "sovereignty" in the normal sense of the word in a mandated area committed to its charge.

In regard to the Tanganyika question, Dr. Nansen said that he was very pleased with the most important statement which had been made on this subject by the representative of the British Government. The British representative had said in effect that, whatever his Government's opinion on the question was, no decision would be taken before the plan proposed had been examined by the Mandates Commission.

Another delicate subject was Palestine. Every member of the Committee realised how difficult the present situation was and also realised that words used in the Committee might have repercussions elsewhere which might add to the difficulties of the task which the mandatory Power had to fulfil. Nevertheless, the fundamental facts of the situation should be recognised.

Palestine was under a mandate which had been solemnly drawn up and confirmed by the Council of the League, and the mandatory Power had an international responsibility. It was therefore particularly satisfactory that the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary of Great Britain should have given public assurances that nothing would divert the mandatory Power from carrying out the mandate which had been entrusted to it.

He was sure the Assembly would desire him to express his gratification at that decision, and he assured the mandatory Power that it would have full support from the League in its difficulties.

Incidents had occurred in Palestine owing to differences of opinion between different sections of the population. The British Government was studying this question thoroughly and would find a solution which it was hoped would be satisfactory and which would remove, in the future, all causes of friction.

It was satisfactory to see that increased publicity was being given to the work of the Mandates Commission, the very full and valuable Minutes of which were quickly published and read more and more by the public. A great number of copies of the reports dealing with mandated territories had been distributed by the mandatory Powers, and recently the Governor of Tanganyika had taken the very useful initiative of distributing copies also to the Members of the Legislative Council. The sale of the publications and reports on this subject was increasing every year.

In regard to the campaign against the liquor traffic, the Council had been able to note the adhesion of all the mandatory Powers to the definition of various terms concerning the liquor traffic found in the mandates and in the St. Germain Convention. The Council had also proposed various measures to be taken in West Africa for the control of the liquor traffic.

The relations existing between Persia and Iraq had given rise to some anxiety last year. The Committee would no doubt be glad to note the very considerable improvement which had taken place since then, especially in connection with the proposal by the British Government for the institution of a uniform judicial system in Iraq.

In view of the fears which had sometimes been expressed that the present procedure with regard to petitions made it difficult for inhabitants of territories under mandate to gain access to the organs of the League, it was interesting to note that the Mandates Commission was dealing at every session with an increasing number of petitions, the majority of which had emanated from inhabitants of those territories.

In conclusion, he desired to say that the documents which were laid before the Committee had increased his faith in the satisfactory work and the future success of the mandates system as a whole, which permitted of international co-operation being exercised in questions of a very delicate nature for the welfare of the countries concerned.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) wished to repeat very briefly the observations of the representative of Italy on the Council with regard to the question of the union of Tanganyika with Kenya and Uganda, which were under British sovereignty.

The Mandates Commission had not felt called upon to formulate any conclusion in this matter since, as yet, only a scheme had been brought forward. The observations of its members on various points had shown, however, the importance which the Commission attached to this subject, and which should be attached to it by the Members of the League.

The scheme in question was based upon Article 10 of the mandate, which, it seemed, would authorise its adoption. It should not be forgotten, however, that this article also contained a very important and very explicit reservation to the effect that no measure could be taken which would be contrary to the mandatory system.

It had been thought, in view of certain precedents that this reservation would not apply in this particular case. The precedent of the Union of the Cameroons under British mandate with Nigeria had been recalled. It should be pointed out, however, that there was a great difference between a small colonial territory and a large country under mandate such as Tanganyika. The aims that a Government might have in view in the administration of a colonial territory and the aims which it should endeavour to achieve in the administration of territories under mandate were very different.

The essential characteristic of the mandate, moreover, was its temporary nature, and an administrative fusion, which might also entail extensive joint schemes for important public works and improvements of all kinds, seemed incompatible with this characteristic. From the political point of view, the union might be taken as indicating a tendency towards a modification of the legal position of the mandated territory, which would be contrary to the very exact definition that Dr. Nansen had just given.

Count Bonin-Longare was reassured, however, by the frank, full and loyal statements of the British Government, which he noted with satisfaction. In view of these statements, he did not doubt that the League might make a pronouncement on this question through the normal channel constituted by the technical body which assisted the Council in these matters.

It seemed to him that, of all the mandates, the Palestine mandate was the most delicate one, mainly for historical reasons. The country over which this mandate was exercised had been the scene of events which were at the basis of world civilisation. The names of the various parts of this country were known to everyone, even to the humblest, to whom they had become familiar through their daily reading. It was only to be expected, therefore, that the regrettable incidents which had occurred should have attracted general attention. Such incidents were particularly regrettable in that they had led to a considerable loss of human life, and in that they were evidence of an explosion of racial hatred which, one would have believed, had been long banished from present-day civilisation.

Nevertheless, the Committee might remember that the mandatory Power had assured it through its most authoritative representatives—its Prime Minister at the Assembly, and its Minister for Foreign Affairs at the Council—that it had the situation well in hand, that order would be restored immediately, and that an enquiry had been instituted in order to ascertain the causes of these deplorable incidents. The Committee might note these statements with satisfaction and offer the mandatory Power its wishes for as early a success as possible.

He trusted that the region where had been pronounced the most august words of peace and human brotherhood that the world had heard would soon be pacified for the worshippers of all nations.

Sir James PARR (New Zealand) agreed that difficulties should not be placed in the way of a mandatory Power by anything that might be said in the Committee. Count Bonin-Longare's appeal was a very necessary one.

He would like to express his great pleasure that Dr. Nansen was still with the Committee as a kind of unofficial umpire, to see fair play in the territories under mandate and to keep a watchful eye on the doings of all authorities connected with mandates.

He wished to join in the expressions of regret that had been made regarding the death of Mr. Grimshaw, a member of the Mandates Commission, whose independence of view, clear-headedness, and clarity of judgment Sir James Parr had always admired.

As Dr. Nansen had said, the mandates system was still in an experimental stage. This was the speaker's conviction after four years of intimate relation with it. It would, he believed, be a success largely because of the good feeling, understanding and sympathy between the Mandates Commission and the mandatory Powers. Unlimited patience was necessary in the working out of this new relationship in government created since the war—patience on the part of the mandatory Power with conditions and problems which were the most difficult the world had ever seen, and sympathy on the part of the Mandates Commission and an understanding of those problems.

Great Britain (and in some measure, her dominions also), which had been entrusted with these mandates had, for years past, poured out millions of money obtained from taxpayers—at a time when they were faced with the gravest financial problems—for developing these new territories, and it could not be a source of surprise that there was a section of English opinion which almost regretted that Great Britain had ever undertaken these mandates. He referred to an article appearing in the *Daily Mail* under the heading "Hand back the Mandates"; but Great Britain would not hand back the mandates, nor would her dominions. He could assure the Committee of that. It was a matter of national honour to perform a great trust.

Sir James Parr had welcomed the straightforward statement of the British Foreign Secretary that, notwithstanding the troubles in Palestine, the British Government would continue to administer that territory, as it had done in the past, in the best interests of the peoples. He had merely referred to the article in the *Daily Mail* as an instance of the point of view of a section of the British public, which was rather tired of the extraordinary expense and difficulties involved in these new countries.

With reference to Palestine, Sir James Parr said that, from his knowledge of that country, he could affirm that Great Britain had to face there a problem of the most extreme and urgent difficulty grasped: a problem that would tax all the resources and statesmanship of the British people. The Italian delegate had been perfectly right when he had said that too hasty judgments should not be formed in regard to matters that might occur in any of those territories, but that the great difficulties confronting the mandatory Powers should always be remembered.

With regard to the question of sovereignty, he personally was not greatly concerned with it. It was true that a difference of opinion existed, and that one of the Dominions had taken the view that sovereignty was absolutely vested in the mandatory Power. A decision had even been given by the Appeal Court of that Dominion on a case of high treason, to the effect that sovereignty was vested in the mandatory Power. In carrying out its mandate, however, New Zealand at present regarded sovereignty as an academic issue and was more concerned with the practical question of doing its best for the territory under mandate than with the theoretical question of sovereignty. It recognised that the mandates system created a new kind of governmental relationship quite foreign to the old ideas of international law, and that it had accepted a trust from the League to do its best for the backward peoples in the territory under mandate. New Zealand would continue to hold that view and to put it into practice, reserving the question of technical sovereignty for some other time.

The Mandates Commission was entitled not only to the support of the Committee but also to its sympathy. It had an extremely difficult duty to perform, and it was upon the tact, patience, and understanding of the Mandates Commission that the continuance of the success of the system depended. The Mandates Commission might easily irritate by its actions a great Power or a small, virile, independent nation, like New Zealand, which was administering territories under mandate, but, so far as he had been able to see, that Commission had shown the utmost consideration and understanding of the difficulties with which the mandatory Powers were faced, and, so far as New Zealand was concerned, had been a partner (which was the correct relationship) with the mandatory Power in carrying out its duties.

Dr. VON SCHUBERT (Germany) wished to submit a few general observations to indicate the German Government's views on the League's activities in the sphere of mandates.

He expressed his great satisfaction at the manner in which the Mandates Commission had performed its difficult task. The Minutes and the various reports of this Commission clearly showed how conscientiously it had done its work.

It also gave him great satisfaction to notice that the Mandates Commission had done its best to ensure in every way the application of the main principles on which the mandates system was based, and which were embodied in the Covenant, including, among others, the maintenance of the territories under mandate as separate units. This principle applied notably to the constitutional status of Tanganyika.

As the question had already been publicly discussed in the Council, he confined himself to referring to the statements made there by Dr. Stresemann, when the latter had emphasised the great importance attached to this point by the German Government.

The other fundamental principle on which the mandates system was based was the maintenance of the legal relations between the League and the territories under mandate—in other words, the question of sovereignty. In this connection, the speaker entirely associated himself with Dr. Nansen's views.

Dr. von Schubert was convinced that the Mandates Commission's efforts, especially in regard to the application of these main principles, would be unremittingly pursued.

Apart from the main political questions, the Mandates Commission had also dealt with numerous questions of detail. Dr. von Schubert drew attention particularly to that of the most-favoured-nation clause; he regarded it as just and equitable that the Members of the League which, in virtue of the provisions of the mandates, enjoyed the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clause in certain territories under mandate should grant the latter the same rights in commercial matters.

The German delegate considered that the Mandates Commission had been well inspired to draw attention to this point and he hoped that an equitable solution would be reached in due course.

Passing to the events in Palestine which had recently been discussed by the Council, Dr. von Schubert recalled that on that occasion Dr. Stresemann had expressed the German Government's profound regret at the unfortunate incidents which had cost so many lives. The British delegate on the Council had supplied provisional details regarding these deplorable events and had stated that the British Government as Mandatory had immediately taken all the necessary measures to put an end to the situation.

Dr. von Schubert hoped that the British Government would succeed in its efforts to appease the population of these territories as soon as possible, and to obviate the possibility of any recurrence of such events in the future.

Mrs. SWANWICK (British Empire) said that frequent reference had been made in the Council to the statements of the Secretary of State. The British delegation was grateful to the Sixth Committee for the sympathy expressed with it in the present situation, which was a cause of grief not only to the Government but to the people of Great Britain. The suffering and misery caused by the recent outbreak in Palestine were a source of very great grief to all well-thinking people in her country. Assurances had been given that there would be a thorough enquiry into the situation and that martial law was not now in force in Palestine, but that the civil courts were functioning. It was hoped to discover by impartial enquiry some of the deep-lying causes of the trouble, which had been quite truly referred to as due to problems of extraordinary difficulty and complexity. There was nothing to add to what the Secretary of State had said because no further detailed information was to hand, and further policy would be determined in the light of facts as discovered by impartial enquiry. The mandate would be supported in every possible way, and Great Britain was grateful to the Assembly and this Committee for their sympathy.

She would point out that the Hilton-Young report regarding the project for the administrative union of Tanganyika with Kenya and Uganda was only issued in January of this year and it had not been possible to make it the subject of detailed consideration by the present Government. She could only repeat that any decision taken by the Government would be reported to the Mandates Commission, which would have an opportunity of considering and making observations upon it. While refraining from expressing any opinion, because the question was under consideration by the Government, she had no doubt that the British Government would consider with interest and respect all that was said by the Mandates Commission and by any body sitting under the auspices of the League. The more interest that was taken by the League in mandates the greater the help to the proper administration of mandates.

She hoped that more would be heard in future regarding the vast concessions which were said to have been made in the mandated area of Ruanda-Urundi to private persons. The British, who had so much to do with colonial administration, knew very well what great difficulties might arise from vast private concessions, which seemed to help to develop a country, and which very often did so in one sense, but were the cause of very serious future difficulties from the point of view of the mandate. She was glad that the Mandates Commission had drawn attention to the fact and hoped that the Belgian Government would be able to give assurances that the concessions would be kept very firmly within the control of the mandatory Power and would be administered with the sympathy and understanding which were fully expected from Belgium in the matter.

*The continuation of the discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.*

---

## FIFTH MEETING.

*Held on Saturday, September 14th, 1929, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

### 11. Mandates (continuation).

M. DE QUEVEDO (Portugal) thanked Dr. Nansen on behalf of the Portuguese delegation for his speech on the previous day regarding General Freire d'Andrade, a member of the Mandates Commission, whose death was regretted by all his countrymen. He paid a brief tribute to Mr. Grimshaw, who had gained the devotion and friendship of all with whom he had come in contact.

The work of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth sessions of the Mandates Commission showed with what care it was accomplishing the delicate task entrusted to it by the Covenant. It was not always an easy matter to investigate conscientiously the administration of mandated territories without impairing the necessary authority of the mandatory Powers and without giving offence to them. Yet the Commission had successfully discharged this duty.

The questions raised in the annual report proved how complicated colonial problems were and showed that the mandatory Powers were most efficiently fulfilling the mission entrusted to them by the League.

The chapter on petitions contained complaints which were an inevitable accompaniment of the mandates system. They were frequently extremely delicate questions requiring infinite tact. The procedure with regard to petitions had been very judiciously drawn up and, even when petitions were not granted, the publicity secured for complaints was of advantage to the petitioners.

The mandates system was not in every case well conceived as regarded its principles or the details of its operation, but it had done good service in furnishing a satisfactory solution for many major post-war problems.

In this matter too, he could only congratulate the Mandates Commission on the impartiality and skill with which it had carried out its task; the Council, too, had handled these delicate questions with great prudence and discretion.

Dr. Nansen had strongly emphasised a number of questions raised by the reports submitted for examination to the Sixth Committee, and in his enthusiasm for mandates had even thought the principle might be partially extended.

The speaker thought it would be a mistake to extend the mandates principle in any way. Mandates were the result of a very special situation which was a legacy of the war. They had a unique juridical basis and could not be applied apart from the whole situation *de facto* and *de jure* resulting from the liquidation of the world war. For the rest, the Italian delegate, Count Bonin-Longare, had shown very clearly the difference between ordinary colonial administration and the colonial administration of territories under mandate.

The Portuguese delegation heartily supported Sir James Parr's point of view as to the theoretical character of the problem of sovereignty under the mandates system, and identified itself with his statement that the authority of the mandatory Powers should not be lessened, in view of the very delicate and complex nature of colonial problems.

With regard to Tanganyika and Palestine, the speaker paid a tribute to the loyal attitude of the British Government, whose declarations testified to a deep respect for the obligations entailed by mandates.

Serious examination should be given to the question of the most-favoured-nation clause. The principle of reciprocity did not exist under the mandates system; the problem was one that should be studied objectively, as it could not be solved in an entirely uniform way.

In conclusion, M. de Quevedo expressed his admiration and respect for the work of the Mandates Commission, which had paid a compliment to the colonial experience of his own country by appointing Count de Penha Garcia in the place of General Freire d'Andrade.

He also expressed his satisfaction with the excellent organisation of the Mandates Section of the Secretariat under M. Catastini, who had paid a visit to Portugal this year and had described to audiences consisting of the intellectual élite of the country how the mandates system worked generally.

M. de Quevedo suggested that the Committee should appoint Dr. Nansen as Rapporteur.

M. MUHLSTEIN (Poland) wished to comment briefly on the incidents in Palestine.

The Polish Government had followed with close attention the deplorable occurrences, and its sympathy for the victims was all the keener because it controlled a country inhabited by more than three million Jews, who had close bonds of attachment to those who had suffered in Palestine.

The Polish delegate had been very glad to hear the statements of the British representative, which gave the necessary satisfaction to all who were interested in the future of the Palestine mandate. He trusted that the Committee would be unanimous in hoping that the praiseworthy efforts of the British Government would be successful so that the very important work accomplished in Palestine might continue in an atmosphere of harmony and security.

H. H. Mohammad Ali Khan FOROUGHI (Persia) said that he would like to thank Dr. Nansen for his interest in regard to the friendly relations between Persia and Iraq ; he was also anxious to make a short statement on the situation.

Until recently, the Government of Iraq had not been recognised by the Persian Government, mainly because a certain number of foreigners enjoyed legal privileges in Iraq which were refused to Persians. The Persian Government could not agree to Persians being treated less favourably than other foreigners.

The British Government, fortunately, had in the end concurred in the Persian point of view. At the March session of the Council, Sir Austen Chamberlain had admitted that the judicial system in Iraq was decidedly unfair and had proposed that the Council should authorise the British Government to negotiate with Iraq a new judicial agreement based on the equality of all foreigners. This authorisation was granted and the Persian Government had immediately recognised the Iraq Government.

The new judicial agreement between Great Britain and Iraq would shortly be submitted to the Council of the League and would confer a definite and equitable status upon all foreigners residing in Iraq.

The Persian delegate then referred to events in Palestine, regarding which he thought it was still premature to express an opinion.

As the representative of a Moslem country, he sympathised with his co-religionists who had suffered and were still suffering in that unfortunate country. As a member, however, of the human family, deeply desirous to see good understanding, peace and brotherhood prevail among all nations, he deplored the recent happenings and trusted that they would never recur.

He was quite convinced that both parties could live in complete harmony if they would only realise and feel that their interests were not necessarily opposed and could, with goodwill, be reconciled. This result could easily be obtained if the British Government, with its vast experience in the administration of peoples, set itself to find for Palestine the system which would result in the establishment there of peace and concord.

In conclusion, he emphasised the necessity for a strictly impartial investigation. It would obviously not be in accordance with the spirit of equality and justice animating the League of Nations if one of the parties to this tragic dispute could stifle the legitimate rights and aspirations of the other.

He was following the course of events closely and devoutly hoped that everything possible would be done to enable the people of Palestine to enjoy the harmony and tranquillity which they so much needed.

M. AUBERT (France) associated himself with the wish expressed by several speakers to see the troubles in Palestine speedily settled. These incidents had occurred between races many of whose representatives inhabited territories administered by France and in two places with which France, a Latin Power, could not but be concerned.

He reminded the Committee that France had also had to suppress similar troubles in a neighbouring country, on which occasion she had received the entire sympathy of the League, just as had Great Britain in the present case. France was doing all she could to prevent the troubles in Palestine having any reaction in Syria.

In view of the delicate nature of the mandates system, the French delegate thought that every care should be taken to avoid making any statements which might complicate the task of the mandatory Powers. He would draw the attention of the Italian delegate to the danger of general allusions to the temporary nature of the mandates. Although this expression had been used in regard to Tanganyika, he thought that Count Bonin-Longare had had in mind A mandates, which related to populations that might one day hope to attain self-government. Article 22 of the Covenant made no allusion in this sense as regards B and C mandates, but only as regards A mandates. On the other hand, there was nothing in the decisions of the Supreme Council of the Allied and Associated Powers by which the mandates had been allotted which indicated that their constitution or attribution was in any way temporary.

M. Aubert thought that, if the peoples under mandate got the impression that the mandatory Powers governed them in a temporary capacity, the task of the latter would obviously be made more difficult and they would not be encouraged to incur large expenditure in promoting the prosperity of such countries.

Mrs. SWANWICK (British Empire) wished to refer to a definite juridical point, which was all the more important since ill-informed newspapers, very often with a large circulation, were apt to overlook juridical points to which the League of Nations was bound to give attention. The point she had in mind was this : The bestowal of the mandates was vested in the Allied and Associated Powers, and the mandates could not be alienated except by the agreement of all the Allied and Associated Powers, which included the United States of America.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) thanked Sir James Parr for his kind reference at yesterday's meeting, but thought he ought to correct the impression made, as Sir James had evidently not quite clearly understood his meaning. In deprecating any remarks which might in any way add to the difficulties of exercising a mandate, Count Bonin-Longare stated that he had had in view only the special case of Palestine.

If he had spoken on this subject in general terms, he would apparently have been suggesting that the League of Nations should supervise mandates in an intermittent or superficial manner. On the contrary, during all the years that he had shared in this work he had always tried to emphasise the fact that it was the League's right and duty to supervise through the intermediary of the Mandates Commission. Nothing had happened to make him change his view, nor did his instructions permit of such a thing.

Replying to M. Aubert's observations regarding the temporary character of the mandates, the Italian delegate thought that the word "mandate" itself, and within the meaning of civil law, implied an institution of a temporary nature. Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations spoke of tutelage, and, under the civil code, tutelage also came to an end—namely, when the ward attained his majority.

The temporary nature of the mandate had been frequently affirmed during the discussions of the Mandates Commission, as the Minutes proved. The Minutes of the last session even reproduced a passage from a diplomatic document emanating from a Government which had taken a leading part in framing the Covenant of the League of Nations. In this document the temporary nature of the mandates was clearly stated.

In conclusion, the Italian delegate agreed that this was not the moment to start a debate on such a delicate question of principle ; he would merely register his reservation to the opinion expressed by the French delegate.

M. HUBERT (France) wished merely to bring forward one consideration in connection with the statement made by his colleague — M. Aubert. It referred to the comparisons made by his friend and colleague Count Bonin-Longare with civil law ; colonial mandates were a new conception—an outcome of the war. He did not think the idea originated directly from ordinary civil law, but rather from Anglo-Saxon thought which had assumed concrete form in the three types of mandates.

It was true that tutelage ceased when the object of it attained his majority, and this was stipulated in the articles dealing with A mandates, but nothing was said in respect to B and C mandates.

In conclusion, he agreed with Count Bonin-Longare that this discussion should not be pursued, as it might only increase difficulties.

Mr. Louw (South Africa) said he regretted that he had not been able to be present at the previous meeting. From a perusal of the Minutes, he had gained the impression that there had been no expression of dissatisfaction with regard to the way in which the mandatory Powers had exercised their administration. He thanked the members of the Sixth Committee.

He pointed out that the Government of South Africa had always done its best to collaborate with the Mandates Commission, to which it had sent men actually in charge of the administration of the mandated territories at considerable inconvenience, sacrifice and expense, for the purpose of giving the necessary information to the Mandates Commission.

A great number of difficulties existed in connection with the administration of the territory of South West Africa, which was a vast territory with very primitive means of communication, inhabited by absolutely savage tribes. As an illustration of the difficulties encountered by the mandatory Power in South West Africa, he mentioned that the efforts made in regard to health and education were often openly opposed by the natives.

He did not wish to embark on a legal discussion of the question of sovereignty. Dr. Nansen's references to the subject at the previous meeting did not state the position quite correctly. The Council had not finally settled the question and it had not declared that the mandatory Power possessed no sovereignty over a territory under mandate.

In the report to the Council on the work of the fifteenth session of the Mandates Commission it was stated :

"The Permanent Mandates Commission notes with regret that, in spite of all its previous discussions on the subject and all the correspondence exchanged between the Council of the League of Nations and the Government of the Union of South Africa in 1927 and 1928, it has never received an explicit answer to its repeated question on the meaning attached by that Government to the term 'full sovereignty', used to define the legal relations between the mandatory Power and the territory under mandate."

He thought that these remarks of the Mandates Commission were not quite fair to his Government. He referred the Committee to the previous discussions on the subject, and particularly to the report adopted by the Council, in which it was stated that

“ . . . it had resolved not to express any opinion on the delicate question as to where sovereignty over mandated territories resides, but that the Secretary-General should simply be instructed to forward the relevant passage of the Mandates Commission's report for the information of the mandatory Power concerned.”

He particularly wished to emphasise the use of the word “simply”. The matter had again been discussed in the following year, but it was perfectly clear that the Rapporteur had never intended to request the Government of South Africa, through the Council, to give a reply to this question, and that the statements of the Council were simply forwarded for its observations.

He wished, therefore, to correct the impression that his Government had failed to pay attention to the wishes of the Council. That was not the case. In view, moreover, of the statements of the Prime Minister in the South African House of Assembly, he thought his Government need not raise the question afresh.

In conclusion, Mr. Louw asked the Committee to offer the mandatory Governments its fullest sympathy in the discharge of a task which bristled with difficulties.

M. LOUWERS (Belgium), referring to the observations of the British delegate regarding Ruanda-Urundi, said that this question was of a special character falling within the sphere of the Mandates Commission. It had been examined very carefully during the fourteenth session of the Commission, and the observations made about it would be found on pages 127 and following of the Minutes. It would be seen that the Belgian member of the Mandates Commission had been the most insistent in having the matter entirely cleared up. The Mandates Commission had adopted resolutions on the subject which were contained in its report to the Council, and a reference to it would be found in the report on the work of the League presented to the Assembly. The matter, therefore, had been by no means kept in the dark, and information could be obtained by referring to the very complete documentation.

M. Louwers said that obstacles of a practical nature might arise if the Assembly and the Sixth Committee took the place of the Mandates Commission to examine special matters. Such matters should be dealt with by the Mandates Commission, while the Sixth Committee's task was to examine mandatory questions in their general aspect. This was the tradition that had been followed up to the present, and it was perfectly justified. Taking into account this aspect of the question, the Belgian delegate nevertheless said that he would give the required explanations.

The territory of Ruanda-Urundi was over-populated, but the population was not very evenly distributed; it was concentrated in the highlands. The vast plain reaching to Lake Tanganyika was hardly populated at all. In the over-populated part, concessions of land had not been made up to the present or, if so, they had been made to a negligible extent, to allow the establishment of enterprises indispensable to the life of the country. In the plain, where unoccupied lands seemed to exist in a fairly large number, the administration of the mandatory Power had granted two or three concessions of a relatively considerable extent with regard to which no difficulty had arisen. Such was not the case in another district, which was not situated quite on the plain, where a concession of 7,000 hectares had been made. It appeared that the quantity of vacant land was not so large as had been thought, but as the concession had only been granted subject to the rights of the natives, there could be no doubt that, if it appeared to the Belgian Government that it could not grant the whole 7,000 hectares to the concessionaire without injuring the rights of the natives, the company would not obtain the concession.

Similarly, the Committee could rest assured that the general policy of the Belgian Government as regards the question of concessions would always safeguard the rights of the natives of which it was the guardian.

M. FIERLINGER (Czechoslovakia) thanked Mrs. Swanwick for her statement and for the assurances she had given with regard to the situation in Palestine. He associated himself with the observations of previous speakers on the subject. The whole civilised world followed with the greatest sympathy and interest Great Britain's constructive policy in Palestine, where it hoped to establish a new Jewish home. He had confidence in the breadth of view of the British Government and was sure that it would succeed in solving the problems in Palestine with the same tact as it had succeeded in solving others much more difficult and much more important.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) said that he spoke in his capacity as a member of the Mandates Commission and not as the Swiss delegate. Moreover, he had not received any instructions regarding this subject.

He wished to thank those who had expressed their sympathy for the loss of two members of the Committee who had died during the past year; he also wished to express his sympathy with the families bereaved.

The question of the extension of the mandates system to other colonies could only be of interest for the future. It was understood that this extension would not be made without the help of the colonial Powers. Either the mandates system would develop to such an extent that both the mandatory Powers and those under their authority would approve the system, in which case there appeared to be no reason why the colonial administrations should object to its becoming general, or the system would show itself to be inferior to the colonial regime without international control, and then it was to be expected that the mandates system itself would only be of a temporary character.

In regard to the duration of the mandate, it was undeniable that, according to the texts, the contention of the Italian delegate was the correct one. When the mandate spoke of peoples as “not yet being capable of governing themselves,” it was implied that a time would come when they

would be able to govern themselves. M. Rappard also agreed with M. Aubert, the French delegate, that it was dangerous to awaken hopes which might lead to unrest. These two opinions could be reconciled by saying that the best proof that those under mandate could give of their capacity to govern themselves lay in peaceful co-operation with the mandatory Powers. If the peoples had recourse to acts of violence, they demonstrated the necessity for the mandate.

The fact that the question of sovereignty recurred acted as an irritant. The best way, however, of getting rid of this source of irritation was frankly to recognise what was juridically evident. In his view, the problem was quite clear. The mandatory Power did not possess sovereignty. The Mandates Commission had done all it could to clear up the problem.

Mr. Louw had said that the South African Government had never been asked to reply to a definite question. In this connection, he would recall the text of the report sent for the consideration of the Government of the Union, in which the question was asked in terms which only admitted of a categorical reply. The best way of putting an end to these discussions was to declare that the Government of the Union did not consider itself as possessing sovereignty and to apply to these terms simply the sense of the texts. If certain provisions in the official texts of the Union Government which were not in accord with the spirit of the mandates were modified, everyone would be pleased.

M. Rappard then dealt with the question of private concessions accorded by the Administration of Ruanda-Urundi, the only territory under mandate which was obviously over-populated. He had heard with satisfaction that extensive concessions in this territory would be examined most thoroughly by the Administration. It was difficult to understand why concessions of land amounting to 7,000 hectares were granted in a country where famine was rife and where there was over-population.

All the members of the Committee realised the difficulty of the problem in Palestine. On the one hand, there was an obligation assumed by the mandatory Power to provide a National Home for the Jews and, on the other hand, the British Government had undertaken to ensure the development of the institutions of free government and not to interfere in any way with the civil or religious rights of the population. The task was of great difficulty, but that it might reach a successful conclusion had been shown by the history of the last ten years. Understanding between the two sections of the populations had been possible in the past; it would be again possible in the future.

The policy of establishing a National Jewish Home in Palestine was a most interesting experiment based on two principles; on the one hand, the home-sickness of the Jewish people and its devotion to what it considered to be its ancient home, and, on the other hand, the protection of the mandatory Power and of the League of Nations. This last principle had broken down to some extent owing to the recent incidents.

At the beginning of the exercise of the mandate, the Jews and the Arabs had been disarmed by the mandatory Power. Deprived of the means of defending themselves against hostile attacks, they had placed their faith in the protection of the British Government. The British Government had little by little reduced the military and police force in the country. Everyone must agree with this policy, for it would be strange if the League of Nations should regret the reduction of armies in a territory under its control. Everyone saw in this, moreover, the best proof of peace, but it was certain that, by congratulating the mandatory Power on its efforts towards disarmament pursued for years in a systematic manner, the Mandates Commission did to some extent share with it the responsibility for the recent events. But the responsibility fell, in the first instance, on the administration of the mandatory Power, whose assurances the Commission had accepted.

All the civilised world greatly regretted the incidents which had occurred in Palestine. It had, however, been somewhat consoled by the fact that France had immediately and generously collaborated with the mandatory Power when the disturbances had broken out, and above all by the frank, sincere and loyal declarations made by the representative of the British Government, who had hidden nothing and had promised to throw full light on the question. The Mandates Commission would do everything possible to clear up the situation quite dispassionately.

M. Rappard warmly thanked the mandatory Powers for their collaboration with the Commission. The appearance at Geneva, in an ever-increasing number, of representatives of the responsible administrations was the best proof of this desire for co-operation. It was due to their collaboration with the Mandates Commission, which had no direct control, that it was able to gain a precise idea of the nature of the problems.

He remarked with pleasure on the unusual breadth of the discussion this year. He saw in it a proof of the co-operation of the League in the work of the mandatory Powers and the fruitful carrying-out of an experiment which was as important as it was difficult.

M. STOICA (Roumania) said that the people of his country had much regretted the recent events in Palestine. Many Jews who were inspired with the idea of reconstructing and making fertile one of the most ancient homes of human civilisation had been victims of the disorders. The regrets of the Roumanian people had been all the more acute because a small part of the colonies there had been founded by a population which, during its unhappy wanderings, had found refuge for some time on Roumanian soil and was still deeply attached to it. It should not be forgotten that there were about a million inhabitants of Jewish origin among the 18,000,000 inhabitants of Roumania.

He was sure that the mandatory Power in restoring order would take every possible step to give to a people made unhappy by reason of historic disasters a peaceful life on the soil of its ancestors. He hoped it all the more because the complete pacification and restoration of order in Palestine affected also the Christian world. According to the newspapers, His Holiness the Pope



had postponed pilgrimages to the Holy Land owing to the present state of affairs. He added that His Holiness the Patriarch of Roumania had given the same advice to Roumanian pilgrims.

He particularly emphasised this point as the Christian world was profoundly desirous that peace and concord should reign in those spots where Our Saviour had lived and preached and where its most holy sanctuaries were situated.

M. PALACIOS (Spain), after having associated himself with the tributes that had been paid to M. Freire d'Andrade and Mr. Grimshaw, said that he welcomed the appointment of Dr. Nansen as Rapporteur.

With regard to the important questions that had been referred to the Sixth Committee, he need not state that he shared the view of Count Bonin-Longare with regard to the question raised by the Hilton-Young report in connection with Tanganyika.

The mandates were essentially temporary. The words quoted by M. Rappard, "Peoples not yet able to stand by themselves", were contained in the first paragraph of Article 22 of the Covenant. They expressed the common principle which held good for all the paragraphs of that article and which applied to all the different categories of mandates. M. Palacios was surprised that the French delegates should have upheld any other view.

Guardianship was a transitory institution, although in certain circumstances it might happen that it would extend over a whole lifetime when the incapacity which had made it necessary continued to exist. Nevertheless, although this incapacity might have become the normal, the guardian should always be guided by the hope that it would one day be replaced by full human powers.

Further, paragraph 4 of Article 22 of the Covenant did not authorise in any way the distinction that it had been endeavoured to set up. The provisions of this paragraph had proved to a large extent impracticable and had consequently become obsolete. According to Article 1 of the Palestine mandate, the mandatory Power had "full powers of legislation and of administration in Palestine", as if the mandate were a B or C mandate. If, however, Article 22 of the Covenant were observed literally, the mandatory Power, which only exercised an A mandate in this territory, should merely give "administrative advice and assistance". This situation had come about by the force of circumstances, as a result of the great difficulty that was experienced in putting the Balfour Declaration into practice. M. Palacios recalled that the authors of certain works on the mandates system had inferred from that Declaration that the Palestine mandate should be regarded as a mandate of a special character.

The explanation of the incidents which the Committee was unanimous in deploring lay in the complexity of the problem. There was a point in this connection on which M. Palacios did not agree with M. Rappard. Since the British Government had instituted an enquiry, he did not wish to express any opinion on the matter. It seemed to him unjust, however, that M. Rappard should have held the Mandates Commission as partly responsible, in view of the fact that it had induced the mandatory Power to disarm. In M. Palacios' opinion, the question was certainly not a question of police, of militia or of troops.

As he had said on a previous occasion, when examining the report of the mandatory Power with Sir Herbert Samuel at the session of the Commission in October 1924, the two sections of the Balfour Declaration relating to the Jews and Arabs respectively seemed contradictory, but might be reconciled. It was reassuring to note that the Persian delegate, H. H. Mohammad Ali Khan Foroughi, although personally in favour of the Moslems, also thought that the two principles might be brought into line. The dispute should be raised to a higher plane, in order that both parties might reconcile their points of view as a result of mutual correction and stimulus. A more kindly feeling should be created, and confidence should be placed in Great Britain, whose history had won her such well-deserved prestige, in order that the peace which was desired by all might be secured, within the limits of the mandate.

M. Palacios wished to add that the cause of the recent events had, apparently, been the incident that had occurred in the preceding year at the Wailing Wall. The "holy place" of the Jews was involved. Article 14 of the Palestine Mandate had prescribed the constitution of a special Commission to enquire into questions concerning the holy places. This commission had not yet been appointed, not merely, it was true, through the fault of the mandatory Power, but also on account of the fact that the other Powers concerned had not come to an agreement on this point. It was regrettable that no organisation existed through which other nations and other religions might help to maintain peace, as was their duty and their privilege.

With regard to the question of sovereignty, he agreed with the statement that M. Briand had made in this connection to the Council.

M. Palacios was glad that there had been such a thorough discussion on the mandates question, which affected so many interests in the world of politics.

Sir James PARR (New Zealand) regretted to note the tendency of certain delegations to regard the mandates as being merely temporary. The word "temporary" had perhaps not been very happily chosen. Care should be taken not to give the natives the idea that the mandatory Power had only a temporary rôle; a sort of guardian who could be easily removed. Such an interpretation would create mischief.

He stated that the mandatory Powers had received their mandates from the Allied and Associated Powers and that the League was largely a supervisory body to watch over the mandates and see that they were executed. It was the duty of the League therefore to encourage the efforts made to improve the lot of the natives and to assist the mandatory Powers.

In conclusion, he expressed his full agreement with the view of the French delegation, which was opposed to the interpretation that the mandate was of a temporary character.

Dr. VON SCHUBERT (Germany) said he agreed with the observations of the Italian delegate on the question of the temporary character of the mandates, but he had no desire to enter into an

elaborate juridical investigation. He would merely state that the term "mandate" in itself indicated that it was a temporary institution. Moreover, that view had more than once been endorsed in the Mandates Commission.

He would like to say a few words in reply to the British delegate, who had made some theoretical observations as to a possible change in the distribution of the mandates and had expressed the view that the legal basis of the mandates was an agreement between the Allied and Associated Powers. He wished to state that that question involved a number of highly delicate and complicated legal points. He had no desire at the moment to go exhaustively into the matter which the British delegate had raised, and he would merely make a general reservation on the subject.

*The discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.*

## SIXTH MEETING.

*Held on Monday, September 16th, 1929, at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

### 12. Question of accelerating the Work of the Committee : Letter from the President of the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from the President of the Assembly suggesting to the Chairmen of Committees that they should take various steps to accelerate the work, in particular by restricting the length of the speeches and increasing the length and number of the meetings.

*The communication was noted.*

### 13. Mandates (continuation).

Lidj ANDARGUÉ MASSAÏ (Abyssinia), speaking in the name of the Christian Power in Africa and in the name of the direct descendants of Solomon, wished to make a few remarks with regard to the recent unfortunate incidents in Palestine, — that crossroad of different religions and races.

As between the chief religions of Palestine, — Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism, — hostility was most frequent between Jews and Arabs. The Christians, although they were the nearest to Christ, encouraged sometimes the one sect, sometimes the other, and on occasions they even took part in demonstrations which had a grievous issue. Had not Christ preached in favour of friendly relations and brotherly love ? It was regrettable that the Christians in Palestine, and especially the ecclesiastics, exacerbated feeling instead of acting as impartial mediators.

Since the state of peace was more precarious in Palestine than in other parts of the globe, the speaker appealed to his colleagues on the Committee to urge the heads of the respective churches in their turn to give definite orders to their representatives in Palestine. That would be one means of facilitating the work of the mandatory Power. The mandatory Power should also be asked to recommend to the Christians in Palestine to adopt an impartial attitude towards both parties, since this was in the interests of peace and therefore of the whole world.

In conclusion, he congratulated the British Government on the strong measures it had already taken to establish order in Palestine, and he hoped that a method would be found of restoring a lasting period of calm in that unfortunate country, whose troubles had roused feeling throughout the world.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) wished to say a few words in reply to M. Hubert, who had complained of a lack of logic in his speech made two days previously. It was a question of the word "tutelage" twice repeated in Article 22 of the Covenant. If the first two paragraphs of this article were taken together, it would be seen that the word "tutelage" applied to all the mandates without exception. The mandates differed in their extent ; for example, it was impossible to identify the situation of the inhabitants of Iraq with that of the inhabitants of Central Africa. The principle, however, was the same for all.

Count Bonin-Longare pointed out that the temporary character of the mandates had been mentioned several times in the Minutes of the Mandates Commission and, as far as he knew, these references had never been questioned. But that was not all. In September 1925, the Council had actually discussed the possibility of terminating a mandate, on the occasion of a loan which at that time was under consideration for Tanganyika, a territory under B mandate.

To say that a mandate was not temporary was to claim that it was perpetual, a conception which approached very closely to the idea of the sovereignty of the mandatory Power, which M. Briand himself had rejected at the Council's last session. If it had really been contemplated that the mandates were perpetual, Count Bonin-Longare was sure that they would have been very differently appreciated at the time of the peace settlement.

With regard to the possible effects on the minds of the natives of references to the temporary character of mandates, the fears that had been expressed would only be founded if it were a question of terminating a mandate at an early or at any rate at a fixed date. Count Bonin-Longare emphasised the fact that there was no fixed time-limit. A mandate would cease when the peoples under mandate had reached a stage of civilisation at which they were fit to govern themselves. This eventuality, which might be near at hand in respect of certain A mandates, lay in the dim and

distant future for populations subject to B and C mandates. Accordingly, a discussion of this kind could not disturb them.

Count Bonin-Longare added that he did not intend to prolong this discussion, which had arisen incidentally through his statement made two days before. There was no point in prolonging this theoretical discussion of principle on a subject which was not within the competence of the Sixth Committee, but rather within that of the Council.

Sir Granville de Laune RYRIE (Australia) said that first-hand experience of the way in which the Permanent Mandates Commission had examined the reports from the territories under mandate had clearly demonstrated to him the efficiency of its work.

He did not agree with the speakers who had said that the mandates had a temporary character. Would Australia have taken a mandate, have done a tremendous amount of hard work, and expended an enormous sum of money on New Guinea as a merely temporary expedient? The idea, moreover, would have a very harmful effect upon the natives, who had a certain amount of intelligence and would soon get wind of the rumour that they would be free by and by from the mandatory Powers.

Nauru was a small and happy island, where the only fly in the ointment was an outbreak of leprosy. Australia had done everything to check the scourge, and a great authority, a specialist in the disease, had been called in, and under his administration the disease was being kept under.

It was not generally appreciated that the mandated territory of New Guinea covered an immense area and was inhabited to a large extent by savage tribes.

Forced labour was not allowed in New Guinea, and when the regulations were broken severe penalties had been inflicted. A payable goldfield had recently been discovered in a very inaccessible part of New Guinea. There had been a rush of white people to this new field and something had been done by them in the way of impressing the natives. But it was evidence of Australia's desire to observe the mandate that some of these people had been prosecuted and very severely dealt with.

The Australian Government was therefore fully seized of its obligations towards New Guinea, and had administered affairs within the spirit of the Covenant.

M. HUBERT (France) said, in reply to Count Bonin-Longare, that he did not wish to open a polemical discussion on ideas and words. As regards ideas, they were agreed in principle, and whether they were dealing with civil law or a new law created by circumstances and for which a proper vocabulary had not yet been invented, he thought that any discussion on the subject would be superfluous.

In regard to words, Count Bonin-Longare had taken the responsibility of introducing the word "temporary" into the discussion. He himself, in making a distinction between A and B mandates, had only been following the Covenant. That was not to say that "non-temporary" meant "perpetual".

M. Rappard had made a particularly valuable statement which was the only one to which M. Hubert would refer. He had said that it was for the populations themselves to fix the hour of their emancipation. No one could say when that hour would strike; it might be soon for the A mandates, but it was no doubt a long way off for the B and C mandates.

Mr. Louw (South Africa) wished to refer to M. Rappard's remarks at the last meeting to the effect that the Mandates Commission had no desire to force replies from the South African Government, but that, as a question had been clearly put to the South African Government, the Commission expected it to reply: He would like to point out that the Union Government's dealings were with the Council and not with the Commission.

It was difficult to agree, as Dr. Nansen had suggested, that the Council had finally settled the question in 1927. The report of M. Beelaerts von Blokland was indefinite on the point and only referred to certain new international relations, and the later report by M. Procopé dealt with sovereignty only in its "traditional meaning". In a matter of this kind, words should be used in their strict legal sense. Unless that was done, it became impossible to agree on the meaning of the word "sovereignty".

If he had dealt with this matter in some detail before the Sixth Committee it was because, owing to a misunderstanding, he had been unable to do so at the last meeting of the Council. For that reason he had written to the President, telling him that he could not associate himself with the resolution by which the Council had adopted the report of the Mandates Commission.

In conclusion, he asked that an alteration should be made in Dr. Nansen's report. He would like to see his point of view included in it.

Count APPONYI (Hungary) desired to say a few words on the question of Palestine.

Hungary also had a large number of Jewish citizens who were naturally alarmed at the dangers threatening their co-religionists in Palestine. He would not, however, enter into details concerning the arrangements in Palestine, as the feelings of his compatriots were divided on this subject. Nevertheless, since these arrangements existed, both humanity and honour required, especially from the Powers which contributed towards their making, the removal of the dangers with which these peoples were at present faced and the creation of conditions in which such events would not recur.

He fully associated himself with what had been said in this connection by the previous speakers.

The question of Palestine also concerned hundreds of millions of Christians whose safety might be affected in places which they held most holy.

Baron YRJO-KOSKINEN (Finland) said that the attitude of the Council as regards the question of sovereignty in connection with mandates had been set forth in the report by M. Beelaerts van Blokland adopted by the Council in September 1927. This year the Council had explained still

more clearly its point of view by stating that it followed implicitly from the report that sovereignty in the traditional sense of the word did not rest with the mandatory Power.

As there still seemed to be some misunderstanding, the Rapporteur to the Council had seen fit to draw the attention of the South African Government to the observations made by the Permanent Mandates Commission and to the report. The mandatory Power had therefore been asked to send a reply on the question which had been so clearly put by the Commission.

As regarded the question of the temporary character of the mandate, it was true that the Council had never had occasion to give a decision, but the question had arisen in the Mandates Commission during the discussions on the Hilton-Young report. Although neither the Commission nor the Council had expressed a definite opinion regarding the anxiety felt in the Commission on this matter, the Council had thought it necessary to refer to it. Moreover, the Commission would be able to return to the matter at a later session.

M. DEKIEN TUNG (China) had listened with keen satisfaction to what the previous speakers had said on the question of mandates, particularly Dr. Nansen. All had expressed the wish to improve the lot of those peoples which were not yet capable of governing themselves.

In his opinion, the authority of the mandatory Power was exercised on behalf of the League of Nations, sometimes by means of advice, sometimes through the administration, until such time as the countries under mandate would attain their majority. Accordingly, sovereignty rested temporarily with the League of Nations. He hoped that, if the principles which governed this sovereignty were to undergo any modification, it would be in favour of the peoples under mandate. He also hoped that those peoples would shortly enter the League of Nations on the same footing as other countries.

He cordially approved of Dr. Nansen's appointment as Rapporteur on the question of mandates.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) pointed out that the Mandates Commission did not unanimously support the declaration by the Chinese delegation, according to which sovereignty in the territories under mandate rested with the League of Nations. Opinions differed as to where sovereignty lay, but the point which appeared to be quite clear to all the members of the Commission was that it could not rest with the mandatory Power, for, if it did, the Mandatory would not have to render an account to the League of Nations on its administration of the mandate.

The CHAIRMAN, noting that there were no further speakers, emphasised two principal observations which had been made during the discussion.

Several speakers had paid a tribute to the memory of General Freire d'Andrade, a member of the Mandates Commission, and of Mr. Grimshaw, who had represented the International Labour Office on the Commission. The Chairman felt sure that he would be interpreting the feelings of the whole Committee if he asked Dr. Nansen to include in his report an expression of the thanks which the Committee felt they owed to the two deceased.

Several members of the Committee had expressed the deep emotion by which the whole civilised world had been stirred at the news of the unhappy events in Palestine. He would ask Dr. Nansen also to mention in his report the unanimous feeling of the Committee on this matter.

The members of the Committee had noted with satisfaction the very frank declarations by the British Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs before the Council. These declarations justified the hope that such events, which had staggered the civilised world, would not recur.

On the Chairman's proposal, and in response to a suggestion by the Portuguese delegation, Dr. NANSEN (Norway) *was appointed Rapporteur on the mandates question.*

---

## SEVENTH MEETING.

*Held on Wednesday, September 18th, 1929, at 3.30 p. m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

### 14. Slavery Convention. — Annual Report by the Council: Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.

M. PALACIOS (Spain), Rapporteur, stated that the draft report (Annex 1a) which had been distributed took into account all the wishes expressed during the discussions.

M. SOTTILE (Liberia), referring to the first paragraph of the draft report, informed the Committee that he had handed in to the Council on Tuesday the memorandum of which he had spoken. Further, on behalf of his Government, he had informed the Council of a proposal with regard to the appointment of the representative of the League of Nations on the international Commission of Enquiry in Liberia. The question was on the agenda of the Council meeting for the following day.

He declared that the Government of Liberia had fulfilled its duty in accordance with Article 7 of the 1926 Convention.

In conclusion, M. Sottile suggested a slight change in the last paragraph of the proposed resolution, substituting for the passage "To collect from States Members of the League and from those non-Member States which are Parties to the Convention all possible information" the following

text : "To ask States Members of the League and those non-Member States which are Parties to the Convention to provide all information."

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) thought it would be a pity to make any change in the resolution, which had been considered carefully by the Sub-Committee and had already been approved by the Sixth Committee.

Referring to the paragraph in the report dealing with ratifications, Lord Cecil asked if he was not right in saying that the Swiss Government had also informed the Committee that it would sign and ratify the Convention, though Switzerland was not directly interested, if the Committee cared for it to do so.

Referring to the following paragraph : "The British representative emphatically stated in the Sub-Committee that the work of the Commission, as he understood it, ought not in any way to assume the form of control or of a direct investigation in the various countries", he pointed out that what he thought he had said, and what he had certainly intended to say, was that it should not be a control or direct investigation except by the consent of the Governments of such territories. He would be glad if those words could be added.

M. PALACIOS (Spain) stated that M. Sottile's first observation dealt with supplementary information which was not relevant to the text as drawn up.

In regard to the second observation, he supported the views of Viscount Cecil. The proposed resolution had been discussed word for word and it would be regrettable to alter it.

He welcomed the two additions asked for by Viscount Cecil : namely, notice of the Swiss Government's promise and the condition that the interested Governments gave their consent.

M. GORGÉ (Switzerland) saw no objection to adding to the report the declaration of the Swiss Government. This would be in accordance with the intention of the Federal Council, which had always intended to accede to the Convention if this seemed really necessary.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) was also of the opinion that no change should be made in the draft resolution.

He emphasised the moral importance of the promised accession of Switzerland and he recommended that it should be mentioned in the report.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee was unanimous as regards the report, since the Liberian delegate had declared his agreement to it.

*The draft report was adopted with the two additions mentioned above and subject to the conclusions of the Fourth Committee on the putting into force of the resolution attached to the report.*

#### 15. Mandates : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN thought that he should make the following statement to the Committee : He considered that, possibly, Dr. Nansen had not dealt sufficiently objectively in his report (Annex 2) with the discussion which had taken place in the Committee regarding the question of sovereignty. He thought that it would perhaps be more in accordance with the spirit of the discussion and with the functions of the Sixth Committee to delete from the report the following two passages :

"In the course of the general discussion, which touched upon a number of aspects of the institution of mandates, a highly interesting exchange of views took place with regard to the conception of sovereignty as far as mandated territories are concerned. The general opinion was expressed by all the members of the Committee who took part in the debate, with the exception of the representative of the Union of South Africa, that there was no reason to depart from the decision made in this matter by the Council of the League in the report which it adopted in September 1927 and which was reaffirmed at its meeting on September 6th, 1929."

M. HUBERT (France) agreed with the Chairman's remarks.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that, if the Committee was of this opinion, he would raise no objection. He would only remark that, under these conditions, the report would not give quite a faithful reproduction of the debates which had taken place in the Sixth Committee ; for it appeared to him that most of the members of the Committee did not share the views expressed by the representative of the Union of South Africa.

Sir James PARR (New Zealand) supported the Chairman's suggestion in favour of the elimination of the paragraph referring to the attitude of the representative of South Africa. He thought this would be a more decorous method and one which would avoid misunderstandings. This did not imply that the New Zealand Government held the same view as the representative of South Africa ; the point of view of his Government was that the less said at the moment with regard to academic questions such as this the better.

In conclusion, he congratulated Dr. Nansen upon the restraint which he had exercised in reporting the debate.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) had no objection to the proposed modifications, but that did not mean that he had in any way changed the point of view which he had always adopted in this matter and which, furthermore, had quite recently been confirmed before the Council. The Sixth Committee could not, moreover, encroach on the competence of the Council with regard to this question.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) also supported the Chairman's proposal. It was true that the gist of the discussion would be omitted from the report, but if anybody wished to obtain information on the discussion they could do so by referring to the Minutes.

Mr. Louw (South Africa) desired to thank his colleagues and especially Dr. Nansen for their conciliatory attitude. He wished to make it perfectly clear that throughout the whole discussion he had not ventured to express an opinion as to whether sovereignty did or did not lie with the mandatory Power. If the report had been adopted as drafted, his Government would have been placed in a very awkward position owing to the fact that it had all along been under the genuine impression that it was not called upon to reply to certain observations.

In any case, it was probably more a question for the Council than for the Sixth Committee.

The CHAIRMAN declared the discussion closed on that point and thanked Dr. Nansen for accepting the proposed modification of his report.

*The report and draft resolution were adopted with the formal modifications proposed by the Chairman.*

**16. Settlement of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan. Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.**

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) confined himself to repeating his advice to the Council and the Assembly to drop the question for the time being. It followed that the offers of money and credits made by certain Governments would not now hold good.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) thanked Dr. Nansen for this observation, and said that it would be impossible for the German Government to maintain its offer of credits for an indefinite period.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) asked the German delegate if he wished a reference to this point to be made in the resolution.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) thought that the statement he had just made would suffice. At the same time, if Dr. Nansen thought it desirable to mention the matter in the resolution, he would willingly agree.

M. RAPHAËL (Greece) reminded the Committee that the Greek Government was amongst those which had offered help for the transport of refugees. He noticed that the report (Annex 3) mentioned the sum of 100,000 francs for the purpose of transporting refugees. He would be glad to have further information on the matter. He believed that the Greek Government was still prepared to maintain the offer it had made in the case of refugees from Greece.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) replied to M. Raphaël that the interpretation given to the word "transport" arose from a misunderstanding. It was not, strictly speaking, a question of transport, but rather one of transfer and settlement.

It was understood that the report would contain a reference to the fact that the promises made by certain Governments would no longer have effect.

*The report and draft resolution were adopted.*

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, Dr. NANSEN (Norway) was appointed *Rapporteur* of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly for this question.

---

**EIGHTH MEETING.**

*Held on Friday, September 20th, 1929, at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman : M. JANSON (Belgium).*

**17. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.**

Mrs. HAMILTON (British Empire) submitted her draft report (Annex 4).

At the request of the Rapporteur, in addition to certain purely formal modifications to the draft report, the following amendments to the text of the resolution were adopted :

*Add to paragraph 2 of the resolution :*

" . . . and asks them to continue their work on the basis of the programme outlined in the Advisory Commission's report, under the direction of the Council of the League of Nations."

*Add, at the end of the resolution, the following paragraph :*

"10. Asks the Council to take such steps as this resolution may render necessary until the next session of the Assembly."

M. HUBERT (France) said that the Committee could congratulate itself on having entrusted Mrs. Hamilton with the duty of presenting the report on this question. He wished to associate himself, on behalf of the French delegation, with the conclusions contained in her report. He expressed his entire agreement with the ideas which underlay the report, particularly in regard to the transitory character of the refugee organisation and the conditions for its liquidation.

There were two essential questions involved. That of finding employment was clearly the more urgent.

He observed, further, that to speak to-day of the liquidation of the refugee organisation was to pay the highest tribute to Dr. Nansen, for it involved a recognition that this work had been carried through and was on the point of arriving at a very successful conclusion.

Mention had been made on more than one occasion in the Committee to the sacrifices which France had made on behalf of Armenian refugees in Syria. The speaker was averse to the French delegation's receiving all the praise and he wished to give it to one whom Dr. Nansen knew well and who had been the mainstay of French work in this direction in Syria, Dr. Burnier. He wished, if Dr. Nansen had no objection, to invite the Committee's attention to the devoted and useful work which Dr. Burnier had done.

The second essential question related to the juridical status of refugees. This was a delicate question and possibly a lengthy one to solve. The League of Nations had accepted responsibilities in this regard and had created a status for Russian and Armenian refugees and for a certain category of Oriental refugees who had been assimilated to the first two categories. The speaker considered that no change should be made and that the categories which had been designated should be maintained.

He noted with satisfaction that Mrs. Hamilton's report had not referred to Dr. Nansen's proposal to give him a sort of assistant or deputy High Commissioner. He was glad not to have to speak on this question because he would have had to stress the fact that such an appointment, even though unpaid, was a matter for the Council and not for a Committee of the League of Nations.

In conclusion, the speaker recommended the Committee to adopt Mrs. Hamilton's report.

Mlle. FORCHHAMMER (Denmark) considered that some indication of the work that had been done during the previous year should be included in the report.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) stated that he would like to see his colleagues, particularly Major Johnson, mentioned in the report.

The speaker proposed in paragraph 7 of the resolution the deletion of the words "either through the national authorities or with the help of the High Commissioner's agents". He considered these words superfluous.

As regards the second paragraph of page 4, the question could be considered as settled if the arrangements referred to were adopted. Accordingly, Dr. Nansen suggested altering the second paragraph on page 4 as follows: To delete the sentence beginning "It should further be noted. . ." down to ". . . to facilitate the acceptance of these recommendations by Governments" and to alter the fourth line of the paragraph to read: "The Advisory Commission found that this question could be practically settled. . ."

M. RAPHAËL (Greece) mentioned, as regards the words "either through the national authorities or with the help of the High Commissioner's agents", that certain Governments had made reservations. The Greek Government had reserved the right to apply the arrangements through its national authorities.

M. GORGÉ (Switzerland) enquired, in regard to paragraph 8 of the resolution, if it would not be possible to insert a phrase requesting Governments to push the sale of Nansen stamps. Switzerland, where there were only 2,400 refugees, provided approximately ten per cent of the funds produced by the sale of these stamps. The High Commissioner would dispose of far more abundant funds than had been the case up to the present if Governments would take steps to increase the sales of Nansen stamps.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) replied to the Greek delegate that the reservations in question would remain in force irrespective of the text of the resolution. It was not therefore necessary to mention them in the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN said that several amendments had been proposed.

First of all there were the observations made by Mlle. Forchhammer and Dr. Nansen and accepted by Mrs. Hamilton, which it seemed the Committee was also ready to accept.

The Swiss delegate had proposed asking the Governments to give more active encouragement to the sale of Nansen stamps. If this idea were accepted, it ought to be inserted in a new paragraph.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that the sale of stamps was increasing, but, if the Committee would agree to insert in the resolution a phrase requesting Governments to try to increase their sale, he would gladly welcome it.

The CHAIRMAN proposed adding to paragraph 7 of the resolution the words: ". . . and expresses the wish that the use of the Nansen stamp should be further developed".

*This proposal of the Chairman was adopted.*

Mrs. HAMILTON (British Empire) agreed. She thought it would be quite possible for her to insert in the report a very short summary of the most important departments of the work, including that in Syria, and also to meet Dr. Nansen's wish that the admirable services of his staff should be recognised in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the matter should be left to Mrs. Hamilton and that she should be authorised to introduce into her report the amendments that had been discussed.

*The proposal was adopted.*

#### 18. Close of the Session.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there remained only two more points for the Committee to settle.

It had not yet received the Fourth Committee's reply on the decision taken regarding the question of slavery. He thought it very probable, however, that, in view of the Supervisory Commission's support, the Fourth Committee would agree to the resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee. In that case it would not be necessary for the latter to reconsider the report on slavery.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) warmly thanked the Chairman for the admirable manner in which he had conducted the meetings.

He then thanked the Secretariat and all the departments of the League of Nations which had co-operated with the Committee in its work.

The CHAIRMAN, in his turn, thanked the Italian delegate for his remarks and pronounced the meetings of the Sixth Committee closed.

---



ANNEX 1.

A. VI/1. 1929.

SLAVERY CONVENTION — ANNUAL REPORT BY THE COUNCIL : REPORT BY THE  
SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED ON SEPTEMBER 5TH, 1929.

*Rapporteur* : M. PALACIOS (Spain).

The Sub-Committee, consisting of the delegates of Abyssinia, Belgium, British Empire, France, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Siam and Spain, held two meetings, on September 6th and 7th, 1929, presided over by Count de Penha Garcia (Portugal), Vice-Chairman of the Sixth Committee. The Sub-Committee had been instructed by the Sixth Committee to consider a proposal submitted by the British delegate and supported by the delegates of India, Norway and Spain, to revive the temporary Commission on Slavery, whose report was submitted to the Sixth Assembly in 1925.

The proposal of the British representative, submitted in the form of a draft resolution, was as follows :

“The Committee,

“Considering the importance of the general ratification of the Slavery Convention and the desirability of the fullest information on the subject of slavery and forced labour being placed at the disposal of the League ;

“Anxious to complete the abolition of the slave trade and slavery in all its forms :

“Recommends to the Council the reappointment of the Commission on Slavery to report on all the above matters.”

The British representative informed the Sub-Committee that the work of the Commission, as he understood it, ought not in any way to assume the form of control or of a direct investigation in the various territories.

Further, the Sub-Committee noted that any conclusions at which it might arrive could only relate to the slave trade and slavery in all its forms, and must exclude forced labour, the investigation of which is being pursued by the International Labour Organisation, as indicated in the Assembly resolution of September 25th, 1926.

Certain objections were expressed in the Sub-Committee, more particularly in regard to the following two points :

1. The present legal situation as regards slavery is, from the point of view of the League of Nations and therefore of the Assembly, very different from what it was in 1925. Since that date, a Convention has been framed. Following on negotiations in which the plenipotentiary delegates of the States Members of the League took part, the Convention was approved by the seventh Assembly. This approval was accompanied by a recommendation that the communication of the laws and regulations enacted to put an end to slavery should be supplemented by information furnished spontaneously by the Members of the League with regard to the measures taken by them.

2. The report submitted in 1925 by the Temporary Commission on Slavery may be said to have exhausted the investigations of the problem of slavery.

The Sub-Committee considered that, having regard to the information which the League had received since the Convention on Slavery was approved, there might be some reason to believe that the Convention is not producing the results that were anticipated when the resolution of the seventh Assembly was adopted in 1926. But, in view of the comparatively short period which has elapsed since the signature of the Convention, it would, in the opinion of the Sub-Committee, be premature to give any definite opinion on this matter.

The Sub-Committee was unanimous in thinking that the first step should be to try to obtain further ratifications and accessions to the Convention by renewing the efforts which had previously been made in this direction. It also believed that a general outline should be given of the results as regards slavery so far obtained in consequence of the application of the Convention, and that the existing state of the problem, with all possible details, should be ascertained so as to allow of a comparison of the means now available and the present needs of the situation. The Sub-Committee was therefore of opinion that an investigation in this direction should precede consideration of the other means which might be contemplated to deal with the situation, and therefore should also precede any decision on the British delegation's proposal to revive the Commission on Slavery.

The Sub-Committee thinks that, in the meantime, the Secretary-General should be requested to obtain from States Members of the League and from non-Member States which are parties to the Convention all information on the existing position of slavery in all its forms, and to report to the next Assembly.

At the close of the discussion, the Sub-Committee drew up the following resolution, which it has the honour to submit to the Sixth Committee for approval :

“The Committee,

“Being extremely anxious to achieve the complete and final abolition of slavery and of the slave trade ;

“Considering the importance, in order to attain these results, of the general ratification of the Convention on Slavery ;

“Having considered the British Government’s proposal for the creation of a new temporary Commission on Slavery ;

“Being of opinion that an urgent appeal should first be addressed to the States which have not already done so to ratify or accede to the Convention on Slavery, and that it is necessary above all to collect information on the present position of the question :

“Postpones, therefore, further consideration of the British Government’s proposal, and

“Recommends that the Assembly should urgently request the States which have not already done so to ratify or accede to the Convention of September 25th, 1926, relative to slavery, and that the Secretary-General be instructed to collect from the States Members of the League and from those non-Member States which are parties to the Convention all possible information on the present position of slavery, and to report to the next Assembly.”

---

ANNEX 1a.

A. VI/4. 1929.

SLAVERY CONVENTION — ANNUAL REPORT BY THE COUNCIL : DRAFT REPORT BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur* : M. PALACIOS (Spain).

The Sixth Committee has noted the information communicated to the League by a number of Governments in connection with the gradual abolition of slavery and similar conditions. This information has been sent in pursuance of a resolution passed by the seventh Assembly on September 25th, 1926. It is furnished by the Governments of Great Britain, India, Portugal, Spain and the Sudan. The delegate of the Republic of Liberia has also announced that his Government will shortly send a memorandum containing the information required by Article 7 of the Convention of September 25th, 1926.

The Committee highly appreciates the readiness of these States to send information, the value of which needs no emphasising. It is particularly grateful to the British Government for furnishing detailed information as to the social and economic results of the abolition of domestic slavery in the Sierra Leone Protectorate. The Committee, which had this problem under consideration last year, is happy to learn that the introduction in Sierra Leone of the “Legal Status of Slavery of (Abolition) Ordinance, 1927” has given rise to no social or economic disturbances in the Protectorate.

Since the Sixth Committee of the ninth Assembly considered the question of slavery in 1928, the number of ratifications or definitive accessions to the Slavery Convention of 1926 has increased from twenty-four to twenty-eight. The countries which have ratified the Convention or acceded to it during the past year are Germany, the United States of America, Estonia and Iraq. The Liberian delegation has also informed the Committee that its Government’s ratification will not be long delayed.

The Committee had before it a proposal by the British delegate to revive the temporary Commission on Slavery. This proposal took the form of a draft resolution in the following terms :

“The Committee,

“Considering the importance of the general ratification of the Slavery Convention, and the desirability of the fullest information on the subject of slavery and forced labour being placed at the disposal of the League ;

“Anxious to complete the abolition of the slave trade and slavery in all its forms :

“Recommends to the Council the reappointment of the Commission on Slavery to report on all the above matters.”

This proposal which had been supported by the delegates of India, Norway and Spain was referred to a Sub-Committee consisting of the delegates of Abyssinia, Belgium, British Empire, France, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Siam and Spain, which met under the chairmanship of Count de Penha Garcia (Portugal), Vice-Chairman of the Sixth Committee.

The British representative emphatically stated in the Sub-Committee that the work of the Commission, as he understood it, ought not in any way to assume the form of control or of a direct investigation in the various territories.

Further, the Sub-Committee noted that any conclusions at which it might arrive could only relate to the slave trade and slavery in all its forms, and must exclude forced labour, the investigation of which is being pursued by the International Labour Organisation, as indicated in the Assembly resolution of September 25th, 1926.

Certain objections were expressed in the Sub-Committee, more particularly in regard to the following two points :

1. The present legal situation as regards slavery is, from the point of view of the League of Nations and therefore of the Assembly, very different from what it was in 1925. Since that date,

a Convention has been framed. Following on negotiations in which the plenipotentiary delegates of the States Members of the League took part, the Convention was approved by the seventh Assembly. This approval was accompanied by a recommendation that the communication of the laws and regulations enacted to put an end to slavery should be supplemented by information furnished spontaneously by the Members of the League with regard to the measures undertaken by them.

2. The report submitted in 1925 by the temporary Commission on Slavery was said to have exhausted the investigations of the problem of slavery, but the Sub-Committee considered that, having regard to the information which the League had received since the Convention on Slavery was approved, there might be some reason to believe that the Convention is not producing the results that were anticipated when the resolution of the seventh Assembly was adopted in 1926. But in view of the comparatively short period which has elapsed since the signature of the Convention it would, in the opinion of the Sub-Committee, be premature to give any definite opinion on this matter.

The Sub-Committee was unanimous in thinking that the first step should be to try to obtain further ratifications and accessions to the Conventions by renewing the efforts which had previously been made in this direction. It also believed that a general outline should be given of the results as regards slavery so far obtained in consequence of the application of the Convention, and that the present state of the problem, with all possible details, should be ascertained so as to allow of a comparison of the means now available and the present needs of the situation. The Sub-Committee was therefore of opinion that an investigation in this direction should precede consideration of the other means which might be contemplated to deal with the situation, and therefore should also precede any decision on the British delegation's proposal to revive the Commission on Slavery.

The Sub-Committee thinks that, in the meantime, the Secretary-General should be requested to obtain from States Members of the League, and from non-Member States which are parties to the Convention, all information on the existing position of slavery in all its forms and report to the next Assembly.

The Committee accepted the Sub-Committee's arguments and conclusions, and decided to propose that the Assembly adopt the following resolution :

The Assembly,

"Being extremely anxious to achieve the complete and final abolition of slavery and of the slave trade ;

"Considering the importance, in order to attain these results, of the general ratification of the Convention on Slavery ;

"Having considered the British Government's proposal for the creation of a new temporary Commission on Slavery ;

"Being of opinion that an urgent appeal should first be addressed to the States which have not already done so to ratify or accede to the Convention on Slavery, and that it is necessary above all to collect information on the present position of the question ;

"Postpones, therefore, further consideration of the British Government's proposal ;

"Urgently requests the States which have not already done so to ratify or accede to the Convention of September 25th, 1926, relative to slavery, and instructs the Secretary-General to collect from the States Members of the League and from those non-Member States which are parties to the Convention all possible information on the present position of slavery, and to report to the next Assembly."

---

## ANNEX 2.

A. VI/7. 1929.

### MANDATES : DRAFT REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur* : Dr. NANSEN (Norway).

The Sixth Committee has considered the reports and statements concerning the execution of the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant in the mandated territories during the period that has elapsed since the ninth Assembly.

It deeply regrets the death of General Freire d'Andrade, who, ever since the formation of the Permanent Mandates Commission, had been one of its most active members. It has also learnt with sorrow the recent loss of Mr. H. A. Grimshaw, who had represented the International Labour Organisation on the Mandates Commission from its first meeting onwards and who, like General Freire d'Andrade, had rendered most distinguished services in promoting the welfare of the native peoples of the world.

The Committee has devoted three meetings to the study of several technical questions, as well as to problems of a general nature connected with the institution of mandates and its operation.

The Committee recognises that, thanks to the efforts of the mandatory Powers and the impartial and authoritative assistance of the Permanent Mandates Commission, the mandates system has already yielded excellent results. There is every reason to hope that the principles underlying this new institution will continue to be applied and will thus effectively contribute to the welfare of the territories for the government of which it was set up. The Permanent Mandates Commission

must always be the central organ in this system, and its members may have full confidence that the Assembly will continue in the future to give them their full confidence and support as it has in the past.

Several members of the Sixth Committee dwelt upon the gravity of recent events in Palestine, and the painful impression those events have created in their respective countries. The Chairman, in the name of all the delegations, associated himself with the expressions of regret that had already been uttered for the loss of life in the different sections of the population. The Committee noted with satisfaction the declarations on this subject made in the Assembly by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in the Council by the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and in the Sixth Committee by the British delegate. The representatives of the mandatory Power gave assurances that no acts of terrorism or disorder would be allowed to modify their policy for the full application of the terms of the mandate for which they had international responsibility to the League as a whole.

They further informed the Assembly, the Council and the Committee that effective measures had already been taken to restore order, and that a Commission of Enquiry had been set up, and that the mandatory Power had no intention of proposing changes in the system which the mandate lays down. The Committee has no doubt that the British Government's enquiry will enlighten the League as to both the immediate and the more remote causes of these sad events and that the mandatory Power will at the same time state what arrangements it has in contemplation to remove these causes, to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents in the future and to build up a solid foundation for the future self-government in Palestine.

In the course of the general discussion, which touched upon a number of aspects of the institution of mandates, a highly interesting exchange of views took place with regard to the conception of sovereignty as far as mandated territories are concerned. The general opinion was expressed by all the members of the Committee who took part in the debate, with the exception of the representative of the Union of South Africa, that there was no reason to depart from the decision made in this matter by the Council of the League in the report which it adopted in September 1927 and which was reaffirmed at its meeting on September 6th, 1929. It will be remembered that the matter has been repeatedly dealt with by the Council of the League and by the Permanent Mandates Commission. The Committee is confident that, when the matter comes up again, the Council will find it possible to solve any practical problems which may arise on the basis of the principle which they have laid down.

*Draft Resolution:*

- "The Assembly,  
"Having noted the work of the mandatory Powers, the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council in execution of Article 22 of the Covenant :  
"(a) Renews the expression of confidence in them voted by previous Assemblies ;  
"(b) (i) Expresses its profound regret at the recent incidents in Palestine involving the loss of human lives, and  
(ii) Its complete confidence in the enquiry which the mandatory Power is instituting ;  
(iii) Trusts that the latter will speedily succeed in completely restoring order and taking measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents ;  
"(c) Trusts that, thanks to the united efforts of the mandatory Powers, the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council, the institution of mandates will continue to pursue the ideal of civilisation which is set before it."

---

ANNEX 3.

*Series of Publications :* 1929.VII.3.

*Official No. :* A.63. 1929. VII.

SETTLEMENT OF ARMENIAN REFUGEES IN THE REPUBLIC OF ERIVAN : DRAFT REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur :* Dr. Fridtjof NANSEN (Norway).

The ninth Assembly decided that the work of establishment of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan should be carried on under the auspices of the League, and requested the Council to continue negotiations with those Governments which had offered their assistance for the purpose, in order that the conditions under which other offers had been made might be fulfilled.

As a result of those and other negotiations, a total sum of £155,720 was promised for this particular settlement work ; fuller particulars concerning that sum appear in Chapter III (2) of the Appendix to document A.23.1929.VII.

Although that sum fell short by nearly £150,000 of the minimum amount required for the reduced settlement operations, on the basis of which the Armenian Government had agreed to co-operate, it was nevertheless thought desirable to make a start with the actual settlement work, even on a reduced scale, in the hope that further financial support might be forthcoming after it had been proved by practical results that the Armenian refugees could be settled under satisfactory conditions in the Republic of Erivan.

The High Commissioner was, moreover, encouraged to take that step by the important success which had attended the work for the settlement of the Armenian refugees in Syria, which was begun on a small experimental scale, but which, in the course of little more than two years, had developed in such a way as to provide for the settlement of nearly ten thousand refugees.

The Armenian Government, however, holds the view that the sum of £300,000 is the minimum fund on which the settlement operations could be launched under the auspices of the League.

As there appears to be no immediate prospects of obtaining the balance of nearly £150,000 which is still required to take advantage of the offer of the Armenian Government, the Assembly is reluctantly forced to the conclusion that there is no alternative but to recommend that the League should discontinue, at any rate for the moment, its connection with this scheme.

If the Assembly adopts those recommendations, the contributions which have been made from Government and private sources will revert to the subscribers and the credits offered by various Governments will automatically lapse.

As regards the contribution of £100,000 subscribed by the Armenian refugee organisations, it is understood that this sum will be utilised as an outright gift for the transport of Armenian refugees to, and their settlement in, the Republic of Erivan, and that the Armenian organisations will continue their efforts for the development of the movement of the Armenian refugees to that country.

If, therefore, it is the desire of the Assembly, the High Commission could keep in touch with that movement so that, should general conditions improve in such a way as to indicate that the assistance of the High Commission would be desirable, the matter might be brought once more to the attention of the League.

The Sixth Committee therefore invites the Assembly to adopt the following resolution :

“The Assembly,

“Having considered carefully Dr. Nansen’s report concerning the result of his negotiations for the settlement of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan :

“Notes that, although he does not consider the moment opportune for the prosecution of those negotiations, he is willing to keep in touch with the movement for the return of Armenian refugees to the Republic of Erivan in order that he may be in a position to judge whether, at a later date, the co-operation of the High Commission for Refugees might be effective ;

“Decides to discontinue for the moment its connection with this scheme, but to invite the High Commissioner to keep in touch with the movement for the return of the Armenian refugees to the Republic of Erivan and to acquaint the Council if and when the High Commission’s co-operation might appear to be opportune.”

---

#### ANNEX 4.

A. VI / 8. 1929.

### RUSSIAN, ARMENIAN, ASSYRIAN, ASSYRO-CHALDEAN AND TURKISH REFUGEES : DRAFT REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur* : Mrs. HAMILTON (British Empire).

This year’s Assembly is called upon to take important decisions on the question of the Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish refugees. The reports submitted to it by the Advisory Commission, the High Commissioner and the Supervisory Commission, necessitate a retrospective study of the work so far accomplished by the High Commissioner and also call for decisions of principle in regard to the continuation and completion of the League’s work in this connection.

The Assembly and the Council recognised, as long ago as 1921, that the creation, as a result of the war, of masses of refugees without homes and without money constituted both an international danger and an international responsibility. At their request Dr. Nansen agreed to act as High Commissioner of the League of Nations. The immediate problem at that time was the existence of more than a million Russian refugees. During the years that followed, the High Commissioner was further required to deal with the new danger due to the presence of more than a million refugees in Greece, to whom were added in 1923 some 300,000 Armenian refugees in the Near East.

We all know the energy and devotion with which Dr. Nansen embarked upon this work and the great success he achieved. This success was so complete that, in 1924, the Council and the Assembly were enabled to decide on his recommendation that the responsibilities of the High Commissioner with regard to the settlement and emigration of refugees should be transferred from the Secretariat to the International Labour Office, the High Commissioner continuing to deal with the political, legal and financial aspects of the question. In these connections the High Commissioner succeeded in developing the system of the inter-Governmental identity certificates of 1922, 1924 and 1926.

In 1928, the International Labour Office asked the Assembly to relieve it of the share of responsibility it had assumed in the previous years. There still remained about 200,000 refugees without employment; of whom many were incapable of working by reason of their age, infirmities or lack

of qualifications. Taking into account the fresh and very heavy responsibility thus placed upon the High Commissioner's shoulders, the Assembly and the Council created an inter-Governmental Advisory Commission which they instructed to submit a report on the possible ways and means of securing a final solution of the problem within the shortest possible time.

The Advisory Commission drew up its report during its first session, which was held at Geneva from May 16th to 18th, 1929. This report is based on a thorough examination of all the sources of information and of all the documents with which the Commission was furnished.

A study of these documents shows that the characteristic and essential feature of the refugees problem is the fact that persons classed as refugees have no regular nationality and are therefore deprived of the protection and solicitude which every State extends to its own nationals both within and beyond its frontiers. Accordingly, the ideal solution of the refugees question would be to furnish them with a regular and definitive nationality. This, however, raises innumerable difficulties. In the present state of international law, nationality is a question which belongs exclusively to the sovereignty of States. The League of Nations could not create and could not even definitely recognise any nationality which does not directly belong to a specific and existing State. From the beginning, therefore, a solution of the problem has been sought either by nationalising refugees according to the countries in which they are settled or by restoring to them their original nationality. It is true that some progress has been made in both these directions, but in the existing circumstances neither solution is capable of settling the position of all the refugees.

The Advisory Commission has closely considered the various possibilities of solution, but it has again been forced to realise that the present provisional regime will continue to be necessary for some time yet. This regime combines action by the Governments of the countries where the refugees are settled with international action by the High Commissioner. It is greatly to the credit of the Governments and the League, for it relieves the refugees of a great deal of suffering and want which would have been their inevitable lot if they had simply been treated as persons without nationality (*heimatlose*).

With regard to the provisional legal status of the refugees—a status which must govern their position until they can acquire a regular and definitive nationality—the Advisory Commission found that this question can be regarded as practically settled by the provisions of the inter-Governmental arrangements made in 1922, 1924, 1926 and 1928. Accordingly, the Assembly can only hope that the recommendations contained in these arrangements may be adopted and applied by all the Governments concerned. It should further be noted that—particularly as regards the important recommendations of the Inter-Governmental Conference of 1928—these can be applied either directly by the national authorities in each country or by having recourse to the collaboration of the High Commissioner's external agents who have already been or who may be appointed for this purpose. This elastic system would appear very greatly to facilitate the acceptance of these recommendations by Governments. The Assembly may therefore wish to repeat the invitation it extended to States by its resolution of September 25th, 1928, concerning the adoption and application of these arrangements.

Nevertheless, the Advisory Commission does not think it desirable that this special regime should continue indefinitely. It is a provisional expedient made necessary by the present position of the refugees. If, when the High Commissioner resigns his duties, there still remains a considerable number of refugees, the Governments should agree to grant the refugees the benefit of these arrangements by adapting them to the new situation following upon the High Commissioner's resignation.

As regards the settlement of refugees who are still without work, the Advisory Commission had been able to note important progress. At the present moment the total number of refugees exceeds one million, 200,000 of whom are without work, or at any rate only irregularly employed, 70,000 are disabled persons, old people or children, incapable of earning their living and for whom suitable measures should be taken. These figures, however, do not include the many refugees in South or North America, as to whose approximate number there are no statistics.

Nor must we leave out of account the many refugees who have been compelled to accept work for which they are not in the least qualified and who thus represent a considerable total of wasted effort. The High Commissariat does much towards improving this state of affairs by helping such refugees to find work for which they are more apt.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the Advisory Commission, although it considers that the High Commissioner's work cannot cease at once, suggests that a period of ten years should be fixed as a maximum period for winding up affairs. In order to give a more stable and more regular basis to the international work of the High Commissariat, the Advisory Commission thinks it necessary that the central services of the High Commissariat for Refugees should be incorporated in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, of which it would form a temporary department.

As regards the budget, the Advisory Commission, in agreement with the High Commissioner, expressed the opinion that the amount requested from the Assembly for 1930 should in no case exceed the amount granted for 1929 and that subsequent budgets should show a tendency towards a gradual decrease.

The Advisory Commission's recommendation for the incorporation of the central service in the Secretariat of the League of Nations was not, however, accepted by the Supervisory Commission, which recommends in its report of June 1929 that the refugee work should be transferred to an independent and autonomous organisation.

At the first meeting at which it dealt with this question, the Sixth Committee had before it the report of the Advisory Commission and that of the Supervisory Commission. It had also had the advantage of hearing a statement by Dr. Nansen. After a discussion, the Committee came to the decision that it was necessary for the High Commissioner to continue his work for the benefit of the refugees. At the same time, however, the Sixth Committee clearly expressed the opinion that it was desirable that the liquidation of this work should take place as rapidly as possible, the longest period contemplated being ten years.

The Sixth Committee then had to consider what form of administration would lead most surely to this result.

The two points which chiefly engaged its attention were :

(1) To find means of winding up the work in the most practical and rapid manner, while having due regard to the interests of the unhappy refugees ;

(2) To relieve Dr. Nansen in some degree of the enormous burden which he has shouldered for the last eight years on behalf of the League of Nations.

The Sixth Committee came to the conclusion that this result could better be attained by the incorporation of the services in question in the Secretariat than by the constitution of a temporary autonomous organisation in conformity with the Supervisory Commission's suggestion.

The problem having numerous administrative and financial aspects, the Sixth Committee applied to the Fourth Committee. At its meeting of September 17th, the Fourth Committee heard Dr. Nansen and the Rapporteur, and decided to set up a Sub-Committee to make a detailed study of the question. This Sub-Committee's report was submitted on September 19th to the Fourth Committee, which approved it.

This text is as follows :

"In examining the question of the future organisation of the services of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the Sub-Committee noted that the Advisory Committee for Refugees and the Supervisory Commission and the High Commissioner himself, whilst proposing different solutions, had the same end in view : namely, to carry through this organisation in such a way as to enable the High Commissioner's work to be terminated as speedily and satisfactorily as possible.

"The Sub-Committee discussed the two solutions proposed at great length. Both alternatives give rise to numerous administrative and financial questions, most of which call for exhaustive enquiries that could not be undertaken and completed during the present Assembly.

"For these reasons, the Sub-Committee proposes that the High Commissioner's central service should be placed for a period of one year, and as an experiment, under the administrative authority of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. During this period, all the financial obligations of the High Commissioner and the funds accruing from external sources will be administered and controlled by the competent organs of the League in accordance with the Financial Regulations and the decisions of the Assembly, under conditions which will be subject to examination and approval by the Supervisory Commission. It is moreover understood that this temporary management will not affect the status of the personnel of the High Commissioner.

"The Secretary-General will thus be in a position to consider the whole of the questions relating to this problem, to report to the next Assembly on the experience thus obtained, and to make proposals for the administration of the refugees organisation during the whole period in which it is being wound up."

The Secretary-General had no objection to the proposed arrangement, but he pointed out that the personnel thus incorporated in the Secretariat must be disregarded if a reckoning be made of the number of the different nationalities on the Secretariat. The Sub-Committee agreed to this view.

The Sixth Committee wishes to express its gratitude to the Fourth Committee and to the Secretary-General for the practical solution which has thus been found. Although in the nature of a compromise, it is not in contradiction to the principles on which the Sixth Committee laid stress with a view to attaining as rapid and effective a final solution as possible. The Committee expresses the hope, however, that it will be possible to arrange for the High Commissioner's staff to share in certain advantages of the Provident Fund.

Lastly, mention should be made of certain recommendations of a special nature submitted by the Advisory Commission for Refugees. Being anxious to improve the lot of refugees unable to work, the Advisory Commission proposes that the High Commissioner should be authorised to utilise part of the funds derived from the sale of the Nansen stamps to help the funds set up to provide relief for the refugees deserving of assistance. The Sixth Committee proposes that the Assembly should grant the High Commissioner the necessary authority.

The Advisory Commission also attaches great importance to the co-operation of the International Organisations of the Red Cross and of various private associations and individuals with the High Commissioner both for the colonisation and relief of refugees unable to work. The Assembly will certainly share this view and will authorise the High Commissioner to make a fresh appeal to these organisations to continue and develop their efforts in order to obtain the largest possible sums for the continuance of the work undertaken by the High Commissioner.

In conclusion, the Sixth Committee has the honour to propose to the Assembly the adoption of the following resolution :

"The Assembly,

"(1) Having examined the reports submitted by the High Commissioner, the Advisory

Commission and the Supervisory Commission on the question of Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish refugees :

“(2) Thanks the High Commissioner and the Advisory Commission for the work accomplished ;

“(3) Decides that the refugees organisation should be wound up within a maximum period of ten years ;

“(4) Recommends that the work of winding-up should be methodically pursued in order that it may be possible subsequently to reduce this period of ten years ;

“(5) Decides that the High Commissioner's central service be placed for a period of one year, and as an experiment, under the administrative authority of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, subject to the condition indicated by the Fourth Committee ;

“(6) Requests the Secretary-General to report to the next Assembly on the experience thus acquired and to make proposals for the administration of the refugees organisation during the whole period in which it is being wound up ;

“(7) Requests the Governments to apply and adopt, either through the national authorities, or with the help of the High Commissioner's agents, the inter-Governmental arrangements of July 5th, 1922 ; May 31st, 1924 ; May 12th, 1926, and June 30th, 1928 ;

“(8) Sees no objection to part of the funds derived from the sale of the Nansen stamps being utilised to add to the funds created for the benefit of deserving refugees ;

“(9) Authorises the High Commissioner to make a fresh appeal to the International Organisations of the Red Cross and to various private associations and individuals to continue and develop their efforts in order to obtain the largest possible sums for the continuation of the work undertaken by the High Commissioner.”

---



# INDEX

	Page		Page
<b>Agenda of Committee</b>		<b>Mandates (continued).</b>	
Adoption and text.....	7	Liquor traffic, control and definition....	19
Mandates question added to.....	12	Mandatory Powers.	
<b>Armenian Refugees</b>		Legal relations with mandated territories, <i>see below</i> Sovereignty.	
See Refugees, Armenian and below Russian, Armenian, etc.		Representation by high officials....	19
<b>Asia, Slavery in</b>		Tribute to.....	26
<b>Assyrian and Assyro-Chaldean Refugees</b>		Nauru, leprosy in.....	29
See Refugees, Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, etc.		New Guinea.....	29
<b>Close of Session.....</b>	33-4	Palestine	
<b>Colonial Institute, International</b>		Disturbances in	
Views <i>re</i> question of native labour.....	10	Discussion 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 26-7, 27, 28,	29, 30
<b>Credits, Supplementary</b>		Report of Sixth Cttee., comments in.....	38
Procedure <i>re</i> .....	13	Restoration of order undertaken by British Govt.....	20, 21, 20, 38
for Slavery question.....	18, 34	National Jewish Home, policy of establishing.....	26, 26
<b>Erivan, Settlement of Armenians in</b>		Wailing Wall, incident at, in 1928..	27
See Refugees, Armenian, etc.		Petitions, procedure concerning.....	19, 22
<b>Freire d'Andrade, General</b>		Question added to agenda of 6th Cttee..	12
Death and tributes to his memory. 18, 22, 27, 30, 37		Rapporteur, appointment of.....	30
<b>Grimshaw, Mr.</b>		Report of Sixth Committee	
Death and tributes to his memory. 18-19, 20, 22, 27, 30, 37		Discussion and adoption with modifications.....	31-2
<b>Iraq</b>		Text (draft).....	37-8
See <i>that title under</i> Mandates.		Resolution of Sixth Committee.....	38
<b>Kenya</b>		Ruanda-Urundi, concessions in....	22, 25, 26
Slavery in.....	8	Section of Secretariat, tribute to.....	23
Union, administrative, with Tanganyika proposed, <i>see</i> Mandates, Tanganyika, etc.		South West Africa	
<b>Labour, Forced and Compulsory</b>		Administration.....	24
Discussion.....	10, 11, 12, 17	Legal relations with mandatory Power, <i>see below</i> Sovereignty, Attitude of South African representative	
in Liberia, future investigation.....	12, 17	Sovereignty, conception of	
Native and non-native conditions, question of difference between.....	10	Attitude of South African representative.....	24-5, 26, 31, 32
in New Guinea.....	29	Discussion. 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 29-30	31, 32
<b>Labour Office, International</b>		Report of 6th Cttee., comments in.....	38
Representative to Mandates Commission, <i>see</i> Grimshaw, Mr.		Tanganyika, administrative union with Kenya and Uganda proposed. 19, 19-20, 21,	22, 27
Study of question of compulsory labour. 10, 35, 36		Temporary nature and question of duration. 20, 23-4,	24, 25-6, 27, 27-8, 28-9, 29
<b>Leprosy in Nauru.....</b>	29	Western Samoa, administration of.....	21
<b>Liberia, Slavery and Forced Labour in</b>		<b>Members of Committee, List of.....</b>	5-6
Investigation by Commission of Enquiry. 12, 17, 18, 30		<b>Most-favoured-nation Clause</b>	
<b>Liquor Traffic</b>		As applied to mandated territories....	21, 22
in Mandated territories.....	19	<b>Native Labour</b>	
<b>Mandates</b>		See <i>under</i> Labour, forced, etc.	
Commission, Permanent		<b>Nauru, Leprosy in.....</b>	29
Labour Office representative, death and tributes to. 18-19, 20, 22, 27, 30, 37		<b>New Guinea.....</b>	29
Members: death of General Freire d'Andrade and tributes to. 18, 22, 27, 30, 37		<b>Palestine</b>	
Minutes.....	19, 21	See <i>that title under</i> Mandates	
Publicity given to work.....	19	<b>Persia</b>	
Discussion in Sixth Committee. 18-22, 22-8, 28-30, 31-2		Relations with Iraq.....	19, 23
Duration, <i>see below</i> Temporary nature, etc.		Slave traffic in, and attitude to Slavery Convention.....	18
Extension of system to other colonies. 20, 22, 25		<b>Publicity of Meetings of Committee....</b>	7
<b>Iraq</b>		<b>Rapporteurs of Committee</b>	
Judicial system in.....	19, 23	Appointment.....	7, 14, 15, 18, 30
Relations with Persia.....	19, 23	<b>Red Cross, Int. Organisations of</b>	
		Appeal for aid by High Commissioner for refugees.....	41, 42
		<b>Red Sea, Slave-trading on.....</b>	8

Refugees	Page	Slavery	Page
Advisory Commission		<i>See also</i> Labour, forced and compulsory	
Recommendations <i>re</i> future of High Commissariat, <i>see below</i> High Commissariat, Transfer, etc.		In Asia.....	8
Representation of British Govt on... 13, 14		Commission, Temp.: re-appointment proposed by British delegation.	
Work of 1st session..... 13, 40		Discussion..... 8, 9, 10, 11, 16	
Armenian: renunciation of scheme for settlement in Erivan Republic		Objections of Liberian delegate. 12, 16-17, 18	
Contributions, disposal of..... 32, 39		Postponement of consideration decided by 6th Cttee..... 16, 36, 37	
Discussion..... 14, 16, 32		Sub-Committee to study proposal	
Report of Sixth Committee		Composition..... 12	
Discussion and adoption..... 32		Proposal to appoint..... 9, 11	
Text (draft)..... 38-9		Work	
Resolution of Sixth Committee..... 39		Discussion..... 16-18	
<i>See also below</i> Russian, Armenian, etc.		Report..... 35-6	
Arrangements, Inter-Governmental, 1922, 1924, 1926 and 1928		Terms of reference..... 8, 11, 31, 36	
Resol. of Sixth Cttee. <i>re</i> ..... 42		Text..... 9, 35, 36	
Financial questions		Convention, Int., 1926	
Budget, 1930..... 40		Application of provisions.	
Reference to Fourth Cttee proposed. 14, 15		Discussion..... 7-12, 16-18	
Sources of funds..... 13		Results inadequate..... 16, 35, 37	
Work of Sub-Cttee. of Fourth Cttee. 41		Ratifications and accessions	
High Commissariat		Declarations by	
Autonomous organisation, creation proposed by Supervisory Comm. 13, 15, 40, 41		Persia..... 18	
Completion of work, maximum time-limit proposed. 13, 14, 15, 32, 40, 41, 42		Switzerland..... 18, 31	
Deputy High Commissioner, proposed nomination of Mr. Lodge..... 13		List in 1929..... 36	
Discussion..... 13-16, 32-3		Need of greater number 7, 8, 9, 11, 35, 37	
Historical summary of activities, etc 39-40		States urged to ratify..... 36, 37	
Procedure <i>re</i> liquidation..... 15, 32		Credits, supplementary: reference to Fourth Cttee..... 18, 34	
Report of Sixth Cttee.		Information sent by Govts. reviewed. 7-8, 36, 8	
Discussion and adoption..... 32-3		Laws and regulations, communications <i>re</i> to be supplemented by information, <i>see above</i> Information, etc	
Text (draft)..... 39-42		in Liberia, future investigation... 12, 17, 18, 30	
Resolution of Sixth Cttee. and amendments..... 32, 41-2		Rapporteur, appointment..... 18	
Status of personnel and recommendation <i>re</i> admission to Staff Provident Fund..... 72		Report of Sixth Committee	
Time-limit for completing work, <i>see above</i> Completion of work, etc.		Discussion and adoption with additions..... 30-1	
Transfer of central services to Secretariat..... 13, 14, 15, 40, 41, 42		Text (draft)..... 36-7	
Legal status, <i>see that title below under</i> Russian, etc.		Resolution of Sixth Committee adopted subject to proviso..... 31, 37	
Rapporteur, appointment of..... 14, 15		Secretariat to apply to States Members etc., for further information 16, 18, 30-1, 35, 36, 37	
Refugee Service, <i>see above</i> High Commissariat.		in Sierra Leone, abolition..... 36	
Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish		Sub-Committee appointed to examine British proposal, <i>see above</i> Commission, Temp., etc.	
Armenian in Syria..... 14, 33, 39		in Sudan..... 8	
Assimilation..... 13, 14		South West Africa	
Co-operation of Red Cross Organizations, private associations, etc... 41		<i>See that title under</i> Mandates	
Discussion..... 13-16, 32-3		Sudan, Slavery in..... 8	
Legal status and question of nationality..... 33, 40		Supervisory Commission	
Nansen stamps, encouragement of sale and utilisation..... 33, 41, 42		Proposals <i>re</i> future arrangements for High Commissariat for refugees..... 13, 15, 40, 41	
Repatriation..... 13, 14		Syria	
Report of Sixth Committee		Armenian refugees in..... 14, 33, 39	
Discussion and adoption..... 32-3		Tanganyika	
Text (draft)..... 39-42		<i>See that title under</i> Mandates	
Resolution of Sixth Cttee. and amendments..... 32, 41-2		Turkish Refugees	
Total number..... 40		<i>See</i> Refugees, Russian, Armenian, etc.	
<i>See also above</i> Armenian, renunciation of scheme, etc.		Uganda	
Ruanda-Urundi		Union, administrative, with Tanganyika proposed, <i>see</i> Mandates, Tanganyika, etc.	
<i>See that title under</i> Mandates		Vice-Chairman of Committee	
Russian Refugees		Election..... 7	
<i>See</i> Refugees, Russian, Armenian, etc.		Western Samoa	
Secretariat of League		<i>See that title under</i> Mandates	
Incorporation in, of central services of High Commissariat for refugees. 13, 14, 15, 40, 41, 42		Work of Sixth Committee	
Mandates Section, tribute to..... 23		Question of accelerating..... 28	
Tribute of Sixth Committee to..... 34			
Sierra Leone			
Abolition of slavery in..... 36			