

(Communiqué au Conseil,  
aux Membres de la Société  
et aux Délégués à l'Assemblée)

A. 9 (I). 1921.

Genève,  
le 1 septembre 1921.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

---

## RAPPORT SUPPLÉMENTAIRE

A LA DEUXIÈME ASSEMBLÉE SUR L'ŒUVRE DU CONSEIL  
ET SUR LES MESURES PRISES POUR EXÉCUTER  
LES DÉCISIONS DE LA PREMIÈRE ASSEMBLÉE.

---

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

## SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

TO THE SECOND ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE ON THE WORK  
OF THE COUNCIL AND ON THE MEASURES TAKEN  
TO EXECUTE THE DECISIONS OF THE FIRST ASSEMBLY.

---

*Notes.* — Le présent rapport supplémentaire a pour but de compléter le 1<sup>er</sup> septembre 1921 le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil et sur les mesures prises pour exécuter les décisions de la première Assemblée qui a été communiqué le 18 août 1921 (A. 9. 1921). Le Conseil de la Société et différentes Commissions, dont les travaux sont rapportés, se trouvent encore en session au moment où le présent document est envoyé à l'impression. Il est donc impossible de présenter un compte rendu complet de certaines questions à l'examen.

*Notes.* — The present supplementary report is intended to complete the report on the work of the Council and on the measures taken to execute the decisions of the first Assembly which was distributed on August 18th. (A. 9. 1921). The Council of the League and several of the Committees whose activities are recorded are still in session as the present document goes to print. It is therefore impossible to present a complete account of certain of the questions under consideration.

# SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

## **RAPPORT SUPPLÉMENTAIRE**

**à la deuxième Assemblée sur l'œuvre du Conseil et sur les mesures prises pour exécuter les décisions de la première Assemblée.**

---

### CHAPITRE PREMIER.

#### APERÇU GÉNÉRAL DES TRAVAUX DU CONSEIL

- I. Iles d'Aland.
- II. La Pologne et la Lithuanie.
- III. Secours aux réfugiés russes.

### DEUXIÈME CHAPITRE.

#### MESURES PRISES EN EXÉCUTION DES RÉOLUTIONS ET DES VŒUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE.

- I. Finances de la Société.
- II. Cour permanente de Justice internationale.
- III. Lutte contre le typhus en Europe Orientale.
- IV. Protection des minorités.
- V. Déportation de femmes et d'enfants: Commission d'enquête dans les territoires de l'ancien Empire ottoman.
- VI. Organisation d'Hygiène.
- VII. Commission chargée d'examiner la portée de l'article 18 du Pacte (Enregistrement des Traités).
- VIII. Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium.
- IX. Commission internationale du Blocus.

---

### CHAPITRE PREMIER.

#### APERÇU GÉNÉRAL DES TRAVAUX DU CONSEIL.

##### I. ILES D'ALAND

Il est dit, dans le rapport sur les travaux du Conseil (A. 9, page 20) que le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Suède, dans une lettre adressée au Secrétaire général, le 3 juillet, a demandé que des mesures fussent prises immédiatement en vue de réunir une Conférence des Puissances intéressées dans la question de la démilitarisation des Iles d'Aland, afin d'ouvrir une discussion et d'aboutir à une conclusion sur le projet de traité de neutralisation. Le Ministre suédois suggérait que les Etats suivants devraient être priés d'envoyer des représentants à la Conférence:

Danemark,	Grande-Bretagne,
Finlande,	Italie,
France,	Pologne,
Allemagne,	Suède.

Le Secrétaire général, se conformant aux instructions contenues dans la résolution adoptée par le Conseil, le 24 juin, est entré d'abord en communication avec

# LEAGUE OF NATIONS

## **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**

**to the Second Assembly of the League on the work of the Council  
and the measures taken to execute the decisions of the First Assembly.**

---

### **CHAPTER ONE.**

#### **THE GENERAL WORK OF THE COUNCIL.**

- I. The Aaland Islands.
- II. Poland and Lithuania.
- III. Assistance to the Russian Refugees.

### **CHAPTER TWO.**

#### **MEASURES TAKEN IN EXECUTION OF THE RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY.**

- I. The Finances of the League.
- II. The Permanent Court of International Justice.
- III. The Campaign against Typhus in Eastern Europe.
- IV. The Protection of Minorities.
- V. The Deportation of Women and Children: the Commission of Enquiry to the Territories of the Former Ottoman Empire.
- VI. The Health Organisation.
- VII. The Committee appointed to consider the scope of Article 18 of the Covenant (Registration of Treaties).
- VIII. The Advisory Committee on the Opium Traffic.
- IX. The International Blockade Committee.

---

### **CHAPTER ONE.**

#### **THE GENERAL WORK OF THE COUNCIL.**

##### **I. THE AALAND ISLANDS.**

It is recorded in the Report on the Work of the Council (A. 9, page 20) that the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on July 3rd, asked that immediate steps should be taken to call a conference of the Powers interested in the demilitarisation of the Aaland Islands in order to discuss and conclude the proposed treaty of neutralisation. It was suggested by the Swedish Minister that the following States should be asked to send representatives to the Conference:—

Denmark	Great Britain
Finland	Italy
France	Poland
Germany	Sweden.

The Secretary-General, in execution of the resolution adopted by the Council on June 24th, first communicated with the Governments of Finland and Sweden,

les Gouvernements de Finlande et de Suède, parties dans le différend concernant les Iles d'Aland, ainsi qu'avec les Gouvernements de Grande-Bretagne et de France, signataires de la Convention de 1856.

La Grande-Bretagne, en réponse à cette invitation, donna une acceptation de principe, et suggéra que l'Esthonie et la Lettonie devraient également être invitées. Le Gouvernement suédois fut aussi d'avis que les invitations fussent adressées à ces Etats.

Le 10 août, la France et la Finlande ayant accepté de prendre part à la Conférence, le Secrétaire général adressa une invitation générale à tous les Etats intéressés, y compris l'Esthonie et la Lettonie.

Lors de la réunion du Conseil à Genève, le 24 août, toutes les Puissances invitées à envoyer des représentants, à l'exception de l'Allemagne, avaient notifié leur désir de participer à la Conférence. Le représentant de l'Italie déclara que son Gouvernement s'occupait de désigner un délégué à la Conférence.

Le 31 août, une réponse fut reçue du Gouvernement allemand, déclarant qu'il était prêt à envoyer des représentants à la Conférence.

## II. POLOGNE ET LITHUANIE.

Il est dit dans le rapport sur les travaux du Conseil (A. 9, page 27) que M. Hymans adressa, le 28 juillet, aux Gouvernements de Pologne et de Lithuanie, une lettre leur demandant s'ils étaient prêts à envoyer des délégués à Genève pour poursuivre les discussions qui avaient été entamées à Bruxelles.

La Délégation de Lithuanie notifia à M. Hymans, le 7 août, que son Gouvernement était disposé à envoyer des représentants à Genève.

Le Gouvernement polonais informa M. Hymans qu'il avait envoyé des instructions à son délégué, M. Askenazy, afin de se rendre à Genève le 25 août pour répondre au désir exprimé par M. Hymans dans sa lettre.

## III. SECOURS AUX RÉFUGIÉS RUSSES.

Conformément à la décision prise par le Conseil le 27 juin (voir le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil, A 9, page 37), le Secrétaire général a invité les Gouvernements qui se déclareraient intéressés dans la question des réfugiés russes, à envoyer des délégués à une conférence. Il était suggéré que ces délégués fussent choisis parmi les fonctionnaires spécialement chargés de suivre la question dans les différents pays. L'invitation à une conférence fut acceptée par onze pays, qui furent ainsi représentés :

MM. Mikoff (Bulgarie), Chetchong Li (Chine), Enckel (Finlande), de Reffye (France), Dendramis (Grèce), Perlovski (Pologne), Greciano (Roumanie), Delaquis (Suisse), Dusek (Tchéco-Slovaquie), et Jovanovitch (Yougo-Slavie),

Étaient en outre représentés : le Bureau international du Travail par M. Butler, la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix-Rouge par M. Donald Brown, le Comité international de la Croix-Rouge par MM. Cramer et Brunel, l'Union internationale de Secours aux Enfants par Miss Jebb et M. Clouzet, et le Secrétariat de la Société par M. Slavik, Secrétaire de la Conférence, et M. Hudson, Conseiller juridique.

La Grande-Bretagne avait délégué un représentant qui ne put prendre part à la Conférence.

M. Jovanovitch fut élu président, M. Delaquis, vice-président.

La Conférence a adopté un certain nombre de résolutions que le Conseil examine en ce moment.

Les résolutions ont été communiquées au docteur Nansen qui a été invité à accepter les fonctions de Haut Commissaire par le Président du Conseil en exercice avec l'assentiment unanime de ses collègues.

## DEUXIÈME CHAPITRE.

### MESURES PRISES EN EXÉCUTION DES RÉOLUTIONS ET DES VŒUX DE L'ASSEMBLÉE.

#### I. FINANCES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ.

Par une recommandation adoptée le 17 décembre 1920, la première Assemblée a invité le Conseil à préparer pour la session annuelle de l'Assemblée de 1921 un projet de résolution sur la gestion financière de la Société.

as parties to the dispute concerning the Aaland Islands, and with the Governments of Great Britain and France as signatories of the Convention of 1856.

Great Britain, in reply to the invitation, accepted it in principle and suggested that Esthonia and Latvia should also be invited. The Swedish Government also took the view that invitations should be addressed to these States.

On August 10th, France and Finland having agreed to the Conference, the Secretary-General addressed a general invitation to all the States concerned, including Esthonia and Latvia.

When the Council met in Geneva in August all the Powers, invited to send representatives, except Italy and Germany, had notified their willingness to participate in the Conference. The representative of Italy stated that his Government was considering the appointment of a delegate to the Conference.

On August 31st a reply was received from the German Government stating that it was prepared to send representatives to the Conference.

## II. POLAND AND LITHUANIA.

It was stated in the Report on the Work of the Council (A.9, page 27) that M. Hymans addressed a letter to the Governments of Poland and Lithuania on July 28th, asking whether they were prepared to send delegates to Geneva to continue the discussions which had been started at Brussels.

The Lithuanian Delegation notified M. Hymans on August 7th that its Government was willing to send representatives to Geneva.

The Polish Government informed M. Hymans that it was instructing its delegate, M. Askenazy, to proceed to Geneva on August 25th in accordance with the desire expressed by M. Hymans in his letter.

## III. ASSISTANCE TO THE RUSSIAN REFUGEES.

In conformity with the Council's decision on June 27th (see Report on the Work of the Council, A.9, page 37), the Secretary-General invited the Governments which declared themselves interested in the question of the Russian refugees to send delegates to a Conference. It was suggested that the delegates should be appointed from among the officials in the various countries which were responsible for dealing with the question. The invitation to a Conference was accepted by 11 countries, which were represented as follows:—

MM. Mikoff (Bulgaria), Chetchong Li (China), Dusek (Cecho-Slovakia), Enckel (Finland), de Reffye (France), Dendramis (Greece), Perlovsky (Poland), Greciano (Roumania), Delaquis (Switzerland), and Jovanovitch (Yugo-Slavia).

The International Labour Office was represented by Mr. Butler, the League of Red Cross Societies by Mr. Donald Brown, the Comité international de la Croix-Rouge by MM. Cramer and Brunel, l'Union internationale de Secours aux Enfants by Miss Jebb and M. Clouzet, and the Secretariat of the League by M. Slavik, Secretary of the Conference, and by Dr. Hudson, Legal Adviser.

Great Britain nominated a representative, who was unable to take part in the Conference.

M. Jovanovitch was elected President, and M. Delaquis Vice-President.

The Conference adopted a number of resolutions, which are under consideration by the Council.

These resolutions have been forwarded to Dr. Nansen, who has been invited to accept the post of High Commissioner by the Acting-President of the Council with the unanimous assent of his colleagues.

## CHAPTER TWO.

### MEASURES TAKEN IN EXECUTION OF THE RESOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY.

#### I. FINANCES OF THE LEAGUE.

The first Assembly, in a recommendation adopted on December 17th, 1920, requested the Council to prepare a draft resolution on the financial administration of the League for the annual session of the Assembly of 1921.

Le Conseil a examiné cette recommandation le 30 août. Il a estimé qu'il serait prématuré de réglementer définitivement la gestion financière de la Société avant que l'Assemblée ait eu l'occasion d'examiner le rapport préparé par la Commission d'enquête.

Le Conseil, en conséquence, a adopté la résolution suivante:

« Attendu que le rapport de la Commission des experts présente, relativement à la gestion des finances de la Société, certaines propositions qui seront discutées à la seconde session de l'Assemblée,

« Le Conseil décide d'ajourner à l'année prochaine une réglementation complète de la gestion financière de la Société, qu'il soumettra à l'Assemblée. »

Le 17 décembre 1920, la première Assemblée a établi, dans les articles destinés à guider le Conseil en ce qui concerne la gestion financière de la Société, qu'au cours de l'année 1921 des virements pourraient être effectués dans un même chapitre du budget en vertu d'une résolution spéciale du Conseil, qui doit être immédiatement communiquée à tous les Membres de la Société.

Comme il est dit dans le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil (A. 9., page 42) tous les virements ont été effectués pendant l'année 1921 conformément à cette procédure.

Le Conseil a exprimé, le 30 août, l'opinion suivante sur le système de virement recommandé par la première Assemblée:

« Le Secrétaire général a fait connaître au Conseil l'utilité ou la nécessité qu'il y aurait pour le Secrétariat à ce que fût continué pendant l'année 1922 la pratique des virements.

« Le Conseil, reconnaissant le bien-fondé de cette mesure, estime qu'il y a lieu de la signaler à l'Assemblée. »

## II. COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE.

### *Etats ayant signé le protocole.*

(fin août 1921)

Afrique du Sud	Libéria
Albanie	Luxembourg
Australie	Nouvelle-Zélande
Autriche	Norvège
Belgique	Panama
Bolivie	Paraguay
Brésil	Pays-Bas
Bulgarie	Perse
Canada	Pologne
Chine	Portugal
Colombie	Roumanie
Costa-Rica	Royaume-Uni
Cuba	Salvador
Danemark	Etat serbe-croate-slovène
Espagne	Siam
Finlande	Suède
France	Suisse
Grèce	Tchéco-Slovaquie
Italie	Uruguay
Inde	Venezuela
Japon	

### ETATS SIGNATAIRES DE LA CLAUSE D'OPTION CONCERNANT LA JURIDICTION OBLIGATOIRE.

Bulgarie	Portugal
Costa-Rica	Pays-Bas
Danemark	Salvador
Finlande	Suède
Libéria	Suisse
Luxembourg	Uruguay

The Council considered this recommendation on August 30th. It took the view that it would be premature to draft final regulations for the financial administration of the League before the Assembly had had an opportunity of considering the report on the organisation of the Secretariat prepared by the Committee of Experts.

The Council accordingly adopted the following resolution:—

“Whereas the report of the Committee of Experts makes certain proposals regarding the financial administration of the League which will be discussed at the second session of the Assembly.

“The Council decides to postpone until next year the presentation to the Assembly of a complete code of regulations for the financial administration of the League.”

The first Assembly on December 17th, 1920, in the articles drafted for the guidance of the Council in regard to the financial administration of the League, laid down that during the year 1921 transfers from one item to another in the same chapter of the budget might be effected by virtue of a special resolution of the Council, which must be immediately communicated to all the Members of the League.

All such transfers during 1921 have been effected in accordance with this procedure as has already been stated in the Report of the work of the Council (A. 9, page 42).

The Council, on August 30th, recorded the following opinion in regard to the system of transfers recommended by the first Assembly:—

“The Secretary-General has drawn the attention of the Council to the fact that it is convenient and even necessary for the Secretariat that the system of transfers should be continued during 1922.

“The Council, recognising the convenience of this procedure, considers that the attention of the Assembly should be drawn to the matter.”

## II. THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

### *States which have signed the Protocol.*

(Up to the end of August.)

Albania	Luxemburg
Australia	Netherlands
Austria	New Zealand
Belgium	Norway
Bolivia	Panama
Brazil	Paraguay
Bulgaria	Persia
Canada	Poland
China	Portugal
Colombia	Roumania
Costa Rica	Salvador
Cuba	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
Czecho-Slovakia	Siam
Denmark	South Africa
Finland	Spain
France	Sweden
Greece	Switzerland
India	United Kingdom
Italy	Uruguay
Japan	Venezuela
Liberia	

### SIGNATORIES OF THE OPTIONAL CLAUSE CONCERNING COMPULSORY JURISDICTION.

Bulgaria	Netherlands
Costa Rica	Portugal
Denmark	San Salvador
Finland	Sweden
Liberia	Switzerland
Luxemburg	Uruguay

ETATS AYANT DÉPOSÉ LES RATIFICATIONS.

Afrique du Sud	Inde
Albanie	Italie
Australie	Nouvelle-Zélande
Autriche	Norvège
Belgique	Pologne
Bulgarie	Roumanie
Canada	Royaume-Uni
Danemark	Etat serbe-croate-slovène
Espagne	Suède
France	Suisse
Hollande	

ETATS DONT LES RATIFICATIONS ONT ÉTÉ EFFECTUÉES ET SONT EN VOIE D'ÊTRE TRANSMISES.

Brésil	Haïti
Grèce	Siam
Espagne	Uruguay
Japon	

ETAT DONT LE PARLEMENT A VOTÉ LA RATIFICATION.

Venezuela.

ETATS DONT LES GROUPES NATIONAUX ONT FAIT PART DES NOMINATIONS DE LEURS CANDIDATS.

Afrique du Sud	Haïti
Autriche	Italie
Belgique	Inde
Brésil	Japon
Bolivie	Norvège
Bulgarie	Panama
Canada	Pays-Bas
Chili	Perse
Chine	Pologne
Cuba	Portugal
Danemark	Roumanie
Espagne	Siam
Finlande	Suède
France	Suisse
Grande-Bretagne	Tchéco-Slovaquie
Grèce	Venezuela
Guatémala	Yougo-Slavie

III. LUTTE CONTRE LE TYPHUS EN EUROPE ORIENTALE.

A sa réunion du 30 août 1921, le Conseil a pris note d'un rapport présenté par le Dr Norman White, Commissaire en chef pour les Epidémies, sur l'œuvre accomplie à cette date par la Commission des Epidémies.

Le Dr White expose que les souscriptions suivantes ont été versées aux fonds de la Commission:



STATES WHICH HAVE DEPOSITED RATIFICATIONS.

Albania	New Zealand
Australia	Norway
Austria	Poland
Belgium	Roumania
Bulgaria	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
Canada	South Africa
Denmark	Spain
France	Sweden
Holland	Switzerland
India	United Kingdom
Italy	

STATES WHOSE RATIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED AND ARE IN COURSE OF TRANSMISSION.

Brazil	Spain
Greece	Siam
Japan	Uruguay
Haiti	

STATE WHOSE LEGISLATURE HAS VOTED THE RATIFICATION.

Venezuela.

STATES WHOSE NATIONAL GROUPS HAVE SENT IN NOMINATIONS OF CANDIDATES

Austria	India
Belgium	Italy
Brazil	Japan
Bolivia	Jugo-Slavia
Bulgaria	Netherlands
Canada	Norway
Chile	Panama
Cuba	Persia
China	Poland
Czecho-Slovakia	Portugal
Denmark	Roumania
Finland	Siam
France	South Africa
Great Britain	Spain
Greece	Sweden
Guatemala	Switzerland
Haiti	Venezuela

III. THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST TYPHUS IN EASTERN EUROPE.

At its meeting on the 30th August, 1921, the Council noted a report presented by Dr. Norman White, Chief Epidemic Commissioner, on the work accomplished by the Epidemics Commission up to that date.

Dr. Norman White stated that the following subscriptions had been paid into the funds of the Commission:—

Date de réception.	Pays.	Montant de la souscription.		
		£	s.	d.
20 août 1920.	Bulgarie . . . . .	27	0	0
1 <sup>er</sup> septembre 1920.	Perse . . . . .	2,000	0	0
6 " " "	Siam . . . . .	1,000	0	0
6 janvier 1921	Japon . . . . .	5,316	15	10
6 " " "	Suède . . . . .	3,000	0	0
6 " " "	Suisse . . . . .	2,150	10	9
14 " " "	Belgique . . . . .	1,000	0	0
17 " " "	Grande-Bretagne . . . . .	5,000	0	0
21 " " "	Grèce . . . . .	1,000	0	0
9 février 1921.	Autriche . . . . .	42	17	0
15 " " "	Finlande . . . . .	500	0	0
14 mars 1921.	Pérou . . . . .	363	12	9
25 " " "	Albanie . . . . .	981	7	5
4 juin 1921	Canada . . . . .	4,1095	17	10
11 " " "	Danemark . . . . .	5,000	0	0
21 juillet 1921.	Norvège . . . . .	1,919	7	9
2 août 1921.	Chine . . . . .	2,000	0	0
		£ 126,397	9	4

Certains pays ont promis leur souscription, mais ne l'ont pas encore versée: la France, l'Allemagne, le Honduras, les Pays-Bas, l'Espagne et l'Uruguay. (Voir le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil, A. 9, page 47.)

Les dépenses faites ou engagées à la date du 1<sup>er</sup> août s'élevaient à £ 119.067 Ces dépenses comprennent les frais d'équipement hospitalier et sanitaire, d'ambulances automobiles et autres moyens de transports, vêtements, remèdes, savon, nourriture, construction et réparation, etc. d'établissements de bains et de désinfection et d'hôpitaux épidémiques, assurance de frets, etc., salaires, frais de route, etc.

L'administration d'hygiène polonaise a reçu une assistance sous les formes suivantes:

1<sup>o</sup> Fourniture d'objets et marchandises particulièrement difficiles à se procurer, tels que vêtements, savon, remèdes, équipements médicaux et sanitaires.

2<sup>o</sup> Livraison d'ambulances automobiles et autres moyens de transports dans les régions les plus affectées par la maladie, c'est-à-dire la partie septentrionale du territoire le plus à l'Est, soumis à l'administration polonaise.

3<sup>o</sup> Ravitaillement des hôpitaux épidémiques de ces régions.

4<sup>o</sup> Equipement complet de 50 hôpitaux épidémiques de 50 lits dans cette région.

5<sup>o</sup> Mise en activité et équipement de la station de quarantaine par où doivent passer tous les prisonniers de guerre, réfugiés et émigrants revenant de Russie.

6<sup>o</sup> Construction, achèvement et réparation d'établissements de bains et de désinfection.

7<sup>o</sup> Transformation de certains bâtiments, de façon à les rendre utilisables pour leur conversion en hôpitaux épidémiques.

Tous les arrangements pris par la Commission des Epidémies, depuis les achats de marchandises jusqu'à leur emploi final et leur distribution, ont été menés à bien; le pourcentage de pertes a été insignifiant.

La situation en Pologne, au point de vue épidémique, est, à l'heure actuelle, beaucoup plus satisfaisante qu'elle n'était il y a un an. Toutefois l'épidémie de choléra, importée de Russie, cause une certaine anxiété.

Les dispositions prises en Pologne concernant la quarantaine opèrent maintenant de façon satisfaisante; plusieurs cas de choléra ont été déjà décelés à la grande station de quarantaine de Baranavicz. Toutes les mesures nécessaires ont été prises pour prévenir le développement de la maladie.

#### IV. PROTECTION DES MINORITÉS.

1. *Garanties* Le 30 août, à Genève, le Conseil a décidé de placer sous la garantie de la Société des Nations les stipulations relatives à la protection des minorités, contenues dans le traité signé à Paris le 9 décembre 1919 entre les Principales Puissances alliées et associées et la Roumanie.

Une garantie similaire fut, à cette même date, donnée aux stipulations relatives à la protection des minorités, contenues dans le traité signé à Trianon le 4 juin 1920 entre les Puissances alliées et associées et la Hongrie.

Date of receipt,	Country.	Amount of subscription.		
		£	s.	d.
August 20, 1920	Bulgaria . . . . .	27	0	0
Sept. 1, 1920	Persia . . . . .	2,000	0	0
Sept. 6, 1920	Siam . . . . .	1,000	0	0
Jan. 6, 1921	Japan . . . . .	5,316	15	10
Jan. 6, 1921	Sweden . . . . .	3,000	0	0
Jan. 6, 1921	Switzerland . . . . .	2,150	10	9
Jan. 14, 1921	Belgium . . . . .	1,000	0	0
Jan. 17, 1921	Great Britain . . . . .	50,000	0	0
Jan. 21, 1921	Greece . . . . .	10,000	0	0
Feb. 9, 1921	Austria . . . . .	42	17	0
Feb. 15, 1921	Finland . . . . .	500	0	0
March. 14, 1921	Peru . . . . .	363	12	9
March. 25, 1921	Albania . . . . .	981	7	5
June. 4, 1921	Canada . . . . .	41,095	17	10
June. 11, 1921	Denmark . . . . .	5,000	0	0
July. 21, 1921	Norway . . . . .	1,919	7	9
August. 2, 1921	China . . . . .	2,000	0	0
		£ 126,397	9	4

The countries which have promised subscriptions, payment of which is still awaited, are: France, Germany, Honduras, the Netherlands, Spain and Uruguay. (See Report on the Work of the Council A. 9. page 47).

The expenditure and commitments incurred up to August 1st amounted to £ 119,067. This expenditure was incurred on hospital and sanitary equipment, motor ambulances and other transport, clothing, drugs, soap, foodstuffs, construction and repair, etc., of bathing and disinfecting establishments and epidemic hospitals, freight insurance, etc., and salaries, travelling expenses, etc.

The Polish Health Administration has received assistance in the following ways: —

1. By supplying it with such articles and stores as were most difficult to obtain, e.g., articles of clothing, soap, drugs, medical and sanitary equipment.
2. By supplying motor ambulances and other transport in the area most affected by the disease, that is to say, the northern portion of the most eastern area under Polish Administration.
3. By supplying foodstuffs to the epidemic hospitals in that area.
4. By supplying complete epidemic hospital equipment for 50 hospital units of 50 beds in that area.
5. By the efficient working and equipping of the quarantine station through which all prisoners of war, refugees and emigrants returning from Russia must pass.
6. By the construction, completion or repair of bathing and disinfecting establishments.
7. By carrying out certain structural alterations to buildings in order to render them suitable for conversion into epidemic hospitals.

All the arrangements of the Epidemics Commission from the purchase of stores to their final use and distribution have worked successfully, and the percentage of loss has been insignificant.

The epidemic situation in Poland is at the moment very much more satisfactory than it was a year ago. The cholera epidemic, however, reported from Russia gives cause for anxiety.

The quarantine arrangements in Poland are now working satisfactorily; several cases of cholera have already been detected at the large quarantine station at Baranaviczė. All necessary measures have been taken to prevent the spread of the disease.

#### IV. THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

1. *Guarantees.* On August 30th, the Council decided to place under the guarantee of the League of Nations the stipulations relating to the protection of minorities contained in the Treaty signed in Paris on December 9th, 1919, between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Roumania.

A similar guarantee was at the same date given to the stipulations relating to the protection of minorities contained in the Treaty signed at Trianon on June 4th, 1920, between the Allied and Associated Powers and Hungary.

V. DÉPORTATION DE FEMMES ET D'ENFANTS:  
COMMISSION D'ENQUÊTE SUR LES TERRITOIRES DE L'ANCIEN EMPIRE OTTOMAN.

Selon un rapport des membres de la Commission désignés par le Conseil pour enquêter sur les déportations de femmes et d'enfants en Turquie et dans les pays avoisinants (voir rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil, A. 9., page 51), environ 90.000 Arméniens ont été réclamés, mais un nombre presque égal de femmes et enfants chrétiens demeurent retenus chez les Turcs.

Le Secrétaire général, préalablement à la réunion du Conseil, avait distribué à ses Membres une lettre de Miss Cushman, membre de la Commission, demandant que la Commission soit mise en mesure d'engager une action plus directe dans l'œuvre de secours à Constantinople. Le Président du Conseil, alors en fonctions, avait, en l'absence d'un avis contraire de la part des Membres du Conseil, chargé le Secrétaire général d'informer la Commission qu'elle était libre d'entreprendre l'action envisagée pourvu qu'elle n'excédât point les crédits qui lui étaient alloués sur le budget.

Les membres de la Commission, dans leur rapport, suggèrent la continuation et l'extension de leur œuvre. Etant donné que ces suggestions sont faites seulement à titre d'essai et pourraient impliquer des engagements financiers nécessitant une décision de l'Assemblée, le Conseil a décidé, le 30 août, que le rapport de la Commission serait soumis à l'Assemblée et qu'un membre de la Commission serait invité à assister aux réunions de l'Assemblée où cette question sera mise en discussion.

VI. ORGANISATION D'HYGIÈNE.

Le Comité provisoire d'hygiène (voir rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil, A. 9., page 60), s'est réuni à Genève du 25 au 29 août 1921, conformément à l'invitation du Conseil. Il était composé des personnalités suivantes:

Le Prof. Léon BERNARD, Professeur d'Hygiène à l'Université de Paris.

Le Dr BUCHANAN, « Senior Medical Officer » au Ministère britannique de l'Hygiène.

Le Dr CAROZZI, Chef du Service de l'Hygiène du Travail au Bureau international du Travail.

Le Dr CARRIÈRE, Directeur général des Services suisses d'Hygiène publique.

Le Dr CHODZKO, Sous-Secrétaire d'Etat à l'Hygiène, Varsovie.

Le Dr LUTRARIO, Directeur général des Services italiens d'Hygiène publique.

Le Dr MADSEN, Directeur de l'Institut national de Sérothérapie de Copenhague.

Le Dr MIYAJIMA, Membre de l'Institut Kitasato de Tokio pour les maladies infectieuses, Professeur au Collège médical de l'Université de Kéio.

Le Dr PULIDO, Président du Conseil royal d'hygiène d'Espagne.

M. O. VELGHE, Directeur général des Services belges d'Hygiène, Président du Comité de l'Office international d'Hygiène publique.

Le Prof. WINSLOW, Directeur médical à la Ligue des Sociétés de la Croix Rouge.

Le Dr L. J. STEEGMANN, Secrétaire médical en fonctions.

Le Dr Madsen a été nommé président et le Dr Buchanan, vice-président de la Commission.

La Commission a adopté un certain nombre de résolutions que le Conseil examine en ce moment.

VII. COMMISSION CHARGÉE D'ÉTUDIER LA PORTÉE DE L'ARTICLE 18 DU PACTE  
(ENREGISTREMENT DES TRAITÉS.)

Le Conseil a pris note, le 30 août, du rapport de la Commission chargée d'étudier la portée de l'article 18 du Pacte (voir le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil, A. 9., page 70).

Le Conseil a décidé que le rapport serait transmis, sans commentaires, à l'Assemblée et a remercié les membres de la Commission du travail qu'ils ont accompli. Le Conseil a exprimé l'espoir que le plus grand nombre possible des membres de la Commission fussent présents à l'Assemblée quand le rapport sera mis en discussion.

#### V. THE DEPORTATION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN. THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY TO THE TERRITORIES OF THE FORMER OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

According to a report received from members of the Commission appointed by the Council to inquire into the deportation of women and children in Turkey and neighbouring countries (see Report on the Work of the Council, A. 9, page 51) some 90,000 Armenians have been reclaimed, but a number almost equally large of Christian women and children still remain in Turkish houses.

The Secretary-General, previous to the meeting of the Council, had circulated a letter from Miss Cushman, a member of the Commission, asking that the Commission might be empowered to take more direct action in rescue work in Constantinople. The Acting President of the Council had, in the absence of any opinion to the contrary on the part of the Members of the Council, instructed the Secretary-General to inform the Commission that it was at liberty to take the action proposed, provided it did not exceed the financial appropriation made to it under the budget.

The members of the Commission in their report make suggestions for the continuation and extension of their work. As these suggestions are only tentative, and might involve financial considerations requiring the decision of the Assembly, the Council decided on August 30th that the report of the Commission should be placed before the Assembly, and that a member of the Commission should be invited to attend the meetings of the Assembly at which this question was discussed.

#### VI. — THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

The Provisional Health Committee (see Report on the Work of the Council, document A 9, page 60) met, at the invitation of the Council, in Geneva from the 25th to the 29th August, 1921. It was constituted as follows:—

- Prof. Leon BERNARD, Professor of Hygiene at the University of Paris.
- Dr. BUCHANAN, Senior Medical Officer, British Ministry of Health.
- Dr. CAROZZI, Head of the Health Section of the International Labour Office.
- Dr. CARRIÈRE, Director-General of the Swiss Public Health Service.
- Dr. CHODZKO, Minister of Health, Warsaw.
- Dr. LUTRARIO, Director-General of the Italian Public Health Service.
- Dr. MADSEN, Director of the National Institute of Serotherapy, Copenhagen.
- Dr. MIYAJIMA, Member of the Kitasato Institute for infectious diseases at Tokio, Professor of the Medical College of the University of Keio.
- Dr. PULIDO, President of the Royal Council of Public Health, Spain.
- M. O. VELGHE, Director General of the Belgian Public Health Service; President of the Office international d'Hygiène publique.
- Prof. WINSLOW, Medical Director of the League of Red Cross Societies.
- Dr. L. J. STEEGMANN, Acting Medical Secretary.

Dr. Madsen was appointed Chairman, and Dr. Buchanan Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee adopted a number of resolutions, which are under consideration by the Council.

#### VII. — THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE SCOPE OF ARTICLE 18 OF THE COVENANT (REGISTRATION OF TREATIES).

The Council on August 30th noted the report of the Committee appointed to study the scope of Article 18 of the Covenant (see Report on the Work of the Council A 9, page 70).

The Council decided that the report should be forwarded to the Assembly without comment, and that the members of the Committee should be thanked for their work. The Council expressed the hope that the greatest number possible of the members of the Committee should be present at the Assembly when the report was discussed.

### VIII. COMMISSION CONSULTATIVE DU TRAFIC DE L'OPIMUM.

Les mesures suivantes ont été prises en exécution des décisions du Conseil, du 28 juin, au sujet du trafic de l'opium (voir le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil A. 9. page 71).

1. Une lettre a été adressée aux Etats suivants, Membres de la Société, qui n'ont pas signé la Convention internationale de l'Opium ou qui l'ont signée sans la ratifier, ou qui n'ont pas signé le Protocole spécial: Albanie, Argentine, Chili, Colombie, Costa-Rica, Danemark, Finlande, Perse, Portugal, Salvador, Suisse, Venezuela. Ces Etats sont invités à prendre les mesures nécessaires aussitôt que possible.

2. Une requête semblable a été adressée par l'intermédiaire du Gouvernement des Pays-Bas aux Etats suivants: Equateur, Saint-Domingue et Mexique.

3. La Commission provisoire d'Hygiène qui s'est réunie à Genève du 23 au 29 août a discuté la question des quantités moyennes de drogues, visées au chapitre 3 de la Convention internationale de l'Opium.

4. Tous les Etats Membres de la Société qui ont ratifié la Convention ont été invités à prendre en considération la recommandation du Conseil, aux termes de laquelle un rapport annuel doit être présenté sur l'exportation et l'importation de l'opium et autres drogues. Le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas a été prié de faire une démarche auprès des Etats ayant adhéré à la Convention qui ne sont pas Membres de la Société.

5. Dix-huit pays qui sont liés à la Chine par un traité, et qui ont adhéré à la Convention internationale de l'Opium, ont été interrogés, conformément à l'article 15 de la Convention, sur les mesures qu'ils ont prises pour prévenir la contrebande de l'opium et autres drogues en Chine. Il s'agit des pays suivants: Autriche, Belgique, Bolivie, Brésil, Cuba, Espagne, France, Grande-Bretagne, Italie, Japon, Norvège, Pays-Bas, Panama, Pérou, Portugal, Suède et Uruguay.

6. La résolution du Conseil relative à la limitation de la production de l'opium aux besoins strictement médicaux et scientifiques, a été renvoyée à la Commission consultative du trafic de l'opium qui se réunira au commencement de l'année prochaine.

### IX. COMMISSION INTERNATIONALE DU BLOCUS.

La Commission internationale du Blocus (voir le rapport sur l'œuvre du Conseil A. 9., page 82), s'est réunie à Genève du 22 au 28 août 1921. Elle a tenu neuf séances.

La Commission ne s'est pas proposée de donner une interprétation générale de l'article 16, mais de recommander, dans ses grandes lignes, la procédure qu'il conviendrait de suivre pour l'application de cet article. Elle a évité de se prononcer sur les points de détail qui, à son avis, peuvent être plus utilement examinés dans chaque cas concret. Elle a estimé que la création d'un organisme permanent offrait plus d'inconvénients que d'avantages et que s'il devenait nécessaire d'employer l'arme économique, le Conseil pourrait se faire assister d'une Commission technique.

La Commission a approuvé à l'unanimité un rapport, qui est divisé en quatre chapitres:

1. Dans quelles conditions y a-t-il lieu à sanctions ?
2. A qui appartient-il de décider s'il y a lieu à sanctions ?
3. A quel moment et par qui les sanctions seront-elles appliquées ?
4. Comment seront-elles appliquées ?

La Commission a estimé que l'application de l'article 16 nécessiterait des amendements sur les deux points suivants:

- a) méthode à suivre en ce qui concerne l'unanimité du Conseil quand il prend des décisions pour l'emploi de l'arme économique;
- b) dérogations à accorder dans des cas particuliers.

Si ces amendements proposés par la Commission sont accueillis favorablement, la question se posera d'une rédaction nouvelle de l'ensemble de l'article 16.

### VIII. — THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE OPIUM TRAFFIC.

The following steps have been taken to carry out the decisions of the Council on June 28th concerning the Opium Traffic (see Report on the Work of the Council, A. 9, page 71).

(1) Letters have been sent to the following States Members of the League, which have not signed the International Opium Convention, or which have signed the Convention but have not ratified it, or which have not signed the special protocol: Albania, Argentine, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Persia, Portugal, Salvador, Switzerland and Venezuela, inviting them to take the necessary action as soon as possible.

(2) A similar request was addressed to Ecuador, San Domingo and Mexico through the Government of the Netherlands.

(3) The question of the average requirements of the drugs specified in Chapter 3 of the International Opium Convention has been discussed by the Provisional Health Committee, which met in Geneva from August 25th to 29th.

(4) All the States Members of the League which are parties to the Convention have been invited to consider the recommendation of the Council that an annual report should be furnished on the export and import of opium and other drugs. The Netherlands Government has been asked to approach the countries adhering to the Convention which are not Members of the League.

(5) Eighteen countries having treaty relations with China, which are parties to the International Opium Convention, have been asked, in accordance with Article 15 of the Convention, what measures they have taken to prevent the smuggling of opium and other drugs into China. These countries are as follows: Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Norway, the Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay.

(6) The resolution of the Council concerning the restriction of the cultivation of opium for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes has been referred to the Advisory Committee on the Opium Traffic, which will meet at the beginning of next year.

### IX. — INTERNATIONAL BLOCKADE COMMITTEE.

The International Blockade Committee (see Report on the Work of the Council, Document A. 9, page 82) met in Geneva from the 22nd to the 28th of August 1921, and held nine meetings.

The Committee was of opinion that it should not undertake to give a general interpretation of Article 16, but that it should make general recommendations concerning the procedure to be followed in applying the Article. It avoided giving any opinion on points of detail which it considered could be more usefully examined as each concrete case arose. It considered that the establishment of a permanent organisation offered more inconveniences than advantages, and that, if it became necessary to employ the economic weapon, the Council could be assisted by a Technical Committee.

The Committee unanimously approved a report divided into four chapters:—

1. In what circumstances are sanctions to be applied ?
2. With whom does the right remain to decide whether sanctions shall be applied ?
3. At what moment and by whom shall they be applied ?
4. How are they to be applied ?

The Committee was of opinion that the application of Article 16 necessitated its amendment on the two following points:—

- (a) The procedure to be followed in respect of unanimity within the Council when it has to take decisions for the employment of the economic weapon.
- (b) The exemptions to be granted in specific cases.

If the amendments proposed by the Committee are favourably received the question will arise of re-drafting the whole of Article 16.

---

(Distributed to the Council,  
to the Members of the League,  
and to the Delegates at the Assembly.)

A. 6. 1922

Geneva,  
July 3rd, 1922.

League of Nations.

---

**Report to the Third Assembly of the League on  
the Work of the Council and on the Measures  
taken to execute the Decisions of the Assembly**



## LEAGUE OF NATIONS

### REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL AND ON THE MEASURES TAKEN TO EXECUTE THE DECISIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY.

---

*Note.* — The Second Assembly completed its work on October 5th, 1921. The Council continued its meetings in both ordinary and extraordinary session until the 12th. It met in ordinary session to give immediate effect to the urgent recommendations of the Assembly, and in extraordinary session to draw up its recommendation to the Supreme Council with regard to Upper Silesia. Between October 12th, 1921, and July 1st, 1922, the Council met twice in ordinary session, from January 10th to 14th and from May 11th to 17th, and twice in extraordinary session, from November 16th to 19th and from March 24th to 28th. In November the Council was convened in extraordinary session at the request of the British Prime Minister to deal with the state of affairs in the North of Albania, which the British Government considered to be of such a nature as to threaten to disturb international peace. At its extraordinary session in March, the Council examined the question of Russian refugees and that of the participation of the League of Nations in the Genoa Conference.

In the course of these four sessions, the Council conducted its deliberations in public whenever practicable. When adjudicating in the disputes which were brought before it, the Council held public meetings in order to hear the parties on both sides and to adopt its resolutions. At the last session, from May 11th to 17th, Press representatives were admitted to nine meetings out of twelve. Further, the Minutes of all these sessions were published in the *Official Journal* at the earliest possible moment.

\* \* \*

Article 4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly provides for the communication of two reports to the Assembly: one on the work of the Council since the last session of the Assembly and the other on the work of the Secretariat and on the measures taken to execute the decisions of the Assembly.

These two Reports have been amalgamated this year, as was done last year. It would have been difficult to explain in two separate reports to what extent the Council has acted on its own initiative as regards each question, or has given effect to the decisions of the Assembly through the intermediary of the Secretariat. The one report would often have contained repetitions of the other.

The Secretariat has throughout maintained its efforts to comply with the recommendation contained in the report of the Fourth Committee which was adopted by the Assembly on October 1st, 1921, that, in the preparation of the work and the decisions of the various organisations of the League, the Secretariat "should regard it as its first duty to collate the relevant documents and to prepare the ground for these decisions.... and should confine itself to executing them in the letter and in the spirit."

The work which it has accomplished cannot easily form the subject of a special memorandum, but the present Report indicates under the different headings the manner in which the Secretariat has worked for the Council and for the Technical Organisations of the League.

The questions dealt with since last October are grouped together in this Report in logical order, and efforts have been made to set forth as clearly as possible in each case the position with regard to the question under discussion at the end of the second Assembly, the decisions of the Council since that date and the work of the Secretariat in the execution of those decisions.

---

## SUMMARY OF CONTENTS.

---

	Page
I. PRESENT SITUATION AS REGARDS INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS REGISTERED WITH THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE:—	
I. Protocol of Signature concerning the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, opened at Geneva, December 16th, 1920 . . . . .	5
II. Barcelona Conventions, April 20th, 1921:—	
(a) Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit . . . . .	5
(b) Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern . . . . .	6
(c) Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern . . . . .	6
(d) Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-Coast . . . . .	6
III. Convention concerning the Non-Fortification and Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands, October 20th, 1921 . . . . .	6
IV. Convention on the Traffic in Women and Children, September 30th, 1920 . . . . .	6
V. Declaration regarding the Protection of Minorities in Albania, October 2nd, 1921 . . . . .	7
VI. Protocols regarding Amendments to the Covenant, October 5th, 1921 . . . . .	7
A. Signature of the Protocols . . . . .	7
B. Ratification of the Protocols . . . . .	12
VII. Registration and Publication of Treaties and International Engagements (Article 18 of the Covenant) . . . . .	12
2. LEGAL QUESTIONS:—	
I. Proposed Amendments to the Covenant . . . . .	12
II. Application of Articles 11 and 17 of the Covenant. — Correspondence with the Hungarian Government . . . . .	13
III. Committee entrusted with the Enquiry into the Procedure for Conciliation . . . . .	13
3. THE ECONOMIC WEAPON OF THE LEAGUE . . . . .	14
4. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE . . . . .	15
5. FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAGUE . . . . .	17
6. REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS . . . . .	18
7. POLITICAL QUESTIONS:—	
I. Upper Silesia . . . . .	23
II. Dispute between Lithuania and Poland . . . . .	25
III. Albania . . . . .	28
IV. Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands . . . . .	32
V. Armenia . . . . .	33
VI. Legal Status of Eastern Galicia . . . . .	34
VII. Eastern Carelia . . . . .	34
8. ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS:—	
I. Territory of the Saar Basin . . . . .	35
II. Free City of Danzig . . . . .	40

	Pag
9. PROTECTION OF MINORITIES . . . . .	44
10. DUTIES INCUMBENT ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS BY VIRTUE OF ARTICLE 22 OF THE COVENANT (MANDATES) . . . . .	49
11. THE WORK OF THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS:—	
I. The Provisional Economic and Financial Committee . . . . .	52
II. Communications and Transit Organisation. . . . .	55
III. Health Organisation . . . . .	58
12. THE GENOA CONFERENCE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS . . . . .	63
13. HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS:—	
I. Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs. — Work of the Advisory Com- mittee . . . . .	68
II. Traffic in Women and Children . . . . .	72
III. Deportation of Women and Children in Turkey and Neighbouring Countries	73
14. RELIEF OF RUSSIAN REFUGEES . . . . .	75
15. RELIEF WORK IN RUSSIA . . . . .	79
16. REPATRIATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR . . . . .	80
17. INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX:—	
I. International Hydrographic Bureau . . . . .	81
II. Central International Office for the Control of the Liquor Traffic in Africa	81
III. International Institute of Commerce . . . . .	81
IV. International Association for the Promotion of Child Welfare . . . . .	82
18. INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION . . . . .	82
19. ESPERANTO . . . . .	83

PRESENT SITUATION AS REGARDS INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS REGISTERED WITH THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

---

I. PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE CONCERNING THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE, OPENED AT GENEVA, DECEMBER 16th, 1920.

• Up to the present the following thirty-four Members of the League have ratified the Protocol of the Court:

Albania	Finland	Poland
Australia	France	Portugal
Austria	Greece	Roumania
Belgium	Haiti	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
Brazil	India	Siam
British Empire	Italy	Union of South Africa
Bulgaria	Japan	Spain
Canada	Lithuania	Sweden
China	Netherlands	Switzerland
Cuba	New Zealand	Uruguay
Czechoslovakia	Norway	Venezuela
Denmark		

and the following thirteen have accepted and put into force among themselves the optional clause:

Austria	Haiti	Portugal
Brazil	Lithuania	Sweden
Bulgaria	Netherlands	Switzerland
China	Norway	Uruguay
Denmark		

The following have not yet ratified:—

Bolivia	Esthonia	Panama
Chile	Latvia	Paraguay
Colombia	Liberia	Persia
Costa Rica	Luxemburg	Salvador

II. BARCELONA CONVENTIONS, APRIL 20th, 1921.

The Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, the Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, the Additional Protocol to the Convention of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, and the Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-Coast, have been signed by a large number of the Members of the League.

(a) *Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit:—*

Albania	Esthonia	Norway
Austria	Finland	Panama
Belgium	France	Persia
Bolivia	Greece	Poland
British Empire (with New Zealand and India)	Guatemala	Portugal
Bulgaria	Italy	Roumania
Chile	Japan	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
China	Latvia	Spain
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Sweden
Denmark	Luxemburg	Switzerland
	Netherlands	Uruguay

(b) *Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern:—*

Albania	Czechoslovakia	Luxemburg
Austria	Denmark	Norway
Belgium	Esthonia	Panama
Bolivia	Finland	Poland
British Empire (with New Zealand and India)	France	Portugal
Bulgaria	Greece	Spain
Chile	Guatemala	Sweden
China	Italy	Uruguay
	Lithuania	

(c) *Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern:—*

Albania	Czechoslovakia	Norway
Belgium	Denmark	Portugal
British Empire (with New Zealand)	Finland	Spain
Chile	Greece	Sweden
	India	

(d) *Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-Coast:—*

Albania	Esthonia	Norway
Austria	France	Panama
Belgium	Greece	Persia
Bolivia	Guatemala	Poland
British Empire (with New Zealand)	India	Portugal
Bulgaria	Italy	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
Chile	Japan	Spain
China	Latvia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Switzerland
Denmark	Netherlands	Uruguay

Up to the present Albania alone has ratified the above-mentioned Acts. The Bulgarian Secretariat, in a letter dated May 6th, 1922, gave notice that the Sobranje had ratified the two Conventions and the Declaration referred to above; the instruments of ratification have not yet been deposited with the Secretariat.

III. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE NON-FORTIFICATION AND NEUTRALISATION OF THE AALAND ISLANDS — GENEVA, OCTOBER 20th, 1921.

This Convention, concluded at Geneva on October 20th, 1921, has up to the present been ratified by the following:—

On April 6th, 1922 . . . . .	British Empire	France
	Denmark	Germany
	Finland	Sweden
On May 11th, 1922 . . . . .	Italy	
On June 29th, 1922 . . . . .	Poland	

Latvia has not yet ratified but has announced that her instrument of ratification will be deposited in the near future.

IV. CONVENTION ON THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN — GENEVA, SEPTEMBER 30th, 1920.

This Convention was signed by a large number of the Members of the League and by two States which do not belong to it:—

Albania	Cuba	Netherlands
Australia	Czechoslovakia	New Zealand
Austria	Esthonia	Norway
Belgium	Germany	Persia
Brazil	Greece	Poland and Danzig
British Empire	Hungary	Portugal
Canada	India	Roumania
Chile	Italy	Siam
China	Japan	Union of South Africa
Colombia	Latvia	Sweden
Costa Rica	Lithuania	Switzerland

The Belgian ratification was deposited with the Secretariat on June 15th, 1922 and that of the British Empire including Ireland, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and India, on June 28th 1922. From information received, it appears probable that other ratifications will be deposited with the Secretariat before the third Assembly.

V. DECLARATION REGARDING THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES IN ALBANIA.  
GENEVA, OCTOBER 2ND, 1921.

Albania has ratified this declaration and the instruments of ratification were deposited with the Secretariat on March 22nd, 1922<sup>1</sup>.

VI. PROTOCOLS REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT — GENEVA, OCTOBER 5TH, 1921.

It will be remembered that the Protocols of the Amendments to the Covenant adopted by the second Assembly must, in conformity with the new text of Article 26 — which is also awaiting ratification, be ratified within 22 months after the vote of the Assembly, by the Members of the League whose representatives composed the Council when the vote was taken, and by the majority of those whose representatives form the Assembly. The expiration of this time limit renders the ratification of the above-mentioned Protocols of exceptional importance.

A *Signature of the Protocols.*

Rather more than half the Members of the League have signed the 14 Protocols, namely:

1. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 4.*

The following paragraph shall be inserted between the second and third paragraphs of Article 4:

“The Assembly shall fix by a two-thirds majority the rules dealing with the election of the non-permanent Members of the Council, and particularly such regulations as relate to their term of office and the conditions of re-eligibility.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:—

Albania	Denmark	Netherlands
Australia	Esthonia	New Zealand
Bolivia	France	Norway
British Empire	Greece	Panama
Canada	Haiti	Paraguay
China	Italy	Persia
Colombia	Japan	Poland
Costa Rica	Latvia	South Africa
Cuba	Liberia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Switzerland

(30 signatures.)

2. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 6.*

That the last paragraph of Article 6 of the Covenant shall be replaced by the following paragraph:

“The expenses of the League shall be borne by the Members of the League in the proportion decided by the Assembly.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Australia	Denmark	Liberia
Bolivia	France	New Zealand
British Empire	Greece	Norway
Canada	Haiti	Panama
China	Italy	Paraguay
Colombia	Japan	Sweden
Costa Rica	Latvia	Switzerland
Czechoslovakia		

(22 signatures.)

<sup>1</sup> The representative of Lithuania accredited to the League of Nations signed a similar declaration on May 12th, 1922. It has not yet been ratified.

3. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 6.*

That the following paragraph shall be added to Article 6 of the Covenant as amended:—

“The allocation of the expenses of the League set out in Annex 3 shall be applied as from January 1st, 1922, until a revised allocation has come into force after adoption by the Assembly.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Albania	Esthonia	New Zealand
Australia	France	Norway
Bolivia	Greece	Panama
British Empire	Haiti	Paraguay
Canada	Italy	Persia
China	Japan	Poland
Colombia	Latvia	Siam
Costa Rica	Liberia	South Africa
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Sweden
Denmark	Netherlands	Switzerland

(30 signatures).

4. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 6.*

That the following list shall be inserted in the Annex to the Covenant:

“III. ALLOCATION OF THE EXPENSES OF THE LEAGUE.

States	Units payable	States	Units payable
Albania . . . . .	2	Japan . . . . .	65
Argentina . . . . .	35	Latvia . . . . .	5
Australia . . . . .	15	Liberia . . . . .	2
Austria . . . . .	2	Lithuania . . . . .	5
Belgium . . . . .	15	Luxemburg . . . . .	2
Bolivia . . . . .	5	Netherlands . . . . .	15
Brazil . . . . .	35	New Zealand . . . . .	10
British Empire . . . . .	90	Nicaragua . . . . .	2
Bulgaria . . . . .	10	Norway . . . . .	10
Canada . . . . .	35	Panama . . . . .	2
Chile . . . . .	15	Paraguay . . . . .	2
China . . . . .	65	Peru . . . . .	10
Colombia . . . . .	10	Persia . . . . .	10
Costa Rica . . . . .	2	Poland . . . . .	15
Cuba . . . . .	10	Portugal . . . . .	10
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	35	Roumania . . . . .	35
Denmark . . . . .	10	Salvador . . . . .	2
Esthonia . . . . .	5	Serb-Croat-Slovene State . . . . .	35
Finland . . . . .	5	Siam . . . . .	10
France . . . . .	90	South Africa . . . . .	15
Greece . . . . .	10	Spain . . . . .	35
Guatemala . . . . .	2	Sweden . . . . .	15
Haiti . . . . .	5	Switzerland . . . . .	10
Honduras . . . . .	2	Uruguay . . . . .	10
India . . . . .	65	Venezuela . . . . .	5”
Italy . . . . .	65		

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Albania	Esthonia	Norway
Australia	France	Panama
Bolivia	Greece	Paraguay
British Empire	Haiti	Netherlands
Canada	Italy	New Zealand
China	Japan	Persia
Colombia	Latvia	Poland
Costa Rica	Liberia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Switzerland.
Denmark		

(28 signatures.)

5. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 12.*

Article 12 shall read as follows:

“The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration *or judicial settlement* or to enquiry by the Council and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators *or the judicial decision*, or the report by the Council.

“In any case under this Article, the award of the arbitrators *or the judicial decision* shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Australia	Czechoslovakia	Liberia
Bolivia	Denmark	New Zealand
British Empire	France	Norway
Canada	Greece	Panama
China	Haiti	Paraguay
Colombia	Italy	Siam
• Costa Rica	Japan	Sweden
Cuba	Latvia	Switzerland

(24 signatures.)

6. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 13.*

Article 13 shall read as follows:—

“The Members of the League agree that, whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration *or judicial settlement*, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration *or judicial settlement*.

“Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration *or judicial settlement*.

“For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the *Permanent Court of International Justice*, established in accordance with Article 14, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

“The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award *or decision* that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award *or decision*, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:—

Albania	Esthonia	New Zealand
Australia	France	Norway
Bolivia	Greece	Panama
British Empire	Haiti	Paraguay
Canada	Italy	Persia
China	Japan	Poland
Colombia	Latvia	Siam
Costa Rica	Liberia	South Africa
Cuba	Lithuania	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Netherlands	Switzerland
Denmark		

(31 signatures.)

7. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 15.*

The first paragraph of Article 15 shall read as follows:

“If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration *or judicial settlement* in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.”



This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Australia	Czechoslovakia	Liberia
Bolivia	Denmark	New Zealand
British Empire	France	Norway
Canada	Greece	Panama
China	Haiti	Paraguay
Colombia	Italy	Siam
Costa Rica	Japan	Sweden
Cuba	Latvia	Switzerland

(24 signatures.)

8. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 16.*

The latter part of the first paragraph of Article 16 of the Covenant shall read as follows:—

“..... which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between persons residing in their territory and persons residing in the territory of the Covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between persons residing in the territory of the Covenant-breaking State and persons residing in the territory of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Albania	Greece	Norway
Bolivia	Haiti	Panama
China	Italy	Paraguay
Colombia	Japan	Persia
Costa Rica	Latvia	Poland
Cuba	Liberia	South Africa
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Sweden
Denmark	Netherlands	Switzerland
Esthonia		

(25 signatures.)

9. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 16.*

The second paragraph of Article 16 shall read as follows:

“It is for the Council to give an opinion whether or not a breach of the Covenant has taken place. In deliberations on this question in the Council, the votes of Members of the League alleged to have resorted to war and of Members against whom such action was directed shall not be counted.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Bolivia	Greece	Norway
China	Haiti	Panama
Colombia	Italy	Paraguay
Costa Rica	Japan	Siam
Cuba	Latvia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Liberia	Switzerland
Denmark		

(19 signatures.)

10. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 16.*

The third paragraph of Article 16 shall read as follows:

“The Council will notify to all Members of the League the date which it recommends for the application of the economic pressure under this Article.”

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Bolivia	Greece	Norway
China	Haiti	Panama
Colombia	Italy	Paraguay
Costa Rica	Japan	Siam
Cuba	Latvia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Liberia	Switzerland
Denmark		

(19 signatures.)

11. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 16.*

The fourth paragraph of Article 16 shall read as follows:

"Nevertheless, the Council may, in the case of particular Members, postpone the coming into force of any of these measures for a specified period where it is satisfied that such a postponement will facilitate the attainment of the object of the measures referred to in the preceding paragraph, or that it is necessary in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience which will be caused to such Members."

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:—

Albania	Denmark	Norway
Bolivia	Greece	Panama
China	Haiti	Paraguay
Colombia	Italy	Siam
Costa Rica	Japan	Sweden
Cuba	Latvia	Switzerland
Czechoslovakia	Liberia	

(20 signatures.)

12. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 26.*

The first paragraph of Article 26 of the Covenant shall be replaced by the following text:

"Amendments to the present Covenant the text of which shall have been voted by the Assembly on a three-fourths majority, in which there shall be included the votes of all the Members of the Council represented at the meeting, will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives composed the Council when the vote was taken and by the majority of those whose Representatives form the Assembly."

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:—

Albania	Esthonia	New Zealand
Australia	France	Norway
Bolivia	Greece	Panama
British Empire	Haiti	Paraguay
Canada	Italy	Persia
China	Japan	Poland
Colombia	Latvia	Siam
Costa Rica	Liberia	South Africa
Cuba	Lithuania	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Netherlands	Switzerland
Denmark		

(31 signatures.)

13. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 26.*

A paragraph reading as follows shall be added after the first paragraph of Article 26:

"If the required number of ratifications shall not have been obtained within twenty-two months after the vote of the Assembly, the proposed amendment shall remain without effect."

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:—

Australia	Esthonia	New Zealand
Bolivia	France	Norway
British Empire	Greece	Panama
Canada	Haiti	Paraguay
China	Italy	Persia
Colombia	Japan	Poland
Costa Rica	Latvia	Siam
Cuba	Liberia	South Africa
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Sweden
Denmark	Netherlands	Switzerland

(30 signatures.)

14. *Protocol regarding an Amendment to Article 26.*

The second paragraph of the present Article 26 shall be replaced by the two following paragraphs:—

"The Secretary-General shall inform the Members of the taking effect of an amendment.

"Any Member of the League which has not at that time ratified the amendment is free to notify the Secretary-General within a year of its refusal to accept it, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League."

This Protocol has been signed by the following countries:

Australia	Esthonia	New Zealand
Bolivia	France	Norway
British Empire	Greece	Panama
Canada	Haiti	Paraguay
China	Italy	Persia
Colombia	Japan	Siam
Costa Rica	Latvia	South Africa
Cuba	Liberia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Lithuania	Switzerland
Denmark	Netherlands	

(29 signatures.)

#### B. Ratification of the Protocols.

Up to the present, Norway alone has ratified the 14 Protocols of Amendments to the Covenant. The Bulgarian Secretariat, in a letter dated May 6th, 1922, gave notice that the Sobranje had ratified the Protocols, but the instruments of ratification have not yet been deposited with the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

### VII. REGISTRATION AND PUBLICATION OF TREATIES AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS.

(Article 18 of the Covenant.)

The second Assembly adopted the following resolution on October 5th, 1921:—

“The Assembly, taking note of the proposal for the amendment of Article 18 contained in the Report of its First Committee, decides to adjourn further consideration of this Amendment until the third Assembly.”

The registration of Treaties by the Secretariat has accordingly been continued in conformity with the method laid down in the Council's memorandum of May 19th, 1920.

Since the second Assembly, the Members of the League have submitted their Treaties for registration more regularly than had previously been the case. From June, 1920, the date on which the Registration Office entered upon its duties, to the end of the second Assembly, October 1921, 159 Treaties or international engagements had been submitted for registration. From the end of the second Assembly to the present date (June 16th, 1922) no less than 110 Treaties have been registered. It is to be hoped that, as the system of submitting Treaties for registration becomes increasingly familiar to the Governments of the Members of the League, Article 18 will be universally observed.

Similar progress has been made with the publication of Treaties as with their registration; since the second Assembly more than 150 Treaties have been published in Volumes IV, V, VI, VII and VIII, each of which contains 400 pages. The publication of Treaties was suspended last year, because the Secretariat was awaiting a decision of the Assembly on this subject. Treaties are now published very shortly after registration.

---

## 2

### LEGAL QUESTIONS.

---

#### I. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

The second Assembly decided on October 5th, 1921, that the Committee on Amendments, which had done the preparatory work for the proceedings of the first Committee of the Assembly, should continue in being, and that the Council should refer to it the draft amendments on which the Assembly

had been unable to come to a definite decision, together with any other proposed amendments which might be submitted to the third Assembly.

The draft amendments adjourned by the second Assembly for further consideration include the proposal of the Canadian Delegation that Article 10 of the Covenant should be struck out and the proposed amendment to Article 18 of the Covenant (Registration of Treaties) discussed by the full Assembly on October 5th, 1921.

There is also a proposed amendment to Article 6 of the Covenant presented by the Polish Government. This amendment, at the request of the Polish Government, was withdrawn from the agenda of the second Assembly, and placed on the agenda of the third Assembly. The Polish Government has again requested the withdrawal of the amendment.

The Council, on January 10th, 1921, decided to postpone calling the Committee on Amendments together until other proposals of amendments had been received from Members of the League.

The Council noted that the expenses of this Committee, if it should resume its work in 1922, would have to be charged in the budget to the item of "Unforeseen Expenditure" by a special resolution of the Council.

## II. APPLICATION OF ARTICLES 11 AND 17 OF THE COVENANT.

### *Correspondence with the Hungarian Government on this subject.*

On November 13th, 1921, the Hungarian Government addressed to the Secretary-General a Note in which it expressed its surprise and deep regret that on the occasion of the crisis resulting from the return of the ex-King Charles IV, it had "received no information as to the steps taken by the League of Nations to safeguard the peace and the safety of nations, in conformity with the rights and duties assigned to it by the Covenant." The Hungarian Government, after referring to the terms of Articles 11 and 17 of the Covenant, felt bound emphatically to call attention to the fact that no invitation had been addressed to it in conformity with Article 17.

In accordance with the instructions of the Council, before whom the Note of the Hungarian Government was immediately laid at its extraordinary session held on November 16th to 19th, 1921, the Secretary-General replied that a meeting of the Council had not been summoned to deal with the crisis resulting from the return of the ex-King, because Article 11 was only applicable if a request were made by a Member of the League, and Article 17 if a request were made either by a Member of the League or by one of the States between whom a dispute had arisen.

Copies of the Note of the Hungarian Government and of the reply thereto were communicated to the Members of the League.

The Hungarian Government stated in a further letter dated December 19th, 1921, that it could not accept the interpretation of Article 17 contained in the Secretary-General's letter. That Article "speaks of an invitation to be addressed to the non-Members. The actual text of the Covenant provides that 'the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept obligations' of Members of the League. The Article invites them to accept; it is precise, it is categorical, as it is natural that it should be in regard to the vanquished. No concessions are allowed; on the contrary, if the initiative referred to in Article 11 is not exercised, an invitation is issued, which constitutes, so to speak, the second phase of the procedure laid down in Article 11."

The Secretary-General replied to the above on January 11th, 1922, in conformity with the instructions of the Council, as follows:

"..... Article 11 of the Covenant, which is referred to in the first Note from the Hungarian Government, dated November 13th, establishes the means by which a question, such as that in which you were interested, should be brought before the Council; it states that there must first be made a request by a Member of the League, and the Secretary-General has then to convene the Council immediately, in pursuance of this request. If the question at issue is in the nature of a dispute, it is evident that one of the parties to this dispute may bring the matter before the Council, provided that the party is a Member of the League. This course, however, will not be open to a party which is not a Member of the League. Such a State could only inform the Members of the League, either directly or through the Secretary-General, of the situation which, in its opinion, threatens the peace of the world and thus give occasion for a request by one of the Members of the League for the convening of the Council.

"Article 17 of the Covenant does not lay down any special method of bringing a question before the Council. It simply provides a method for extending the action of the Council to non-Members of the League, and it assumes that the question has been duly submitted to the Council. In other words, with regard to convening the Council, the Secretary-General has no more right of initiative by virtue of Article 17 than by virtue of Article 11 of the Covenant....."

## III. COMMITTEE ENTRUSTED WITH THE ENQUIRY INTO THE PROCEDURE FOR CONCILIATION.

The Committee entrusted with the task of enquiring into the procedure for conciliation, appointed by the Council in pursuance of a recommendation made by the Assembly on October 4th, 1921, has finished its work and submitted its report to the Council.

The Committee, which was composed of:—

His Excellency Dr. ADATCI (Japan), Chairman,  
MM. Hold VON FERNECK (Austria),  
Gil FORTOUL<sup>1</sup> (Venezuela),  
Charles DE VISSCHER (Belgium),  
UNDÉN<sup>1</sup> (Sweden),

met at Geneva on May 23rd, 1922.

It presented its conclusions in the form of a draft resolution, for adoption by the Assembly.

A special feature of the method of conciliation recommended by the Committee is the institution of commissions in pursuance of Conventions which would be freely concluded between States. The majority of the members of the Committee declared in favour of an optional system, which would not impose on the States a definite obligation to create conciliation commissions. It is interesting to note that the proposals of the Committee do not involve any amendment to the Covenant.

The organisation of the conciliation commissions, their powers and their procedure are to be settled freely by the contracting parties.

Members of the League of Nations desiring to conclude conventions on the basis of this resolution can notify their intention to the other Members by means of a declaration deposited with the Secretariat of the League.

The Secretary-General may, if requested to do so by the Members concerned, give the assistance of the Secretariat for the purpose of the conclusion of conciliation conventions.

The Council will be empowered, independently of the other means placed at its disposal by the Covenant for ensuring the maintenance of peace, to make use of the conciliation commission instituted by the parties to a dispute; it may invite the parties to submit their differences to this commission, and it will also be able to refer to the commission for examination any dispute submitted to it, under Article 15 of the Covenant, by one of the parties.

The articles of the draft resolution are chiefly concerned with the composition of the commissions, their places of meeting, and periods of grace.

The commissions will adopt their decisions by a majority vote of their members.

It should be specially noted that, by the terms of Article 9 of the resolution, should the parties not have arrived at an amicable settlement of their difference within a period of 30 days, dating from the submission of the commission's report, the matter may be referred to the Council, either by one of the parties or at the request of the commission.

---

### 3

## THE ECONOMIC WEAPON OF THE LEAGUE.

---

The second Assembly, in resolutions adopted on October 4th, 1921, proposed that certain amendments should be made to Article 16 of the Covenant, which provides that in certain circumstances blockade measures shall be enforced against a Covenant-breaking State. The resolutions of the Assembly were based on a careful study of the subject by a special Committee appointed on the recommendation of the first Assembly.

The second Assembly, aware that it would be some time before the suggested amendments to Article 16 could be put into force in the form required by the Covenant, desired that the resolutions and proposed amendments should "constitute rules for guidance" and be accepted as a provisional measure by the Council and by the Members of the League.

The Council considered these resolutions on January 10th, 1922. It decided that, should any necessity for action arise under Article 16 before the final rules had been established, it would be guided by these rules, so far as its own action was concerned. The resolutions, however, refer also to action to be taken by the Members of the League. In particular, the last resolution recommends that the Governments should take preparatory measures, above all of a legislative character, to enable them to apply the economic weapon of the League at short notice. The Council

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Löfgren (Sweden) and M. Alvarez (Brazil) were invited by the Council to serve on the Committee, but were unable to attend.

accordingly decided to address a circular letter to the Members of the League asking for their observations on the proposed "rules for guidance".

This letter was despatched by the Secretary-General on January 27th, 1922. Replies have been received from Austria, Bulgaria, Italy, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Japan and Czechoslovakia. These replies have been published in the June and July numbers of the *Official Journal*.

The proposed amendments to Article 16, together with the other amendments to the Covenant voted by the Assembly, were placed for ratification before the Members of the League by means of a circular letter addressed to all the Governments on December 17th, 1921.

---

4

## PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

---

The Secretary-General was able to inform the Council on January 10th, 1922, that 45 States had signed the Protocol of Signature of the Statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice; that 18 States<sup>1</sup> had signed the optional clause concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court; that 30 States<sup>2</sup> had already deposited deeds of ratification to the general Protocol; and that 9 States<sup>3</sup> had ratified their signature of the optional clause. He further informed the Council that the Court had been invited to meet at The Hague on January 30th.

A solemn opening of the Permanent Court took place on February 15th in the Great Hall of Justice in the Peace Palace of the Hague.

Of the fifteen judges and deputy-judges elected in the previous September by the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations, twelve took part in the work of this preliminary session, namely, nine judges: M. ALTAMIRA (Spain), M. ANZILOTTI (Italy), Lord FINLAY (Great Britain), M. Max HUBER (Switzerland), Dr. LODER (Holland), Mr. John Bassett MOORE (United States), M. NYHOLM (Denmark), M. ODA (Japan), M. WEISS (France); and three deputy-judges: M. Michel YOVANOVITCH (Serb-Croat-Slovene State), M. BEICHMANN (Norway), and M. NEGULESCO (Roumania). Two judges, M. BARBOZA (Brazil) and M. de BUSTAMANTE (Cuba) were prevented by illness from attending, and the deputy-judge, M. WANG-CHUNG-HUI (China), delegate at the Washington Conference, was also prevented from taking part.

The members of the Court made in turn the formal declaration required by Article 20 of the Statute, and speeches were delivered by M. da Cunha, representing the Council; by Sir Eric Drummond; by M. van Karnebeek, who welcomed the Court in the name of the Royal Government of the Netherlands, and by M. Patijn, Burgomaster of The Hague; and M. Loder, the President of the Court.

The first session of the Court was devoted to administrative questions, and to the establishment of the rules of procedure.

M. LODER was elected President, and M. André WEISS was elected Vice-President.

Three special Chambers were constituted under the Statute of the Court: a Chamber for Summary Procedure, a Chamber for Labour and a Chamber for Transit and Communications Questions.

The Chambers were constituted as follows:—

*The Chamber of Summary Procedure:*

M. LODER (President),  
MM. WEISS and HUBER (members),  
Lord FINLAY and M. ALTAMIRA (deputy-members).

*Labour Chamber:*

Lord FINLAY (President),  
MM. BUSTAMANTE, ALTAMIRA, ANZILOTTI and HUBER (members),  
MM. NYHOLM and MOORE (deputy-members).

---

<sup>1</sup> Now 19 States. (June 1922).

<sup>2</sup> Now 34 States.

<sup>3</sup> Now 10 States.

*Transit and Communications Chamber:*

M. WEISS (President),  
MM. BARBOZA, NYHOLM, MOORE and ODA (members),  
MM. ANZILOTTI and HUBER (deputy-members).

The rules of procedure of the Court were completed and published in March. They are supplementary to the Statute, and are intended to fit into the framework of that document. They settle the terms of office of the judges and their order of precedence. They include rules governing the convocation of deputy-judges and the appointment of judges of the nationality of the parties to sit in a given case. They establish the procedure for summoning the technical assessors who are to assist the Court in dealing with labour and with transit and communications cases.

An important series of rules describes the method by which the Court will arrive at its decisions.

Every member of the Court who is present at a discussion is obliged to give a reasoned opinion, and the decision of the Court is to be based on the conclusions adopted, after a final discussion of the various opinions expressed by the members.

The provisions governing the procedure before the Court distinguish between procedure before the full Court and before the special Chambers for Labour and for Transit and Communications Questions on the one hand, and the Chamber for Summary Procedure on the other.

A suit is always brought before the Court either by the notification of a special agreement between the parties (*compromis*), or, if the jurisdiction of the Court is compulsory for the case in question or between the parties concerned, by an application filed with the Court.

The application or notification will make it clear whether the full Court or one of the Chambers is to deal with the case and whether assessors are to be employed.

If proceedings are instituted by application, the Court fixes a time limit within which the applicant must file his case, and the date before which the respondent must communicate his counter-case. If the respondent files no counter-case, the Court may, under the Statute, pass judgment by default, if it is satisfied that it has jurisdiction and that the claim submitted is well founded in fact and law.

The President is empowered to fix a date for beginning oral proceedings. The date must fall either within one of the ordinary sessions of the Court (generally beginning on June 15th) or within an extraordinary session which the President has power to summon.

The oral proceedings will consist in the hearing of witnesses, and the presentation of the case by the representatives and counsel of the parties. At any time during the proceedings the parties may conclude an agreement regarding the dispute, or arrange to withdraw from the Court. Failing such agreement, the procedure will terminate in a judgment which is final and without appeal; revision may, however, be demanded if there is discovery of some really new and important fact.

The summary procedure which is instituted with a view to the speedy despatch of business, in many respects resembles the procedure before the full Court. There are, however, important differences. The Chamber for Summary Procedure can, for instance, only deal with a case by virtue of a special agreement between the parties concerned; it has to be ready to sit at any time, and the intention is that, if possible, a decision shall be given on the basis of two written documents only, one produced by each party, which should normally suffice to furnish a full explanation of the question from their respective points of view. Oral proceedings may be instituted by the Chamber if it considers that fuller information is necessary, but such proceedings can be eliminated by agreement between the parties.

Under Article 14 of the Covenant, which constitutes the basis of the whole of the Court's activities, the Court has not only to give judgments, but it may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or the Assembly of the League of Nations; such opinions will always be given by the full Court. The rules of the Court contain provisions concerning the giving of such opinions. The rules make it clear that the Court is not likely to give opinions except on questions stated in precise terms and relating to actual events.

In elaborating its rules of procedure, the Court decided to defer laying down the conditions under which the Court would be open to States not Members of the League nor mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant, until it had ascertained how the Council proposed to exercise the powers conferred upon it by Article 35 of the Statute. In the course of its session held in May 1922 the Council adopted the following general rule: The Court shall be open to the States concerned, on condition that they shall previously have deposited a declaration by which they accept the jurisdiction of the Court and undertake to carry out in full good faith the decisions of the Court and not to resort to war against a State complying therewith. Such declaration may be either particular or general. A State, in making such a general declaration, may accept the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, but such acceptance may not, without special convention, be relied upon *vis-à-vis* Members of the League of Nations or States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant which have signed the "optional clause" concerning compulsory jurisdiction. The Council reserved the right to rescind or to amend this resolution at any moment by a resolution which shall be communicated to the Court. The States which are not Members of the League shall pay their share of the expenses of the Court when they are parties in a case.

At the same May session the Council decided, by virtue of Article 33 of the Statute (which stipulates that the expenses of the Court shall be borne by the League of Nations in the manner

which the Assembly may determine on the recommendation of the Council) to propose to the Assembly that the expenses of the Court should, at least for the present, be regarded as forming part of the general budget of the League, and that they should be paid out of the ordinary funds of the League. The method so far adopted for supplying funds for the Court is the "permanent imprest system". At the end of each month the Registrar indicates the amount by which the available bank balance, fixed at 100,000 Dutch florins, has been reduced, and the Financial Director of the League remits to the Bank the sum required in order to restore the credit balance to the original amount.

With regard to the rank and titles of the members of the Court, the Council considered that questions of precedence might, in so far as was necessary, be settled individually in each case by agreement with the authorities at the place where the ceremonies are held.

The first two cases which the Court had to consider at its ordinary session in June 1922 were brought before it by virtue of a decision taken by the Council at its May session. These cases had reference to those provisions of the Treaty of Peace which dealt with Labour questions, and were submitted to the Court for its advisory opinion, in pursuance of Article 14 of the Covenant. At the request of the French Government, the Council addressed to the Court the following question:

"Does the competence of the International Labour Organisation extend to the international regulation of the conditions of labour of persons employed in agriculture?"

The other question on which the Council, at the request of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, asked the Court to give an advisory opinion was the following:

"Was the nomination of the Workers' Delegate for the Netherlands at the third Session of the International Labour Conference made in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 389 of the Treaty of Versailles?"

---

5

## FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAGUE.

---

On October 12th, 1921, the Council adopted the following Resolution:

"In accordance with the recommendation of the Assembly adopted on October 3rd, the Council resolves that a Commission of Control be appointed immediately....."

This Commission, composed of the following members:

M. Georges NOBLEMAIRE, Deputy of the French Chamber (*President*),  
Dr. J. A. NEDERBRAGT, Head of the Economic Section of the Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs (*Rapporteur*),  
Sir James ALLEN, High Commissioner for New Zealand in London,  
Dr. Stephen OSUSKY, Czechoslovakian Minister in Paris,  
M. Luis WADDINGTON, Financial Counsellor to the Chilian Legation in London,

met at Geneva from May 16th to 22nd, 1922.

The Commission's report has been communicated to the Members of the League (C. 350. M. 201. 1922).

Since it was impossible for the Commission of Control to meet and examine the draft budget for 1923 before it was submitted to the Council at its May Session, the Council adopted on May 16th the following Resolution:—

"The Council,

"Owing to the fact that at the date of its 18th session it had not been able to receive the report of the Commission of Control on the Budget of 1923:

"Instructs the Secretary-General to forward that Budget without delay to all the Members of the League and to forward at the same time any observations which the Commission of Control may wish to make upon it.

"This decision of the Council is taken subject to the right of the Members of the Council, should they find it impossible to examine the Budget at a subsequent session, to discuss or amend the Budget through their representatives during the Assembly."

The budget estimates of the Secretariat, amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission of Control, and the estimates of the Permanent Court of International Justice,



as forwarded to the Commission by the Court, have been communicated to the Members of the League (A. 3. 1922).

The Secretary-General also forwarded to the Members of the League the accounts for the financial year 1921 (C. 237. M. 133. 1922.) which have been audited at the request of the Council, by auditors appointed by the Netherlands Government.

The Commission of Control will meet again towards the end of August.

---

## 6

### REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

---

The second Assembly on October 1st, 1921, adopted eleven resolutions concerning the reduction of armaments. It is proposed to take these resolutions separately, and to record the steps taken to carry them into effect by the various bodies which have been dealing with the question.

#### RESOLUTION 1: WORK OF THE TEMPORARY MIXED COMMISSION.

“That it is desirable that the Temporary Mixed Commission should be asked to continue the work which it has begun.”

The Council of the League, on October 12th, 1921, instructed the Temporary Mixed Commission to continue its work in accordance with this resolution.

#### RESOLUTION 2: GENERAL SCHEME FOR A REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

“That the Temporary Mixed Commission be asked to make proposals on general lines for the reduction of national armaments which, in order to secure precision, should be in the form of a draft treaty or other equally definite plan, to be presented to the Council, if possible, before the Assembly next year.

“In order to enable the Temporary Commission to accomplish this task, the Council should be asked to strengthen this Commission.”

The Council noted this resolution on October 12th, 1921. In accordance with the second paragraph, it invited the Temporary Mixed Commission to meet as soon as possible in order to lay before the Council the names of such new members as it might judge desirable to co-opt, recommending that the new members should not be more than six in number.

#### *Meeting of the Temporary Mixed Commission.*

The first plenary session of the Temporary Mixed Commission since the second Assembly was held on February 20th, 1922.

#### *Draft Treaty on Reduction of National Armaments.*

The Commission had been requested by the Council, in pursuance of the Assembly's resolution, to frame proposals for the reduction of national armaments in the form of a draft Treaty or other equally definite plan. The Commission felt itself unable to adopt in principle the idea of drawing up a draft Treaty. It thought that the task of preparing a Treaty was the prerogative of the Council and that the duty of the Commission was to collect the necessary material and so enable the Council to accomplish this work.

The Commission, however, took note of a series of definite proposals submitted by Lord Esher, for the reduction of land armaments. At the suggestion of Lord Esher himself, the Commission adjourned the consideration of these proposals to the next session (July 3rd).

#### *Extension of the Washington Naval Agreement.*

The Commission also had under consideration a draft resolution submitted by Rear-Admiral Segrave for the extension of the Naval Agreement concluded at Washington to the States Members

of the League which are not signatories of that Agreement. Consideration of this draft resolution was also adjourned to the next session of the Commission (July 3rd).

*Statement by Governments on their National Requirements.*

In order that it might be in a position to work out the general lines of a scheme for the reduction of armaments, with full knowledge of the facts, and with due regard to the feelings of the Governments concerned, the Commission decided to request the Council to give effect, as early as possible, to the following resolution approved by the Assembly:

“That, as soon as possible, each of the Governments should be asked to furnish a statement of the considerations it may wish to urge in regard to the requirements of its national security, its international obligations, its geographical situation and any special circumstances.

“The Governments should be specially requested to indicate separately the police and military forces which they consider indispensable for the preservation of domestic order, and the expenditure entailed thereby.”

*Co-option of new members to the Temporary Mixed Commission.*

With a view to strengthening the Commission in accordance with the wishes of the Assembly, in order that it might work out a scheme for the reduction of armaments, the Council had delegated to the Commission itself the duty of co-opting six new members and submitting their names for the approval of the Council. The Commission decided to transmit to the Council a list of States which are not yet (or which are inadequately) represented on the Commission, in order that the six new Members might be selected from nationals of these States. This list included Spain, Poland, Latin-America, Switzerland, Great Britain, France and, in addition, one employer and one worker. The Commission requested the Council itself to deduct from this list sufficient names to reduce the candidates to six.

*Action taken by the Council.*

The Council considered these recommendations on March 25th, 1922.

*Lord Esher's proposals.*

Noting that the Temporary Mixed Commission had decided to discuss the proposals of Lord Esher at its next session, and while adopting no formal resolution regarding them, the Council decided to call the attention of the Temporary Mixed Commission to the opinion expressed by some of its members to the effect that it was not the duty of the Commission to propose a scale of co-efficients for land armaments. The Minutes containing the opinion of the Council were forwarded to the members of the Commission.

*Statement by Governments on their National Requirements.*

The Council instructed its President to ask the Governments to furnish the statement on considerations of national security mentioned in the report of the Third Committee of the second Assembly, to which the Temporary Mixed Commission had drawn attention.

*Co-option of New Members to the Temporary Mixed Commission.*

Finally, in order to strengthen the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Council decided to appoint seven new members: M. LEBRUN (France), M. SAPIEHA (Poland), M. URRUTIA (Colombia), Lord Robert CECIL (Great Britain), M. LOHNER (Switzerland), M. A. TORRE (Italy) and M. Alcalá ZAMORA (Spain).

RESOLUTION 3: STATISTICAL ENQUIRY.

“That a statistical investigation be made with regard to the armaments of the various countries upon the lines indicated in the body of the report of the Third Committee.”

The Council on October 12th, 1921, endorsed this resolution, and referred it to the Temporary Mixed Commission which, on February 20th, 1922, requested the Secretariat to expedite as far as possible this statistical work, and authorised the Secretariat to appoint expert correspondents qualified to assist it.

Professor Benini and Professor Janssen, undertook to prepare statements on the financial situation and on military expenditure in Italy and Belgium respectively. They further drafted

the general lines of the programme on the basis of which steps were taken immediately to compile statistics concerning the economic conditions, population and military organisation of each State. In this work the Disarmament Section secured the co-operation of the Economic and Health Sections of the Secretariat.

The general lines of the programme drafted by M. Benini and Professor Janssen having been approved by the Temporary Mixed Commission, the statistical researches were undertaken accordingly.

The Council, in a report adopted on March 28th, 1922, further emphasised the importance of the statistical enquiry as an essential step towards a reduction of armaments, founded on a concrete and objective basis.

#### RESOLUTIONS 4, 5 AND 6: PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF AND TRADE IN ARMS.

"4. That the Temporary Mixed Commission be requested to continue the examination of the question of the private manufacture of armaments and the trade in arms."

"5. That the Council be requested to invite all the Members of the League and interested States which are not Members of the League to take part in an international conference on the private manufacture of arms and the trade in arms, which should meet as soon as possible at a date to be fixed under the responsibility of the Council. It is considered highly desirable that this date should be prior to the next session of the Assembly.

"The Temporary Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the task of preparing the programme of the Conference and of submitting to it a draft Convention."

"6. That the urgent importance of ratifying the Convention at the earliest possible moment be strongly impressed on all the States signatories to the Arms Traffic Convention of St. Germain, whether Members of the League of Nations or not, and that at the same time all non-signatory States be invited to adhere to the Convention.

"The Assembly expresses its earnest desire that the importance of this subject may be strongly urged at the forthcoming Conference on Disarmament at Washington."

The Council on October 12th, 1921, requested the Temporary Mixed Commission to continue the examination of the question of the private manufacture of armaments in accordance with Resolution 4.

#### *Opinion of the Temporary Mixed Commission on the Private Manufacture of Arms.*

The Temporary Mixed Commission on February 20th, 1922, expressed the view that the best means of securing control over the private manufacture of arms and munitions would appear to be the ratification of the Arms Traffic Convention as provided for in the Treaty of St. Germain. The Commission accordingly requested the Council to draw the attention of the Governments signatories to the Treaty of St. Germain, whether Members of the League or not, to the urgent need of ratifying this Treaty.

It also decided that the Permanent Advisory Committee and the Legal Section of the Secretariat should be requested to examine questions of a technical and legal character relating to the definition of war material and to the private manufacture of arms.

On March 25th the Council noted this Resolution.

The Permanent Advisory Committee discussed the matter and stated in a report to the Council that it had noted the proceedings of the Temporary Mixed Commission and that it was prepared to examine from a technical point of view, should the Council so desire, any specific questions regarding private manufacture which might arise in the course of the enquiry conducted by the Temporary Mixed Commission.

#### *Definition of the term "Munitions and Implements of War".*

In answer to a request of the Temporary Mixed Commission to define the term "munitions and implements of war" the Permanent Advisory Committee, during its seventh session, expressed the opinion that the object to be aimed at should be not a general definition but a definition designed to meet the specific case referred to in paragraph 5 of Article 8 of the Covenant, which denounces the "evil effects" of the private manufacture of "munitions and implements of war". Owing to the fact that modern war involves the entire employment of the resources of a State, it would be impracticable to enumerate the materials indispensable to carry on a war. The Commission therefore felt that it could not do more than state that the expression "munitions and implements of war" meant the material which was exclusively used for war purposes. It was nevertheless prepared to draw up lists of all possible material which might come within the categories under consideration, should the Council so desire.

The Legal Section of the Secretariat also submitted a preliminary report to the Temporary Mixed Commission on the other legal points involved in question of the private manufacture of arms. As, however, the question was somewhat complex, the Legal Section is conducting a more complete examination of the matter as a whole.

Regarding the necessity of convening an international conference on the private manufacture of arms as contemplated by Resolution 5 of the Assembly, the Council on October 12th, 1921, suggested that action should be postponed until the subject had been more completely examined.

*Ratification of the Arms Traffic Convention of St. Germain.*

Acting on the first resolution adopted by the Assembly at its first session, the Secretary-General on March 8th, 1921, addressed a letter to all States Members of the League, asking them to ratify the Convention, and, if necessary, to formulate a reservation to the effect that the Convention should not come into force until other Signatory Powers had also ratified. A similar letter was also addressed to non-signatory States in order to obtain their adherence. Twenty-six States only have replied to this letter.<sup>1</sup>

The second Assembly adopted a new resolution again emphasising the urgent importance of the ratification and expressing its earnest desire that the importance of this subject might be strongly urged at the Washington Conference.

The Secretary-General despatched two letters dated November 8th, 1921, and March 22nd, 1922, to certain States which attended the Washington Conference, and the Governments of three of these States, Great Britain, France and Japan, have informed the Secretariat that there was no opportunity at Washington for discussing the ratification of this Convention. No progress has therefore been made in this matter as a result of the Washington Conference.

Acting on the Council's instructions of October 12th, 1921, the Secretary-General sent a second letter on November 21st, 1921, to all States which had not informed the League regarding the ratification of, or adherence to, the Convention.

A reply from seven States only has been received.<sup>2</sup>

A further letter was accordingly sent to all States which had not replied.<sup>3</sup>

*Replies of the various Governments.*

The replies of the Governments indicate that most of the Signatories make their ratification of the Convention conditional on its ratification by all the Principal Powers.

The United States did not reply to the Secretary-General's letter.

Great Britain, France and Japan will ratify the Convention as soon as the other Principal Powers do so.

Italy will ratify the Convention when it has been approved by Parliament.

A certain number of Powers such as Denmark, India, Sweden and Norway impose the condition that their ratification shall depend on the ratification of all the Signatory Powers.

Spain, New Zealand and South Africa will ratify as soon as the Principal Powers ratify.

Colombia<sup>4</sup>, Roumania, the Netherlands, Persia<sup>4</sup> and Uruguay<sup>4</sup> have expressed themselves ready to adhere to the Convention.

The States which have actually ratified the Convention up to the present are: Brazil, Chile, China, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Peru, Siam, and Venezuela. Germany and her former allies are bound by the Treaties of Peace to adhere to the Convention the moment that it enters into force.

RESOLUTION 7: ARMS TRAFFIC.

"The Assembly, taking note of the view expressed in the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission on the Reduction of Armaments with regard to the desirability of making provision for excluding the import of arms and ammunition in time of peace from countries in which the traffic is uncontrolled, invites the Council to prepare a draft protocol for this purpose for the consideration of the various Governments. At the same time it expressed the earnest hope that this procedure will not in any way be permitted to delay the general ratification of the Convention of St. Germain.

"The steps that may eventually have to be taken for the destruction of the surplus stocks of munitions may be considered by the Temporary Mixed Commission."

The first part of this Resolution being connected with the previous Resolutions (4, 5 and 6), the Temporary Mixed Commission considered it in connection with them. On March 25th, 1922, the Council authorised the Temporary Mixed Commission to consider the first part with the assistance of the Permanent Advisory Committee if necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Japan, India, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Roumania, San Salvador, Spain, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela.

<sup>2</sup> Lithuania, Mexico, Monaco, Norway, Panama, Peru, South-Africa.

<sup>3</sup> Abyssinia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentine, Australia, Azerbaidjan, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Esthonia, Georgia, Hedjaz, Honduras, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Persia, Portugal, Roumania, San Domingo, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Turkey, Uruguay.

<sup>4</sup> These States have not officially informed the Secretariat of their readiness to adhere to the Convention.

As regards the second paragraph (Destruction of surplus stock) the Council suggested that the Permanent Advisory Committee might be asked to examine the question.

*Opinion of the Permanent Advisory Committee on Surplus Stocks of Munitions.*

In May, 1922, the Permanent Advisory Committee reported that the solution of the question depended on the meaning to be attached to the expression "Surplus stocks of munitions". If this expression referred to munitions abandoned by retreating armies, these had been destroyed; if it referred to surplus stocks in the possession of the ex-belligerent Powers at the time of the Armistice, these stocks had been reduced by the Governments concerned to the minimum considered essential. The Committee considered that it was not the fact that there might be a surplus stock of munitions that constituted the danger, but the fact that those munitions might be distributed over all the world to persons or States not fitted to possess them. The only way to deal with this aspect of the question was to secure the ratification of the Arms Traffic Convention. Proposals concerning the eventual destruction of surplus stocks could not be put forward, since this had already been dealt with by the various countries concerned.

RESOLUTION 8: BUDGETARY LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.

"That, subject to the conditions set out in the recommendation of the first Assembly, the recommendation that Members of the League should undertake not to exceed for the next two financial years following the present year the sum total of expenditure on military, naval and air forces provided for in the budget of that year, be again forwarded to all Members of the League together with a statement showing the replies already received to this recommendation."

The Council on October 12th felt that it was premature to repeat immediately the appeal which it had made in the preceding February to the Governments asking them to state what action they found it possible to take under the resolution. On January 13th, 1922, it instructed the Secretary-General to draw the attention of the Members of the League again to the matter.

Up to the present, replies from ten countries: namely, the Governments of South Africa, Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Greece, Latvia, the Netherlands, Peru and Sweden, have been received by the Secretariat. Though few in number, these replies may be considered as more encouraging in character than those received last year.

The Secretary-General has addressed a further letter to the States from which no answer had been received.<sup>1</sup>

RESOLUTION 9: POISONOUS GASES.

"That the Temporary Mixed Commission be asked to examine — in consultation with the Permanent Advisory Committee — whether it is advisable to address an appeal to the scientific men of the world to publish their discoveries in poison gas and similar subjects, so as to minimise the likelihood of their being used in any future war."

The Council on October 12th decided to forward this resolution to the Temporary Mixed Commission and to the Permanent Advisory Committee.

*Opinion of the Temporary Mixed Commission.*

The Temporary Mixed Commission on February 20th, 1922, decided that in view of the agreements as to the use of poisonous gases which had been arrived at in Washington, the examination of the question, which was bound up with the general question of the laws of war, would best be undertaken only after full details of the agreement had been received and circulated.

During the Washington Conference a Treaty was drawn up between the United States, British Empire, France, Italy and Japan by which the signatories declared that they would conform to the prohibition already in force against the use in war of all asphyxiating and other poisonous gases and that they would invite all other civilised nations to take similar action.

- |                      |                |             |                          |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| <sup>1</sup> Albania | Cuba           | Liberia     | Portugal                 |
| Argentina            | Czechoslovakia | Lithuania   | Roumania                 |
| Australia            | Estonia        | Luxemburg   | Salvador                 |
| Bolivia              | Finland        | Nicaragua   | Serb-Croat-Slovene State |
| Brazil               | Guatemala      | Norway      | Siam                     |
| Canada               | Honduras       | New Zealand | Spain                    |
| Chile                | Haiti          | Panama      | Switzerland              |
| China                | India          | Paraguay    | Venezuela                |
| Colombia             | Italy          | Persia      |                          |
| Costa Rica           | Japan          | Poland      |                          |

RESOLUTION 10: PROPAGANDA.

“That it is desirable that propaganda in favour of the reduction of armaments, as contemplated in the Covenant, should be carried out with earnestness and conviction among all nations.”

The Council, having considered this resolution at an earlier session, decided on March 25th, 1922, that it was not the intention of the Assembly that the League of Nations itself should undertake the work of propaganda. The Council noted that no credits had been voted for the purpose. It asked the Temporary Mixed Commission simply to note the question.

RESOLUTION 11: ORGANISATION OF THE SECRETARIAT.

“In pursuance of the third resolution of the first Assembly, the Assembly is of opinion that the Secretariat should be asked to complete the organisation of the Section of the Secretariat dealing with the question of the reduction of armaments, and that this Section should have a directorship of its own, or other equivalent official organisation, quite separate from and, if necessary, in addition to, those already proposed by the Fourth Committee of the Assembly.”

Measures have been taken accordingly.

---

7

POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

---

I. UPPER SILESIA.

The question of Upper Silesia was referred to the Council of the League by a letter dated August 12th, 1921, forwarded by M. Briand on behalf of the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers. The Council of the League was invited to present a recommendation as to the line which the Principal Allied and Associated Powers should lay down as a frontier between Germany and Poland. The Supreme Council addressed this invitation to the League under Article 11 of the Covenant, which declares it to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disturb peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

The Council of the League, at a meeting held on August 29th, 1921, decided to accept the invitation, and at a further meeting held on September 1st, 1921, it resolved to entrust the preliminary study of the question to the representatives of Belgium, Brazil, China and Spain, as being States which had not so far been directly interested in the discussion of the problem. The four chosen representatives were instructed to report to the Council after a full investigation. It was understood that they could obtain such expert advice as might be necessary, as far as possible from among persons already associated with the work of the technical organisations of the League, and that they could consult representatives, both German and Polish, from the territory in dispute.

The extraordinary session of the Council which dealt with the problem of Upper Silesia partly coincided with the session of the second Assembly, and its decision, in the form of a recommendation addressed to the Supreme Council, was forwarded to the President of the Supreme Council on October 12th, 1921.

The Council considered that the solution which it should recommend must, in the first place, be in conformity with the wishes of the inhabitants as expressed by the plebiscite, and must take count, in the next place, of the geographical and economic conditions. The Council endeavoured, in determining the frontier, to find a solution which would assign to each State a number of its nationals proportionate to the total number of the votes given in its favour during the plebiscite,

and which, at the same time, would leave the smallest possible minorities on either side of the frontier. It was, however, inevitable that these minorities should be considerable, owing to the close inter-mixture of German and Polish elements throughout the whole of the plebiscite area. Moreover, the concentration of the population in the industrial region rendered a division of this zone inevitable. It was therefore necessary to separate industries which had hitherto been closely connected with each other.

The Council considered it necessary to lay down a series of measures establishing a transitional regime, in order to give opportunities for re-organising public services in this zone and for avoiding the disturbance which might result in the economic and industrial situation from the new course of the frontier, and to preserve the continuity of the economic life of the district. The Council also considered that measures must be taken to provide for the protection of minorities.

The Council, in its final recommendations, thus briefly describes the measures necessary to ensure economic and social prosperity:

“To preserve, for a certain time, for the industries of the territory separated from Germany their former markets, and to ensure the supplies of raw material and manufactured products which are indispensable to these industries; to avoid the economic disturbances which would be caused by the immediate substitution of the Polish mark for the German mark as the sole legal currency in the territory assigned to Poland; to prevent the working of the railways serving Upper Silesia from being affected by the shifting of the political frontier; to regulate the supplies of water and electricity; to maintain freedom of movement for individuals across the new frontier; to guarantee respect for private property; to guarantee, as far as possible, to the workers that they shall not lose, in the portion of territory assigned to Poland, the advantages which were secured to them by German social legislation and by their trades union organisation; and, finally, to ensure, the protection of minorities upon the basis of an equitable reciprocity.”

The Council proposed that the solution of these problems should be achieved by means of arrangements effected under the form of a general Convention between Germany and Poland. Such a Convention might be negotiated under Article 92 of the Treaty of Versailles, which stipulated that questions arising out of the cession of Upper Silesia not settled by the Treaty of Peace should be regulated by further agreements.

In order to supervise the carrying out of the transitional measures, the Council considered it necessary to appoint a commission composed of an equal number of Germans and Poles from Upper Silesia, with a chairman belonging to another nationality who might be designated by the Council itself.

The duration of the transitional period of adjustment, during which the measures laid down by the Council were to be applied, was fixed at 15 years.

The principles on which the transitional measures were to be based were set forth in the Council's recommendation in separate paragraphs, grouped under the following headings: railways, water and electric power, the monetary system, the postal services, the customs regime, coal and the products of the mines, employers' and workers' federations, social insurance, movement between the zones, and the protection of minorities.

The German laws were to remain in force in the portions of the plebiscite area assigned to Poland until Poland should have passed measures applicable to the whole of her territory.

Poland was asked to renounce for a period of fifteen years the powers granted to her under Article 92 of the Treaty of Versailles for the expropriation of industrial undertakings, mines or deposits, except where, in the opinion of the Mixed Commission, such Powers were indispensable to their continued operation.

It was proposed that any dispute between the German and Polish Governments which might occur within a period of 15 years in respect of any legislative measure adopted by either of the two countries for the control of companies and industrial or commercial enterprises should be referred by the Government concerned to the Council of the League. It was further suggested that an arbitral tribunal should be constituted to settle private disputes arising out of the application of the temporary measures.

The Council recommended that the stipulations contained in the Polish Minorities Treaty should apply to minorities living in those parts of Upper Silesia definitely recognised as part of Poland, and that the German Government should accept, at least for the transitional period of 15 years, corresponding stipulations for minorities in those parts of Upper Silesia definitely recognised as part of Germany. It was assumed that the provisions of the Germano-Polish Agreement as regards minorities should constitute matters of international concern, and be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. The Council recommended that any petition by one or more of the inhabitants of Upper Silesia should be sent to the Government in whose territory the petitioners were domiciled, which would be bound to forward it, with or without observations, to the Council of the League for consideration.

The Conference of Ambassadors at once decided to adopt these recommendations, and M. Briand, in a letter dated October 20th, 1921, informed the Council of the League of this decision.

The Conference of Ambassadors decided that there should be a conference between a German and a Polish plenipotentiary under the presidency of a person appointed by the Council of the League to conclude the proposed Convention on the lines suggested. The German and Polish Governments were requested to inform the Principal Allied Powers within eight days of the names



of the plenipotentiaries whom they desired to appoint. The two Governments were also requested to appoint within eight days their delegates for the Mixed Commission.

The German and Polish Governments announced that the following plenipotentiaries would attend the Conference appointed to draft the Convention:

*For Germany:* M. SCHIFFER.  
M. LEWALD.  
*For Poland:* M. OLSZOWSKI.

The following representatives were appointed to sit on the Mixed Commission:—

*For Germany:* M. BUNTZEL.  
M. THEUSSNER.  
*For Poland:* M. KIEDRON.  
M. GRABIANOWSKI.

The President of the Council, with the approval of his colleagues, invited M. Félix Calonder, former President of the Swiss Confederation, to preside over the Conference. M. Calonder accepted the appointment, and convened a meeting of the plenipotentiaries at Geneva on November 23rd, 1921.

The Conference held five meetings, at which it prepared and adopted rules for its subsequent proceedings. These rules provided for the appointment of eleven sub-committees, each of which was to investigate one of the special questions to be dealt with in the Convention.

With the approval of the Conference of Ambassadors, it was agreed that these sub-committees should meet in Upper Silesia in different localities of the plebiscite area. They started work on December 9th, and by the end of the year were able to report considerable progress.

M. Calonder went to Upper Silesia in January 1922, where he visited the mines and industrial establishments in the territory assigned to Poland, and attended meetings of professional organisations, engineers, tradesmen, farmers, clergy and the liberal professions. He afterwards conducted similar investigations in the territory assigned to Germany.

The work of the sub-committees was almost complete by the end of January, and the plenary Conference met again at Geneva under the presidency of M. Calonder on February 14th, 1922.

The Conference continued its work throughout February and March, and reached a final agreement on all points on April 13th, 1922.

Two points in particular were keenly disputed: namely, the liquidation of German property and interests in the territory of Upper Silesia allotted to Poland, and certain questions with regard to the protection of minorities.

M. Calonder asked the plenipotentiaries, in dealing with these questions, to choose between a procedure of mediation and the procedure of arbitration which he was entitled to exercise as neutral chairman of the Conference. The plenipotentiaries chose the method of mediation.

By March 23rd most of the outstanding questions had been settled by this procedure, but it seemed as though the President would need to exercise his arbitral powers in order to settle the question of the liquidation of property. At the last moment, however, M. Calonder, at a public sitting summoned in order to announce his decision as arbitrator, was able to state that a satisfactory conclusion had been reached, the procedure of mediation having sufficed to bring the parties to an agreement. Further meetings of the Conference were held in order to settle a number of questions in regard to the protection of minorities. These questions were all settled by mediation, and the full text of the Convention was published at Geneva on May 15th, 1922.

The Council of the League, at its meeting on May 11th, 1922, addressed to M. Calonder its sincere thanks and congratulations on his successful work in connection with these negotiations, and, in accordance with the desire expressed by the German and the Polish representatives at the Conference, appointed him on May 16th Chairman of the Mixed Commission for a period of one year.

The Council, at the same time, appointed M. Kaeckenbeeck, Chairman of the Arbitral Tribunal.

## II. THE DISPUTE BETWEEN LITHUANIA AND POLAND.

### *The Scheme for a Settlement rejected by the Parties.*

When the second Assembly met in September last, the Council was endeavouring to secure the adhesion of Poland and Lithuania to a scheme drafted by M. Hymans for a final settlement of their dispute. The Council was obliged to conclude on September 20th that it would not be possible to obtain an agreement upon this scheme between the two parties. The Council considered the scheme of M. Hymans as a fair and satisfactory basis for a settlement, and it passed a resolution to that effect. It was impossible, however, to obtain the consent of the Parties to this scheme; and on September 24th M. Hymans, on behalf of the Council, explained to the second Assembly the position of the dispute, the steps which had been taken to adjust it and the reasons why the parties had been unable to agree. The Assembly, after hearing this explanation and noting the resolution of the Council, expressed its warm appreciation of the skill and patience displayed by M. Hymans in the cause of peace. It thanked the Council for its action and assured it of the full support of the Assembly. Finally, it addressed to the two peoples a further appeal to reach an agreement, invoking their wisdom and their common memories of the past.



Full particulars of these proceedings will be found in the Report on the Work of the Council for 1921, and in the records of the second Assembly.

The Polish Government sent no reply in writing to the recommendations of the Council.

The Polish attitude to the recommendations of the Council was clearly stated by the Polish delegate to the second Assembly, who stated that the scheme of M. Hymans as approved by the Council could not be imposed in this form, *i.e.*, without the consent of the population in the disputed territory, then under the *de facto* administration instituted by the Zeligowski raid.

The attitude of the Lithuanian Government was subsequently defined in a note dated December 24th, 1921, in which it was stated that the Lithuanian Government was unable to accept the solution recommended by the Council.

These refusals appeared to close the direct negotiations between the two parties, which had been begun in the spring of 1921 under the presidency of M. Hymans.

The Council had therefore exhausted all the means at its disposal under the Covenant for a settlement of this unhappy dispute.

#### *Withdrawal of the Commission of Control.*

It now became necessary for the Council to decide what measures should be taken for a withdrawal of the Commission of Control from the territory in dispute, and what steps it might be possible to recommend, in order to avoid a renewal of hostilities. Before the Council separated in October, 1921, M. Hymans had already submitted a proposal to maintain the Commission of Control in office for a period not exceeding four months. It was decided that the President of the Commission should notify the two Governments of the date of its withdrawal. The Commission of Control was still on the spot when the Council met for its sixteenth session at Geneva in January, 1922.

On January 13th, the Council, after hearing the two parties, and noting that both the Governments had formally refused to accept the resolution of September 20th for a settlement, decided to withdraw its Military Commission of Control within one month. The Council, in taking this decision, noted with satisfaction a formal engagement undertaken on behalf of both Governments by their representatives to abstain from any act of hostility, and to maintain the peace which had been fortunately preserved during the past year owing to the intervention of the League of Nations.

#### *The question of a Neutral Zone.*

It will be remembered that the Military Commission had established two neutral zones in the disputed territory, one in the region of Suwalki, and the other in the Vilna district. It was feared that the position of the population in these neutral zones would become intolerable on the withdrawal of the Commission of Control. The existing position was extremely unsatisfactory, as the absence of any clear line of demarcation between Polish and Lithuanian territory had produced a condition of administrative anarchy.

Unfortunately, the two parties were unable to agree upon the steps to be taken. The Polish representative thought that a provisional line of demarcation should be substituted for the neutral zone without prejudicing the rights of the two parties to the territory in dispute.

The Lithuanian representative could not agree to a provisional line of demarcation. He contended that the only possible division between Poland and Lithuania was the line of demarcation fixed by the Suwalki Agreement, which should have come into force on October 10th, 1920, which attributed to Lithuania the territory of Vilna. He could not accept any line of demarcation, even if it were provisional, which ran contrary to this agreement. He desired the retention of the neutral zone, and asked the Council to appoint a High Commissioner belonging to a neutral nation to serve as intermediary between the two Governments to protect the various racial groups in the disputed territory, and generally to prevent the revival of frontier incidents within the neutral zone on the withdrawal of the Commission of Control.

The Polish representative refused to entertain the proposals of the Lithuanian representative.

The Council decided in favour of a provisional line of demarcation to be substituted for the neutral zones, and formally invited the representatives of the two Governments to accept this solution.

The Lithuanian Government persisting in its refusal to accept a provisional line of demarcation, it followed that, when the Military Commission of the League withdrew from the zone, a population of some 20,000 people remained outside both the Lithuanian and Polish systems of administration. The consequence was a constant danger of anarchy, repeated protests on either side, and reprisals which continually aggravated the situation.

The Council again considered the position on May 16th, 1922. M. Hymans on this occasion again insisted on the desirability of fixing a provisional administrative line. The Polish representative again accepted the proposal for a provisional line of demarcation. He insisted, however, that in the region of Suwalki the line already existed, being the frontier fixed by the Great Powers on December 8th, 1919 (frequently referred to as the Curzon line), whereas in the Vilna region no line of demarcation at present existed.

The Lithuanian representative again hoped that the Council would not insist on fixing a line of demarcation other than the Suwalki line, and repeated his request to the Council to take the population of the neutral zone under its protection by the appointment of a High Commissioner.

The Council on May 17th passed a resolution. It noted the refusal of the Lithuanian Government to accept a provisional line of demarcation, and in view of this refusal expressed the opinion that it was desirable from the military point of view to maintain the neutral zone throughout its entire extent. It renewed its recommendation, however, as to the urgent need of "establishing a provisional line of demarcation crossing this zone for the purpose of civil and judicial administration of the communes situated in the zone". It was further decided to send a Commission to study on the spot the line which might eventually be adopted, and to submit a report to the Council.

The Lithuanian representative was unable to accept this resolution. He regarded the tracing of a new administrative line of demarcation other than that provided for in the Suwalki Agreement as tantamount to endorsing the state of affairs created by the action of General Zeligowski. He pointed out that the Polish Government, by a decision of the Diet taken on March 24th, had annexed the disputed territory, and was now taking in hand its administration. He thought that the only possible solution was for the League to take the population of the neutral zone under its protection until Poland carried out the Suwalki Agreement, or until the Eastern frontiers of Poland had definitely been traced by the Allied Powers. He refused to accept the proposal of the Council to send a Commission to study the line which might eventually be adopted.

#### *•The Political Position in the Disputed Territory.*

General Zeligowski retired, and left the territory of Vilna in November 1921. The troops of General Zeligowski, however, were not withdrawn, and the military occupation which he had instituted was still maintained. General Zeligowski had left behind a provisional Governing Commission, which, under a decree signed by General Zeligowski, was instructed to arrange for elections in the Vilna area to enable the population to express its wishes. These elections took place on January 8th.

It should be remembered that the Polish Government had undertaken not to allow elections to be held at Vilna as long as the direct negotiations between the two Governments begun in the spring of 1921 continued, except with the approval of M. Hymans. On December 14th, the Lithuanian Government strongly protested against the preparation of these elections and stated that it would regard them as null and void.

The Council noted this protest of the Lithuanian Government on January 13th, 1922, and stated that it could not recognise any solution of the dispute submitted to the League by one of its Members which might be reached without regard to the recommendation of the Council or without the consent of both parties. By a decree of the Diet of Warsaw dated March 24th, the disputed territory was annexed to Poland as a result of the elections.

#### *The Treatment of Minorities and the Proposal for a General Amnesty.*

The Council has throughout these proceedings received continual protests from either side in regard to the alleged suppression of minorities and arbitrary acts of violence.

The Lithuanians complained continuously of the Polish Administration in Vilna, asking the Council to protect the Lithuanians, White Russians and Jews resident in this territory. The Polish Government complained of the treatment of the Polish minority in Lithuania, and particularly of the sanitary condition of a prison in Kovno where persons belonging to that minority were detained after being tried for conspiracy, and where typhus was reported to have carried off victims. The Council, in its resolution of January 13th, pointed out that Poland was bound by the obligations imposed on it by the Treaty of Versailles, and that Lithuania had undertaken, by her declaration of September 14th, 1921, on her admission to the League, to apply the general principles contained in the Treaties for the protection of ethnical and religious minorities. The Council, in its resolution, expressed its conviction that both parties would consent to its sending representatives on the spot, should it see fit to do so, to secure the necessary information for a report to the Council on the subject.

Circumstances soon compelled the Council to make use of the right thus reserved. On January 26th the Lithuanian Government complained of the arrest of certain leading Lithuanians and White Russians by the Provisional Governing Commission immediately after the Vilna election. M. Hymans, acting President of the Council, ordered an immediate enquiry, which was entrusted to the members of the Military Commission of Control then about to depart from the disputed territory. Thanks to the intervention of the Commission, and with the assistance of the Polish Government, most of the arrested persons were released, but they were expelled from the territory in which they had been domiciled. Despite new protests and fresh correspondence on the subject, the orders of expulsion were not revoked.

The question of the prisoners at Kovno was also the subject of a report of the Commission of Control before its return, and the acting President of the Council also intervened in their favour. The Lithuanian Government, in a letter dated March 20th, stated that the typhus epidemic had ceased and that it was doing everything it could to better the health conditions in which the political prisoners were living.

During its session in May, the Council again took up the question of the treatment of minorities. M. Hymans said that the Council would scarcely be able to give an opinion on the special cases brought to the notice of the League nearly every week by one or other of the two parties. He expressed the hope that the two Governments would understand that it was to their common

interest to put an end to a policy of reprisals by means of a general amnesty. On May 18th, the Council therefore adopted the following resolution:

“The Council requests both Governments, in the interests of peace, to undertake to annul by an act of clemency the effects of legal proceedings in Lithuania, in Poland or in the territory in dispute against all persons detained or expelled for political reasons who have not been charged with offences against common law.”

Although the representatives of the two Governments welcomed this recommendation, up to June 15th it had not been put into execution.

#### *The Establishment of Diplomatic and Consular Relations.*

The Council has endeavoured to secure the resumption of diplomatic and consular intercourse between the two Governments. In a resolution adopted on January 13th, it advised the two Governments, if unable to come to an understanding for the reciprocal establishment of diplomatic and consular relations, to confide their respective interests to friendly Powers.

### III. ALBANIA.

#### *Recommendations of the Second Assembly.*

The Assembly had last year to consider an appeal addressed to it by Albania against the Serb-Croat-Slovene State. It was stated by Albania that troops of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State had violated the Albanian frontier and committed acts of war within Albanian territory. The Assembly, in considering this appeal, noted similar charges brought by the Serb-Croat-Slovene State against certain tribes and individuals in Albania, and was confronted with further statements to the effect that there was serious unrest in Southern Albania and Northern Epirus.

At that time the frontiers of Albania had not yet been fixed by the Conference of Ambassadors, but it was understood that an agreement on the subject had very nearly been reached.

The Assembly, in these circumstances, advised Albania to accept the forthcoming decision of the Conference of Ambassadors, and requested the Council to appoint a Commission of three impartial persons to proceed immediately to Albania, and to report fully on the execution of the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors and on any disturbances which might occur on or near the frontiers.

#### *Appointment of the Commission of Enquiry.*

The Commission of Enquiry was appointed by the Council on October 6th 1921. It consisted of the following members:—

Major Jens Christian MEINICH.

Colonel Charles SCHAEFER.

M. Rolf THESLEFF (later replaced for reasons of health by Professor J. J. SEDERHOLM).

M. H. de POURTALES (Secretary).

The Secretary-General issued instructions to the Commission on November 10th, 1921, based on the recommendations of the Assembly and the Council.

It was directed to take no action with regard to the frontier enquiry until the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors had been given, but to send periodical reports to the Secretary-General on its work and on any events of importance which might occur.

#### *Special Session of the Council (November 16th to November 19th 1921).*

Meanwhile, disquieting reports as to the situation in Northern Albania were received, and the accounts given in the Press caused much anxiety. Serbian forces were said to be advancing into Albania, and it was reported in the Belgrade papers that Serbian troops had occupied Arras and were near Tirana.

The British Government decided that the position was sufficiently serious to call for a special session of the Council. Under Article 11 of the Covenant it is the friendly right of each Member of the League, to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever respecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace, or the good understanding between nations, upon which peace depends.

The British Prime Minister accordingly requested the Secretary-General to take immediate steps to bring the Council together in order to “consider the situation, and to agree upon measures to be taken under Article 16 in the event of the Serb-Croat-Slovene Government refusing or delaying to execute their obligations under the Covenant.”

The Council met on November 16th, and decided that the interested parties should be heard in public.

The British representative, Mr. Fisher, reminded the Council that, as far back as April 29th, 1921, the Albanians had appealed against acts of war committed by Serbians within the frontier

zone, and that since that time the position had grown continually more critical. He drew particular attention to the proceedings of Marca Gjoni in the summer of 1921. Marca Gjoni was a local Mirdite chieftain who had been in rebellion against the Government of Tirana. His campaign in July of 1921 had been conducted from Prizrend on Serbian territory, and in August there had been raids into Albania from Serbian territory led by Serbian officers. These events were followed in September and October by an advance of Serbian regular troops into Albania as far as Oroshi and Lurya, and by a Serbian ultimatum. Mr. Fisher continued:

“The British Government infers from the facts of which it has been placed in possession that a plan is on foot for detaching the north of Albania.... from the Tirana Government by encouraging certain disaffected members of the Mirdite tribes to revolt against the Government of Tirana and to proclaim themselves an independent republic.”

The session of the Council in November coincided with the decision taken by the Conference of Ambassadors in regard to the frontiers of Albania. This decision was announced to the Council of the League in a letter from M. Jules Cambon dated November 18th.

The Conference of Ambassadors had decided to constitute a demarcation zone, to be freed from all Albanian and Serb-Croat-Slovene troops until the frontier had been traced on the spot. The demarcation zone was described topographically, but the interested Governments were assured that this description in no way prejudiced the details of the final frontiers, as they would be fixed on the spot by a Delimitation Commission appointed for the purpose. The Serb-Croat-Slovene Government were requested to withdraw their troops from the demarcation zone before December 10th. The Conference of Ambassadors asked that the Commission of Enquiry appointed by the League might notify the Delimitation Commission of any difficulties arising between the parties in regard to the demarcation zone.

The decision of the Conference of Ambassadors was on the point of being accepted by the Serb-Croat-Slovene Government as well as by the Government of Tirana when the Council met.

The Council, after hearing statements by the representatives of Albania and of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, found, in regard to the events which had taken place, that it was confronted with contradictory declarations. It felt that its chief concern was with the future relations between the two countries, and that past events should, as far as possible, be forgotten. The position was, in any case, greatly simplified by the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors. Many of the incidents which had occurred within the zone of demarcation had been due to the absence of a fixed and agreed frontier between the two countries. The Conference of Ambassadors was sending out a Delimitation Commission which would determine the frontiers on the spot, and thus remove one of the principal causes of misunderstanding.

The position was further simplified by assurances given to the Council by M. Boskovitch, the representative of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State. He said that his Government would accept the frontiers defined by the Conference of Ambassadors and would withdraw its troops from the Albanian State. He further declared that the Serbian Government would recognise the Albanian State as so constituted, and do everything to promote good relations with it.

The Council, noting these declarations, decided, by a resolution adopted on November 19th, 1921, to ask the Commission of Enquiry to carry out the following instructions:

“(1) The Commission shall keep the Council informed of the retirement of both the Serb-Croat-Slovene and Albanian troops from the provisional zone of demarcation provided for in the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors of November 18th, 1921; it shall keep in touch with the Delimitation Commission whenever necessary and shall place itself at the disposal of the local authorities to assist in carrying out the evacuation so as to avoid incidents.

“(2) The Commission shall satisfy itself that no outside assistance is given in support of a local movement which might disturb internal peace in Albania. The Commission shall examine and submit to the Council measures to end the present disturbances and to prevent their recurrence...”

#### *Preliminary Reports of the Commission of Enquiry.*

The Commission arrived at Durazzo on November 19th, 1921, and proceeded to Tirana, where it received an enthusiastic reception from the population. It was greatly impressed by the great moral authority and prestige enjoyed by the League in Albania. The opinion was everywhere expressed that Albania owed to the League its present independence and political existence, and there was a general desire that the League should continue to assist and advise Albania, not only in political but in economic questions. On November 27th the Commission left for Scutari. It wished to enquire into the recent Mirdite rebellion and to investigate reports to the effect that Serbian troops were within Albanian territory at Tarabosh.

The report of the Commission on the Mirdite rebellion throws considerable light on the difficulties with which Albania is confronted. Marca Gjoni, the leader of the rebellion, had hoped to establish himself as chief of an independent State of Mirdita. He had undoubtedly relied upon assistance from abroad. His headquarters, while preparing his enterprise, were at Prizrend, on Serbian territory, and in organising the rebellion he had distributed large sums of money to local chiefs. He had thus enlisted some 1,300 adherents, and had secured artillery and machine guns and ammunition. He had had several armed encounters with the forces of the Government of

Tirana in the summer of 1921; but the movement collapsed towards the middle of November, when the Serbian troops began to evacuate the country.

The Commission saw several chiefs of the Mirdite clans. They completely disavowed the policy of Marca Gjoni, and said that they were firm in their allegiance to the central Government. It was clear to the Commission that there had never been any question of an independent government under Marca Gjoni, and that the whole movement had been largely factitious. In this connection, the Commission remarks that among the population, which numbers about 18,000, there were only three men who could read and write, and that Marca Gjoni was not one of them.

The Commission afterwards rode through the zone of demarcation as far as Dibra. It reported that the evacuation was carried out everywhere in good order and without disturbance. This also was the case in the districts of Scutari and Tarabosh.

The preliminary reports of the Commission of Enquiry were presented to the Council in January, 1922. The Commission made in them a number of practical suggestions for the carrying out of its work, which were accepted by the Council on January 12th, 1922. The Council requested the Commission, after its work was completed and its inspection of the demarcation zone finished, to meet the Delimitation Commission at Scutari and, after a consultation with that body, to report whether it was desirable or necessary to remain in Albania.

#### *General Report of the Commission.*

The Commission, in its general report dated April 19th, 1922, describes its activities in detail, and gives an interesting account of the political, social and economic position of Albania.

The Commission is convinced that there exists both on the Serbian and the Albanian side a real desire to respect the demarcation zone. If, as a result of mistakes or negligence, certain insignificant infringements of the zone have taken place, these were immediately adjusted at the request of the Commission. It was agreed, when the Commission met the Delimitation Commission at Scutari, that the latter should deal with any difficulties which might arise in the demarcation zone.

The Commission, while at Koritza in January, investigated the position on the Greco-Albanian frontier. It found that there was a genuine uncertainty as to the frontier laid down by the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors, between Albania and Greece. The Commission accordingly proposed to establish on this frontier a neutral zone analogous to that already existing on the Serb-Croat-Slovene frontier. This proposal was afterwards accepted by the Conference of Ambassadors.

The Commission testifies that at Koritza there is a complete absence of Greek nationals. A certain proportion of the population (less than one-third) is opposed to the present regime. This proportion includes a number of warm adherents of Greek culture, who fear that the creation of an Albanian autonomous church, as desired by the Albanian nationalists, may cause a rupture with the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The Commission records its firm conviction that an Albanian nation not only exists but that its existence is a political necessity. The Albanians are a nationality distinct in race, customs and language, and the national feeling is sufficiently strong to reconcile diversities in religion. The clergy of the three religions — Catholic, Orthodox, and Mahomedan — have been known to visit together both the mosque and the Christian churches to celebrate solemn services. The Commission considers that any attempt to stifle Albanian nationalism would not only be destined to failure but would have disastrous consequences for the peace of the Balkans.

The country has the material resources necessary for an independent economic existence, but it is admitted by the Commission that its social and political organisations are at present embryonic. Northern and Eastern Albania are peopled by tribes of an independent and headstrong temperament, whose social organisation is similar to that of the Scottish Highlands in the Middle Ages. Political struggles are almost personal rivalries, which often become armed conflicts. In such circumstances it is not difficult for an intriguing party to create disorder, and the importance of such disturbances has often been misrepresented by foreign propaganda. The Commission instances the Mirdite rebellion in the summer of 1921.

The Commission deals at length with the political events which have happened in Albania since the second Assembly. It notes in particular the overthrow by Hassan Bey Prishtina of Pandeli Evangheli's Government in December 1921. The policy of Hassan Bey was hostile to Serbia. He was immediately dispossessed by Achmed Bey, whose influence is at present predominant. Achmed Bey has no irredentist ambition with regard to the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, and since his accession to power there has been a desire for closer relations between the two countries. There have been attempts to overthrow Achmed Bey on the part of certain chieftains, but these attempts have been suppressed, not always without bloodshed.

In the various attempts to alter the composition of the Government, rumours have been current that one party or another is subsidised by foreign money. It is difficult to prove the truth of these allegations, but it seems certain that these movements can hardly be carried out with the always limited resources existing within the country. Further, remembering the instability and uncertainty which constantly reigned in this country until its recognition by the Great Powers, it is not surprising that all should have tried to advance their own interests and to oppose by every possible means those of their adversaries.

It is also clear that these foreign influences will tend to diminish as conditions in Albania become more stable. In several quarters friendly and disinterested declarations have recently been made.



The Serb-Croat-Slovene Government has recognised the Albanian State *de jure*, and has appointed a representative at Tirana.

The Commission expresses the view that relations between Greece and Albania will always be difficult, so long as Greece refuses to recognise the frontiers laid down by the Conference of Ambassadors and continues to dispute the rights of Albania over Northern Epirus. The Commission finds that the great majority of the population of this region is in favour of the present regime and plays an important part in the Albanian nationalist movement. Greek schools for the Greek-speaking minority have been established and subsidised by the Albanian Government.

The Commission draws the attention of the Council to difficulties which still call for settlement in regard to the Greek frontier. The Conference of Ambassadors, acting on the advice of the Commission of Enquiry, established a neutral zone on this frontier at the beginning of April, and instructed the Delimitation Commission to include the zone in its programme. The major part of the Greco-Albanian frontier was settled in 1913 and the Conference of Ambassadors has decided that it should not be altered. The neutral zone established is on a small part only east of Koritza which was not definitely traced on the ground in 1913. The exact limits of the ancient Kasa of Koritza are a matter for deliberation by the Commission of Delimitation appointed by the Conference of Ambassadors. The Albanians complain that certain villages, stated to lie within the zone, remain in the occupation of the Greek authorities and that irregular bands have been formed to influence and intimidate the Albanian population.

The Commission, in its general report, asks the Council to draw the attention of the Conference of Ambassadors to this situation.

It is the intention of the present Government to summon a national constituent assembly which will decide whether Albania is to be a monarchy or a republic and will draft a constitution. The Commission fears that during the period of constitutional experiment difficulties may arise involving a risk of complications abroad. The Commission believes, and in this it is supported by the Albanian Government, that during this period it would be well to maintain some organisation in the country for the purpose of observation, and points out in this connection that it has already, when it was present in Tirana, helped the Government to overcome serious internal difficulties without resorting to methods which might estrange public opinion in more settled countries.

The Commission has been asked by the Albanian Government whether it would be possible for the League to assist Albania by appointing expert advisers to suggest the reforms required for the better administration and economic development of the country. The Albanian Government intends to devote all its efforts to pacification and reform. It proposes to carry out a disarmament of the population, to strengthen the educational system, to enforce monogamy, and to replace the Turkish legal system by a more modern system of jurisprudence. For this purpose it requires assistance and advice, as there are few in Albania whose knowledge of the technical questions of administration suit them for carrying out a constructive policy. The financial resources of the country, moreover, are extremely limited, and would not suffice without foreign capital for a development of the economic resources of the country.

The Commission hopes that the League may be able to nominate impartial experts to investigate the financial and economic position of the country, and to advise the Government as to the reforms most needed to secure the participation of foreign capital. It also suggests that the League might help Albania by selecting specialists in various branches of administration to act as advisers in carrying out the necessary reforms.

#### *Further Action taken by the Council.*

The Council, during its session in May 1922, noted the reports and recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry.

Lord Balfour, reviewing the position, made the following statement in regard to the part played by the League:

“The peaceful settlement of the question was very largely due to the machinery of the League of Nations, and to the fact that, in accordance with the Covenant, the Council invited representatives of the two States immediately concerned to sit as members at its meetings, and dealt with the question in a spirit of the most friendly co-operation. Both Albania and the Kingdom of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State enthusiastically assisted the Council in its work of pacification. All the Serbian troops were withdrawn from the frontier zone in dispute, and the League of Nations Commission of Enquiry was able to report to the Council that there was once more a condition of tranquillity in Albanian territory. There was no doubt that there was no statesman, nation, organisation or machinery in the world which could have done what the League of Nations had done in this matter. The reasons of its success lay in the fact that Albania and her neighbours and all others concerned had been convinced that the League of Nations, its Assembly, its Council, and its Commission of Enquiry were working for wholly unselfish ends. The advice of the Commission had been taken because the Commission represented the League of Nations. The League, as well as Albania and her neighbours, should be congratulated.”

M Mehdi Bey Frasheri, at this meeting of the Council, begged the League of Nations to assist Albania in the work of reconstruction by appointing experts.

The Council decided:

- (1) To retain one member and one secretary of the Commission of Enquiry in Albania for the time being;
- (2) To communicate the request of the Albanian Government for economic assistance to the Economic and Financial Committee, and to request the Economic and Financial Committee to send experts to Albania to report on the measures necessary to encourage the investment of foreign capital in Albania.
- (3) To request the Financial Committee to propose a list of candidates for the post of financial adviser to the Albanian Government.
- (4) To draw the attention of the Conference of Ambassadors to the situation on the Greco-Albanian frontier, expressing the hope that a rapid solution of the question would be reached.

Professor SEDERHOLM (Finland) accepted the mission of returning to Albania as the member of the Commission of Enquiry, and Count Frederik MOLTKE (Denmark) accepted the post of Secretary of the Commission.

The Financial Committee considered the resolution of the Council at its meeting on June 9th and decided, as a preliminary measure, to send an expert in financial and economic matters to Albania for a period of some two months to make, after consultation with the Albanian Government, a report on the conditions under which the appointment of a Financial Adviser to the Albanian Government could most usefully be realised. This expert will suggest to the Financial Committee the sending of experts on particular subjects for the purpose of making reports, should he consider this course desirable.

#### IV. NEUTRALISATION OF THE AALAND ISLANDS.

The Council, as a corollary to its settlement of the question of the Aaland Islands, recommended, on June 24th, 1921, that an agreement for the non-fortification and neutralisation of the Islands should be concluded, so as to guarantee to all the countries concerned that the Islands would never become a source of danger from the military point of view. The Council suggested that an agreement, drawn up with this object, should be placed under the guarantee of all the Powers concerned, including Sweden.

The Secretary-General was instructed to ask the Governments concerned to appoint representatives to discuss and conclude the agreement at a special Conference.

The Conference met at Geneva, and a Convention was drawn up and signed in that city on October 20th, 1921, by all the participating Powers. These Powers comprised the Baltic States interested owing to their geographical position, and the signatories of the Convention of 1856 which had hitherto regulated the status of the Islands. The following States were included:—

Denmark	Germany	Latvia
Esthonia	Great Britain	Poland
Finland	Italy	Sweden
France		

The Convention sets out fully the limits of the zone of the Islands, and defines the territorial waters as extending over three marine miles below watermark. Finland engages not to fortify the Islands, nor to set up or maintain any base for warlike operations. Provisions are inserted limiting the number and size of the warships of Finland and other Powers which may anchor in the Islands in time of peace. Freedom of passage for warships through territorial waters is permitted in accordance with international custom. In time of war the zone is to be treated as neutral, power being reserved to Finland to lay mines in order to protect the neutrality of the Islands in the case of a war affecting the Baltic.

This was the first European agreement to be concluded under the direct auspices of the League of Nations, which thus succeeded in finding a satisfactory solution for a question of great difficulty and complication.

The important part played by the League is recognised in certain provisions of the Convention. The Contracting Parties undertake to invite the Council of the League to decide the measures to be taken, when necessary, in order to enforce the execution of the Convention and to execute a unanimous recommendation of the Council in the event of the violation of the neutrality of the Islands. If unanimity within the Council cannot be obtained, any one of the Contracting States will be authorised to take such measures as may be recommended by a majority of two-thirds of the Council.

The Council noted this Convention on January 11th, 1922, and decided to accept the obligations defined in the Convention, subject to its ratification by the signatory Powers.

The first deposit of ratifications of the Convention took place at Geneva on April 6th, 1922. The representatives of Germany, Great Britain, Finland, France and Sweden deposited ratifications in the name of their Governments. On that date the Convention was also registered in

conformity with Article 18 of the Covenant, and a certificate of registration was sent to the signatory Governments Members of the League of Nations.

On May 11th, 1922, the Marquis Imperiali deposited the instrument of ratification in the name of the Italian Government and on June 29th the instrument of ratification was deposited with the Secretariat on behalf of the Polish Government.

## V. ARMENIA.

On October 2nd, 1921, the President of the Council addressed to the Principal Allied Powers the following letter:

"I have the honour to inform you that at its session of the September 21st, the Assembly of the League of Nations unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Seeing that the first Assembly, on November 18th, 1920, entrusted the Council with the duty of safeguarding the future of Armenia;

"And that the Council, on February 25th, 1921, while holding that the situation in Asia Minor made action for the time being impossible, entrusted the Secretary-General with the duty of watching developments in Armenian affairs with a view to procuring subsequent decisions by the Council;

"And that in the meantime the Supreme Council, in the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres, proposed to make provision for a National Home for the Armenians;

"Seeing, further, the probable imminence of a Peace Treaty between Turkey and the Allied Powers at no distant date:

"The Assembly urges the Council to press upon the Supreme Council of the Allies the necessity of making provisions in this Treaty for safeguarding the future of Armenia, and in particular of providing the Armenians with a National Home entirely independent of Turkish rule.

"The Council of the League considered this resolution at its meeting on October 2nd, and decided to associate itself with the views expressed by the Assembly.

"The Council has therefore requested me to urge upon you the importance of this matter, and to express the hope that at the appropriate moment the Principal Allied Powers will make provision for safeguarding the future of Armenia, and in particular for providing the Armenians with a National Home entirely independent of Turkish rule."

At the meeting on November 19th, 1921, the Secretary-General drew the attention of the Council to a letter from the Armenian United Delegations in which they expressed their gratitude for the resolution of the Assembly, and urged the Council "to make every effort to ensure that the Allied Governments should, at the earliest possible moment, take the necessary steps to carry into effect" this resolution.

The Council decided to communicate this letter to the Principal Allied Powers.

At its session in January 1922, the attention of the Council was also drawn by the Belgian Government to the appeals addressed to that Government by the International Philarmenian Union, the Belgian Philarmenian Committee, as well as by the Catholic and Protestant communities of Constantine, requesting that provision should be made for the protection of the Armenian populations in the province of Cilicia, which had been evacuated by the French troops in pursuance of the Angora Agreement. In presenting his report to the Council, M. Hymans observed with satisfaction that the fears expressed by the Armenians had proved to be unfounded, thanks largely to the measures taken by the French Government, of which M. Hanotaux then gave an account to the Council. By the Angora Agreement, the French Government had obtained from the Nationalist Turks the promise of a number of guarantees similar to those which the Allies had considered essential for the safeguard and welfare of racial and religious minorities in the regions of Eastern Europe where problems of the same kind arise. The French Government had, by maintaining a special mission on the spot, ensured the carrying out of these promises with regard to the protection of life and property in Cilicia. Further, Armenian refugees had been admitted into the territories of Syria and the Lebanon, and a credit of 50 million francs had been granted to the High Commissioner in Syria in order to give assistance to these refugees and to help them to find work.

The Council took note of the declarations of the French representative and adopted the following resolution:

"The Council of the League of Nations:

"In view of the fact that the sufferings of the Armenian nation have been aggravated and protracted by events which have unhappily delayed the definite restoration of peace in the East;

"In the hope that the negotiations which have now been opened between the Principal Allied Powers will enable outstanding questions to be settled in a satisfactory manner, and will lead to the restoration of peaceful conditions in regions which have so long been ravaged by war, and where acts of violence, from which the Armenian populations have particularly suffered, have continually occurred:



“Reminds the Principal Allied Powers of the resolution adopted by the Assembly on September 21st, 1921, in which their representatives took part, concerning the safeguarding of the future of the Armenian people;

“Notes with satisfaction the statements of the French representative pointing out the measures adopted by the French Government to protect the Armenian populations;

“Draws the attention of the Principal Allied Powers to the urgent need for taking all steps to ensure the protection of minorities in the Ottoman Empire, and states its willingness to co-operate in any measures which may be decided upon to attain this object.”

## VI. STATUS OF EASTERN GALICIA.

On October 2nd, 1921, the Council considered the following resolution, which had been adopted by the Assembly on September 27th:

“The Assembly of the League of Nations expresses the wish that the Council of the League draw the attention of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to the desirability of determining, at an early date, the status of Eastern Galicia.”

The President of the Council transmitted this resolution to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

## VIII. EASTERN CARELIA.

The Government of Finland, having brought to the notice of the Council at the end of November 1921, the violent measures taken by the Soviet Government in Eastern Carelia, in spite of the autonomy previously recognised for this province, and having asked for the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry, the Council considered this question at its sixteenth Session (January 1922). On January 12th, the Council heard a statement on the question by M. Enckell, representative of Finland, a statement by M. Pusta on behalf of the Esthonian Government in support of the Finnish Government's request, and a communication from M. Askenazy, representative of Poland, stating that his Government had already offered its good offices to both parties. The Council also took note of a memorandum from the Latvian Delegation, expressing a desire on the part of its Government to contribute to a peaceful solution of the dispute.

On January 14th, after a letter had been read in which the Lithuanian Government declared that it associated itself with the appeal of the Finnish Government, the Council adopted the following resolution:

“The Council of the League of Nations, having heard the statement submitted by the Finnish Delegation on the situation in Eastern Carelia contained in a letter from the Finnish Government dated November 26th, 1921, and the statements submitted by the Esthonian, Latvian, Polish and Lithuanian representatives, is willing to consider the question with a view to arriving at a satisfactory solution if the two parties concerned agree. The Council is of opinion that one of the interested States Members of the League, which is in diplomatic relations with the Government of Moscow, might ascertain that Government's intentions in that respect.

“The Council could not but feel satisfaction if one of these States could lend its good offices as between the two parties in order to assist in the solution of this question, in accordance with the high ideals of conciliation and humanity which animate the League of Nations.

“The Secretary-General is instructed to obtain all necessary information for the Council.”

The Council has not received any official information regarding the result of the steps taken in pursuance of the desire expressed in its resolution.

---

8

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

---

THE TERRITORY OF THE SAAR BASIN.

I. GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY.

A. THE GENERAL SITUATION.

The complexity and importance of the questions concerning the Saar Territory already appear from the survey contained in the report on the work of the Council to the second Assembly. Since that time different questions relating to the Saar problem have been brought before the Council, and many interesting reports from the Governing Commission, as well as petitions from the inhabitants of that Territory, have been communicated through the Secretariat to the Members of the League. Certain of the questions dealt with will be mentioned below, but it seems advisable in this report to begin with a general survey of the position as stated in a report adopted by the Council on March 26th 1922, on the occasion of the issuing of a Decree by the Governing Commission of the Saar Basin creating certain representative bodies in order to secure effective collaboration between the inhabitants of the Saar and the Governing Commission in the administration of that Territory.

The report of March 26th recalls certain facts regarding the status of the Saar Basin— facts with which the Council of the League of Nations is already well acquainted, but which are not perhaps sufficiently well known to the public who are interested in the problem. The report reads as follows:

“The reply of the Allied and Associated Powers to the observations of the German Delegation on the conditions of peace includes, with regard to the Saar Basin, certain comments which are of fundamental interest in order to understand the situation created in that Territory by the Peace Treaty. Amongst other things, the reply states:

“‘It is true that the Governing Commission, with which the final control rests, will not be directly responsible to a Parliamentary Assembly, but it will be responsible to the League of Nations and not to the French Government. The arrangement made will afford an ample guarantee against the misuse of the power which is entrusted to it; but, in addition, the Governing Commission is required to take the advice of the elected representatives of the district before any change in the laws can be made or any new tax imposed. The people will live under a Government resident on the spot which will have no occupation and no interest except their welfare.’

“The provisions of the Peace Treaty are in every respect in conformity with those principles.

“Article 49 of the Treaty of Peace of Versailles lays down that Germany renounces in favour of the League of Nations, in the capacity of trustee, the government of the Saar Basin Territory. At the end of fifteen years from the coming into force of the Treaty, the inhabitants of the said Territory shall be called upon to indicate the sovereignty under which they desire to be placed. The steps taken with the object of ensuring the government of the Territory for a period of fifteen years are included in Chapter II of the Annex to Section IV, Part III, of the Peace Treaty.

“In accordance with the provisions of the Annex, the Government of the Saar Basin Territory is entrusted to a Commission representing the League of Nations. This Commission consists of five members chosen by the Council of the League of Nations, and includes one citizen of France, one native inhabitant of the Saar Basin not a citizen of France, and three members belonging to three countries other than France or Germany. The members of the Commission are appointed for one year and may be re-appointed. They can be removed by the Council of the League of Nations, which will provide for their replacement. The Governing Commission possesses within the Territory of the Saar all the powers of government hitherto belonging to the German Empire, Prussia or Bavaria, including the appointment and dismissal of officials and the creation of such administrative and representative bodies as it may deem necessary. Its decisions are taken by a majority.

“The special situation arising in the Saar Territory owing to the fact that its final position is to be decided by a plebiscite and that in the meanwhile certain very important economic rights

have been given to France, made it necessary that the Governing Commission should be entrusted by the Treaty itself with rights which exceed the ordinary rights of a constitutional government. The Governing Commission has, for instance, the right to alter the laws and regulations in force and to impose new taxes. It is true that the Commission is obliged to consult the elected representatives of the population in these matters; but it is also true that the Commission is not responsible to the elected representatives, but only to the Council of the League of Nations. Moreover, the Governing Commission has established a superior civil and criminal court for the Saar Basin. This court renders justice in the name of the Governing Commission. Reference might also be made to Article 33 of the Annex, which lays down that the Governing Commission shall have power to decide all questions arising from the interpretation of the preceding provisions, and that France and Germany agree that any dispute involving a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of the said provisions shall in the same way be submitted to the Governing Commission, and the decision of a majority of the Commission shall be binding on both countries.

“With regard to consultation of the population by the Governing Commission concerning legislation and taxation, the provisions of the Treaty are as follows:

“In Article 28 of the Annex it is laid down that, under the control of the Governing Commission, the inhabitants will retain their local Assemblies. The right of voting will belong to every inhabitant over the age of twenty years, without distinction of sex.

“Article 23 of the Annex lays down that the laws and regulations in force on November 11th, 1918, in the Territory of the Saar Basin (except those enacted in consequence of the state of war) shall continue to apply. If, for general reasons or to bring these laws and regulations into accord with the provisions of the present Treaty, it is necessary to introduce modifications, these shall be decided on and put into effect by the Governing Commission, after consultation with the elected representatives of the inhabitants in such a manner as the Commission may determine.

“Article 26 reads as follows:

“The Governing Commission will alone have the power of levying taxes and dues in the Territory of the Saar Basin. These taxes and dues will be exclusively applied to the needs of the Territory. The fiscal system existing on November 11th, 1918, will be maintained as far as possible, and no new tax except customs duties may be imposed without previously consulting the elected representatives of the inhabitants.’

“Consultation with the elected representatives of the inhabitants as regards changes in existing legislation and the introduction of new taxes, as stipulated by Articles 23 and 26 of the Annex to the Peace Treaty, has up to the present been carried out in the form of a consultation with the councils of the circles and districts. This method of consultation has not, however, shown itself suitable, and the Governing Commission, by its decree of March 24th, 1922, decided to establish an Advisory Council composed of thirty representatives elected by all the inhabitants of the Saar Basin and meeting as one assembly at the seat of the Governing Commission. The provisions regarding the constitution of this assembly are included in Articles 1-10 of the Decree of March 24th, 1922. The assembly will have the duties of an advisory council, giving its opinion to the Governing Commission on all proposals which, in virtue of Articles 23 and 26 of the Annex to the Peace Treaty regarding the Saar Territory, should be submitted to the elected representatives of the inhabitants.

“The Council will be composed of members elected by equal direct and secret universal suffrage by the method of *scrutin de liste* in accordance with the principle of proportional representation. The electors of the Territory are to form a single electoral body. The Council will meet at least once every three months. The right to vote is granted to all persons without distinction of sex who have the status of inhabitant of the Saar, and who are more than twenty years old on the day of voting. Persons of twenty-five years of age who are native inhabitants of the Territory and do not fill any elective or public post outside the Saar Basin are eligible without distinction of sex. The members of the Advisory Council will receive remuneration for their work.

“Without entering upon a detailed examination of the value of each of these provisions, I would draw attention to the liberal spirit in which they have been drawn up. I have no doubt that my colleagues on the Council of the League of Nations will join with me in congratulating the Governing Commission on its adoption of these principles for its collaboration with the population of the Saar Basin.

“I believe, however, that it is my duty to draw the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to the serious effects which the establishment of the Saar Advisory Council might have as regards the task which the League has undertaken in accepting the responsibility for the government of the Saar Basin. In accepting this task, the League has undertaken to maintain intact the entire authority which was reserved to the Governing Commission by the Peace Treaty. The League of Nations could not allow the Governing Commission in any way to deprive itself of its powers. It is the duty of the League to see that the Governing Commission is always in a position to carry out the duties in accordance with the Treaty. The Governing Commission could not be permitted, therefore, to set up, in contradiction to the Treaty, a Saar parliament to which the Commission would be responsible and which could prevent the Commission appointed by the Council of the League from carrying out its duties.

“This aspect of the question was taken into account in the decree by which the Advisory Council was established. The decree, in fact, lays down that the Advisory Council can only discuss matters submitted to it in virtue of Articles 23 and 26 of the Annex to the Treaty regarding the Saar Territory, that is to say, the modification of existing laws and the introduction of new taxes.

"Although the Advisory Council has not the right to vote the budget, I think that one of the happiest consequences of the decree will be that the elected representatives of the population will be acquainted with the Saar budget, which is not at present the case. The population will thus be able to appreciate the reasons for the taxes which it is called upon to pay, and the representatives will be able to decide upon the advice which they will tender in connection with the taxes proposed.

"Moreover, the decree lays down explicitly that any discussion upon a question which the Advisory Council has not been requested to discuss in the course of its session is null and void. The decree also stipulates that all discussions, motions or resolutions tending either directly or indirectly to affect the legal situation created in the Saar Territory by the Treaty of Versailles or by subsequent decrees of the Governing Commission shall be null and void.

"It is clear, then, that, although the Governing Commission cannot allow the curtailment of its powers which would be occasioned by the establishment of a parliament; it has, nevertheless, clearly shown its desire to establish direct collaboration between itself and the population.

"In order to secure this collaboration more completely on the technical side, the Commission has proposed that in addition to the Advisory Council a second body should be established differing in a marked manner from the former both as regards its method of appointment and its powers. This body, known as the 'Technical Committee', will include a certain number of individuals over thirty years of age, native inhabitants of the Saar Basin and chosen in view of their experience and technical knowledge. The Technical Committee will lend its assistance to the Governing Commission in all matters which the Governing Commission submits to it.

"I am confident that the Governing Commission's initiative will be welcomed by the inhabitants and that its difficult task will be facilitated by its collaboration with a number of particularly competent inhabitants of the Saar Basin outside the central administration.

"It seems clear to me that, with the establishment of the Advisory Council of the Saar and the Technical Committee, a new era will begin in the administration of this Territory. There is no doubt that the success of the measures instituted by the Governing Commission will depend upon the spirit in which they are carried out.

"I know that the Governing Commission earnestly desires the establishment of continuous and whole-hearted collaboration with the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the Saar.

"The Advisory Council will meet at least once every three months, and its relations with the Governing Commission will be both numerous and important. I know that the Governing Commission intends to ask the opinion of the Advisory Council on the final drafting of the rules of procedure of the latter, and this will no doubt contribute to no small extent to the establishment of good relations between the Advisory Council and the Governing Commission.

"I have no doubt that the representatives of the inhabitants of the Saar will, by their collaboration with the Governing Commission, render important service to the Territory. They may be assured that the Council of the League of Nations will follow their work with the greatest interest."

On the same date as the above report, another report was also approved by the Council, relating to the position of the Governing Commission in the light of the political situation created by the establishment of the Advisory Council of the Saar Basin. The report is as follows:

"I have dealt in another report with the constitution of the Advisory Council and Technical Committee, established by a Decree of the Saar Basin Governing Commission dated March 24th, 1922, with the object of obtaining the close collaboration of the population of the Territory. Such collaboration is of considerable political importance, and I feel that it is not sufficient merely to have created the organisations which are necessary to bring this about, but that continuous action on the part of the Governing Commission will be necessary in order to attain the desired object.

"I am led by this consideration to the conclusion that the Council of the League of Nations, in noting the establishment of the representative bodies which have just been created, should also consider the situation of the Governing Commission itself. It is the common action of all these bodies which will create the political stability necessary for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Saar Basin. For this reason I feel that steps should be taken to assure a certain measure of permanence in the personnel of the Governing Commission, which is called upon to give concrete expression to the hopes which we entertain regarding the results of the establishment of the Advisory Council and the Technical Committee.

"In order more fully to assure the authority of the Governing Commission, to allow its various members the certainty that they will be able successfully to carry out the programme of collaboration with the inhabitants of the Territory, and to avoid the discussions to which the possibility of new appointments gives rise each year, it appears necessary to me that the Commission and its members should be placed upon a more permanent footing than is stipulated by the Peace Treaty as regards the annual renewal of their appointment.

"These observations which I venture to submit to the Council are in any case only facts which the Council has itself clearly recognised since the constitution of the Governing Commission, as, at its January session, it appointed for the third time the members of the Commission whose terms of office had expired.

"But the difficulty with which the Council is faced in this matter is the stipulation of the Peace Treaty, which lays down explicitly that the members of the Governing Commission are appointed for one year only and that their appointment may be renewed.

"In consideration of these two facts — on the one hand, the precedent created by the Council, on the other hand, the definite limitation stipulated in the Treaty of Peace — it may be asked, whether without in any way changing the present conditions, the matter could not simply be left to the discretion and wisdom of our successors on the Council, relying upon them to ensure, so far as it will be advisable, the stability essential to the Commission.

"Personally I do not believe that this is sufficient. The execution of the programme submitted by the present Governing Commission and the good administration of the Saar Territory demand that the Commission should be given the assurance that, unless exceptional circumstances arise, its term of office will be renewed twice more, that is to say up to the beginning of 1925; the Governing Commission will then have held its term of office for five years.

"In adopting this resolution, the Council will not in any way infringe the stipulations of the Peace Treaty since it will still be able to make use of all the rights conferred upon it by the Peace Treaty and to revoke or not to renew the appointment of this or that member of the Commission. But a declaration of this kind, made public, will ensure to the Commission the stability which is necessary to it and will undoubtedly have a tranquillising effect upon the situation in the Saar Territory and diminish the political difficulties which necessarily arise from annually renewing the Commission."

In reply to a protest by Germany against this decision, the Council called particular attention to the statement contained in the report that it will still be able to make use of all the rights conferred upon it by the Peace Treaty and to revoke or not to renew the appointment of this or that member of the Commission. The Council added that the provisions of the Treaty were maintained completely and in their entirety.

It will be seen from the different reports sent in by the Chairman of the Governing Commission and already published in the *Official Journal* of the League, that the task of creating the administrative machinery of the Saar Basin, which was necessary under the Treaty, has been completed. The Governing Commission has felt the time ripe for the establishment of a closer collaboration with the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the territory, and the Decree of March 24th, 1922, is a result of this view, to which the Council has given its hearty support. It ought to be mentioned that the local Press of the Saar and the leaders of the political parties of that Territory had for some time past put forward claims for the establishment of a Saar Parliament to represent on a democratic basis the whole of the population of that Territory.

Elections for the Advisory Council of the Saar were held on June 25th, 1922.

## B. THE GOVERNING COMMISSION.

In accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, in which the League of Nations is named as trustee for the government of the Saar Basin, that Territory has continued under the rule of a Commission of five appointed by the Council. All its members, who, with one exception, have served since the Commission was first set up in 1920, were reappointed for the second time during the past year.

The Members of the Commission are:

Dr. HECTOR (Saar),  
M. LAMBERT (Belgian),  
Count MOLTKE-HUITFELDT (Dane),  
M. V. RAULT, Chairman (French),  
Mr. R. D. WAUGH (Canadian).

The Commission has continued to report regularly to the Council on the work accomplished and on the political and economic situation of the Territory.<sup>1</sup> The Council has followed with interest the state of affairs in the Saar, but it has not attempted to express any considered opinion on all the many important acts of the Governing Commission.

The acts of the Commission have consisted largely of administrative duties resulting from the various stipulations of the Peace Treaty. The Commission not only has had to carry on the ordinary work of government for the Territory, but it has had to build up and inaugurate a new and autonomous administration for the Saar Basin as a whole.

## C. OTHER SAAR QUESTIONS CONSIDERED BY THE COUNCIL.

In addition to the question of collaboration with the population, the Council has, since the second Assembly, acted upon three problems involving the government of the Territory:—

- (1) The protest of the German Government against the Decree of the Governing Commission defining the term "inhabitant of the Saar Territory".
- (2) The adhesion of the Saar to the Berne International Railway Convention of 1890.
- (3) The settlement of pre-war debts due by residents in the Saar Territory.

<sup>1</sup> The latest periodical report of the Governing Commission — its twelfth — was received as this statement was going to press. It will be published in the *Official Journal* of the League.

(1) *The Decree defining the term "Inhabitant of the Saar Territory"*

The German Government protested against this Decree as a violation of the Treaty of Versailles, contending, among other things, that the idea embodied in it was more that of "citizen of the Saar State" than that of "inhabitant of the Saar" and that the Decree in reality undermined the existing nationality of the inhabitants. In answer to this, the Chairman of the Governing Commission stated that the Decree did not affect the nationality of the inhabitants nor create a new nationality, but merely defined those individuals in the Territory who were entitled to the legal rights given by the Treaty to the inhabitants thereof.

The Council, after reviewing the various arguments on both sides, and pointing out, among other things, that, under the Treaty, although not losing their nationality, the inhabitants acquired a new status which concerned their position, their rights and their obligations under the Treaty, decided that the German protest did not call for any action on its part.

(2) *The Adhesion of the Saar to the Berne International Railway Convention of 1890.*

This question, which was referred to in the report to the second Assembly, was submitted to the Advisory and Technical Committee on Communications and Transit, which gave its opinion that the declaration of adhesion to the Convention by the Governing Commission was superfluous, as the Convention was, in so far as concerned all Powers which had signed or adhered thereto, rightfully in force in the Saar Territory in the same way as in the territory of the Allied and Associated Powers which had signed or adhered to it.

This opinion was forwarded by the Council to the Governing Commission, which has been in communication on the matter with the German and the Swiss Governments.

(3) *Settlement of Pre-war Debts.*

In October last the Council enquired from the Governing Commission as to the prospects of an early solution of the question of the settlement of pre-war debts due by residents in the Saar Basin. The preliminary examination of this question, which had then been begun, has since been completed, and negotiations are being conducted with the German Government in order that arrangements may, if possible, be made to apply the German legislation with regard to this question to German nationals in the Saar.

#### D. THE ECONOMIC SITUATION OF THE TERRITORY.

At the time of the last Assembly certain inhabitants of the Saar Basin came to Geneva to set forth what they alleged to be the increasingly miserable economic conditions of the Territory and for which they held the introduction of the French franc to be largely responsible.

The Chairman of the Governing Commission pointed out at the time that the situation, although difficult, was not nearly so serious as these persons had represented, and, late in December, to support this contention, he submitted a special report to the Council containing a detailed collection of statistical material on unemployment, coal and iron production, wages, cost of living, banking, etc. In conclusion, he emphasised that in 1925, Saar production and trade would have to reckon with a complete customs barrier between the Saar and Germany, and that the Governing Commission would have failed in one of its most important duties if it had not foreseen the conditions which would arise in the future and the fact that the inhabitants would have to be in a position to pay the French Customs duties.

#### E. THE FRENCH TROOPS AND THE LOCAL GENDARMERIE.

In June 1921 the Council requested to be supplied regularly in the future with detailed information as to the prospects for the reduction of the French troops and the development of the local gendarmerie. The question of the reduction of French troops was accordingly considered in subsequent reports by the Commission, and in February 1922 certain statistical tables and diagrams were forwarded to the Secretariat. These documents showed a reduction of the strength of the French troops from 7,977 available for duty on February 1st, 1920, to 2,736 available for duty on February 1st, 1922. They also indicated that 7,750 men were the minimum considered necessary in case of trouble.

#### F. THE REGULAR ADMINISTRATIVE WORK OF THE COMMISSION.

The administrative work of the Commission, which is divided among its five members, comprises all the many duties incumbent upon a general Government, and it is naturally impossible in a report of this length to cover in any adequate way its accomplishments in this field. It may, however, be interesting to note that the reports of the Commission have dealt, among others, with the following subjects:



- (1) *Legislative and Administrative Measures.* — The alteration of the Civil and Criminal Codes, plans for a census of the population and for a method of revising farm leases.
- (2) *Railways, Postal, Telephone and Telegraph Service and Public Works.*
- (3) *Public Education, Justice and Worship.* — The examination of the curriculum in the primary schools, and the introduction of optional French therein.
- (4) *Commerce, Industry and Labour.* — The formation of social organisations for the Territory; investigations of mining accidents.
- (5) *Agricultural and Food Supply.* — Arrangements with the German Government regarding the supply of cereals.
- (6) *Public Relief, Public Health and the Housing Situation.* — The distribution of money and coal to necessitous persons during the winter months, the campaign against tuberculosis.
- (7) *Public Finance.* — The 1921-1922 budget, which was forwarded to the Council and published.

#### G. COMPLAINTS FROM DIFFERENT ELEMENTS OF THE POPULATION.

In addition to protests concerning the economic situation and the relations between the population and the Governing Commission, certain of the political parties in the territory have forwarded complaints on various points, including protests against the Governing Commission for its alleged policy of furthering French interests, against the presence of French troops in the Territory, and concerning the position and method of selection of the members of the Governing Commission; the housing situation, the enactment of or the failure to enact new legislation, and on other subjects. All these protests have been taken up quite fully in the reports of the Governing Commission to the Council, and have been distributed to all the Members of the League for information.

#### 2. THE SAAR PLEBISCITE.

Certain political parties in the Territory, in a memorandum to the Council, urged that the lists of persons entitled to vote in the plebiscite which is to take place in the Saar Basin in 1935 could now be set up completely and accurately, but that this would not be possible after a lapse of some years; the Governing Commission, in commenting on this statement, pointed out that it was not a plebiscite commission authorised to act on this matter.

Under the Treaty, it is the Council which has to preside over the plebiscite, and one of its Members, the Chinese representative, has been appointed as rapporteur and charged with the duty of making proposals concerning the measures to be taken for the preservation of information in connection with the drawing up by the Council of these lists of voters. In order to assist him in this work, the Secretary-General has secured considerable information from the Conference of Ambassadors as to the conduct of other plebiscites which have been held recently under the treaties negotiated at the Paris Peace Conference.

---

## II. THE FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

As explained in the report to the second Assembly, the general position of the League *vis-à-vis* the Free City of Danzig was set forth in a report and a resolution adopted by the Council on November 17th, 1920. That report reviewed in detail the treaty stipulations applicable to Danzig and the arrangements made by the Treaty of November 9th, 1920, for the relations between the Free City and Poland. It further examined the Constitution of the Free City and requested certain amendments to be made thereto.

During the succeeding months the Council considered many problems resulting from the assumption by the League of its position as the protector of the Free City and the guarantor of its Constitution.

#### A. THE RELATIONS BETWEEN POLAND AND DANZIG AND THE DECISIONS OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

During the past year the League's High Commissioner and the Council have been concerned in adjusting some of the differences between Poland and the Free City which were not settled by the Treaty of Versailles and the Polish-Danzig Treaty of November 9th, 1920. The two Governments have been able to work out an understanding directly between themselves on most of these unsettled points. The Polish-Danzig Agreement of October 24th, 1921, contains 244 articles on many different questions, including naturalisation in Danzig, extradition, postal arrangements, regulations for ships, stock exchange transactions, customs, fisheries, export and import trade and food supply for Danzig. Such differences, however, as could not be arranged directly between

the two parties have been, in accordance with the treaties, referred to the High Commissioner of the League, who has sometimes been able to adjust the matter informally, but who has, in a number of cases, rendered a formal decision on the point. Against such a decision, either or both parties could appeal to the Council, and this has been done in most cases. In fact, appeals have been made against 9 out of the 12 decisions of the High Commissioner rendered until May 1st, 1922.

In the important case of the ownership, control, administration and operation of the railways of the Territory of the Free City, the two parties, after many weeks of conference with the High Commissioner and the Secretariat during the last Assembly, were able to come to an agreement without any action by the Council, and as a rule the appeals against the High Commissioner's decisions have been withdrawn as a result of further negotiations either directly between the two parties, or through the good offices of the High Commissioner, or under the auspices of the Rapporteur to the Council. General Haking pointed this out at the end of the Council session in May 1922, and suggested that in order to save the time and trouble involved in the constant appeals, the two parties, when informed of a decision of the High Commissioner with which they are not altogether satisfied, should endeavour to reach an agreement between themselves before making an appeal. The Council agreed with this recommendation.

It may perhaps be of interest to review briefly some of the more important questions which have been settled through decisions of the High Commissioner and subsequent negotiations:

• (1) *The Ownership, Control, Administration and Operation of the Danzig Railways.*

This was a question of interpreting the provisions of the Treaty of November 9th, 1920. The High Commissioner defined the standard-gauge railways which especially served the port, and decided that they should belong to the Danzig Harbour Board but be administered by the Polish Railway Administration under certain very definite regulations as to their operation — these concerned language, currency, taxation, jurisdiction, police, social insurance, etc. — which were laid down in the second of his two decisions on this question. Certain further points were cleared up in the Polish-Danzig Agreement of September 23rd, 1921, as a result of which the original Danzig appeal was withdrawn.

(2) *Legal Status of Polish Government Property, Officials and Ships in Danzig.*

Poland had demanded certain ex-territorial rights for her Government property, authorities, officials and ships in Danzig, and the High Commissioner, after laying down certain general principles in his decision, suggested that further points should be settled by direct negotiations. Poland appealed to the Council, and long discussions were held at Geneva last May, under the auspices of the Rapporteur and in the presence of the High Commissioner, on many of the practical questions involved. These conversations resulted in an agreement, which served to interpret and supplement the High Commissioner's decision, and Poland withdrew her appeal. Further points are still to be settled by direct negotiation, but it is now decided in brief:

That Polish State property utilised for the service of the Polish State by virtue of the treaties in force shall not be subject to taxation by the Free City nor to Danzig jurisdiction, except as regards real property charges; that Polish ships in Danzig are subject to the administration of the Harbour Board, which must retain its full administrative powers and activities under the Treaty of November 9th, 1920, and to the Danzig tribunals and authorities, like all other vessels, Danzig or foreign; that Polish nationals in Danzig are subject to the jurisdiction of the Free City, but that this does not prejudice their rights under Article 33 of the Treaty of November 9th; that Polish authorities and officials in Danzig, acting within their special sphere of competence, shall receive the same treatment as Danzig authorities and officials performing similar duties, and that the Polish officials shall only, in the performance of their duties, be responsible to their Polish superiors; that Polish Government archives and offices shall be inviolable, and that the Polish diplomatic representative shall appoint his own staff, diplomatic, administrative and subordinate for the purposes laid down in the treaties, submitting a list thereof to the Danzig Government.

(3) *Conduct by Poland of the Foreign Relations of the Free City.*

This was a question of the exact meaning of Article 2 of the Treaty of November 9th, which stipulated that Poland should undertake the conduct of the foreign relations of the Free City, and of the respective rights of the Polish and the Danzig Governments under this article. The High Commissioner decided as follows:

"1. That Poland, when called upon by Danzig to conduct any of the foreign relations of the Free City, has the right to refuse the application, if the matter involved is clearly to the detriment of the important interests of the Polish State.

"2. That Poland has no right to initiate and impose upon Danzig a definite foreign policy which is clearly opposed to the well-being, prosperity and good government of the Free City. Moreover, it is apparent from the Polish statement of the case that she has no desire to do so.



"3. That on the request of the Danzig Government to conduct any foreign relations of the Free City, the Polish Government will, as fully agreed to in her own statement of the case, at once take cognisance of the demand, and will either carry out the wishes of Danzig without delay, and in a complete and loyal manner, or will inform the Government of the Free City as soon as possible, and in any case within a delay of 30 days, that the Polish Government is unable to carry out the wishes of the Danzig Government. Poland will also give her reasons for this refusal, and will suggest to the Danzig Government how far she is prepared to go, or what alternative she would accept, to meet the wishes of the Danzig Government in the matter.

"4. In this, as in all other matters connected with the Treaty of November 9th, 1920, both Governments retain their rights under Article 39 of the Treaty of November 9th, 1920.

Both parties appealed against this ruling, but after various interpretative observations on each of the four paragraphs of the decision had been embodied in the Report to the Council on the question, these appeals were withdrawn.

#### (4) *Direct Judicial Relations between Danzig and Germany.*

In a similar manner an understanding was arrived at with regard to the establishment of *direct judicial relations between Danzig and Germany*. The High Commissioner decided that Poland should give Danzig such facilities for arranging a Treaty with Germany as she proposed to arrange herself, and this was finally agreed to on the understanding that, pending the conclusion of such arrangements, Poland was willing to arrange for the extension to Danzig, in a similar manner, of the provisional agreements which already existed between Germany and Poland on such questions.

On other matters negotiations are still pending:

##### 1. *The Control and Administration of the Vistula within the Territory of the Free City.*

The High Commissioner decided that under the Treaties the control and administration of the whole of the Vistula within the territory of the Free City must be undertaken by the Harbour Board. The Polish Government, however, considered that under certain conditions it should be entrusted with this duty, and, at the January Session of the Council, made certain proposals for a practical arrangement. Since then the problem has been under discussion by the Danzig Harbour Board.

##### 2. *The Expulsion of Polish Nationals from Danzig.*

This question of the right of Danzig to expel Polish nationals from the Free City brought forth voluminous documents, including appeals from both Governments against the High Commissioner's decision, which dealt with the procedure in such cases. The Council called attention to the fact that the Free City of Danzig had already declared in a formal Agreement with Poland (paragraph 1 of Article 29 of the Agreement of October 24th, 1921), that it would not expel Polish nationals from its territory unless their presence was prejudicial to the economic, national, social or religious interests of the Free City, or otherwise threatened its welfare; and added that the Danzig Government would normally decide upon the application of this provision in individual cases, but that the Polish Government, in the event of a difference of opinion arising, would have the right to ask for a decision by the High Commissioner. As to any further arrangements, including rules of procedure in special cases, it was suggested that the two parties should confer with the High Commissioner, and such conversations are now taking place.

##### 3. *The Site of the Depot for Polish War Material (including Explosives) in Transit through Danzig:*

After long discussions in the Harbour Board and a ruling by its President, the High Commissioner, in April last, rendered his decision, giving Poland a temporary site on the north-east of the Island of Holm in the Port of Danzig, proposing the construction of a permanent location further away from the city, and laying down various stipulations to safeguard the metropolis from danger. Both Governments have appealed to the Council, but the grounds for their action have not yet been received.

In other cases concerning respectively passport visas for foreigners entering Danzig, and the interpretation of the term "domicilié" and "ordinary resident" in Articles 105 and 106 of the Treaty of Versailles, the High Commissioner's decision was accepted without appeal, and no appeal has yet been made against his latest decision dated May 25th, 1922, relative to the establishment of a Polish postal, telegraph and telephone service in the Territory of the Free City. There are also several other questions which have been submitted to him for a decision, and on which he thinks an arrangement will quite possibly be arrived at without the necessity for formal action on his part.

## B. CONSTITUTION OF THE FREE CITY AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

Negotiations were going on during most of the year between the different political factions in Danzig with regard to the amendment to the Constitution concerning the reduction of the term of office of the principal Senators from twelve to four years — an amendment which the Council had asked the Free City to make — and it was not until May 11th, 1922, that the High Commissioner, under the provisions of Article 103 of the Treaty of Versailles, agreed to the Constitution as amended in accordance with the wishes of the Council. Long delays had been caused by the desire of the more radical groups in the Popular Assembly to make still further changes in the Constitution, but the amendment in question was finally adopted by a vote of 60 to 13, 47 members having left the House.

In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, and in view of the interest of the League in seeing that the access to Danzig nationality was not inexpediently enlarged or restricted, the Draft Law concerning the acquisition and loss of this status was, after certain necessary delays, submitted to the Council for their examination at their meeting in January last. The question of naturalisation in Danzig had previously formed the subject of negotiations between Poland and Danzig, and the understanding arrived at between them was embodied in the Agreement of October 24th 1921, as well as in the Danzig Law. After examination of this draft law, the Council decided that it had no objection to make to it.

## C. THE PORT D'ATTACHÉ FOR POLISH WARSHIPS AND QUESTIONS CONCERNING WAR MATERIAL AND THE MANUFACTURE OF AIRCRAFT IN DANZIG.

Early in the autumn of 1921, in view of the approach of winter, and at the suggestion of the President of the Council, the High Commissioner, who had not yet made his final report on the question of a *port d'Attaché* for Polish war vessels in the Port of Danzig, as provided for in the Resolution adopted by the Council in June 1921, brought about a preliminary agreement between the two Governments, in order to provide shelter and necessary harbour facilities for Polish warships in the Port of Danzig, until the Council had considered the matter and without prejudice to any final solution. The Council reviewed the situation at their January session, and decided to postpone further consideration of the matter, stipulating at the same time that the preliminary agreement just referred to would remain in force.

In reply to a request from the High Commissioner, the Council forwarded to him in October last the view of the Permanent Advisory Commission on Military, Naval and Air Questions as to what should be defined as military aircraft — the definition which the Commission gave being the same as that applied by the Allies in the case of Germany. As it was, however, reported by the President of the Danzig Senate to be impossible to construct modern and commercial machines in Danzig under these regulations, the High Commissioner asked the Council in May for a reconsideration of the matter. The Permanent Advisory Commission again went into the question, but decided that both from the technical and the economic points of view, there was no reason for a change to be made. The Council also adopted this view.

The High Commissioner has kept in constant touch with the Secretariat on various other matters concerning the manufacture, sale, storage or transit of war material in Danzig, including Danzig legislation to prevent individuals from handling or dealing in such material in the Free City, the granting of permission under certain conditions for the repairing of Polish and Portuguese warships, and for the manufacture of nitric acid in Danzig. The High Commissioner has also received reports on the amount of arms and ammunition in the possession of the Danzig Government, and on such material of this kind as arrives in Danzig for Poland.

## D. FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE FREE CITY.

The Provisional Economic and Financial Committee of the League continued its examination of the financial position of the Free City, and its report on the question, which was submitted to the Council in May 1922, was forwarded to the Danzig Government for their observations. An outline of the views and findings of the Committee will be found elsewhere in this report.

## E. THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

General Sir Richard Haking was re-appointed last January, for a second term of one year, as High Commissioner of the League of Nations in Danzig. He was the first permanent High Commissioner after the establishment of the Free City, and the burden of the work outlined by

the Treaty of Versailles for this office has, therefore, fallen largely upon him. Not only in Danzig has he been able to bring the Danzig and Polish Governments together on many points of difficulty, but the solution of problems which have been discussed in Geneva during the different Council sessions has been greatly due to his friendly intervention.

#### F. OTHER QUESTIONS.

Various other matters concerning the Free City have also been under the consideration of the Council, the High Commissioner or the Secretariat, including certain international agreements affecting the Free City, the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner under Article 39 of the Treaty of November 9th, and the number of German officials in Danzig, etc.

On account of the considerable number of questions concerning the Free City which have come to the attention of the Council and the Secretariat, many of them of a complicated character, the Secretary-General has, since the last Assembly, prepared for the Council two general summary reports with regard to them — in January and May 1922. Copies of these reports have been circulated to all the Members of the League for their information, and published in the *Official Journal*.

---

### 9

## PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

---

#### A. MINORITIES TREATIES CONCLUDED AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

At the time of the Peace Conference a certain number of special treaties relating to the protection of racial, linguistic or religious minorities were concluded with the new States and the States whose territory had been considerably increased as a result of the war. Clauses corresponding to those contained in these treaties were inserted in several of the Treaties of Peace.

All these Treaties contain, apart from special provisions dealing with particular or local conditions, almost identical stipulations for establishing a general system of international protection for minorities applicable to all countries in which these stipulations are in force. The general object of these stipulations is to ensure equal treatment in law and in fact for all the nationals of the State in question. Further, the Treaties grant to minorities certain guarantees as to the maintenance of their language and the exercise of their religion, etc.

Under the terms of the Treaties in question, these stipulations, in so far as they affect persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, constitute obligations of international concern and will be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

The following is a list of the treaties, the terms of which, in so far as they relate to the protection of minorities, have, up to the present, been placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations by resolutions of the Council.

1. *Austria*. — Articles 62 to 69 of the Treaty of Peace with Austria (signed at St. Germain-en-Laye on September 10th, 1919). Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated October 22nd, 1920.

2. *Bulgaria*. — Articles 49 to 57 of the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria (signed at Neuilly-sur-Seine on November 27th, 1919). Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated October 22nd, 1920.

3. *Czechoslovakia*. — Treaty of September 10th, 1919, concluded between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Czechoslovakia. Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated November 29th, 1920.

4. *Hungary*. — Articles 54 to 60 of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary (signed at Trianon on June 4th, 1920). Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated August 30th, 1921.

5. *Poland*. — Treaty of June 28th, 1919, concluded between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Poland. Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated February 13th, 1920.

6. *Roumania*. — Treaty of December 9th, 1919, between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Roumania. Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated August 30th, 1921.

7. *The Serb-Croat-Slovene State.* — Treaty of September 10th, 1919, concluded between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State. Resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated November 29th, 1920.

As the Treaties concluded at Sèvres on August 10th, 1920, with Greece, Turkey and Armenia have not been ratified, the Council has not been called upon to examine the terms of these Treaties as regards the protection of minorities with a view to placing them under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

## B. MEASURES TAKEN BY THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES IN THE BALTIC STATES AND IN ALBANIA.

On December 15th, 1920, the first Assembly of the League of Nations adopted the following recommendation:

“In the event of Albania, the Baltic and Caucasian States being admitted to the League, the Assembly requests that they should take the necessary measures to enforce the principles of the Minorities Treaties, and that they should arrange with the Council the details required to carry this object into effect.”

Of these States, Albania and Finland were admitted in 1920, and Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania in 1921.

### (a) *Finland.*

When settling the Aaland Islands question, the Council, after having recognised the sovereignty of Finland over that archipelago, adopted, on June 27th, 1921, a resolution regarding the guarantees to be granted to the population for the preservation of its language, culture and local Swedish traditions. According to the terms of that resolution, the Council has to supervise the putting into force of these guarantees, and Finland has to forward to it, together with its own observations, any protests or complaints made on such matters by the Aaland Landsting. If the question is of a legal character, the Council may consult the Permanent Court of International Justice.<sup>1</sup>

Finland also laid before the Council a memorandum containing detailed information with regard to the rights guaranteed to minorities by the Finnish Constitution. At its meeting on October 2nd, 1921, the Council took note of this information, which was transmitted to the Assembly then in session.

### (b) *Albania.*

At the same meeting of the Council, on October 2nd, 1921, the Albanian representative signed a declaration containing stipulations analogous to those of the Minorities Treaties. That declaration was ratified by Albania on February 17th, 1922, and placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

### (c) *Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania.*

At the second Assembly, before the admission of Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania to the League of Nations, their representatives signed declarations stating that their Governments adopted the recommendation of December 15th, 1920, and expressed their willingness to discuss with the Council the scope and methods of application of their international obligations for the protection of minorities.

During its session in January, 1922, the Council invited the Brazilian representative to enter into negotiations with the representatives of the above-mentioned States.

On May 12th the representative of Brazil submitted to the Council a report regarding the protection of minorities in Lithuania. This report contained a draft declaration the terms of which were similar to those of the Polish Minorities Treaty. The Lithuanian representative signed this declaration on the same day.

The negotiations regarding the protection of minorities in Esthonia and Latvia are being continued. A certain number of documents relating to this matter have been published in the *Official Journal* of the League of Nations.

## C. MEASURES TAKEN FOR THE PROTECTION OF MINORITIES IN UPPER SILESIA.

In recommending to the Supreme Council a solution of the Upper Silesian question, the Council of the League of Nations considered it advisable to present to the Supreme Council a certain number of recommendations with regard to the protection of minorities.

<sup>1</sup> See Report to the Second Assembly on the Work of the Council, p. 19.

The Conference of Ambassadors incorporated these recommendations in its decision of October 20th, 1921, which provided as follows:

(1) That the Polish Minorities Treaty of June 28th, 1919, should be applicable to the Polish part of Upper Silesia.

(2) That principles of equity, and the maintenance of the economic life of Upper Silesia, required that the German Government should be bound to accept similar provisions, at least for the transitional period of 15 years, with regard to the German part of Upper Silesia.

(3) That the provisions of the Agreement to be concluded between the German and Polish Governments on that subject should constitute obligations of international concern for Germany and Poland, and should be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations in the same way as the provisions of the Treaty of June 28th, 1919.

On the basis of that decision, Germany and Poland began negotiations at Beuthen in December 1921, and have continued them at Geneva since February 15th, 1922.

The results of these negotiations are recorded in Part III (Articles 64 to 158) of the Germano-Polish Convention, signed at Geneva on May 15th, 1922.

Section I of Part III of the Convention (Articles 64 to 72) contains a synoptic table setting forth in one column the Articles of the Polish Minorities Treaty which Poland undertakes to put into force in the Polish part of Upper Silesia, and in another column the same undertakings on the part of Germany.

In order, however, to base the protection of minorities in both parts of the plebiscite area on the principle of equitable reciprocity, and in order to take into account the special conditions due to the provisional character of the regime, the Contracting Parties agreed on certain further stipulations for the period of 15 years during which that regime is to remain in force. These stipulations are contained in Section II (Articles 73 to 146: Civil and political rights, religion, private education, public primary education, professional and supplementary education, secondary and higher education, the official administrative language, the language for use in the courts).

Section III deals with the right of petition and the method of appeal. A Minorities Office will be established in each part of the plebiscite area. Persons belonging to a minority will be entitled, after having submitted their complaint to the final administrative authority, to present a petition for consideration to the Minorities Office of their own State. If that Office does not succeed in obtaining satisfaction for the petitioners, it will forward the petition, together with its observations, to the Chairman of the Upper Silesian Mixed Commission for his opinion. The Chairman may collect any information which he may consider useful and appropriate. He will give the petitioners and the Minorities Office an opportunity of submitting their observations either verbally or in writing. He will give the members of the Commission an opportunity of expressing their opinion.<sup>1</sup> The Chairman will convey his opinion to the Minorities Office, which will transmit it to the competent administrative authorities. Should the petitioners not be satisfied with the solution adopted by the administrative authority, they may appeal to the Council of the League of Nations. This appeal should be addressed to the Minorities Office, which will cause it to be transmitted by the Government to the Council. The Council of the League of Nations is also competent to adjudicate on any individual or collective petition which may be addressed to it directly by persons belonging to a minority.

#### D. PROCEDURE ESTABLISHED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS FOR MINORITIES QUESTIONS.

The Minorities Treaties stipulate that any Member of the Council of the League of Nations has the right to bring to the notice of the Council any infraction or any danger of infraction of the obligations resulting from the stipulations in question and that the Council may thereupon take such action and give such direction as it may deem proper and effective in the circumstances. The Treaties do not provide that the minorities may take the initiative in bringing a question before the Council. According to the terms of the Treaties, the minorities, or the petitioners speaking on their behalf, are not regarded as being parties to the issue. The Treaties provide that a State Member of the Council may request that a dispute between that State and the State within the territory of which the minority is living should be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice; the parties to the dispute would then be the State concerned and the State Member of the Council and not the minorities. The Treaties make it possible for the Government within the territory of which the minorities are living and the League of Nations to co-operate in the solution of the difficult and delicate problem of the treatment of racial, linguistic and religious minorities. The Treaties also assure the maintenance of State sovereignty and of the guarantees which are indispensable for the protection of minorities, the members of which are nationals of those countries.

In order to determine the nature and limits of the guarantees of the League of Nations with regard to the protection of minorities, the Council adopted on October 22nd, 1920, a report submitted

<sup>1</sup> The Mixed Commission consists of two Germans and two Poles with a Chairman of another nationality.

by the representative of Italy, M. Tittoni. The Rapporteur states that the guarantee of the League of Nations signified in the first place that the provisions regarding minorities are inviolable, and in the second place that the League of Nations should make certain that these provisions are always carried out. The report lays stress upon the stipulation contained in the Treaties, by which the right of drawing the Council's attention to any infraction or danger of infraction of the clauses of the Treaties is reserved to Members of the Council, who are therefore asked to attach special importance to the protection of minorities. The report further lays down that the right of initiative of the Members of the Council by no means excludes the right possessed by the minorities themselves, or by the States not represented on the Council, to bring to the notice of the League of Nations any infraction or danger of infraction, but such action should not take any form other than that of a petition or of mere information; it cannot have the same juridical force as if the matter were officially referred to the Council. When a request regarding questions of Minorities is addressed to the League of Nations, the Secretary-General should communicate it without comment for the information of Members of the Council and all the other Members of the League of Nations.

On October 25th, 1920, the Council also adopted the following resolution:

“With a view to assisting Members of the Council in the exercise of their rights and duties as regards the protection of minorities, it is desirable that the President and two members appointed by him in each case should proceed to consider any petition or communication addressed to the League of Nations with regard to an infraction or danger of infraction of the clauses of the Treaties for the protection of minorities. This enquiry would be held as soon as the petition or communication in question had been brought to the notice of the members of the Council.”

Lastly, in a resolution adopted on June 27th, 1921, the Council laid down certain periods of time within which States directly concerned should submit their comments on any petition relating to the protection of minorities before the petition is communicated to the Members of the Council and the Members of the League of Nations. The regulations laid down in this resolution were accepted by all the States concerned. The act of adherence of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, dated from Belgrade, December 5th, 1921, contains the regulations governing the preliminary conditions for sending in minority petitions, as laid down by the Secretary-General. In particular it is stated that petitions or complaints:

- (a) Should have as their object the protection of minorities in accordance with the Treaties;
- (b) Should not, in particular, be submitted in the form of a request to break off political relations between the minority in question and the State of which it forms part;
- (c) Should not emanate from an anonymous or unsubstantiated source;
- (d) Should be drawn up in temperate language.

During the second Assembly a proposal submitted by a Member of the Assembly with a view to forming a permanent Commission for Minorities Questions was withdrawn, after the attention of the author of the proposal had been drawn to the above-mentioned resolution of the Council dated October 25th, 1920.

The procedure adopted by the Secretariat with regard to all minorities petitions is that all such petitions are forwarded, together with a covering letter to the President of the Council after any comments which the Government concerned might wish to make have been received, and despatched to all the Members of the League of Nations. In this letter the Secretariat brings to the notice of the President the resolution of October 25th, 1920, after which the President appoints two of his colleagues to examine with him the documents in question. The Minorities Section of the Secretariat is at the disposal of the Committee for any investigation which the latter may desire, and it thus acts as the secretariat of the Committee. If necessary, the Minorities Section may work in collaboration with the Legal Section or other Sections of the Secretariat.

#### E. MINORITIES PETITIONS SUBMITTED TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

A number of petitions have been dealt with in accordance with this procedure.

The Belgian representative, Acting President of the Council, and the representatives of Italy and Japan examined certain petitions on January 14th, 1922.

#### GERMAN MINORITIES IN POLAND.

##### *Petition from the Germanic League of Bydgoszcz (Bromberg).*

On November 9th, 1921, the Secretary-General received a telegram from the Germanic League (*Deutschtumsbund*), informing him that several thousand families of farmers of German origin (Polish citizens of German race and also nationals of the German State) had been ordered by the Polish Government to leave their property before December 1st, 1921.



The Council, by its resolution of June 27th, 1921, which has already been mentioned, has established a special rapid procedure for exceptional cases of this kind which call for immediate action. In such cases, no period is prescribed within which the reply of the Government concerned must be received. The Secretary-General may at once communicate the petition to the Members of the League of Nations; before making this communication, however, he is bound to inform the representative of the State concerned accredited to the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

In conformity with this procedure, the Secretary-General, after having informed the Polish representative at Geneva of the telegram from the Germanic League, at once communicated it to the members of the Council. The Polish representative stated that the date, December 1st, had been extended and that his Government, acting upon humanitarian principles, had decided that, even apart from the terms of expulsion, which might be fixed by the competent tribunals, it would only carry out these expulsions gradually, and in no case before May 1st, 1922.

In the meantime the Secretary-General received from the petitioners two memoranda dated respectively November 7th and 12th, 1921, containing a detailed statement of the question. The Polish Government submitted certain observations on this statement, and announced its intention of submitting others later.

The Committee of the Council did not consider itself in a position to enter into a close examination of the question before receiving the memorandum to which the Polish Government had referred. As the German settlers, however, were threatened with expulsion in the near future, the Committee, at its meeting on January 14th, 1922, decided to appeal to the Polish Government to refrain from any measure calculated to alter the position of these settlers until its memorandum had been examined.

On January 26th, 1922, the Polish Government's memorandum, which the representative of Poland at Geneva had forwarded to the Secretariat, was communicated to the Members of the League, and the members of the Committee of the Council accordingly began to examine it at the short extraordinary session which was held at Paris on March 24th to 28th, 1922.

In the report which the Committee submitted to the Council at that session, it stated that it had begun to consider the detailed explanation submitted by the Polish Government. In view of the shortness of the session and the complex nature of the questions raised, the Committee considered that it should request the Polish Government to postpone the expulsion of the settlers of German origin until a later date, for example till October 1st, 1922. M. Askenazy, the representative of Poland, having been invited to sit on the Council, stated that he intended to support this request and to bring it without delay to the notice of his Government, which would not fail to accede to it as far as possible.

During the ordinary session of the Council last May, the Committee was able to resume its study of the question and to submit its report to the Council (*Minutes of the 18th session of the Council (Official Year, 3rd Year, No. 6 (Part II), page 702.)*)

The Council took note of the Committee's report, and on May 17th, 1922, after listening to some explanations of a legal character submitted by M. Askenazy, the Polish representative, it adopted the following resolution:—

"1. A copy of this report shall be sent to the Polish Government, which is requested to forward to the Council of the League of Nations as soon as possible detailed information upon the questions of fact, as well as upon the questions of law, referred to in the report.

"2. The representative of the Polish Government is invited to consider, in conjunction with the Secretary-General, the various questions of law raised in the report, in order to enable the Council to decide whether, and, if so, on what questions, the Permanent Court of International Justice should be asked to give an opinion.

"3. The Council earnestly requests the Polish Government to postpone, until the Council has had an opportunity of taking a decision upon the matter, any administrative or judicial measures likely to affect the normal position of persons of German origin engaged in agricultural work who are Polish subjects, or whose status as Polish subjects is dependent upon the decision taken with regard to the questions of interpretation raised in the report."

#### TERRITORY OF THE RUTHENES SOUTH OF THE CARPATHIANS (IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA).

A petition from the "Political Party of the Hungarian Ruthenes" was submitted to the League of Nations on September 10th, 1921. This petition, and also the observations of the Czechoslovak Government were examined by the above-mentioned Committee on January 14th, 1922. No member of the Committee considered that he should ask for this question to be placed on the agenda of the Council.

#### OTHER MINORITIES PETITIONS EXAMINED BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL.

On March 26th, 1922, a second Committee of the Council consisting of representatives of Belgium, Spain and China, considered the three following petitions regarding the rights of certain minorities in Austria and Roumania:

(1) Petition of the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Vienna concerning school instruction for Czechoslovak minorities in Austria.

(2) Petition of the "Joint Foreign Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association" and "l'Alliance Israélite Universelle" concerning the right of option for Jews from the former Austro-Hungarian Empire.

(3) Petition from M. Kroupensky concerning the position of Russian minorities in Bessarabia.

The Committee further took note of the observations of the Austrian Government in regard to the first two of the above petitions and of the observations of the Roumanian Government in regard to the third.

After studying these documents, no member of the Committee considered that under the terms of the Minorities Treaties he should draw the attention of the Council to these matters, nor did any Member of the Council take steps to submit them to the Council.

The same Committee of the Council undertook to examine several petitions regarding minorities of Hungarian origin in Roumania, which were submitted to it by the Hungarian Secretariat accredited to the League of Nations, and also the Roumanian Government's replies.

The "Joint Foreign Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association" and "l'Alliance Israélite Universelle" also submitted a petition regarding the Jewish minority in Hungary. The Committee of the Council has begun the examination of this petition and of the Hungarian Government's reply.

---

## 10

### DUTIES INCUMBENT ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS BY VIRTUE OF ARTICLE 22 OF THE COVENANT (MANDATES).

---

During the past year, the activities of the League of Nations in regard to the problem of Mandates were expressed through the labours of the Permanent Mandates Commission, and by means of various decisions of the Council.

#### PERMANENT MANDATES COMMISSION.

At the time of the last Assembly, the Permanent Mandates Commission had been finally constituted by the Council, but it had not yet assembled.

Under Article 22, this Commission has to "receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the Mandates". The Mandatories cannot be asked to submit the annual reports in question till at least a year after the Mandates have been finally confirmed; but the class C Mandates were only confirmed on December 17th, 1920, and those affecting Central Africa and Asia Minor had not yet been confirmed. Nevertheless, the Council, at its meeting on June 21st, 1921, adopted the following Resolution designed to meet the desire expressed by the First Assembly:

"That the Secretary-General be instructed to invite both those Powers whose Mandates have already been defined by the Council and those which are administering territories which will be placed under the Mandatory system to furnish him, for transmission, if possible before the meeting of the Assembly, to the Permanent Mandates Commission, reports on the recent administration of those territories."

In response to the invitation which was transmitted in pursuance of the above decision, reports relating to the following territories were communicated to the Secretariat and transmitted by that body to the Permanent Mandates Commission:

French Cameroons,  
French Togoland,  
British Tanganyika,  
Belgian East Africa,  
Mesopotamia.  
Palestine.



The Permanent Mandates Commission met for its first session at Geneva on October 4th, 1921.<sup>1</sup>

The Session was opened by His Excellency M. Wellington Koo, Acting President of the Council.

The Commission proceeded to appoint its officers, and elected the Marquis Alberto THEODOLI (Italy) Chairman, and His Excellency M. VAN REES (Netherlands) Vice-Chairman.

It next adopted its own Rules of Procedure<sup>2</sup>, which were approved by the Council under date of January 10th, 1922.

The next act of the Commission was to frame two questionnaires with the object of assisting the Mandatory Powers in drawing up their annual reports in the future. These questionnaires refer to the administration of territories under B and C Mandates respectively.

Finally, the Commission commenced the examination of some of the reports which the Mandatory Powers had communicated to it for its information.

The Commission considered that, owing to the uncertainty which still prevailed in regard to the whole question of A Mandates, it would be inadvisable to consider the reports on Mesopotamia and Palestine which had been communicated to it; it therefore devoted itself to the examination of the reports on South-West Africa, Belgian East Africa, British Tanganyika, the French Cameroons and French Togoland.

The Commission observed, with the greatest interest and satisfaction, the immense efforts at reconstruction and progress to which these reports bore witness. As the documents concerned had been communicated to it not in virtue of any binding provision of the Covenant, but by the free-will of the Mandatory Powers in pursuance of a recommendation of the Assembly, the Commission did not feel called upon to communicate to the Council all the considerations which a study of these reports had suggested to it. It therefore confined itself to giving due weight to them when framing the above-mentioned questionnaire, and to drawing the attention of the Council to the following points.

(a) *National Status of the Inhabitants of Mandated Territories.*

The attention of the Commission had been directed to this question, chiefly in connection with the study of the report on South-West Africa. The presence in this territory of several thousand German colonists, whose co-operation in the administration of the territory the Government of the South African Union was willing to invite, raised a problem of a delicate nature.

(b) *Customs Regime for Territories under B Mandates.*

The Commission was of the opinion that, while authorising the incorporation of a territory under Mandate B in the neighbouring possessions of the Mandatory Powers for customs purposes, it was not the Council's intention to sanction any infringement of the principles of economic equality laid down at the end of paragraph 5 of Article 22 of the Covenant.

(c) *Forced Labour and the obligation to Work.*

The Commission, while noting that the draft Mandates provided for the prohibition of forced or compulsory labour in territories under B and C Mandates, expressed its belief that, in confirming these provisions, the Council did not wish to question the principle of the obligation to work which is the foundation of all civilised society.

(d) Finally, the Commission drew the attention of the Council to certain differences which appeared to exist between the text of the British draft B Mandate on the one hand, and the French Belgian drafts on the other hand; it considered that these differences were only questions of wording and did not imply a difference in substance.

The Marquis Theodoli, having submitted a report on the session of the Commission and communicated the Minutes of the proceedings to the Council, the latter body adopted the following resolution at its session on October 10th, 1921:

"The Council resolves to request the Chairman of the Commission and two of his colleagues to form a Sub-Committee for the purpose of seeking further information on the question of the nationality of the inhabitants of B and C mandated areas. The Sub-Committee shall present a preliminary report to the Council at its coming meeting."

The Council further understood that the Secretary-General would communicate to the Governments the questionnaires drafted by the Commission; this was done under dates October 23rd and 31st, 1921. The Council also referred to the Governments the three questionnaires mentioned above under paragraphs (b), (c) and (d).

At the same meeting, the Council provisionally approved the rules of procedure of the Commission, and gave its final approval to them at its meeting on January 10th, 1922<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The complete documents relating to this session were distributed to the Members of the League under Reference No. C. 395. M. 294. 1921. VI.

<sup>2</sup> Document C. 404. M. 295. 1921. VI.

<sup>3</sup> Document C. 404. M. 295. 1921. VI.

In pursuance of a desire expressed by the Council, the Chairman, accompanied by M. Freire d'Andrade, visited Paris, London and Brussels in order to ascertain the views of the Governments of the Mandatory Powers on this question. M. Theodoli and M. d'Andrade were accompanied during their tour in Paris by M. Beau, in London by Mr. Ormsby Gore, and in Brussels by M. Orts. The information obtained in this way formed the basis of a report which M. Theodoli submitted to the Council at its Meeting of May 12th, 1922.<sup>1</sup>

The Council, having thus been made acquainted with the views of the Mandatory Powers, requested the Permanent Mandates Commission to undertake a fresh study of the question with a view to submitting proposals which in its opinion would be likely to produce the best solution.

#### DECISIONS OF THE COUNCIL.

Since the C Mandates were confirmed, which took place on December 17th, 1920, the desire of the Council to complete its task by confirming the A and B Mandates has been hindered by circumstances over which it had no control. The position taken up by the Government of the United States necessitated an unfortunate delay. The American Government, availing itself of the rights to which it was entitled owing to its participation in the war, announced that it expected to be consulted before the question was finally decided.

The Council, which had previously informed the Allied Powers that it preferred not to carry out the duties which had been entrusted to it by Article 22 of the Covenant until the title of the Mandatory Powers to exercise their mandate had been recognised and defined by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in complete agreement, could only, at its meeting on September 3rd, 1921, note that the negotiations engaged upon between the Allied Governments and the United States were still in progress, and express the hope that they would result in a speedy and satisfactory solution. A letter to this effect, dated September 8th, 1921, was addressed to the Allied Powers.

At its meeting on October 2nd, 1921, the Council, in pursuance of a Resolution adopted by the Second Assembly, decided to send a letter to the Belgian, British and French Governments to the following effect:

(a) With regard to East Africa, Togoland and the Cameroons, while reserving consideration of the details of the draft mandates in view of modifications which might prove desirable later, the Council declared that the principles set forth in them corresponded in general to the high ideals aimed at by the Covenant and established, in a spirit which was in harmony with that of the Covenant, guarantees calculated to safeguard the rights of all the Members of the League.

(b) With regard to Togoland and the Cameroons, the Council approved the application of the mandate system to these territories and confirmed in principle the declarations signed by the representatives of the French and British Governments on July 10th, 1919, concerning the respective spheres which it was proposed to place under the authority of each of those two Governments.

(c) It expressed its belief that, until the position could be definitely determined, the Mandatory Powers would continue to administer all the territories with which they were entrusted in conformity with the spirit of the draft mandates.

(d) Finally, the Council took note in this letter of the statements made before the Sixth Committee of the Second Assembly by the representatives of Belgium, France and England with regard to the information to be furnished to the Mandates Commission

This letter was despatched on October 3rd, 1921.

Since that date the negotiations regarding Mandates A and B have been actively carried on between the Allied Powers and the United States. The results of these negotiations are not, at present, definitely known except in the case of Palestine.

A first draft Mandate for Palestine was forwarded to the Secretariat by the British Government on December 6th, 1920, and communicated to the Members of the Council on December 10th, 1920.

A second draft, which only differs from the first in that Article 25 is added, giving the Mandatory Power discretionary powers as regards the application of the Mandate in Transjordan, was submitted to the British Parliament in August 1921.

At the meeting of the Council in May 1922, the British representative announced that the negotiations with regard to the draft Mandate for Palestine engaged upon between the British Government and the Government of the United States had resulted in complete agreement. He consequently proposed that the Council should confirm this mandate in order to facilitate the delicate and difficult task devolving on Great Britain of administering this territory.

Several other Members of the Council having stated that their instructions did not allow them to take immediate action with regard to this proposal, it was decided that the question should be brought up at a subsequent meeting, which should take place on July 15th, 1922, at latest. The

<sup>1</sup> Document C 54 (a). M. 45. 1922.

hope was expressed that at that date other draft Mandates still outstanding could also be confirmed.

On May 23rd the Secretary of State of the Holy See addressed to the League of Nations a letter<sup>1</sup> (which was communicated to the Council) setting out the views of the Holy See with regard to the proposed terms of the Palestine Mandate.

A number of letters and telegrams<sup>2</sup> regarding this Mandate which had been received by the Secretariat regarding the Palestine Mandate were laid before the Council for its information on May 10th, 1922. These communications emanated from:

1. Arab and other organisations (protesting against the draft Mandate for Palestine);
2. A Catholic organisation (requesting that the rights of Catholics should be safeguarded);
3. Zionist organisations (requesting the confirmation of the Mandate and the establishment of the National Jewish Home);
4. The organisation "Agudath Israel" (requesting that the rights of the Orthodox Jews should be safeguarded).

To sum up, therefore. As there has been delay in arriving at an agreement between the United States and the Principal Allied Powers with reference to the mandates question, the Council has been prevented up to the present from taking the desired action with regard to these drafts. The Council, has, however, arranged to hold a special meeting in order that as much progress as possible may be made with regard to the question at an early date.

---

11

## WORK OF THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

---

### I. PROVISIONAL ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL COMMITTEE.

The Economic and Financial Committee is submitting a separate report to the Assembly containing an account of the various branches of its work during the year 1921-1922.

The Council considers, however, that it should here give a general survey of the activities of this Committee, referring for details to the special report submitted by the Technical Organisation.

The Economic and Financial Committee has devoted itself chiefly to questions affecting the economic and financial reconstruction of various countries. It has regarded these questions from a general point of view, independently of individual cases in which, as will be seen later, various States have had recourse to the League of Nations.

The improvement of the conditions of private business transactions, the endeavour to remove certain injustices or wrongs arising from various conflicting legislations, the study of methods of reviving international credits, the urgently needed restoration of the monetary equilibrium of Europe — all these great problems, which are occupying the attention of public opinion and of the various Governments, have been examined in a wide and practical spirit by the two Committees (Economic and Financial), of which the Technical Organisation is composed.

As is stated farther on (No. 12), the Genoa Conference, which was held in the midst of the period 1921-22 of which the Council is giving an account to the Assembly, has entrusted the League of Nations with a large number of tasks of an economic and financial character. It should be observed that several of these tasks, referring to needs which had been made clear by the Brussels Conference, had already been undertaken by the Economic and Financial Committee. Among these may be mentioned the questions of double taxation, public finance, arbitration clauses and all matters concerning equitable treatment for commerce.

#### *I. Work of the Economic Committee.*

After an exhaustive study of the various laws relating to bills of exchange, this Committee has drawn up the outlines of a scheme for an International Conference for the purpose of obtaining uniformity in this matter. This Conference will be held in 1923 and it is proposed that the Dutch Government should be asked to take a special part in the preparatory work.

Another question of a similar kind with which the Committee dealt was that of the clauses, inserted in numerous commercial contracts, providing for recourse to arbitration in the event of

---

<sup>1</sup> Document C, 332. 1922. VI.

<sup>2</sup> Document C. 252. 1922. VI.

disputes. At the invitation of the Committee, a meeting of experts and jurists was held in London in July to consider whether international conventions were possible in this matter.

Most of the questions of international improvement centre around the idea of equitable treatment for commerce, which is one of the objects of Article 23 (e) of the Covenant. Before the Genoa Conference was held, the Economic Committee appointed a small sub-committee to undertake a detailed examination of those parts of the question which seemed to offer the greatest possibility of obtaining agreement between the different nations. The Committee considered then — and the discussions at Genoa confirmed this view — that it was impossible at the present time to anticipate the possibility of concluding a general international convention on the question as a whole. The small sub-committee met in June and will meet again in order to consider three draft International Conventions with regard to customs formalities, the treatment of foreign nationals and business undertakings and discriminations in customs charges. The results of this investigation will be laid before the Plenary Committee in order that the latter body may submit a report to the Assembly. It will be seen, therefore, that the examination of the important question of Article 23 of the Covenant, which was called for in a resolution adopted by the last Assembly, has been conducted as rapidly and completely as was possible in the circumstances.

The same observations apply to the question of unfair competition. The Economic Committee recommended the League to invite all the States Members to adhere to the Washington Convention of 1911 on industrial property, and to ascertain why it was not found possible to accept unanimously the Madrid Agreement of the same year. Further, a preliminary text was prepared of articles to be inserted either in the existing Convention on Unfair Competition or in a revised Convention.

The Economic Committee began an enquiry into certain classes of problems specially referred to it by the Genoa Conference: dumping, discrimination in customs charges, the publication of customs tariffs, etc. Matters concerning the organisation of statistics form the subject of negotiations with the existing Institutions.

## 2. *Work of the Financial Committee.*

In the first place, the Committee has completed its examination of legislation on lost or stolen securities. At the request of the Council, recommendations have been submitted by the Secretariat to all the States Members.

It has entrusted the consideration of the question of double taxation (the importance of which was emphasised by the Second and Third Commissions of the Genoa Conference) to a small Committee of experts, which is endeavouring to settle the general lines of an international arrangement. The question of the flight of capital also has received attention recently.

As a result of the discussions of the Brussels Conference in 1920, the Assembly recommended the adoption of a system of international credits, known as the ter Meulen plan. The organisation specially established to make known this system carried on its work in London up to the middle of the year, and fully succeeded in its task of acquainting countries impoverished by the war, and possible lenders, with this excellent method of international co-operation. In particular, the ter Meulen plan received a warm welcome in the United States of America. This question will now be dealt with by the Secretariat of the League of Nations at Geneva, as Sir Drummond Drummond-Fraser has brought his work of organisation to an end.

Lastly, the Committee examined the difficulties which would be caused by excessively rapid deflation, and entrusted the Secretariat with the work of undertaking a monetary enquiry with a view to discovering practical methods of avoiding these difficulties and assisting the stabilisation of currencies. The Committee considered that in this way it could help in the work of clearly defining and solving international monetary problems without encroaching on any work which might be undertaken by the Conference of Banks of Issue to be held at Genoa.

As regards all the work already mentioned, particular reference should be made here to the increasing and generally recognised importance of the publications of the Secretariat issued in accordance with the suggestions of the Brussels Conference: the memoranda on Public Finance, Currency and Central Banks, and the *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*.

The Genoa Conference specially recognised the extreme usefulness of the first of these publications. The others are also essential to any serious examination of the problems of economic reconstruction.

On the recommendation of the Committee, the Secretariat also proposes to undertake the collection of information as to commercial banks and the various systems of taxation.

Finally, the Secretariat has already begun the publication of a large portion of the results of the enquiry into the application of the Brussels resolutions, which was carried out in each country from official sources by representatives of the country concerned.

\* \* \*

We have seen that the Economic and Financial Committee undertook, and has successfully carried out, enquiries of a general character intended to result, sooner or later, in the conclusion of international conventions.

The Council must now draw the attention of the Assembly to a series of labours undertaken by the Financial Committee which specially concern certain European countries, and which constitute the application to particular cases of the principles of co-operation, which form the primary object of the League of Nations.

The last Assembly took note of the resolutions of the Council with regard to requests which might be submitted by countries in need of technical advisers as regards finance or economics, and the enquiry into this question was continued during the present year. As has already been seen (Section 7), Albania made a request in June not only for the appointment of a technical adviser but also for the despatch of experts to consider what measures might be taken to encourage the investment of foreign capital in that country. The Financial Committee has, up to the present, decided to send a delegate to Albania to make a general enquiry into the administrative conditions of that country in order to pave the way for an eventual decision by the Committee and the Council as to the despatch of a financial adviser and other experts.

The Free City of Danzig had already had recourse to the services of the League of Nations in 1921, when the High Commissioner of the League of Nations drew the attention of the Council to the financial situation of the Free City. M. Avenol and M. Janssen, members of the Financial Committee, conducted an exhaustive enquiry, the conclusions of which, adopted by the Committee, may be summarised as follows : The cost of occupation and the payment of the value of German property constitute, as the High Commissioner has already pointed out, very heavy burdens for the Free City. It might be possible, by means of negotiations, to arrange for a reduction or revision of these financial burdens, but the Free City of Danzig must first of all introduce reforms in its budget with a view to carrying out certain practicable economies. Such reforms would, moreover, form an excellent preliminary to an international loan, for which the Free City requested the League of Nations if possible to grant its moral support. The report of the Financial Committee was transmitted in June to the High Commissioner of the League at Danzig.

On April 22nd the Czecho-Slovak Government signed a contract in London with a large bank in that City for the issue of a public loan to be floated in Great Britain, the Netherlands and the United States. Certain clauses in this contract concern the League of Nations and assign to the Council the duty of arbitrator should the Czecho-Slovak Government fail to fulfil its obligations or should any other questions arise in the future.

This request is a new and interesting application of an idea to which the Brussels Conference attached great importance, namely, that relations between Governments and foreign creditors may be improved by the intervention of the League of Nations.

If provision is made for such intervention in many future contracts, international relations will certainly become safer and more regular in this respect. The Financial Committee has therefore recommended the Council to accept the responsibility of acting as arbitrator in accordance with the spontaneously expressed desire of the Czecho-Slovak Government and of the bank entrusted with the issue of the loan.

Finally, the Committee has been engaged, in the course of the year, in continuing the efforts which it made in 1921, and which had the approval of the Assembly, with a view to the financial reconstruction of Austria. It will be remembered that the plan recommended by the Financial Committee as a result of its enquiry in May, 1921, could only be carried out if the Governments concerned declared themselves willing to suspend, for a period of at least twenty years, the liens on Austrian assets which had been established in their favour in connection either with reparations or with relief credits.

Pending this suspension, the Austrian Government obtained advances from the Czecho-Slovak, French and British Governments. The latter Government, when making these advances, asked the Financial Committee to arrange with the Austrian Government for the appointment of a financial adviser to collaborate in the carrying out of reforms, but the Austrian delegate informed the Financial Committee in London in February that, for reasons of internal policy, and owing to existing circumstances, the Austrian Government could not ask for the appointment of a financial adviser.

Great progress, however, has been made during the past year in the essential question of the suspension of liens. In particular, the Government of the United States had decided to take this step, and now only three or four States have not yet seen their way to give their definite consent. Members of the Financial Committee, in the course of long and difficult negotiations with the seventeen Governments which are the creditors of Austria, have worked assiduously, through their respective Governments, and in close co-operation. The Committee is happy practically to have brought to a successful conclusion a task without which any economic and financial reconstruction of Austria would be impossible.

\* \* \*

Having thus rapidly reviewed the special activities of the Financial Committee, the Council desires to draw the attention of the Assembly to the relations which have been established by its members with various European countries, and to the great importance of the enquiries which the former have undertaken, or are about to undertake, at the request of those countries. The Free City of Danzig, Albania, Austria and Czechoslovakia have had recourse to the Financial Committee in circumstances which, though different, showed that those countries were alike convinced that only in that direction could they obtain the best counsel as to their problems—counsel inspired alike by breadth of view, impartiality and competence.

The Economic and Financial Committee has in hand the formation of a centre of first-hand information, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated, regarding the budgetary and economic situation of many European countries.

The Genoa Conference showed that any serious reconstruction scheme must be based upon the improvement of public finance in the various States. Completely impartial enquiries into these financial conditions are of the greatest use, not only from a general theoretical point of view, but also from the practical point of view of public or private bodies which may have occasion to conclude contracts with any particular country, and also from the point of view of such a country itself, since its sovereign rights are scrupulously respected in the enquiries of the Financial Committee.

The Council, therefore, recommends the Assembly to give its special approval to this branch of the activities of the Financial Committee, and to request it to continue the work in the future.

## II. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT ORGANISATION.

A separate report adopted by the Communications and Transit Committee gives a detailed account of the work done by the Communications and Transit Organisation between the second and the third Assemblies. It has, however, been considered convenient to give here also a summary of the items on the agenda of that organisation during the year.

### I. RAILWAY QUESTIONS.

#### *Proposed International Railway Convention.*

The Communications and Transit Conference which met at Barcelona in March 1921 decided that a Railway Convention should be prepared by the League of Nations within two years. This Convention is referred to in Article 379 of the Treaty of Versailles, and falls also within the sphere of the obligations undertaken by Members of the League in virtue of Article 23 of the Covenant. The Council of the League has asked the Advisory Committee on Communications and Transit to undertake the preparatory work and to fix the date of the Conference, which must meet early in 1923. This preparatory work has been entrusted to the Railway Sub-Committee, which has already considered the general outlines of the draft Convention, namely, its relation to other general railway conventions like that referred to in Article 366 of the Peace Treaty, which is to take the place of the Berne Convention of 1890. In the meantime, the Governments concerned have received questionnaires requesting their views as to the scope and character of the Convention.

In general, this Convention, which may have a continental or regional character, may be defined as dealing with all matters regarding the facilities of international railway traffic affecting the reciprocal relations of the States and which are susceptible of governmental action. The Genoa Conference, recently, has still insisted on the urgency of such an international arrangement.

#### *Railway and Travelling Facilities.*

The Communications and Transit Committee has considered some immediate practical questions for the improvement of railway traffic. The subjects falling under this head include measures taken with a view to introducing uniformity with regard to the period of "summer-time", the reform of the calendar, information regarding travelling facilities for the blind, the improvement of sleeping-car services in Central Europe and the lightening of existing restrictions with regard to passports, customs formalities and through-tickets.

The Committee, at its meeting in March 1922, agreed to ask the European Governments whether they had decided to introduce and maintain summer-time, and, if so, whether they were prepared to introduce an international agreement in order that there might be uniformity as regards the period.

The reform of the calendar is not only a practical problem of communications. The matter was discussed by the Communications and Transit Committee in March, when it was decided that the Secretariat should collect the necessary documents, and, in co-operation with the various competent organisations, should draft a short analysis of the existing schemes for a reformed calendar. It was further decided to invite opinions from the Economic and Financial Committee and from the Committee appointed by the Council in May 1922 for the co-ordination of intellectual work.

The Communications and Transit Committee (dealing with this question at the request of the Labour Office) at the same meeting decided to collect and publish information received from the various Governments as to existing travelling facilities for the blind.

The question of the sleeping-car service in Central Europe was brought before the Committee at its March session by the British Government. The Committee decided to entrust the examination of the question to its Railway Sub-Committee, and asked the Secretary-General of the League to enquire of the Governments concerned as to the causes of the existing situation. There is at present no sleeping-car service between Vienna and Berlin.



Passports and customs formalities have been appreciably relaxed by various Governments in conformity with the resolution of the Communications and Transit Committee adopted in 1921. Several Governments have gone even beyond these resolutions, and have abolished visa formalities between their respective nationals, and some of them have abandoned the passport system altogether. The Communications and Transit Committee, however, has noted that delays at the frontiers do not appear to be lessened in consequence of these measures, and that there still remains a good deal to be done in co-ordinating the railway services at frontier stations. The Committee, during its March session, decided to bring the matter to the attention of the Governments and of the Time Tables Conference, which is held from time to time by the various European administrations, and instructed its Railway Sub-Committee to follow up the progress already achieved.

## 2. HYDRO-ELECTRIC QUESTIONS.

### *Proposed International Agreements on Electric Power.*

The Communications and Transit Committee, during its March session, decided to appoint a Sub-Committee to consider what provisions might usefully form the basis of international arrangements facilitating the co-operation of the different States in order to develop the use of hydro-electric power and the electrified railways of international concern. This question had, on the proposal of Italy, been discussed at the Barcelona Conference, and a recommendation to this effect had been transmitted to the Communications and Transit Committee.

The question is at present under thorough consideration by a Sub-Committee appointed for the purpose. Two draft conventions—one on the transit of electric power, and the other on the development of the hydraulic power of waterways separating or traversing different States—are already considered. The broader question of the cession of hydro-electric power for electrification of railways of international concern is subject to greater divergency of opinion.

## 3. QUESTIONS OF NAVIGATION

### *Tonnage Measurement of Vessels used in Inland Navigation.*

The tonnage measurement of vessels employed in inland navigation is often different in different countries, and it is necessary, in these cases, for the craft to be re-measured on arrival in another country unless there is an agreement between the Governments of both countries providing for a mutual recognition of tonnage certificates. There are a number of agreements for mutual recognition in existence, notably a Convention between Germany, Belgium, France and the Netherlands, concluded at Brussels in 1898, which, as regards Germany and those of the Allied and Associated Powers party thereto, was renewed by Article 282, paragraph 14, of the Treaty of Versailles.

The absence of more general international conventions (which may be regional or continental) on the subject is likely to become a source of serious difficulty in the immediate future, owing to the great development of inland navigation at present contemplated. The Rhine system will shortly be linked with the system of the Vistula by means of the Mittel-land Canal in Germany. There are plans for connecting the Main and the Neckar system with the Danube. In Czechoslovakia there are plans for linking the Danube with the Elbe and the Oder, and in Switzerland for joining the Rhine and the Rhone. All these plans emphasise the desirability of extending the old arrangement of 1898 to the new countries interested in inland navigation, or of replacing it, if necessary, by a broader one.

The Communications and Transit Committee considered this question during its session held in March. It decided to undertake the preparatory work in the matter, in close collaboration with the different international river Commissions. The same question has also been raised as regards continents other than Europe.

### *Uniformity in the Measurement of Maritime Vessels.*

There is at present an almost universally adopted method of calculating the tonnage of ocean-going vessels. In practice, however, the rules universally recognised give rise to very different methods of application in various countries.

At a recent meeting of the Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce held in London, a resolution was passed to the effect that the method of the application of the regulations in force for the tonnage measurement of maritime vessels should be uniformly applied and the method of their application improved.

The Communications and Transit Committee, which considered this question during its March session, adopted a resolution to the effect that it is highly desirable that an international tonnage code should be drafted, laying down a single universal applicable method of calculating tonnage according to identical rules.

The Communications and Transit Committee has requested the various bodies concerned with the problem to inform it of their wishes and conclusions, in order that it may, as soon as possible, suggest practicable measures to the Governments.

*The Problem of Securing Uniform Private Law on Inland Navigation.*

The importance of securing uniform rules in regard to civil, commercial and sanitary matters has been recognised for many years. The question was considered in 1905 by the Tenth International Navigation Congress, and was again discussed by the Provisional Committee on Communications and Transit at Paris. The question has also been raised by different River Commissions.

The Communications and Transit Committee, during its session in March, decided to draw the attention of the River Commission to the great importance of introducing a more uniform scheme of rules within each of the systems falling under the jurisdiction of the separate Commissions with a view to gradually realising, when and where possible, a still wider uniformity for all the waterways of Europe. The Committee also decided to consider, later on, after having heard the views of the River Commissions, what steps may be taken, at any time, in connection with the progress made in their special field by those Commissions.

The same question has also been raised as regards continents other than Europe.

#### 4. QUESTION OF AIR TRANSPORTATION.

An International Convention on Aerial Navigation was signed at Paris on October 13th, 1919. This convention establishes a permanent international committee vested with extensive powers and placed under the League of Nations.

No official international action has as yet been taken as regards private air law. An international congress on air legislation met recently under the auspices of a private organisation, which was attended by the General Secretary of the Communications and Transit Committee. The Communications and Transit Committee considers that absence of co-operation between the various States which are at present drafting national air legislation may well prove detrimental to the improvement of air navigation. Divergent laws and customs may be established in different countries and many avoidable complications may thus ensue. The Committee wishes to discover whether an agreement may not be included on certain vital points in regard to air navigation.

The Committee suggests that it might perhaps assist the private organisations at present engaged in this work in reducing the results of their investigations to an official form. By keeping in touch with these bodies and with the Governments concerned, it might be possible for the Communications and Transit Committee, when the work is sufficiently advanced, to recommend the convening of a special conference to establish uniformity in such parts of private air law as come within the field of general action.

#### 5. THE BARCELONA CONVENTIONS.

The Convention on Freedom of Transit has been signed by the following States:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, British Empire, Esthonia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, India, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Persia, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Uruguay.

The Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern has been signed by the following States:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, British Empire, Esthonia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, India, Italy, Latvia, Luxemburg, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay.

Albania, the British Empire, Bulgaria and New Zealand have deposited their ratifications.

Italy has officially notified to the Secretary-General of the League her intention of ratifying the Barcelona Conventions.

All States represented at Barcelona and at the Genoa Conference declared in Genoa their intention to ratify the Transit Convention or to adhere to it.

All European States represented at Barcelona and at the Genoa Conference declared in Genoa their intention to ratify the Waterways Convention or to adhere to it, except the Netherlands and Switzerland, which declared that the matter needed further study. Roumania and Portugal reserved some points of interpretation. France declared herself ready to ratify, but reserved her freedom not to ratify in case the Netherlands and Switzerland finally refused to do so. The resolution adopted on the matter at Genoa is quoted later in this report (See page 66).

The Committee, during its March session, decided to ask the Governments which had not yet signed the Conventions whether they intended to do so, and to draw the attention of the signatory Governments to the expediency of hastening, as far as possible, the procedure of ratification.



### III. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

#### *The Epidemic Commission.*

The first instance of an international co-ordinated effort on the part of governmental public health services to fight epidemics in Europe was initiated in March 1920 by the Council of the League of Nations, which asked an International Sanitary Conference sitting in London to submit a detailed plan for a campaign against typhus in Poland, in close co-operation with the representatives of the Polish Public Health Service. As a result of this Conference, successive appeals were launched by the Council to all Governments for funds, and an Epidemic Commission was appointed to administer the funds and to be instrumental in bringing material assistance to the public health services concerned.

The Epidemic Commission is not a charitable relief organisation; its funds are derived from subscriptions received from Governments, which have recognised that the extermination of typhus in Eastern Europe is a matter of international concern. It does not undertake independent work, but it acts through the public health administrations of the countries concerned. It aims at strengthening the sanitary organisation of the countries as the most effective and lasting means of checking the spread of epidemics. It differs therefore fundamentally from the ordinary relief organisations interested in the immediate alleviation of suffering or in satisfying the immediate needs of the situation, with the result that, when assistance is withdrawn, former conditions again prevail. The Epidemic Commission acted on the principle that a permanent system of sanitary defence should be built up in Eastern Europe on the border zone forming the bridge between Poland and Russia.

The Epidemic Commission was the only health organ of the League until September 1st, 1921, when, after very prolonged negotiations, the second Assembly set up the Health Organisation of the League, with the Health Section of the Permanent Secretariat as its executive organ. The Epidemic Commission became one of the working departments of the Health Organisation of the League.

The Health Organisation decided first to obtain accurate information concerning the epidemiological situation and the health conditions of the most affected areas in Europe. Its intimate relations with Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic States, etc., did not suffice for the purpose, and at the end of September a special Commission was despatched to Moscow and contact was established with the People's Health Commissariat. Later on, representatives of the Epidemic Commission were sent to Russia and the information obtained regularly transmitted from Russia and lately also from the Ukraine. These reports were presented to the Warsaw Conference in a series of publications of the Health Organisation.

#### PUBLICATION OF EPIDEMIOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE.

By the resolution of the first Assembly, the Health Organisation of the League is asked "to organise a means of more rapid interchange of information on matters where immediate precaution against diseases may be required (*e. g.*, epidemics), and to simplify methods for acting rapidly on such information where it affects more than one country."

The Health Committee considered this question at its first session in August 1921. It has, from the first, been of the opinion that the collection and exchange of intelligence regarding epidemics would form one of the main duties of the Health Organisation of the League. It was unanimously decided in August 1921 that a service of epidemiological intelligence and public health statistics should be organised immediately, and that a report should be prepared on the methods best adapted for the collection and distribution of such intelligence, and at a later session held in October 1921, it was agreed that the most important work of the kind which could be undertaken at the moment was the collection of systematic information regarding epidemics in Eastern Europe. Considerable progress has been achieved in this direction.

In January 1922 appeared the first of a series entitled *Epidemiological Intelligence* containing the latest available information regarding epidemic diseases in Eastern Europe in 1920 and 1921. This was followed, in March 1922, by a second publication of the same series, being the first part of a report by Professor Tarassevitch upon the epidemic situation in Russia. Professor Tarassevitch, in drafting this report, was assisted by experts attached to scientific institutions spread over the whole of Russia from Irkutsk to Odessa. It contained unpublished statistical and demographic information collected by the most eminent Russian statisticians, and summarised all the facts which could be obtained from published articles and reports.

A series of *Epidemiological Reports* containing the latest intelligence, and issued at short intervals according as the information became available, was started in February 1922. These reports were sent for information to all the Members of the League and to the health administrations of the various Governments.

This systematic collection of epidemiological information by the Health Section of the Secretariat at Geneva enabled a precise estimate to be made in the beginning of the present year of the danger arising from epidemics in Eastern Europe. In January 1922 a short general report

on the health situation in Eastern Europe was prepared dealing with the extension of the famine in Russia and with the greatly increased incidence of epidemic diseases. It was on receipt of this report that the Polish Government applied to the President of the Council of the League requesting the immediate convocation of a technical European conference to consider the situation, and it was largely owing to these accurate and reliable statistics that the Conference, called at Warsaw as a result of this application, was able to frame practical recommendations dictated by the facts.

No institution has hitherto undertaken to publish a comprehensive survey of the epidemiological situation of the world, though the need for such a survey is felt by various national administrations. There is still a great deal to be done in this particular field. It is hoped that the Health Section of the League may become an international clearing house for such information, and that experts and existing institutions may be prepared to assist in the necessary enquiries.

The Health Committee, during its session held in May 1922, congratulated the medical secretariat on the work already accomplished and decided that it should be continued. It considered that for the moment the work should mainly consist in the investigation and study of special problems, pending the organisation of a general service in accordance with the resolution approved by the Assembly in 1921.

#### THE WARSAW CONFERENCE.

##### *The Position in January 1922.*

It has already been mentioned that information collected by the Health Section showed that in January 1922 the position as regards epidemics in Eastern Europe was rapidly becoming extremely serious. In the summer of the previous year the position had gradually improved, but towards the end of the year a number of causes combined to bring about a revival of disease through almost the whole of European Russia. The principal cause was the famine and the mass migration of the population which it caused.

In November and December an increase of typhus was notified by the Russian Commissariat of Public Health, particularly marked in the north-eastern and northern parts of the country. Relapsing fever was increasing throughout practically the whole of Russia.

The general migration towards the western provinces of Soviet Russia and the eastern districts of Poland was particularly marked. Only a small portion of the population came by rail, and only this proportion could be subjected to health control. The scale of the movement towards Eastern Poland may be judged by the fact that in the station of Baranowicze over 300,000 persons were treated between March and December 1921. Over 50,000 were repatriated through this station in October, and of these 800 had to be transferred to hospital. In November 59,843 were repatriated through this station, of whom 2,127 were transferred to hospital. There was every indication that the situation would grow worse in the spring of 1922.

Meanwhile, cholera, which had ended abruptly in August, had reappeared in the Ukraine in the autumn of 1921.

The pressure of the westward migration in November and December broke the Polish sanitary cordon, with the result that in these months the incidence of typhus and relapsing fever increased in the Polish districts of Novogrodek, Polesia and Volhynia, in the district of Vilna, and in the province of Brest-Litovsk. 123 cases of typhus were notified in Warsaw during the first eleven days of January. Energetic steps were at once taken by the Polish authorities, and the sanitary cordon, with the assistance of the Epidemic Commission, was reinforced. Negotiations were begun by Russia and Poland for the conclusion of a health convention.

##### *The Convening of the Conference.*

Such was the position when the Polish Government wrote to the Council of the League, requesting the immediate convocation of a technical European Conference to consider the situation.

The Council invited the Polish Government itself to convene the Conference, placing at its disposal the services of the Health Organisation of the League.

The following Governments accepted the invitation, and were present at the Conference:

Austria	Great Britain	Roumania
Belgium	Greece	Russia
Bulgaria	Hungary	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
Czechoslovakia	Italy	Spain
Danzig	Japan	Sweden
Denmark	Latvia	Switzerland
Esthonia	Lithuania	Turkey
Finland	Netherlands	Ukraine
France	Norway	
Germany	Poland	

The Conference met on March 20th, and passed the last of its resolutions on March 28th. Most of the members went upon a tour of inspection organised by the Polish Department of Public Health, visiting the great quarantine station of Baranowicze and inspecting the epidemic hospitals at Vilna, Wolkowysk and Bialystok.

### *The Resolutions of the Conference.*

The Conference, by a resolution adopted on March 22nd, 1922, formally noted the position with which it had to deal. In Russia before the war the average incidence of typhus fever was about 90,000 cases per annum, and of relapsing fever about 30,000, but in 1920 the typhus cases officially notified numbered three millions, and the relapsing fever cases one million. Poland and other countries of Eastern Europe had suffered on a similar scale. The countries attacked by these epidemics took all the measures of control and defence possible in the circumstances, with the result that in 1921 there was a marked improvement. Unfortunately, towards the end of 1921, famine, migration and repatriation led to an increase of epidemics, which was immediately dangerous to the rest of Europe.

The Conference recorded its conviction that, failing greater efforts than had hitherto been possible, there would be serious suffering and death among the populations of the areas attacked. The work of reconstruction would be impeded and trade hampered. These conditions, moreover, would constitute a real and imminent danger to the whole continent of Europe.

The Conference drew particular attention to the lack of medical men and trained staff, caused in part by disease and death among those who had devoted their lives to the campaign. By a resolution adopted on March 27th, it recommended that training courses for all grades of medical and sanitary staff, directed by experts drawn from the public health services of all nations, should be organised at two or three centres, such as Warsaw, Kharkoff and Moscow.

An important group of resolutions embodies recommendations to the effect that the States threatened by the epidemics should, as soon as possible, take steps to conclude special health agreements. It was understood that these agreements, while taking account of special conditions in the various States, would conform to certain general principles defined in the report of the Conference. The delegations to the Conference expressed their willingness to begin negotiating these agreements at once. Conversations were immediately opened at Warsaw between Poland and Czechoslovakia, Poland and Lithuania, and Poland and Roumania. Russia was prepared to negotiate with Latvia, Esthonia and Finland, and Czechoslovakia with Germany. The negotiations for a convention between Poland and Russia, interrupted by the Conference, were at once resumed.

The Conference suggests that in the event of it being necessary to constitute an organ of conciliation or mediation to settle in a friendly manner questions arising under these conventions, the Health Section of the League of Nations might be entrusted with this duty without prejudice to the right of any State to resort to a different procedure.

The Conference decided that the merely defensive policy hitherto adopted of strengthening the health organisation on the Western frontiers of Russia was not sufficient. It proposed that, in addition, an attack should be made upon the epidemics at their source. Since it was out of the question to conduct a campaign covering the whole of Russia and the Ukraine, the Conference suggested that the offensive part of the programme should be confined to railways and waterways, and to a selected area within Russia of vital importance to her economic life. The Donetz basin was suggested as being an epidemic centre for typhus and cholera, an area easy of access through the Black Sea ports, and a region where coal and iron ore mines were concentrated.

It was estimated that for these offensive measures and for reinforcing the sanitary barrier on the frontiers the sum of 1½ millions sterling would be required.

### *Execution of the Decisions of the Conference.*

The decisions of the Warsaw Conference were communicated to the Health Committee at the session held in May 1922.

The Committee, in a resolution adopted on May 13th, expressed its satisfaction that an endeavour had been made to organise on a broader basis of international co-operation the campaign against epidemics in Eastern Europe. The attention of the Council was earnestly directed to the seriousness of the situation and to the urgent necessity of securing the means required to ensure the adoption of international measures suitable for the protection of the health of Europe.

Meanwhile, the Medical Director had brought the resolutions of the Conference to the notice of the European Governments assembled at Genoa. The Conference at Genoa adopted a resolution approving the principles of the campaign and of the system of defence proposed at Warsaw. It recommended the European Governments assembled at Genoa to consider immediately the practical application of these principles, and for this purpose to appeal to their respective parliaments to provide the necessary means.

The Council of the League considered the resolutions of the Warsaw Conference almost simultaneously. It instructed the Secretary-General to get into touch as soon as possible with the Governments which had been represented at Warsaw, and which had declared themselves interested in the carrying out of the programme of the Conference.

### PROPOSED EXCHANGE OF HEALTH OFFICIALS BETWEEN DIFFERENT GOVERNMENTS.

One of the duties of the Health Organisation, as defined by the first Assembly, is "to bring administrative health authorities in different countries into close relationship with each other,

The Medical Director, in a report presented to the Health Committee in May, suggested that it might be possible to invite certain Governments to commission some four or five of their medical officers of health to work for a period of three months within the ranks of some other health administration.

Another way of correlating the various health activities of the various services would be to invite national health administrations to appoint members to serve temporarily in the Health Section of the Secretariat of the League.

The Health Committee discussed these suggestions during the session held in May 1922. It was felt to be extremely desirable that all possible facilities should be granted to health officials to familiarise themselves with sanitary science and the organisation of public health in countries other than their own. The Committee thought that preliminary steps might be taken to approach the Governments interested in the matter with a view to effecting an exchange of sanitary officers between the countries which desired to make the experiment. The Committee further approved the proposals of the Medical Director for recruiting members for the Health Section from the health administrations of various countries.

#### THE PREVENTION OF EPIDEMIC DISEASES IN THE NEAR EAST.

It is one of the duties of the Health Organisation, as defined by the second Assembly, to promote the conclusion of international agreements necessary for administrative action in matters of health and their revision when circumstances require.

The last of a series of international health conventions was signed at Paris in 1912. It is one of the objects of this convention to regulate health measures in special international questions, such as the sanitary control of the Suez Canal and the Mecca pilgrimage. It is generally recognised that this convention is now out of date. Progressive countries have shown a tendency to go their own way, independent of international rules, whereas new or backward countries are in need of guidance as to their sanitary work upon sea and land frontiers.

The Office international d'Hygiène publique has carefully studied the convention, and has drafted a revised text for Part I which deals generally with matters of international health. Parts II and III of the convention, which deal specifically with Near Eastern questions, has yet to be revised.

A Commission was accordingly nominated by the Health Committee, in consultation with the President of the Office international d'Hygiène publique, and with the sanction of the Council of the League, to make a brief visit for this purpose to the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Straits of Constantinople. The Commission consisted of Professor Madsen, Chairman of the Health Committee, Sir George Buchanan, of the British Ministry of Health, Dr. Jitta, Director-General of Public Health in the Netherlands, Professor Jorge, Director-General of Health in Portugal, and Dr. Violle, of the Pasteur Institute.

The Commission met in Alexandria on February 20th. It visited the quarantine station of El Tor, the Suez Canal and Port Said, Jerusalem, Haifa, Damascus, Deraa, Beyrout, and Constantinople. It received cordial assistance from all the government health authorities of the countries visited.

The Commission presented its report to the Health Committee in May 1922. It surveys the measures necessary to prevent the spread of dangerous epidemic disease, such as cholera, plague, smallpox, and typhus, in and from the areas which it visited. The Commission considers that special health measures remain necessary in the Suez Canal, which provides a channel whereby diseases such as cholera and plague, endemic in India and other Eastern countries, may be carried to countries elsewhere. The Commission recommends that measures should be continued on the principles of the Health Convention of 1912, and that their administration should remain with the Sanitary Maritime and Quarantine Board of Egypt, a body with special international representation and much valuable experience.

For protection against the danger of epidemics arising from the pilgrimage to Mecca, the Commission recommends that the system of quarantine stations established under the Health Convention of 1912 should be maintained. The Commission does not think it possible to organise within the territory of the Hedjaz any really effective health measures, and it considers that the greatest possible difficulties will arise if non-Mahommedan countries were to attempt to intervene in these regions in order to improve the control of epidemics. International action must therefore be directed to keeping the pilgrims under observation at the ports of departure and securing their examination at a quarantine station on their way to and from the Hedjaz.

The quarantine system recommended by the Commission involves the co-operation of public health services in Syria, in Constantinople and in Egypt. The Commission recommends that the action of the various national or international services should be co-ordinated by a committee responsible to the League of Nations. This committee would ensure an exchange of information and co-operation between the large number of nationalities interested in the necessary protective measures.

The Commission considers that the action required in Syria and Palestine can be taken by an effective public health service through their own internal organisation, and does not think that any exceptional international provisions are necessary.

At Constantinople, on the other hand, it is, in the opinion of the Commission, essential that a control should be introduced similar to that in force for the Suez Canal. Countries bordering on the Black Sea are at present exceptionally exposed to epidemics, and the present station, which is situated at the northern entrance to the Bosphorus, is wholly inadequate. It is recommended that a fully equipped health station on modern lines, with hospital accommodation and provision for the observation of contacts, should be instituted.

The Health Committee considered the report of the Commission during the session held in May 1922. It decided to forward it to the Council, and it drew the attention of the Council to the advisability of proceeding as soon as possible to a revision of the Health Convention of 1912 on the lines suggested. The Health Committee noted at the same time that the Office international, having completed the draft revision of Part I of the Convention, has asked the French Government to take steps to convene an international health conference before the end of the year to carry out a satisfactory revision of the Convention on the technical basis provided by the Office international.

The Committee hoped that the Council of the League would ask the Governments of countries Members of the League to do all in their power to facilitate the work of the conference, and to hasten the ratification of the new Convention.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE STANDARDISATION OF SERA AND SEROLOGICAL TESTS.

The Health Committee, at its meeting at Paris in October 1921, decided to begin experimental enquiries on the standardisation of sera and serological tests. It is generally recognised by medical experts that important progress could be made in dealing with certain diseases if an international agreement could be reached for the unification of the standards of anti-toxic sera, such as, for example, the sera used in the prevention and treatment of tetanus, diphtheria, dysentery, etc. International research was also felt to be necessary with regard to the meningococcus and the pneumococcus groups of bacteria.

The Conference which met in London on December 12th, 1921, was convened by the Health Committee. It brought together scientists of various nations who had not met since the beginning of the war. State institutes in Great Britain, France, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, Belgium, Japan, United States, and Austria agreed to participate in the necessary laboratory researches. Professor Madsen, Chairman of the Health Committee, prepared a detailed programme for the inquiry, and placed the Sero-Therapeutic Institute at Copenhagen at the disposal of the Conference as a central laboratory for the receipt of documents and samples. M. Velghe, President of the Office international d'Hygiène publique, accepted the vice-chairmanship in order to emphasise the interest taken by the Office international in the work, and its desire to co-operate.

The Conference appointed four sub-committees to conduct the necessary researches. Each sub-committee arranged for researches to be carried on in the various national institutes and for the results to be exchanged and compared. When the Health Committee met at Paris in May, 1922, Professor Madsen, who presented a report on the Conference, was able to announce that important results had been achieved. He further informed the Committee that the Pasteur Institute of Paris had invited a further Conference to meet at that Institute as soon as the experiments undertaken were sufficiently advanced to allow of a comparison of results.

#### THE OPIUM SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE HEALTH COMMITTEE.

In the autumn of 1921, the Health Committee, at the request of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium, undertook an enquiry regarding the legitimate consumption of dangerous drugs. The Committee decided to conduct this enquiry in a few civilised countries, relatively small, in which, so far as was known, little, if any, material abuse of the drugs existed. A sub-committee was appointed for the purpose.

Enquiries were made in Belgium by M. Velghe, in Switzerland by Dr. Carrière, in Denmark by Professor Madsen. Sir George Buchanan, at the same time, communicated with the public health authorities of Australia and New Zealand.

The most successful of the enquiries were made in Switzerland, where Dr. Carrière, with the co-operation of the doctors, chemists and hospitals throughout Switzerland, obtained figures which seemed fairly accurately to represent the total legitimate consumption for medicinal purposes of opium and cocaine and their derivatives.

The results were communicated to the Health Committee during its session in May 1922. The Committee noted that the facts obtained were meagre. It noted also the opinion expressed by the Sub-Committee to the effect that it would be practically impossible to obtain satisfactory information in countries such as England and France, where the commerce in these drugs was extensive and intricate.

The Health Committee decided that, owing to the difficulties attaching to an investigation of this kind, the information so far obtained was not sufficient to enable the quantity of dangerous drugs required for legitimate purposes to be determined. The Sub-Committee was invited to

continue its investigations, and to hold itself at the disposal of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium if it should happen to require expert medical advice upon any new information obtained.

#### PROPOSED CAMPAIGN AGAINST SLEEPING SICKNESS IN AFRICA.

The Health Committee, during its session in May, recommended the appointment of a small sub-committee of experts to be nominated by the mandatory Powers in Africa to collect information concerning the prevalence of sleeping sickness and tuberculosis among the natives of Equatorial Africa, and to study measures for the prevention of these diseases.

The Health Committee, on the basis of information obtained by this sub-committee of experts, will study the possibility of an agreement between the mandatory Powers in Africa to co-operate in a general campaign against sleeping sickness. It should not be difficult for a general agreement to be reached.

---

## 12

### THE GENOA CONFERENCE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

---

#### *Summary.*

#### I. RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL PRIOR TO THE CONFERENCE, AND THE CO-OPERATION OF THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS IN THE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE.

#### II. RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENOA CONFERENCE INVITING THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO UNDERTAKE CERTAIN TASKS:

##### *A. Economic Questions:*

- (1) Customs tariffs, customs restrictions, treaties and conventions.
- (2) Trade arbitration.
- (3) Treatment of foreigners in conduct of business.

##### *B. Financial Questions:*

- (1) Flight of capital.
- (2) Credits.

##### *C. Questions of Communications and Transit:*

- (1) Passports and customs examination of luggage.
- (2) Barcelona Conventions.
- (3) Recommendations of the Barcelona Conference and Conventions to be subsequently drawn up.
- (4) General mission entrusted to the competent Technical Organisations of the League.

##### *D. Health and Social Questions:*

- (1) Anti-epidemic campaign in Russia.
- (2) Red Cross.

E. *Questions relating to Minorities:*

- (1) Bulgarian minorities.
- (2) Hungarian minorities.

III. MEASURES ADOPTED TO GIVE EFFECT TO THOSE RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENOA CONFERENCE WHICH CONCERN THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS OF THE LEAGUE:

- (1) Resolution by the Council.
- (2) Subsequent action.

I. RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL PRIOR TO THE CONFERENCE, AND CO-OPERATION OF THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS IN THE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE.

On March 26th, 1922, the Council adopted the following resolution:

"The Council of the League of Nations, having noted the proposal of the Italian Government, authorised the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to provide the Genoa Conference with the technical assistance which may be requested to the extent permitted by exigencies of the work for which the Secretary-General is responsible."

In accordance with this resolution, the Secretary-General sent to Genoa, for the period of the Conference, the following members of the Secretariat:

Professor ATTOLICO, Under Secretary-General, Director of the Transit Section;  
M. HAAS, Secretary-General of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit;  
Mr. NIXON, Director *ad interim* of the Economic and Financial Section;  
Dr. RAJCHMAN, Director of the Health Section;

with a view to giving the Genoa Conference all requisite information should the discussions of the Conference bear upon the past, present or future activity of the Technical Organisations of the League.

At the end of the Conference, Signor FACTA, the President, sent the following letter to the Secretary-General:

"The League of Nations was good enough, in response to the invitation of the President of the Genoa Conference, to delegate representatives of its Technical Organisations in order that they might place their documents and their experience at the disposal of the Conference. Now that the work of the Conference has come to a close, I have great pleasure in tendering to the Council my grateful thanks for the courtesy with which it acceded to my request, and in expressing my high appreciation of the manner in which its representatives at Genoa discharged the delicate and important duties with which they had been entrusted.

"Genoa, May 20th, 1922.

(Signed) FACTA."

II. RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENOA CONFERENCE INVITING THE LEAGUE TO UNDERTAKE CERTAIN MISSIONS.<sup>1</sup>

A. *Economic Questions.*

1. *Customs Tariffs, Customs Restrictions, Treaties and Conventions* (Report of the Economic Commission of the Conference, Chapter 1):

(a) The Conference recalls the principle of the equitable treatment of commerce set out in Article 23 of the Covenant of the League of Nations ..... (Article 9).

<sup>1</sup> All these resolutions were officially communicated to the Secretary-General by the President of the Genoa Conference.



(b) The questions regarding dumping and differential prices being among those which concern most closely the equitable treatment of commerce, it is desirable that the League of Nations should undertake at an early date an enquiry on the subject (Article 11).

(c) The League of Nations, in collaboration with the other competent organisations, such as the International Institute of Agriculture, established by international convention, is invited to facilitate the carrying into effect of Articles 2 and 8<sup>1</sup> by all the means which are at its disposal, or which are furnished by the States represented at the Conference (Article 12).

2. *Commercial Arbitration* (Report of the Economic Commission of the Conference, Chapter II):

It is desirable that the enquiries now being made by the League of Nations, as to the best means of safeguarding the validity of voluntary agreements to refer to arbitration disputes arising out of commercial contracts, should be continued (Article 14).

3. *Treatment of Foreigners in the conduct of Business* (Report of the Economic Commission of the Conference, Chapter III):

(a) ..... It is recognised that double taxation should be avoided by agreements between nations, the principles of which may suitably be elucidated by the examination of the matter which is being undertaken by the League of Nations ..... (Article 15).

(b) Passports (Article 16). (See below "C 1".)

B. *Financial Questions.*

1. *The Flight of Capital* (Report of the Financial Commission of the Conference):

We have considered what action, if any, could be taken to prevent the flight of capital in order to avoid taxation, and we are of the opinion that any proposals to interfere with the freedom of the market for exchange, or to violate the secrecy of bankers' relations with their customers are to be condemned. Subject to this proviso, we are of the opinion that the question of measures for international co-operation to prevent tax evasion might be usefully studied in connection with the problem of double taxation, which is now being studied by a Committee of Experts on behalf of the League of Nations.

We therefore suggest that the League should be invited to consider it (Resolution 13).

2. *Credits* (Report of the Financial Commission of the Conference):

Full information is essential to the creation and maintenance of confidence. Each country should undertake the publication of frequent and complete statements of the conditions of its public finances.

It will be useful that such statements should be regularly supplied to the League of Nations and that the League of Nations should continue to compile and issue periodical volumes based on returns from as many countries as possible, whether Members of the League or not (Resolution 18).

C. *Questions of Communications and Transit.*

1. *Passports and Customs Examinations of Luggage.* (Report of the Economic Commission of the Conference, Chapter III):

It is desirable that, in the matter of passport visa regulations, all countries should apply, as soon and as widely as possible, the recommendations and resolutions of the International Conference on Passports, Customs Formalities and Through Tickets, held at Paris in October, 1920, under the auspices of the Provisional Committee on Communications and Transit of the League of Nations.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Art. 2.* — All customs tariffs should be published; such publication should be accompanied by a clear and precise indication in regard to each category of goods of all the duties collected by the Customs authorities which are leviable on the importation or exportation of the goods concerned. In giving this indication, customs duties should be distinguished from other charges collected by the Customs authorities at the time of importation, in such a manner as to show clearly and exactly in the case of each kind or category of goods the total amount payable upon each unit of measure forming the basis of taxation.

Efforts should be made to render comparable, so far as possible, the nomenclature of customs tariffs, and to assimilate it to commercial terminology.

It is desirable that common principles should be adopted generally for economic statistics.

*Art. 8.* — It is accordingly agreed that, if licences are granted, the conditions under which they can be obtained should be publicly announced and clearly stated; that the licensing system should be as simple and unvarying as possible and that every arrangement should be made to secure that applications for licences addressed to the authorities or organisations which are declared to be competent for the purpose should be dealt with rapidly.



Among these resolutions the most urgent are the following:

- (a) The abolition of the visa for exit.
- (b) In general, all entrance visas to be valid for one year. The validity of a transit visa to be the same as the period of the validity of the visa of the country of destination.
- (c) The maximum fees charged for visas to be:
  - Entrance visa. . . . . 10 gold francs.
  - Transit visa. . . . . 1 gold franc<sup>1</sup>.

(It is desirable that the Governments should consider the possibility of a considerable reduction in the case of emigration.)

- (d) The transit visa, unless for exceptional reasons (*e. g.*, undesirables), to be issued without enquiry solely upon production of the entrance visa for the country of destination, in addition to transit visas for the intermediate countries.

It is further desirable that all States should adopt the recommendations of the Conference above referred to concerning the suppression of the examination of registered luggage in transit, and of travellers and securities in transit, and that States with a common frontier should come as far as possible to arrangements to facilitate customs examinations in accordance with the proposals of the Conference (Article 16).

2. *Barcelona Conventions* (Report of the Transport Commission of the Conference):

It is desirable that all the European States signatory of the Conventions concluded at Barcelona on April 20th, 1921, regarding Freedom of Transit and the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern should ratify these Conventions at the earliest possible moment if they have not already done so, and that the European States which are neither signatories of these Conventions nor parties thereto should put their provisions into operation without delay (Article 2).

3. *Recommendations of the Barcelona Conference and Conventions to be drawn up subsequently* (Report of the Transport Commission of the Conference):

The European States represented at Genoa note with satisfaction the work accomplished at Barcelona in regard to the Regime of International Ports. They deem it desirable that the Conventions relating to Ports<sup>1</sup>, Railways<sup>1</sup> and Waterways contemplated by the Treaties of Peace should be prepared and put into operation as soon as possible, and they deem it equally desirable that the recommendations of the Conference of Barcelona regarding the International Regime of Railways should be put into operation without delay (Article 3).

4. *General Mission entrusted to the competent Technical Organisations of the League* (Report of the Transport Commission of the Conference):

It is desirable that the competent Technical Organisations of the League of Nations, with the addition of one representative of any State which is not a Member of the League in cases in which such State may be interested, should be invited:

To examine from time to time the progress achieved in carrying into effect the provisions set forth in the preceding Articles, and

To this end to summon, with the consent of the States concerned, special conferences of experts.

Nevertheless, the powers of the Permanent Commissions on Ports and Navigable Waterways of International Concern shall not be prejudiced<sup>2</sup> (Article 8).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Convention in question includes the General Convention on the Regime of Railways which is provided for by Article 379 of the Treaty of Versailles and which is at present in course of preparation by the Advisory and Technical Committee on Communications and Transit and is to be signed at the General Conference in 1923, and also the General Convention on Ports referred to in the same article, which is ultimately to be drawn up in accordance with the same procedure.

<sup>2</sup> This Article entrusts to the Communications and Transit Organisations the duty of promoting the application of all the resolutions on transport adopted at Genoa. These resolutions provide, apart from the Articles already quoted which concern the League of Nations directly, for the adoption of such measures as may be necessary to obtain international assistance for the restoration and improvement of railways, ports, maritime and fluvial waterways and for the provision of competent experts to assist States which are in need of this kind of aid in organising services of inspection (Article 1); for the putting into force of the Berne Convention, pending the new Convention on the Transport by Rail of Passengers, Luggage and Goods and for the convening by the French Railway Administration of a Conference of technical representatives of all the railway administrations of Europe and other countries interested, in order to consider, *inter alia*, the creation of a Permanent Conference of Railway Administrations for the unification and improvement of the conditions of organisation and exploitation for international traffic; and for the provisional establishment of motor transport services wherever practicable and desirable pending the restoration of railways and riverways.

#### D. Health and Social Questions

##### 1. *Anti-Epidemic Campaign in Russia:*

The Conference approves the principles of the anti-epidemic campaign and of European sanitary defence adopted by the Warsaw Conference, and recommends the European Governments here represented to consider immediately the practical application of these principles, and for this purpose to appeal to their respective Parliaments to provide the necessary means (Resolution adopted by the Conference on May 19th, 1922).

##### 2. *Red Cross:*

The Genoa Conference has decided to transmit to the League of Nations the memorandum which the Joint Commission of the Comité international de la Croix-Rouge and of the League of Red Cross Societies and the President of the Italian Red Cross sent them on May 4th, 1922 (Resolution adopted by the Conference on May 19th, 1922).

#### E. Questions regarding Minorities.

##### 1. *Bulgarian Minorities:*

The Inviting Powers at the Genoa Conference came to the following decision with regard to a Note dealing with the protection of Bulgarian minorities handed by His Excellency the Bulgarian Prime Minister to Signor Facta, President of the Genoa Conference, *viz*: "to transmit this request without comment to the League of Nations."<sup>1</sup>

##### 2. *Hungarian Minorities:*

The Inviting Powers at the Genoa Conference came to the following decision with regard to a Note dealing with the protection of Hungarian minorities presented by the Hungarian Delegation to the Genoa Conference, *viz*: "to transmit this request without comment to the League of Nations."<sup>2</sup>

### III. MEASURES ADOPTED TO GIVE EFFECT TO RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENOA CONFERENCE WHICH CONCERN THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS OF THE LEAGUE.

##### 1. *Resolution of the Council:*

The Council adopted, on May 13th, 1922, the following resolution:—

"Should the resolutions taken by the Genoa Conference be referred to the League of Nations, the Council instructs its President and the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to transmit them to the Technical Organisations of the League."<sup>3</sup>

##### 2. *Subsequent Action:*

In pursuance of this resolution of the Council, the resolutions of the Genoa Conference already quoted in Chapters A and B were transmitted to the Provisional Economic and Financial Committee; those quoted in Chapter C to the Advisory and Technical Committee on Communications and Transit; that quoted in Chapter D (1) to the Health Organisation; and that quoted in Chapter D (2), as has been already explained in Document C. 397, to the Joint Commission of the Comité international de la Croix-Rouge and of the League of Red Cross Societies. Questions such as those referred to in the decisions quoted in Chapter E will be dealt with according to the normal procedure adopted by the Council.

<sup>1</sup> See Document C. 408. M. 250. 1922. I.

<sup>2</sup> See Document C. 409. M. 251. 1922. I.

<sup>3</sup> This resolution was adopted before the end of the Genoa Conference and consequently before the resolutions of that Conference were officially transmitted.

13

HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

I. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

THE WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

On September 30th, 1921, the second Assembly adopted a certain number of resolutions and recommendations concerning the traffic in opium, confirming with certain amendments the resolutions adopted by the Council on June 28th, 1921. The Assembly also adopted certain resolutions and recommendations presented by its Fifth Committee.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, appointed by the first Assembly, held its second session at Geneva from April 19th to 29th, 1922.

The Government representatives on the Committee were:

Sir Malcolm DELEVINGNE ( <i>President</i> )	British Empire.
M. BOURGOIS, substitute for M. KAHN ( <i>Vice-Chairman</i> )	France.
Mr. CHAO HSIN CHU	China.
D <sup>r</sup> ANSELMINO	Germany.
Mr. J. CAMPBELL	India
His Excellency A. ARIYOSHI	Japan.
M. A. DE KAT ANGELINO, substitute for M. VAN WETTUM	Netherlands.
His Excellency M. FERREIRA	Portugal.
His Excellency Prince CHAROON	Siam.

The Assessors were:

M. Henri BRENIER, Sir John JORDAN and Mrs. HAMILTON WRIGHT.

*Invitation to States Members of the League to sign the International Opium Convention.*

The second Assembly confirmed the Council's resolution of June 28th, 1921, to the effect that all Members of the League which had not yet signed the International Opium Convention of 1921 should do so as soon as possible, and the Council, at its meeting of October 12th, 1921, instructed the Secretary-General to communicate this resolution to the Governments of all States concerned. These instructions were duly carried out by the Secretariat.

The position in regard to the Convention when the Advisory Committee met in April 1922, was as follows:

States Parties to the Convention	States which had signed and ratified the Convention but not signed the Protocol putting the Convention into force	States which had signed the Convention but have not ratified	States non-Parties to the Convention
Australia.	Venezuela.	Argentine.	Albania.
Austria.		Chile.	Esthonia
Belgium.		Colombia.	
Bolivia.		Costa Rica.	
Brazil.		Finland.	
Bulgaria.		Latvia	
Canada.		Lithuania.	
China.		Luxemburg.	
Cuba.		Paraguay.	
Czechoslovakia		Persia.	
Denmark.		Salvador.	
France.		Switzerland	
Great Britain.			
Greece.			
Guatemala.			
Haiti.			
Honduras.			
India.			

States Parties to  
the Convention

Italy.  
Japan.  
Liberia.  
Netherlands.  
New Zealand.  
Nicaragua.  
Norway.  
Panama.  
Peru.  
Poland.  
Portugal.  
Roumanie.  
Serb-Croat-Slovene State.  
Siam.  
South Africa.  
Spain.  
Sweden.  
Uruguay.

The Advisory Committee considered that it was of the greatest importance that all Members of the League should put the International Opium Convention into force as soon as possible. The Committee especially urged the importance of securing the adhesion of Switzerland and Persia. It was noted that Switzerland was a considerable importer of the injurious drugs mentioned in the Convention, and that Persia, a signatory of the Convention, had made a reservation regarding the third article, which requires the Contracting Powers "to take measures to prevent the export of raw opium to countries which shall have prohibited its entry". The Advisory Committee observed that there was an important export trade on Persian opium and asked the Council to urge the Persian Government to adhere to the Convention in its entirety.

The Advisory Committee further called the Council's attention to the importance of ensuring that any revision of the Treaty of Sèvres should contain provisions requiring Turkey to adhere to the Opium Convention.

The Council, acting upon these recommendations of the Advisory Committee, instructed the Secretary-General on May 20th, 1922, to despatch a further letter to the Governments on the ratification of the International Opium Convention.

On May 30th, 1922 the Secretary-General sent letters to the States which had not yet put the Convention into force, a letter to Persia asking the Persian Government to withdraw its reservation in view of the fact that Persia was one of the big opium-producing countries, a letter to Turkey asking the Turkish Government to bring the Convention into force for similar reasons, and a letter to Switzerland.

*Action Taken by the Netherlands Government.*

By a resolution adopted by the second Assembly, the Netherlands Government was requested to continue its efforts to secure the ratification of the International Opium Convention by States not Members of the League.

The Netherlands Government has continued to receive texts and statistical information from the Contracting Powers not Members of the League and has communicated these to the Secretariat. It has also served as a means for communicating information on the traffic in opium to these Powers. In this way the Governments of the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Hungary, Mexico and the United States have been kept informed of the various steps taken during the past year.

*Importation Certificates.*

The second Assembly, in adopting paragraph 4 of the Council's resolution of June 28th, 1921, invited all Governments parties to the International Opium Convention to adopt the system of importation certificates. By this system every application for a supply of any of the substances to which the Convention applies must be accompanied by a certificate from the Government of the importing country affirming that the import is approved by that Government and is required for legitimate purposes, or in the case of drugs specified in Chapter III of the Convention, solely for medicinal or scientific purposes.

On October 12th, 1921, the Council instructed the Secretary-General to forward this resolution of the Assembly to all Governments of the League.

The Secretary-General accordingly sent a circular letter dated November 11th, 1921. Several States had already signified their acceptance of the scheme when the Advisory Committee met in April 1922.

The Advisory Committee discussed the importance of obtaining the universal adoption of the system. Unless it were universal, buyers tended to place their orders with States where they could obtain the drugs without having to furnish an importation certificate, and complaints of this practice had already been made. The Committee emphasised the fact that no Government

was required to give an absolute guarantee that no illegitimate use would be made of the imported drugs. Governments were merely required to be satisfied that the imports were within the limits of the legitimate requirements of their countries and that the persons applying for permission to import were persons engaged in legitimate trade. The Committee suggested that a fixed date should be arranged on which the system should come into effect. It proposed September 1st, 1922, for the countries of Europe, America, Africa and Australia, and for other countries, January 1st, 1923. The Committee further prepared a form of importation certificate which it recommends for general adoption.

On May 16th, 1922, the Council instructed the Secretary-General to send letters to Members of the League asking them to adopt the form of import certificate submitted by the Advisory Committee. On May 30th, the Secretary-General complied with these instructions, and, in addition, addressed a letter to the Netherlands Government asking it to communicate with the Governments of States not Members of the League. The Secretary-General himself addressed a letter to Governments not Members of the League and not parties to the Convention.

#### *Article 15 of the International Opium Convention.*

The second Assembly confirmed paragraph 5 of the Council's resolution of June 28th, 1921, to the effect that those Contracting Powers having treaties with China should be invited to pay special attention to the provisions of Article 15 of the International Opium Convention, so as to take the most effective steps possible to prevent contraband trade. The Secretary-General, acting under a resolution adopted by the Council on October 12th, 1921, duly carried out these instructions.

#### *Report on the Execution of the International Opium Convention.*

The second Assembly adopted a resolution to the effect that each country a party to the Convention should make an annual report to the League on the execution in its territory of the provisions of the Convention, and should give statistics of the production and manufacture of and trade in opium. On October 12th, 1921, the Council instructed the Secretary-General to forward this resolution to States Members of the League, and the Secretary-General carried out these instructions on November 11th. The Advisory Committee recommended in April that the Council should invite Governments, in making this annual report, to adopt the form prepared by the Committee, to furnish the report not later than July 1st in the case of Western countries, and October 1st in the case of Eastern countries, and to make the report in either of the official languages of the League. Further, the Council should, if the necessity arose, invite Governments to facilitate the carrying out of joint investigations by commissions appointed partly by the League and partly by the Government concerned into any question arising under the International Opium Convention.

The Council adopted this recommendation in May 1922. On May 30th, the Secretary-General addressed a letter to Members of the League requesting them to comply with it, and a letter to the Government of the Netherlands asking it to bring the recommendation to the notice of States not Members of the League. The Netherlands Government was asked, in particular, to request the Government of the United States to send in an annual report and an answer to the opium questionnaire of 1921.

#### *Additional Information to that contained in the Annual Report.*

The second Assembly recommended that the different Governments should be invited to furnish any additional information which might be of use to the League concerning the illicit production and manufacture of, or trade in, opium or other dangerous drugs. On October 12th, 1921, the Council transmitted this resolution to the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee was unable to report as fully as it wished, since the statistics available, supplied chiefly from the answers to its questionnaire, were inadequate and incomplete. In particular, there were no statistics as to manufacture from several of the most important manufacturing countries. It was realised that there was a large illicit traffic being carried on in Western Europe and America, as well as in the Far East, particularly in morphine and cocaine.

The Japanese representative on the Advisory Committee informed it that his Government undertook to make the strictest possible investigation into the illicit traffic in morphine at present being carried on in the Far East. The Committee recommended that the Japanese authorities and the Chinese Maritime Customs should co-operate in suppressing this traffic, and also that the discrepancies shown between the Japanese import statistics and the export statistics of certain other countries should be rectified. Letters were therefore despatched by the Secretary-General on May 30th, 1922, to Japan, Great Britain, and (through the medium of the Netherlands Government) to the United States of America, asking for the necessary information.

In adopting the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, the Council expressed its satisfaction at the frankness with which the Japanese Government had acknowledged the abuse.

The Advisory Committee further recommended that the information regarding the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible, that the Governments should be asked to furnish as accurate an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their countries,

that they should exchange full information regarding the seizures made by their customs and police authorities, that they should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work to point out the danger of indulgence in these drugs, and that they should increase the penalties attaching to the illicit traffic, since these were at present not sufficiently heavy. In addition, the Advisory Committee recommended that the offer of the League of Red Cross Societies to ask the National Red Cross Societies to undertake educational work on the abuse of opium should be accepted.

The Council adopted these recommendations in May 1922, and on May 30th the Secretary-General addressed letters on the subject of cocaine to the States Members of the League, the Netherlands Government, and to the States non-Members of the League and non-parties to the Convention. The Secretary-General also wrote to the Director-General of the League of Red Cross Societies accepting his offer regarding educational work.

#### *Action taken by the Health Committee.*

The second Assembly accepted paragraph 3 of the Council's resolution of June 28th, 1921, to the effect that the Health Committee of the League should be asked to undertake an enquiry to determine approximately the average requirements of the drugs specified in Chapter III of the International Opium Convention, on the understanding that the enquiries would be of a scientific character and would be made either through or with the consent of the Government of the particular country in which they were carried out. On October 12th, 1921, the Council asked the Health Committee to undertake the enquiry.

The Advisory Committee was informed in April 1922 of the results of the investigations which the Health Committee had undertaken. The Health Committee had investigated the requirements of Sweden, Denmark and Switzerland. It had found it difficult to find an interpretation of the term "legitimate requirements" applicable to all countries, and considered that, if the investigations were to be continued, it would be desirable to extend them over a number of years and to carry them out in a large number of countries. The figures obtained by the enquiry already made could not be taken as the basis of an international standard. The Health Committee further considered it impossible, owing to the widely differing conditions of life, to use the results of the enquiry made in northern countries in order to fix the standard of legitimate consumption for Southern or Oriental countries.

The Advisory Committee recommended the Council to ask the Health Committee to continue its enquiries into the requirements of the various countries. On May 20th, 1922, the Council adopted this recommendation and on May 29th the Secretary-General wrote to the Chairman of the Health Committee forwarding the Council's request.

#### *Enquiry into the Legitimate Consumption of Opium.*

On October 12th, 1921, the Council, in accordance with paragraph 7 of its resolution of June 28th, 1921, as approved by the second Assembly, requested the Advisory Committee to consider the possibility of instituting an enquiry to determine approximately the average requirements of raw opium for legitimate purposes in different countries.

The Advisory Committee, considering this request in April, 1922, found it difficult to suggest any means by which a reliable estimate could be reached. In Western countries the amount of raw opium required for legitimate purposes depends principally on the amount of opium derivatives used in medical practice, while in Oriental countries there is no definite means of ascertaining the amount required for the semi-medicinal use of the population which the second Assembly recognised as legitimate. The Advisory Committee therefore adopted a resolution recommending the Council to notify the Governments to furnish the Secretary-General with a statement of their countries' total requirements for internal consumption per annum of opium and its derivatives. The statement should indicate separately, if possible, the quantities employed for medicinal, scientific and other uses, and should distinguish between the different kinds of opium required. The Advisory Committee thought that this statement should reach the Secretary-General not later than January 1st, 1923, and that it was of special importance that the quantities of opium required by Far-Eastern countries, where the Chinese were the principal consumers, should be available by that date.

The Council adopted this recommendation in May 1922, and on May 30th, the Secretary-General despatched the necessary correspondence.

#### *Representation of Germany and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State on the Advisory Committee.*

The second Assembly recommended that, if possible, any country concerned either in the growth or manufacture of opium and other dangerous drugs should be represented on the Advisory Committee.

On October 12th, 1921, therefore, the Council decided to invite the Governments of Germany and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State to nominate a representative to serve on the Advisory Committee. No reply to this invitation has been received from the Serb-Croat-Slovene State. Germany replied through the Netherlands Government that she was willing to send a representative.

At its second session the Advisory Committee welcomed the representative of Germany and noted with regret that the Serb-Croat-Slovene State was not represented.

*Extension of Investigations to include all Dangerous Drugs of whatever origin.*

The second Assembly recommended that the Advisory Committee should extend its investigations to include not only the drugs mentioned in the International Opium Convention but all dangerous drugs producing similar effects, and that it should consider the desirability of summoning an international conference to draw up a convention for the suppression of the abuse of such drugs. On October 12th, 1921, the Council adopted this recommendation and transmitted it to the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee, in April 1922, had before it a list of drugs supplied by the French Government, with whom the proposal had originated. The Committee recommended that the list should be referred to the interested Governments for the observations of their Health Departments and that, while waiting for these observations, consideration of the summoning of an international conference should be postponed.

The Council adopted this recommendation in May 1922, and on May 30th the Secretary-General wrote to the French Government informing it of the Council's decision. He also despatched a letter to all Governments interested asking their opinion on the list of drugs.

*Report of the Advisory Committee to the Council.*

At its second session the Advisory Committee drew up a report for submission to the Council summarising the action which it had taken on the following subjects not hitherto mentioned:

*The Far-Eastern Problem; Cultivation of the Poppy in China.*

The Committee fully considered the question of the cultivation of the poppy in China and had before it the reports of the special commissioners sent by the Chinese Government to investigate the situation. Certain recommendations were made by the Committee on this subject and were embodied in its report.

In considering the report, the Council decided to recommend that certain amendments should be made before the final form of the report was approved. It therefore instructed the Secretary-General to communicate with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the subject of these amendments and to transmit the report to the Assembly subject to the amendments contained in the Council's resolution.

*Distribution of Drugs through the Post.*

The Advisory Committee noted the information supplied by the Director of the International Office of the Universal Postal Union regarding the consignment of drugs sent by parcel post or in boxes of declared value. At a Conference in Madrid in 1920 the Universal Postal Union agreed to prohibit the transmission of drugs by letter post.

*Cocaine.*

The Advisory Committee considered that the traffic in cocaine and other similar drugs was a question of the utmost importance. This traffic has attracted widespread public notice, and the Committee made several practical suggestions to the Council as to the best way of suppressing it. It recommended that the information with regard to the manufacture of cocaine should be completed as soon as possible, and that the Council should invite Governments to furnish the Secretariat with as close an estimate as possible of the annual requirements of cocaine in their respective countries.

In order to facilitate the suppression of the traffic, the Advisory Committee considered that Governments should arrange for the mutual exchange of full information concerning all seizures of cocaine made by their respective customs and police authorities. This would appear to be the best means, at present, of estimating the size of the traffic and of discovering places where it was most prevalent.

The Committee was further of the opinion that Governments should consider the advisability of undertaking educational work as to the dangers of indulgence in drugs.

In consequence of the enormous profits realised by the illicit traffic in cocaine and other drugs, the Committee was strongly of the opinion that the present pecuniary penalties were no longer a sufficient deterrent. It thought that a substantial sentence of imprisonment as an alternative penalty should be provided.

## II. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

On September 29th, 1921, the second Assembly took note of the Final Act of the Conference of Geneva on the Traffic in Women and Children which met in July 1921, and which had been approved by the Council on September 12th, and expressed the desire that those of its provisions



which required conventional form should be adopted in that form by the Members of the League with the least possible delay. It recommended those delegates possessing the necessary powers to sign the draft Convention. On December 1st, 1921, the Secretary-General transmitted a copy of the Final Act of the Conference to all Governments which had been invited to take part in the conference, and stated in his letter that the plenipotentiaries of the following countries had signed the convention: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, British Empire, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Esthonia, Greece, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Persia, Portugal, Siam, South Africa, and Switzerland. The plenipotentiaries of Australia, British Empire, Colombia, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Siam and Switzerland had made certain reservations.

On Saturday, January 14th, 1922, the Council discussed the proposal of M. da Cunha to appoint a permanent committee in accordance with the recommendations of the Geneva Conference.

The Council adopted a resolution to the effect that the Advisory Committee referred to in Resolution II of the Final Act of the Geneva Conference was definitely constituted, that France, Great Britain, Japan, Poland, Spain, Roumania, Denmark, Italy and Uruguay should each be invited to appoint a representative; and that five assessors should be appointed: one by the International Bureau for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, one by the International Women's Organisations, one by the Federation of National Unions for the Protection of Girls, one by the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls, and one by the International Catholic Association for the Protection of Girls.

The Committee, which held its first meeting on June 28th, was composed of the following members:

Denmark	Mme. Estrid HEIN.
France	M. BOURGOIS (substitute for M. REGNAULT).
Great Britain	Mr. S. W. HARRIS.
Italy	M. le Marquis de CALBOLI.
Japan	M. S. OKUYAMA.
Poland	M. Stanislaus POSNER.
Roumania	M. Margaritescu GRECIANO.
Spain	M. Avelino MONTERO RIOS Y VILLEGAS.
Uruguay	Dr. Paulina LUISI.

Assessors:

International Bureau for the Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children	Miss BAKER.
International Catholic Association for the Protection of Girls	Mme. la Baronne de MONTENACH.
Federation of National Unions for the Protection of Girls	Mme. STUDER-STEINHAUSLIN.
International Women's Organisations	Mme. AVRIL DE SAINTE-CROIX.
Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls	Mr. S. COHEN.

REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

The Secretary-General has received about 90 replies to the questionnaire on traffic in women and children sent out in February 1921.

FIRST SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Advisory Committee held its first session from June 28th to July 1st, 1922.  
*Signatures and Ratifications of the Conventions.*

The Committee took note of a statement giving the number of States which had signed, adhered to or ratified the Agreement of 1904 and the Conventions of 1910 and 1921. Thirty-three States have signed the new Convention of 1921 and Belgium and the British Empire, including the Dominions, have ratified it. The Committee was also informed that Italy and Japan were taking steps to ratify and that France had taken measures to give effect to the recommendations of the International Conference of June 1921. Denmark would ratify as soon as the necessary alterations had been made in her penal code.

The four members of the Committee whose Governments had not yet become Parties to the Convention were asked to urge them to take the necessary action without delay, and a resolution was adopted recommending that all Members of the League which had not signed the Convention should be urged to do so as soon as possible.



The Committee took note of a letter from the Government of the United States explaining the reasons why it had not been able to adhere to the Conventions of 1910 and 1921 and expressing its full sympathy with their objects.

The Committee considered that its work would be materially assisted if it were to include representatives of the United States and Germany. It accordingly adopted a resolution to the effect that the Council should be asked to invite both these countries to appoint members to serve on the Committee.

#### *Replies to the Questionnaire of 1921.*

At the request of the Committee, the French Delegate undertook to complete a summary of all the replies received to the questionnaire for the consideration of the Committee at its next session.

The Committee decided that the Secretariat should compile and send to each Government twice yearly as complete a list as possible of the laws passed by each country on subjects connected with the traffic in women and children.

#### *Reports of the International Voluntary Organisations.*

The Committee considered five reports presented by the five assessors representing various international voluntary organisations, and noted the fact that these associations were working in close co-operation. It suggested that they should endeavour to extend their sphere of action to places where there were at present no agents of any of these societies and that they should keep in close touch with the Secretariat.

#### *Central Authorities.*

The Governments Parties to the Agreement of 1904 undertook by its terms to establish authorities to co-ordinate all information relative to the procurement of women or girls for immoral purposes abroad. The Advisory Committee considered a list furnished by the French Government showing that several States had not yet established such authorities and that about twenty States which had signed the Convention of 1921 would, when they ratified it, be under obligations to establish such authorities. The Committee also noted that the authorities already established belonged to the administrative rather than to the executive departments of the Governments concerned and were consequently unable to take prompt measures regarding information received. There also appeared to be little inter-communication between the authorities in the various countries. The Committee thought that it was of the utmost importance that all Governments should be urged to appoint central authorities if they had not already done so and that a list of them should be circulated from time to time to all Members of the League and to all Parties to the Conventions, and that the Secretariat of the League should keep in close touch with such authorities.

The work of the Secretariat with regard to these authorities should take the form of communicating such information as it might obtain which would appear to call for action on the part of any Government.

#### *Employment of Women abroad in Theatres, etc.*

The Advisory Committee recommended that Governments should be invited to warn women and girls seeking theatrical engagements abroad of the risk of accepting such engagements without proper enquiry, and that Governments should be ready to advise them as to the reasonableness of their contracts. New legislation should be passed for the protection of minors seeking employment abroad, and Governments should exercise supervision as far as possible over the employment of girls in theatres and music-halls, in order to secure that no attempt should be made to induce them to lead immoral lives. Foreign girls should receive the same protection as nationals, and when a girl visited another country facilities should be afforded her to return at the expiration of her contract.

#### *Report of the International Emigration Commission.*

As the question of emigration is closely connected with the problem of the traffic, the Committee considered several resolutions adopted by the International Emigration Commission which affected its work. It agreed with the Emigration Commission's recommendations that the measures proposed for the protection of emigrants should apply equally to women and children as well as to men, and that a very strict supervision should be exercised over the conditions under which emigrants passed from one country to another.

The Advisory Committee asked the International Labour Conference to consider, if it should find it possible to do so, the desirability of securing close co-operation between Governments and private shipping companies, the possibility of safeguarding women engaged in a foreign country against unfair contracts, and that in the framing of measures for the protection of women and children, regard should be paid not only to material conditions but also to moral considerations.

*Juvenile Courts.*

The Spanish Delegate on the Advisory Committee emphasised the importance of preventing young girls from drifting into a life of immorality, and described the steps taken in Spain to establish juvenile courts. The Committee was of opinion that the extension of the system of juvenile courts was most desirable.

*Annual Report.*

The Committee adopted a draft form of annual report which Governments, under the recommendation of the International Conference of 1921, are requested to furnish yearly to the League on the question of the traffic. The Advisory Committee suggested that the reports should be sent to the Secretariat not later than April 1st for Western States and July 1st for Far-Eastern States, and that a summary of these reports should be prepared and submitted at each session of the Committee.

Finally, the Committee expressed its conviction that the suppression of the traffic could only be secured by constant watchfulness on the part of all Governments and by close co-operation in giving effect to the measures prescribed in the international conventions.

### III. DEPORTATION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN TURKEY AND THE NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES.

On September 23rd, 1921, the second Assembly adopted resolutions to the effect that a Commissioner of the League to deal with the deportation of women and children should be appointed at Constantinople and that his appointment should be notified to the Allied and Associated High Commissioners, to the representatives of other interested countries Members of the League, to the Turkish Government and to the Greek and Armenian Patriarchs. France, Great Britain and Italy were requested to instruct their High Commissioners at Constantinople to constitute themselves into a Committee to co-operate with the High Commissioner of the League of Nations.

A further resolution established, under the Commissioner, a Mixed Board composed of the members of the League of Nations Commission of Enquiry and a member of each interested nationality to deal with the reclamation of women and children. The Neutral House for the temporary reception and examination of women and children was also reorganised and placed under the direct management and supervision of the Commission of Enquiry of the League. Further Neutral Houses were to be opened if circumstances permitted.

On October 2nd the Council of the League decided to offer the post of Commissioner of the League to Mr. Peet, a citizen of the United States of America, who, after long correspondence, informed the Secretary-General on June 10th, 1922, that he was unable to accept the Council's invitation.

On May 12th, 1922, the Council, however, adopted a resolution to the effect that, pending the appointment of a High Commissioner in Turkey, the League of Nations Commission of Enquiry was authorised to proceed with the work of reclaiming deported women and children, and the funds allocated for the High Commissioner's use were to be available for this work.

---

## 14

### THE RELIEF OF RUSSIAN REFUGEES.

---

On June 27th, 1921, the Council approved, in principle, the appointment of a High Commissioner to co-ordinate the action of Governments and of private organisations for the relief of Russian refugees.

On August 22nd, 1921, a Conference on the question met at Geneva, consisting of representatives of Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Greece, Poland, Roumania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and Switzerland. In addition to these Government representatives, the

International Committee of the Red Cross, the League of Red Cross Societies and the "Union internationale de secours aux enfants" and other charitable organisations were also represented.

On August 24th the Conference adopted a number of resolutions and recommendations which were transmitted by the Secretary-General to the Council on September 2nd, 1921.

The Conference recommended that a census of refugees should be prepared, that they should be classified according to profession, and that the High Commissioner should avail himself of the International Labour Office to assist him in this classification.

The Conference made a number of recommendations as regards the provision of passports, identity papers and travelling facilities for the refugees. It also recommended that the Governments should forward to the High Commissioner full information regarding the possibilities of employment in their countries and that for this purpose the International Labour Office should co-operate. Those countries whose Governments had set a limit to immigration should consent to a temporary modification of their regulations in favour of refugees. No refugee should be compelled to return to Russia, but assistance should be given to him if he desired to be repatriated.

The Conference also noted the offer made by the International Red Cross Committee to co-operate with the High Commissioner and the offers of assistance from the League of Red Cross Societies and the "Union internationale de secours aux enfants". The High Commissioner should make an urgent appeal to international societies, especially with regard to enlisting their interests in the fate of Russian refugee women. The High Commissioner should also consider how Russian refugee children should be given facilities for education.

The Conference noted the offer of assistance made by the Jewish Colonisation Association and its affiliated societies concerning Jewish Russian refugees. The Conference was of opinion that the burden of relieving the Russian refugees should not be left to a few nations which by reason of their geographical situation had large numbers of refugees within their borders, and that an appeal should be made to all States of the world to contribute to the work of relief. The Economic and Financial Committee of the League should be entrusted with examining the financial aspects of the problem.

Finally, the Conference considered that relief work in aid of the starving populations of Russia and the question of Russian refugees might be co-ordinated.

The Council considered these recommendations on September 2nd and decided to transmit them to all the Members of the League. The lack of financial support necessitated the consideration of general measures for obtaining funds. The High Commissioner was asked to submit this question to the Financial Committee of the League.

On September 4th, 1921, Dr. Fridtjof Nansen accepted the post of High Commissioner.

On September 22nd Dr. Nansen wrote to the French Government asking them to reconsider their decision to discontinue the supplies which they had up to that date been giving to the Russian refugees in Constantinople. The French Government replied stating that it would only reduce supplies by an amount corresponding to the number of refugees leaving Constantinople.

On November 19th, 1921, the Council considered a memorandum by the Secretary-General in which he explained that the High Commissioner had been actively engaged on the preliminary organisation of his work, but that most of his time up to that moment had been devoted to the problem of refugees in Constantinople, suddenly rendered acute by the unexpected cessation of relief work by existing agencies; as a result the refugees were now destitute. Neither the League of Nations nor the High Commissioner had accepted any responsibility for the maintenance of these refugees, but the High Commissioner could not leave them to starve and had appealed to Governments to make every effort to assist them; he thought that £30,000 would be enough to keep them alive until he could arrange for their evacuation. The Government of Czechoslovakia had agreed to accept 6000 refugees; Bulgaria was willing to receive and maintain a number of children. Dr. Nansen had found it difficult to obtain visas and the necessary travelling facilities, and he asked the President of the Council to write to the Governments of all interested States, urging them to afford the refugees all possible transit facilities.

The Council adopted a resolution authorising the President to address a letter to all the interested Governments inviting them to render the High Commissioner all the assistance in their power, especially regarding the transport of refugees and the granting of transit visas.

The League had put no funds at Dr. Nansen's disposal, but owing to his personal prestige he had been able to collect certain sums of money from private sources for the benefit of the Russian refugees at Constantinople.

On February 10th, 1922, the Secretary-General circulated a memorandum received from the Government of Czechoslovakia on the relief of refugees and of the starving populations of Russia. The Czechoslovak Government considered these two questions to be very closely related. The economic situation of Russia was such that she was in great need of experts to revive her agriculture, commerce, transport, etc. These could best be supplied from Russian refugees expert in these various branches of economic life, provided that they could be induced to return to their country and to work as soon as circumstances might allow. The Czechoslovak Government was educating 5,000 Russian and Ukrainian students for this purpose. It suggested that all countries should adopt a similar procedure.

The Secretary-General circulated at the same time Dr. Nansen's observations on the memorandum of the Czechoslovak Government, in which he concurred with that Government's point of view. If European States intended to grapple seriously with the problem of reconstructing Russia, it was essential that they should raise the "economic army" which could alone win back Russia to normal conditions of agricultural and industrial activity. It was therefore essential

that the Governments of Europe and America interested in Russia's economic recovery should realise the necessity of training in their own territories those Russians already fitted by birth and education to assist their country in this manner.

The League had all the necessary information and machinery at its disposal and could therefore give the earliest possible effect to the recommendations of the Czechoslovak Government.

On March 24th, 1922, the Council considered the whole question of Russian refugees anew and had before it a general report on the work accomplished by the High Commissioner, a special report by the High Commissioner requesting the assistance of the Governments Members of the League, and a report by Sir Samuel Hoare on the refugees at Constantinople.

Dr. Nansen, in his general report, described the duties he had been requested to undertake as High Commissioner. For the discharge of these duties the Council had granted him £1,500 for the remainder of 1921, and the second Assembly had granted him £4,000 for 1922. The Council had not recommended that any Members of the League should make a special grant of funds. He had been asked to find productive employment for the refugees but he had had no funds to enable him to take the necessary steps. Certain Governments had spent large sums in doles during 1921, and had even a small part of these sums been placed at his disposal it would have been possible for him to have solved the whole problem comparatively quickly.

The High Commissioner had first considered what measures he could take to disperse the refugees to places where they could obtain employment. He had first carried out a census with the help of the International Labour Office, which was now practically complete. The results of the enquiries addressed by the International Labour Office to Governments as to what categories of refugees they were able to absorb had been disappointing. Very few replies had been received, and, except in the case of Brazil, they had practically all been in the negative. In this connection the High Commissioner emphasised that the general economic crisis had rendered still more difficult the execution of the principal task with which he was entrusted.

The various interested Governments had each appointed a representative to communicate direct with the High Commissioner, who had himself appointed representatives to keep in touch with the Governments and with the organisations of the Russian refugees.

A number of voluntary organisations had been carrying on work for the Russian refugees for two years, and he had invited them to form a special joint committee to advise him in matters relating to the refugees of which they had special knowledge. This committee had already held meetings and had proved invaluable.

The most urgent problem for the High Commissioner had been the destitution of the refugees in Constantinople. This was a problem which did not fall technically within his competence, and he had no funds for dealing with it, but he had, on the other hand, considered it useless to endeavour to find employment for persons who were actually starving and he devoted his immediate attention to the alleviation of their distress. Their position was the more desperate as the sources of supply by which 15,000 of them had been fed during the past year were to be cut off. The French Government had consented to continue feeding the remainder of General Wrangel's army until it could be evacuated, but the American Red Cross, which had been feeding about 15,000 civilians, had no further resources by means of which to continue its work. These refugees were thus faced with imminent starvation. The High Commissioner had made an appeal to the High Commissioners of the three principal Allied Powers — Great Britain, France and Italy — regarding the situation in Constantinople. He had made a further appeal to various international organisations on behalf of the women Russian refugees, and had, as a result, received about £1,000. Other private organisations had also contributed, notably the Jewish Colonisation Association, which had given him £1,000 and lent him £3,000. He had further received gifts of 25,000 French francs from the "Conférence universelle juive", and the "Comité international de la Croix-Rouge" had given him a credit of 200,000 French francs with the French Government. With the money thus collected he had bought 400 tons of rye which would supply 10,000 persons with bread for two months. Finally, Sir Samuel Hoare had obtained a grant from the British Government in the form of foodstuffs and other supplies valued at £20,000. Sir Samuel Hoare had also established in Constantinople a League of Nations office to co-ordinate the work of existing committees.

The High Commissioner had succeeded in evacuating several thousands of refugees to Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, but not the number to Czechoslovakia which had originally been contemplated. Roumania, where many refugees had fled, had agreed to allow them to assemble in provinces where they had succeeded in finding means of livelihood. Some hundreds of individual refugees had been assisted to join friends who could maintain them in various countries.

The problem was also acute in Poland, but the High Commissioner had not been able to make much progress in that country.

Labour exchanges had been set up in several countries, for instance in the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, which were working very well. In that State, for example, 10,000 out of 23,000 refugees had found work by this means.

He had been specially concerned with the problem of Russian students and with the placing of them in various universities. The Czechoslovak Government had undertaken to support 5,000 Russian students at Prague.

The High Commissioner stated, in conclusion, that there were about 1½ million refugees in Europe, but that by no means all of them were in need of assistance. A large proportion had found employment for themselves, and many had resources of their own. There still remained, however, a very large number for whom inter-governmental aid was necessary to secure employment. The High Commissioner appealed to the Governments Members of the League and

particularly to the Council for their fullest support on behalf of the specific proposals he presented regarding the legal status of refugees, including the issue of identity certificates free of charge by the Governments affording them hospitality, the granting of free visas, travelling facilities, the acceptance of Russian students and other categories and the establishment and working of employment exchanges. These proposals were outlined in the special report considered by the Council on the same date.

Sir Samuel Hoare, who had just returned from Constantinople, submitted a report on the condition of the refugees in that city.

There were about 24,000 refugees to be evacuated, and of these about 15,000 were wholly or partially destitute. Relief could be provided for these refugees up to May or June 1922. It was therefore essential for the League to evacuate them before that date. To co-ordinate the various efforts of relief, Sir Samuel Hoare had established an office in Constantinople. This office was also concerned with the evacuation of refugees, and funds must be found to maintain it. The sum required would be about £ 30,000, which would cover the cost of transport and visas for the evacuation of the refugees. With this £ 30,000 the work would be accomplished in a few months and the office could be closed.

In reply to questions put by Mr. Fisher, Sir Samuel Hoare said that the majority of Russian refugees in Constantinople were civilians, belonging to the Wrangel immigration.

M. Léon Bourgeois said that the responsibility of the League with regard to Russian refugees would have to be carefully defined. At present it had no financial responsibility.

Mr. Fisher said that £ 10,000 would be subscribed by the British Government towards the £ 30,000 asked for by Dr. Nansen provided that the remainder of the sum was found by other Governments.

The Council decided to forward to all Governments for their favourable consideration the reports of Dr. Nansen and Sir Samuel Hoare, and to draw attention to the situation of the Russian refugees in Constantinople and to the proposed remedies.

On May 13th, 1922, the Council considered a further report presented by Dr. Nansen on his work up to that date.

The High Commissioner had again to state that he had been prevented from solving the problem in its entirety by lack of funds. He expressed his gratitude to the voluntary organisations for their valuable assistance.

The office of the League of Nations at Constantinople had up to April 12th evacuated 1,426 persons to various countries. The American Relief Administration had offered to feed all the refugees in Constantinople for four months and to contribute \$25,000 towards the evacuation provided the office of the League of Nations would undertake to evacuate them by the end of the summer. It was therefore essential — if this most generous offer were to be accepted — that the £30,000 for which he had already asked should be found without delay.

The High Commissioner had accepted responsibility for 4,600 refugees in Egypt, Cyprus and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State in consideration of the payment of £150,000 from the British Government.

He gave details of the acceptance of refugees by Austria, Bulgaria, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and other countries, and reported that he was negotiating with the Australian and Canadian Governments and hoped as a result to be able to evacuate substantial numbers of refugees to those countries.

The British, Greek, French, Swiss, Austrian, Spanish, Argentine, Brazilian and Serb-Croat-Slovene Governments had all consented to grant free visas under certain conditions.

The High Commissioner informed the Council that their offer to feed Russian refugees in Constantinople for four months, together with the American Y.M.C.A.'s offer of 50,000 dollars to assist in the education of refugees in the countries to which they were evacuated, must be accepted by the end of May.

Dr. Nansen therefore asked the Council to press the Governments to take a decision before June 1st.

During the meeting Lord Balfour strongly emphasised the necessity of taking effective action to secure without a moment's delay the £30,000 required. The League would lose credit among its Members and among the peoples outside it if this small sum were not forthcoming. He again promised £10,000 on behalf of the British Government, and M. Adatci, representative of Japan, promised 30,000 yen towards the sum required provided the rest were found by other Governments.

The Council decided to transmit Dr. Nansen's appeal for £30,000, together with the offer of the American Relief Administration, to all States Members of the League.

The Advisory Committee of the High Commissioner met on May 29th and 30th, and, after considering the reports submitted by the High Commissariat, passed a number of important resolutions and recommendations.

It welcomed the proposal of the French Government that a Conference of Government representatives should be called at an early date to consider fully the question of identity papers and visas for Russian refugees, and asked the High Commissioner to continue to make representations in order to obtain a settlement of this question and particularly to secure the study of the legal status of Russian refugees in the capitulatory countries.

The Committee also asked the High Commissioner to consider the necessity for taking immediate measures for the defence of the legal position of Russians remaining in Constantinople after the departure of the Allies.

A resolution was passed expressing disappointment at the failure of the efforts made to secure a larger access for refugees to the great immigration countries overseas, and an appeal was made to public opinion in those countries to come to the assistance of Europe, which had already made great sacrifices by the absorption in its overcrowded and depressed labour markets of many hundreds of thousands of refugees.

The Committee also passed a resolution that offices be established in Poland and Roumania similar to the League of Nations Office in Constantinople, in order to further the solution of the refugee problems in those countries.

---

## 15

### RELIEF WORK IN RUSSIA.

---

On September 30th, 1921, the Assembly adopted a series of recommendations concerning the necessity of combating the famine in Russia. It addressed a pressing appeal to private organisations to render every possible assistance, and expressed a desire that the Governments of all countries should interest themselves in the efforts of their national associations and grant them such material and moral support as they might need. The Assembly considered that relief work should cover all the region of former Russia attacked by the famine, including Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaidjan. Noting the statements of several delegates to the effect that their Governments did not think that they could at that moment grant official credits, the Assembly considered that possible responsibility of the League of Nations was disengaged. Should, however, the circumstances demand and should the Council consider that its intervention could prove both useful and effective, the Assembly recommended that it should take up the question. The Assembly expressed the hope that the representatives of the Governments attending an international conference summoned at Brussels for October 6th 1921, would successfully deal with the problem, and it suggested that the Governments might be able to give gifts in kind from the liquidation of their war stocks.

On March 26th, 1922, the Council received a telegram from the Norwegian Ministry for Foreign Affairs asking the Council to appoint a Commission to undertake an impartial enquiry into the facts of the situation in Russia, both as regards their intrinsic importance and their relation to the prosperity of Europe and the world. The Council replied that it was impossible to discuss the question until it had received full details of the proposal which it understood the Norwegian Government was sending without delay.

On May 16th, 1922, the Council considered the proposal of the Norwegian Government put forward by Dr. Nansen, acting as the Norwegian representative. Dr. Nansen said that his Government was solely concerned with the economic aspect of the question. The famine had reached a proportion and a severity almost indescribable, and in his capacity of High Commissioner for the co-ordination of the work of private organisations, he had received indisputable evidence of cannibalism and the open sale of salted human flesh. His Government considered that quite apart from humanitarian considerations, a commission of enquiry into the facts of the famine would be of inestimable economic benefit to Europe and to the world in general. The amounts subscribed by various Governments towards famine relief showed that there was a widespread interest in Europe in the problem, despite the fact that no comprehensive view had yet been taken and that no complete information had been available. The Governments had each to judge for themselves how they were affected by the problem. This state of things could not continue, for the economic welfare of Europe as a whole was at stake. The Norwegian Government had made this proposal because Norway itself was suffering from the depression in international trade which was the direct result of the economic collapse of Russia. It was impossible for Russia to be brought back into the economic life of Europe while famine and disease raged in her richest provinces. The Norwegian Government had appealed to the Council of the League rather than to the Genoa Conference, because it had considered that there were certain fundamental underlying realities in the Russian situation with which that conference had not dealt. The Genoa Conference had touched neither on the question of epidemics nor on the question of famine. The League of Nations had realised the importance of the epidemics question, as was shown by the Health Conference at Warsaw, summoned under its auspices in March 1922 — a Conference which had been attended by delegates both of Germany and Russia.

Dr. Nansen then gave details of the extent and severity of the famine, from which it appeared that 45,000,000 people were affected; that the organisations for which he was acting were feeding



about a million; and that the American Relief Administration was feeding at that time close on five million persons. The latest reports concerning the next harvest showed that there would not be sufficient grain to feed more than 50 % of the population in the Volga region during 1922-1923, and that the total area sown in the Ukraine was probably not more than 15 % to 20 % of what it had been before the war.

The Norwegian Government thought it essential that the proposed Commission of Enquiry should be set up in order that the incontrovertible facts of the situation should be laid before the world in a report which would command universal acceptance. The Commission would have plenty of evidence upon which to work, supplied by various agents both of Governments and private organisations who had been working in Russia; it could probably accomplish its main purpose without actually entering the country.

Lord Balfour proposed that the Council should forward the Norwegian proposal to the Genoa Conference. His suggestion was adopted, on the understanding that, if the Genoa Conference did not take up the Norwegian Government's proposal, the League would reconsider it. Dr. Nansen said that his Government would not consider this resolution as satisfactory, but, in view of the assurances given by the Council that it would reconsider the matter if the Genoa Conference did not deal with it, he would not vote against it.

---

## 16

### REPATRIATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR.

---

Dr. Nansen had hoped to finish the repatriation of the prisoners of war from Russia by March 31st of the present year. As that date approached, however, it appeared that there were at least 4,000 prisoners still in Russia who desired to be repatriated. Dr. Nansen ascertained that it was possible to finance their repatriation, and, after consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross, he decided to continue the work, at least until the end of July. He hoped that by that date the work of repatriation would be completed.

Dr. Nansen was able to inform the Council in May that he had succeeded in procuring the release of the Turkish prisoners who had been interned by the Greek Government, when, in April 1921, the Japanese vessel on which they were being repatriated from Vladivostock to Constantinople was taken into custody by the Greek Government.

A representative of Dr. Nansen obtained from the Governments of Constantinople and Angora a guarantee that, if these prisoners were repatriated, they would not be enrolled in any armed or auxiliary force. In view of these guarantees the Greek Government consented, as an act of charity, to their release, and the prisoners were repatriated from the Island of Asinara, where they had meanwhile been received by the Italian Government.

Dr. Nansen expressed his high appreciation of the generous attitude adopted by the Governments particularly of the Greek Government which had helped him in this matter, and also of the assistance given him by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

---

## 17

### INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX.

---

Under Article 24 of the Covenant, all international Bureaux established by general treaties shall be placed under the direction of the League of Nations, subject to the consent of the parties in the cases of Bureaux created before the coming into force of the Covenant. Those international Bureaux and Commissions hereafter constituted shall be placed under the direction of the League



The Council has continued to consider in what way the League's authority over international Bureaux should be exercised in accordance with Article 24.

In order that States Members of the League might have at their disposal information as to the number, objects and general activities of the different international institutions, established by private initiative or created by general treaties, a *Handbook of International Organisations* was prepared by the Secretariat and published on February 23rd, 1922. This handbook does not include institutions and organisations which, notwithstanding their disinterested and international object, are clearly national in their constitution and in their sources of financial support. The handbook gives information concerning 21 public and 292 private organisations.

### I. INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC BUREAU.

On October 2nd, 1921, the Council adopted a report by M. Léon Bourgeois to the effect that the International Hydrographic Bureau, constituted by 19 adherent States and thus forming a public international bureau, came within the meaning of Article 24 of the Covenant. The Council decided therefore that it should be placed under the direction of the League. It was noted that the Bureau is an advisory organisation for the purpose of furthering international co-operation in hydrography and similar questions.

From time to time information prepared by the Bureau is published in the *Official Journal* of the League. In the April number of 1922 appeared a summary of its first annual report.

### II. CENTRAL INTERNATIONAL OFFICE FOR THE CONTROL OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN AFRICA.

At its meeting on January 11th, 1922, the Council considered a request from the Belgian Government of that a Central International Office for the Control of the Liquor Traffic in Africa be established in Brussels. Article 7 of the Convention of St-Germain-en-Laye, signed on September 10th, 1919, provided for the establishment of this Office under the direction of the League of Nations. The work had formerly been carried out by the International Office for the Suppression of the Slave Trade, established at Brussels by the General Act of the Brussels Conference in 1892; and the Committee which drew up the Convention of September 10th, 1919, expressed the wish that the Office should continue the task required by Article 7 of the Convention. Belgium, France and Great Britain have ratified the Convention, which is therefore now in force.

The Council decided, in view of the past valuable experience of the Office, to ask the Belgian Government to continue in Brussels the work begun by the International Office, and to take charge of the duties relating to the control of the liquor traffic in Africa. It was understood that the expenses of the Office would be met by each of the Signatory Powers and collected by the Belgian Government in the proportions to be fixed by those Powers. It was considered that as the Office would now be placed under the direction of the League, it should conform to the general principles laid down by the Council for international bureaux coming under its control. The Council reserved the right of reconsidering the question of the seat of the Office if at any time extra duties are imposed on the Office involving the Members of the League, and wished it to be understood that the establishment of this public international Office under the direction of the League of Nations elsewhere than at the seat of the League should not serve as a precedent in dealing with international bureaux in the future.

The invitation of the Council to continue the work in Brussels has subsequently been accepted by the Belgian Government, which announced that the International Office for the Suppression of the Slave Trade had been reconstituted and was in complete readiness to carry out its functions. The necessary funds are being advanced by the Belgian Government in anticipation of reimbursement by the various Governments signatory to the Convention.

### III. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF COMMERCE.

At its session of August 31st to September 8th, 1921, the Provisional Economic and Financial Committee carefully considered the invitation received from the Council to express an opinion concerning the International Institute of Commerce at Brussels, and also a proposal of the Belgian Government that that organisation should be considered as the organ of economic documentation of the League. The Committee came to the conclusion that this particular bureau was not strictly an international body established by international convention but that it had certain claims to be regarded as an official international bureau since it had been established by the International Parliamentary Trade Conference in 1919 and was financially supported by grants made by the States (seventeen in number) which adhered to it. The Committee decided that it was premature to consider the recognition of the Institute by the League of Nations until its precise relations the International Bureau of Commercial Statistics, established by international convention in 1913, were defined.

On September 19th, 1921, the Council noted the opinion of the Provisional Economic and Financial Committee.

#### IV. INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHILD WELFARE.

An invitation was extended to the Secretariat to send a representative to the second International Congress for the Promotion of Child Welfare, held in Brussels in July 1921. The first International Congress met in Brussels in 1913, when, in agreement with the Swiss Government and with the assent of the official delegates of 36 Governments represented at the Congress, it was decided to establish at Brussels an International Office for the Promotion of Child Welfare. The war intervened, and negotiations were resumed by the Belgian Government only after the armistice. The Congress of 1921 confirmed by a majority the decision of the previous congress to constitute the International Office in Brussels; a permanent secretariat was established and subsidies were granted by the Belgian Government to enable it to start its work. In May 1922, the Secretariat received an invitation to send a representative to the first session of the International Committee of the Association convened in Brussels in July; and in June, the Association made an application to the Council to be placed under the direction of the League in accordance with Article 24 of the Covenant.

### 18

#### INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

On September 21st, 1921, the second Assembly adopted a resolution proposed by M. Léon Bourgeois, in the name of the Council, to the effect that the Council should nominate a Committee to examine international questions regarding intellectual co-operation. The members of the Committee were not to exceed twelve in number and were to include women.

On January 14th, 1922, the Council decided to appoint this Committee, and on May 15th, 1922, nominated the following eleven persons as members of the Committee, the twelfth to be appointed later:

Mr. D. N. BANERJEE	Professor of Political Economy at the University of Calcutta.
M. H. BERGSON	Honorary Professor of Philosophy at the "Collège de France"; Member of the "Académie française"; Member of the "Académie des Sciences morales et politiques."
Mlle BONNEVIE	Professor of Zoology at the University of Christiania; Delegate to the Assembly of the League of Nations.
M. A. DE CASTRO	Director of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Rio de Janeiro.
Mme CURIE-SKLODOWSKA	Professor of Physics at the University of Paris, and Honorary Professor of the University of Warsaw; Member of the "Académie de Médecine" at Paris, and of the Scientific Society at Warsaw.
M. J. DESTREE	Former Minister of Sciences and Arts; Member of the "Académie belge de littérature et de langue française".
Professor A. EINSTEIN	Professor of Physics at the University of Berlin; Member of the Royal Academy of Amsterdam, of the Royal Society of London, and of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin.
Professor G. A. MURRAY	Professor of Greek Philology at Oxford University; Member of the Council of the British Academy, and Delegate of South Africa to the Assembly of the League of Nations.
M. G. DE REYNOLD	Professor of French Literature at the University of Berne.
M. F. RUFFINI	Professor of Ecclesiastical Law at the University of Turin; former Minister of Public Education; President of the Union of Associations for the League of Nations; Vice-President of the Royal Academy at Turin.

M. L. DE TORRES QUEVEDO Director of the "Laboratorio electricmecanico" at Madrid; Member of the Committee for the Extension of Scientific Studies (Junta para Ampliacion de Estudios); Member of the "Académie des Sciences de Madrid."

It was decided that the Committee should hold its first meeting at Geneva on August 1st, 1922.

---

19

ESPERANTO.

---

On September 15th, 1921, the second Assembly adopted the report of the Committee appointed to examine the question of the universal teaching of Esperanto in schools as an auxiliary international language. The Committee recommended that the question should be placed on the agenda of the third Assembly and that the Secretariat of the League should in the meantime prepare a complete report on the results obtained in this field.

In accordance with these instructions, the Secretary-General sent a circular letter to all States Members of the League and to the National Esperanto Associations regarding the teaching of Esperanto in schools, together with a questionnaire asking for certain information. In addition, a report by Dr. Nitobe, Under-Secretary-General, on the Language Question and the League of Nations, was circulated. Replies have been received from the Governments of Austria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Haiti, Italy, France, Great Britain, Norway, Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Roumania, South Africa, Sweden, Siam, Switzerland, Venezuela. The information thus collected has been embodied by the Secretariat in a report to be presented to the third Assembly.

---

ADDENDA

1. *Page 6 of the Report. — Barcelona Conventions.*

Since this report went to press, three further instruments of ratifications of these Conventions have been deposited with the Secretariat, namely:—

British Empire, Bulgaria and New Zealand.

2. *Page 7 of the Report. — Convention on the Traffic in Women and Children.*

The instrument of ratification of the British Empire has recently been deposited with the Secretariat.