LEAGUE OF NATIONS

League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935

1-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

League of Nations Publications.

V. LEGAL.

Ser. L.o.N. P.		
1935.V.1.	Nationality of Women — Convention on the Nationality of Women concluded on December 26th, 1933, at the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo.	3
1935.V.2.	Status of Women — Proposal of certain Delegations for Examination by the Assembly of the Status of Women as a whole and not merely in relation to Nationality.	4
1935.V.3.	Ratification of Agreements and Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations — Sixteenth List.	5-65
1935.V.4.	Ratification of International Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations — Results of the Fifth Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.	66-81
1935.V.5.	Nationality and Status of Women — Statements presented by International Women's Organisations.	82-106
1935.V.6.	Nationality of Women — Second Report of the Secretary-General on the Information obtained in Execution of the Resolutions of the Assembly and the Council.	107-110
1935.V.7.	Nationality and Status of Women — Statements presented by International Women's Organisations (Supplement).	111-112
1935.V.8.	*Idem* — Supplement No. 2.	113

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council, and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 7.** 1935. V.

3

Geneva, May 15th 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NATIONALITY OF WOMEN

Convention on the Nationality of Women concluded on December 26th, 1933, at the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

1. The above-mentioned question was placed on the agenda of the present session of the Assembly, by a decision of the Assembly of September 25th, 1934, as the result of the following letter, dated September 21st, 1934, and addressed to the President of the Assembly by the delegations of the Argentine Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Siam, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia :

" In view of the worldwide restrictions upon the rights of women — the right to earn a living, the right to an education, to hold public office, to enter the professions — and in view of the interdependence of nationality and the right to work, the following delegations request that there be brought before the First Committee the Convention for Equality for Women in Nationality entered into at the recent Conference of American Republics at Montevideo.

" Trusting that this action may be taken immediately, etc. :

" *(Signed)* M. LITVINOFF (U.S.S.R.).
Stefan OSUSKÝ (Czechoslovakia).
Cemal HÜSNÜ (Turkey).
F. CASTILLO NAJERA (Mexico).
M. RIVAS-VICUÑA (Chile).
A. NIETO-CABALLERO (Colombia).
QUO Tai-chi (China).
B. PORRAS (Panama).
Phya Subarn SOMPATI (Siam).
E. BRACHE, Jr. (Dominican Republic).
James PARR (New Zealand).
W. MUNTERS (Latvia).
J. M. CANTILO (Argentine).
Constantin MAYARD (Haiti).
J. SUBBOTITCH (Yugoslavia)."

2. The text of the Convention referred to in the above letter is as follows :

CONVENTION ON THE NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

" The Governments represented in the Seventh International Conference of American States :

" Wishing to conclude a Convention on the Nationality of Women, have appointed the following Plenipotentiaries :

[*Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.*]

S. d. N. 1230 (F.) 1075 (A.) Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935. V. 1.

" Who, after having exhibited their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following :

" *Article 1.*

" There shall be no distinction based on sex as regards nationality, in their legislation or in their practice.

" *Article 2.*

" The present Convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties in conformity with their respective constitutional procedures. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uruguay shall transmit authentic certified copies to the Governments for the afore-mentioned purpose of ratification. The instrument of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan-American Union in Washington, which shall notify the signatory Governments of said deposit. Such notification shall be considered as an exchange of ratifications.

" *Article 3.*

" The present Convention will enter into force between the High Contracting Parties in the order in which they deposit their respective ratifications.

" *Article 4.*

" The present Convention shall remain in force indefinitely, but may be denounced by means of one year's notice given to the Pan-American Union, which shall transmit it to the other signatory Governments. After the expiration of this period, the Convention shall cease in its effects as regards the Party which denounces, but shall remain in effect for the remaining High Contracting Parties.

" *Article 5.*

" The present Convention shall be open for the adherence and accession of the States which are not signatories. The corresponding instruments shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan-American Union, which shall communicate them to the other High Contracting Parties.

" IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the following Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention in Spanish, English, Portuguese and French, and hereunto affix their respective seals in the city of Montevideo, Republic of Uruguay, this twenty-sixth day of December, 1933."

[*Here follow the signatures.*]

3. The Convention was signed on December 26th, 1933, by the plenipotentiaries of the Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras[1], Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador[2], the United States of America[3] and Uruguay.

4. In reply to an enquiry by the Secretary-General as to the effect of Article 5, the Director of the Pan-American Union has been good enough to inform him that, in virtue of an interpretation given by the Supervisory Committee of the Pan-American Union, the Convention may be considered to be open to accession by all States, including States not members of the Pan-American Union. In taking its decision, the Supervisory Committee placed on record that the interpretation adopted in the particular case was not to be considered a precedent for the interpretation of other treaties and conventions in which similar clauses appear.

5. In documents C.342.M.158, C.342(*a*).M.158(*a*) and C.342(*b*).M.158(*b*).1934.V, the Secretary-General has circulated to the Governments the information supplied by Governments down to the close of the fifteenth ordinary session of the Assembly (1934) in regard to the extent to which they have found it possible to adopt the principle of identical treatment of the sexes in the matter of nationality. A further document containing information received from Governments since the fifteenth ordinary session of the Assembly will be circulated in due course.

---

[1] With the following reservation :

" The delegation of Honduras adheres to the Convention on Equality of Nationality, with the reservations and limitations which the Constitution and laws of our country determine."

[2] With the following reservation :

" Reservation to the effect that, in Salvador, the Convention cannot be the object of immediate ratification, but that it will be necessary to consider previously the desirability of reforming the existing Naturalisation Law, ratification being obtained only in the event that such legislative reform is undertaken, and after it may have been effected."

[3] With the following reservation :

" The delegation of the United States of America, in signing the Convention on the Nationality of Women, makes the reservation that the agreement on the part of the United States is, of course and of necessity, subject to Congressional action."

It is understood that legislation of May 24th, 1934, has since brought the law of the United States into conformity with the Convention.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council, and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 8.** 1935. V.

Geneva, May 15th 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

Proposal of Certain Delegations for Examination by the Assembly of the Status of Women as a whole and not merely in relation to Nationality, with Particular Reference to the Treaty signed at Montevideo on December 26th, 1933, by Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador and Cuba

The Secretary-General has the honour to circulate to the Assembly :

(*a*) The letter of September 26th, 1934, which transmitted the above-mentioned proposal to the President of the Assembly and which was signed by the following delegations : Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay.

(*b*) The text of the Treaty referred to in the proposal of September 26th, 1934. This Treaty was signed by Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador and Cuba.

The text of a resolution on the subject of the status of women which was adopted at the Conference of American States held at Montevideo from December 3rd to 26th, 1933, is reproduced for the information of the Assembly as an Appendix to the present document.

(*a*) Letter of September 26th 1934 addressed to the President of the Assembly.

In consideration of the fact that the League of Nations is an international organisation designed to defend human rights, the following delegations deem it urgent that the League take cognisance of the present widespread and alarming encroachments upon the rights and liberties of women and, recognising that the League has no more loyal supporters in its work for international peace than the women of the world, believe that the League should show its appreciation of the services of women by giving immediate attention to every circumstance imperilling their welfare.

Since the Bureau has found it impossible to give consideration at the present time to the subject of the nationality of women and has, we understand, put this subject on the agenda of the next session of the Assembly, we, the undersigned, request that there be included on the agenda, not only the subject of women's nationality, but also the entire status of women, giving particular attention to the Treaty signed by four Governments at Montevideo (December 1933) to remove all legal distinctions based on sex.

We also request the Assembly, or the proper authorities as an emergency matter, to bring the whole critical situation affecting the position of women before the Council of the League at the earliest possible moment.

(Signed) F. Tudela (Peru).
Dr. G. Patterson (Cuba).
A. Costa du Rels (Bolivia).
Dr. B. Porras (Panama).
Dr. E. Brache (Dominican Republic).
F. Castillo Najera (Mexico).
J. M. Cantilo (Argentine).
C. Mayard (Haiti).
L. A. Baeter (Honduras).
A. Guani (Uruguay).

S. d. N. 1.230 (F.) 1.075 (A.) 5/35. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935. V. 2.

(*b*) EQUAL RIGHTS TREATY.

The Governments of URUGUAY, PARAGUAY, ECUADOR and CUBA,

Believing that it is possible to raise the status of women throughout the world by means of an international agreement :

Have decided to conclude a Treaty to that end, and for that purpose have appointed as their plenipotentiaries :

[*Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.*]

Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles :

Article 1.

The Contracting States agree that, upon the ratification of this Treaty, men and women shall have equal rights throughout the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions.

Article 2.

This Treaty shall take effect for the States which ratify it, provided it is ratified by at least two States, as soon as the ratifications have been deposited with the Government of Uruguay.

Article 3.

This Treaty shall remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the States of the world. Every instrument of adherence shall be deposited with the Government of Uruguay, and the Treaty shall immediately upon such deposit become effective as between the States thus adhering and the other States which are parties to the Treaty.

Article 4.

The Government of Uruguay shall furnish each Government named in the preamble and every Government subsequently adhering to this Treaty with a certified copy of the Treaty and of every ratification or adherence, and also shall notify said Governments immediately upon the deposit of each ratification or adherence.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the respective plenipotentiaries sign and seal the present Treaty in the Spanish and English languages, both texts have equal force.

DONE in the city of Montevideo, Uruguay, on this twenty-sixth day of December, nineteen hundred and thirty three.

[*Here follow the signatures.*]

Appendix

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

Resolution adopted at the Seventh Conference of American States held at Montevideo from December 3rd to 26th, 1933.

The Seventh International Conference of American States :

Whereas :

The granting of political and civil rights within each country involves an exact knowledge of ethnic, social, and cultural conditions and of deeply rooted customs, all of which cannot be acquired except after long and arduous study ;

Such conditions differ substantially from country to country ;

The concession of such rights belongs exclusively to the sovereign bodies of each State, and an international conference of the character of the present Conference cannot impose binding obligations on these matters without curtailing the sovereign rights of the different States ;

In view of this, it would seem unwise to conclude a treaty on the granting of civil and political rights to men and women ;

It would be well, nevertheless, to respond to the urgent and well-grounded petitions of the Inter-American Commission of Women, which seek this equality of rights,

Resolves :

To recommend to the Governments of the Republics of America that they endeavour, so far as the peculiar circumstances of each country will conveniently permit, to establish the maximum of equality between men and women in all matters pertaining to the possession, enjoyment and exercise of civil and political rights.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

[Also distributed as Special Supplement No. 136 to the *Official Journal*.]

Official No.: **A. 6(a).** 1935.V. Annex.

Geneva, August 28th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Annex to the Report[1] on the Work of the Council and the Secretariat

to the Sixteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS AND CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

SIXTEENTH LIST

Note by the Secretary-General.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the report adopted by the Council of the League of Nations during its forty-third session on December 6th, 1926, the Secretary-General has the honour to submit herewith to the Members of the Council a list, in chronological order, of the international agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League. The list shows the States which have become parties to these agreements by ratification or accession or definitive signature; the States which have signed but have not yet ratified them, and, finally, the States which have neither signed nor acceded, although they took part in the conferences at which the agreements were drawn up or have been invited to become parties thereto.

According to the decision taken by the Council at its forty-ninth session on March 6th, 1928, the present list contains in addition the reservations affixed or declarations formulated either in signing or in ratifying or in acceding to the agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The International Labour Conventions and other instruments which concern the International Labour Organisation have been grouped at the end of this document.

---

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report to the Fourth Assembly of the League on the Work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Austria, of September 10th, 1919.
2. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Bulgaria, of November 27th, 1919.
3. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Hungary, of June 4th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 187).
4. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey, of July 24th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 11).
5. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Poland, of June 28th, 1919.
6. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Czechoslovakia, of September 10th, 1919.
7. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, of September 10th, 1919.
8. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Roumania, of December 9th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 335).
9. Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, of May 15th, 1922.
10. Declaration by Albania, of October 2nd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 173).
11. Declaration by Finland as to the Aaland Islands, of June 27th, 1921.
12. Declaration by Latvia, of July 7th, 1923.
13. Convention between Bulgaria and Greece respecting Reciprocal Emigration, Neuilly-sur-Seine, November 27th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. I, p. 67).
14. Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, of January 30th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXII, p. 75).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN LIQUOR: Convention relating to the Liquor Traffic in Africa, St. Germain-en-Laye, September 10th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 11).

(*c*) AERIAL NAVIGATION: Convention relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation, Paris, October 13th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XI, p. 173).

S.d.N. 1.770 (F.) 1.390 (A.) 9/35. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935. V. 3.

N.B.—States which have signed, ratified or acceded to particular agreements or conventions since the date of the last list submitted to the Council and Assembly (document A.6(*a*).1934.V, Annex, of September 1st, 1934) are indicated in italics.

The letter "*a*" placed immediately after a date signifies an accession.

The letter "*s*" placed immediately after a date signifies a definitive signature.

(*d*) HEALTH:

1. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Roumania, Warsaw, December 20th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XVIII, p. 103).
2. Sanitary Convention between Poland and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Warsaw, February 17th, 1923.
3. Sanitary Convention between Germany and Poland, Dresden, December 18th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 301.)
4. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Czechoslovakia, Warsaw, 1922.
5. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Latvia, Warsaw, July 7th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 317).
6. Sanitary Convention between Estonia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 25th, 1922.
7. Sanitary Convention between Latvia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 24th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 9).
8. Sanitary Convention between Bulgaria and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, April 1923.

(*e*) AALAND ISLANDS: Convention relating to the Non-Fortification and Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands, Geneva, October 20th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 211).

(*f*) UPPER SILESIA: Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, Geneva, May 15th, 1922.

(*g*) FINANCIAL RESTORATION OF AUSTRIA:

1. Protocol No. I (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
2. Protocol No. II and Annexes and Explanatory Note, Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
3. Protocol No. III (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.

(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XII, pp. 385, 391 and 405.)

(*h*) SAAR: Protocol between the German Government and the Governing Commission of the Territory of the Saar Basin, Berlin, June 3rd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 189).

(*i*) DANZIG:

1. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).
2. Treaty between Germany and Poland concerning the Regulation of Option Questions, Danzig, November 8th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 323).
3. Treaty between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Warsaw, October 24th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXVI).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the Council and of the Secretariat to the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations for the year 1924 (A.8(*a*).1924, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) MINORITIES:

1. Declaration concerning the Protection of Minorities in Lithuania, Geneva, May 12th, 1923.
2. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, signed at Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN ARMS: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva, September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*c*) REVISION OF BERLIN AND BRUSSELS ACTS RELATING TO AFRICAN TERRITORIES: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva on September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*d*) REFUGEES:

1. Arrangement with regard to the Issue of Certificates of Identity to Russian Refugees, Geneva, July 5th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XIII, p. 237).
2. Protocol relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 29).
3. Declaration relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 41).

(*e*) FINANCIAL RECONSTRUCTION OF HUNGARY: Protocols on the Financial Reconstruction of Hungary, March 14th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, pp. 423 and 427).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report for the year 1925 (A.7(*a*).1925, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Proposal relating to the Protection of Greek Minorities in Bulgaria:
2. Proposal relating to the Protection of Bulgarian Minorities in Greece

(Geneva, September 29th, 1924) (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 117 and 123).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929. Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) CURRENCY AND BANKING REFORM:

1. Protocol regarding Currency and Banking Reform in Estonia, signed at Geneva, December 10th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXII, p. 277);
2. Protocol regarding the Bulgarian Stabilisation Loan, signed at Geneva, March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 165);
3. Additional Act to the Protocol of March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 210);
4. Protocol for the stabilisation of the currency and liquidating the budget arrears of the Hellenic State and for further settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 15th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 9);
5. Declaration concerning the above Protocol on behalf of France, Great Britain and Italy, signed at Geneva, December 8th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 73).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

(*c*) REFUGEES:

1. Additional Act to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, relating to the Settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 19th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 413);
2. Declaration relating to the modifications made to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, with regard to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece, by the Additional Act of September 19th, 1924, Geneva, September 25th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 421);
3. Protocol concerning the Settlement of Refugees in Bulgaria, signed at Geneva, September 8th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 245);
4. Arrangement relating to the issue of identity certificates to Russian and Armenian Refugees, supplementing and amending the previous Arrangements dated July 5th, 1922, and May 31st, 1924, signed at Geneva, May 12th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 47);
5. Arrangement concerning the legal status of Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 53);
6. Arrangement concerning the extension to other categories of Refugees of certain measures taken to assist Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series* of the *League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 63);
7. Agreement concerning the functions of the representatives of the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 377).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1931 (A.6(*a*).1931, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) REFUGEES:

Convention between the Hellenic Government and the Refugee Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, January 24th, 1930 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CVIII, p. 349).

(*b*) CONCERTED ECONOMIC ACTION:

1. Commercial Convention and Protocol, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.
2. Protocol regarding the Programme of Future Negotiations, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1933 (A.6(*a*).1933 Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) ROUMANIA:

Agreement establishing technical advisory co-operation in Roumania, signed at Geneva, January 28th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 271).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Agreement between Colombia and Peru relating to the procedure for putting into effect the recommendations proposed by the Council of the League of Nations in the report which it adopted on March 18th, 1933, in order to avoid any incident that might aggravate the relations between the two countries, with Annexes, signed at Geneva, May 25th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 251).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1934 (A.6(*a*). 1934. Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) AUSTRIA:

Austrian Protocol, signed at Geneva, July 15th, 1932 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 285, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 469 and Vol. CXLII, p. 392).

(*b*) ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.

International Convention for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927;

Protocol of the above Convention, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927;

Supplementary Agreement to the Convention of November 8th, 1927, for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.

Protocol of the Supplementary Agreement, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.

(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCVII, p. 391; Vol. C, p. 264; Vol. CVII, p. 538; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 411; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 447 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 336.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT.
Chapter XXXI.

Creation of an International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Company (Convention for the), with Charter and Statutes. Geneva, May 21st, 1931 91

ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.
Chapters VI and XVI.

Awards (Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral). Geneva, September 26th, 1927 52
Clauses (Protocol on Arbitration). Geneva, September 24th, 1923 28

ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR (SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN).
Chapter XI.

Gases (asphyxiating, poisonous and other), and Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 45
Ifni (Declaration regarding the Territory of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925. 45
Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War (Convention for the). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 44

ASSISTANCE (FINANCIAL).
Chapter XXV.

Assistance (Convention on Financial). Geneva, October 2nd, 1930 80

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES (UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON).
Chapters XXIV and XXIX.

Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930. 78
Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931. 87
Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 79
Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 88
Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 76
Uniform Law for Cheques (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 85

COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY (SUPPRESSION OF).
Chapter XX.

Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency (International Convention for the). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 . 67
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, April 20th, 1929 68
Protocol (Optional). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 68

COURT (PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE).
Chapters I and XXII,

Accession of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Protocol relating to the). Geneva, September 14th, 1929 70
Court (Protocol of Signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 9
Clause (Optional). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 10
Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Protocol concerning the). Geneva, September 14th, 1929 69

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (AMENDMENTS TO THE).
Chapters IV, IX and XII.

Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Paragraph to be inserted between the new third paragraph and the original second paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 23
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). First paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). Adding a new paragraph after the first paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 25
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, September 27th, 1924 38
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph of the original text. Geneva, September 21st, 1925 47

CUSTOMS.
Chapter VII.

Simplification of Customs Formalities (International Convention relating to the), and Protocol. Geneva, November 3rd, 1923. 30

DANUBE (DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE).
Chapter XXVII.

Declaration by the Governments of the Powers which are Parties to the Convention instituting the Definitive Statute of the Danube. Geneva, December 5th, 1930 83

Page

DISPUTES (PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XVIII.
General Act. Geneva, September 26th, 1928 57

ELECTRIC (QUESTIONS).
Chapter VIII.
Electric Power (Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 35
Hydraulic Power affecting more than one State (Convention relating to the Development of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 37

EMIGRANTS (TRANSIT CARD FOR).
Chapter XXI.
Preparation of a Transit Card for Emigrants (Agreement concerning the). Geneva, June 14th, 1929 . . 69

EXPORTATION.
Chapter XVII.
Bones (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 55
Protocol of the Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928 56
Hides and Skins (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 . . 53
Protocol of the Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928 54

FILMS (OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER).
Chapter XXXVII.
International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character (Convention for facilitating the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 98

LAW (PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XXIII.
Conflict of Nationality Laws (Convention on Certain Questions relating to the). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 71
Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality (Protocol relating to). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 73
Statelessness (Protocol relating to a Certain Case of). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 74
Statelessness (Special Protocol concerning). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 75

NAVIGATION (INLAND).
Chapters II, XIII and XXVIII.
Collisions in Inland Navigation (Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules concerning), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 83
Flag (Convention on Administrative Measures for attesting the Right of Inland Navigation Vessels to a), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 84
Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation (Convention regarding the), and Protocol of Signature. Paris, November 27th, 1925 48
Registration of Inland Navigation Vessels, Rights *in rem* over Such Vessels and Other Cognate Questions (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 84
Waterways of International Concern (Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 16
Waterways of International Concern (Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 17

NAVIGATION (MARITIME).
Chapters II, VIII and XXVI.
Flag (Declaration recognising the right to a) of States having no Sea-coast. Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 19
Lightships (Manned) not on their Stations (Agreement concerning). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 82
Maritime Ports (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 33
Signals (Agreement concerning Maritime). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 81

OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS (TRAFFIC IN).
Chapters X, XXXII and XXXV.
Opium Convention (International). The Hague, January 23rd, 1912. 39
Opium (Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of Prepared Protocol and Final Act). First Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 11th, 1925 40
Opium Convention (International). Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 41
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 43
Narcotic Drugs (Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, July 13th, 1931 91
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, July 13th, 1931 94
Smoking (Agreement for the Suppression of Opium). Bangkok, November 27th, 1931. 97

PUBLICATIONS (OBSCENE).
Chapter V.
Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications (International Convention for the). Geneva, September 12th, 1923 26

RAILWAYS.
Chapter VIII.
Railways (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 31

RELIEF UNION (INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XV.
Relief Union (Convention and Statute establishing an International). Geneva, July 12th 1927 51

REFUGEES.
Chapter XXXIX.
International Status of Refugees (Convention relating to the). Geneva, October 28th, 1933. 100

ROAD TRAFFIC. Page

Chapter XXX.

Signals (Convention concerning the Unification of Road). Geneva, March 30th, 1931 88
Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, March 30th, 1931 89
Triptychs (Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost). Geneva, March 28th, 1931. 90

SLAVERY.

Chapter XIV.

Slavery Convention. Geneva, September 25th, 1926 49

STATISTICS (ECONOMIC).

Chapter XIX.

Statistics (International Convention relating to Economic). Geneva, December 14th, 1928 64
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, December 14th, 1928 66

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

Chapters III and XXXVIII.

Traffic in Women and Children (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, September 30th, 1921 19
Traffic in Women of Full Age (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 99

TRANSIT.

Chapter II.

Freedom of Transit (Convention and Statute on). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 15

VETERINARY (QUESTIONS).

Chapter XL.

Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals (International Convention for the), with Declaration attached. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 102
Export and Import of Animal Products (Other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products)(International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 104
Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 103

WAR (MEANS OF PREVENTING).

Chapter XXXIV.

Means of preventing War (General Convention to improve the). Geneva, September 26th, 1931 96

WHALING.

Chapter XXXIII.

Regulation of Whaling (Convention for the). Geneva, September 24th, 1931 95

WHEAT.

Chapter XXXVI.

Final Act of the Conference of Wheat Exporting and Importing Countries, with Appendices and Minutes of Final Meeting. London, August 25th, 1933 97

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) adopted as Draft Conventions by the International Labour Conference at its various Sessions.

Chapter XLI.

(*a*) First Session (Washington, October 29th-November 29th, 1919):

Age for admission of children to industrial employment (Convention fixing the minimum) 107
Employment of Women before and after childbirth (Convention concerning the) 106
Hours of work in industrial undertakings (Convention limiting the) to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week 105
Night (Convention concerning the employment of women during the) 106
Night Work of young persons employed in Industry (Convention concerning the) 107
Unemployment (Convention concerning) 105

(*b*) Second Session (Genoa, June 15th-July 10th, 1920):

Age for admission of children to employment at sea (Convention fixing the minimum) 108
Employment for seamen (Convention for establishing facilities for finding) 109
Unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship (Convention concerning) 108

(*c*) Third Session (Geneva, October 25th-November 19th, 1921):

Age for admission of children to employment in agriculture (Convention concerning the) 109
Age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers and stokers (Convention fixing the minimum) 112
Association and combination of agricultural workers (Convention concerning the rights of) 110
Compensation in agriculture (Convention concerning workmen's) 110
Medical Examination of children and young persons employed at sea (Convention concerning the compulsory) 112
Weekly rest in Industrial Undertakings (Convention concerning the application of the) 111
White Lead in painting (Convention concerning the use of) 111

(*d*) Seventh Session (Geneva, May 19th-June 10th, 1925):

Accidents (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for) 113
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational) 113
Equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents (Convention concerning) 114
Night work in Bakeries (Convention concerning) 114

(*e*) Eighth Session (Geneva, May 26th-June 5th, 1926):

Simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship (Convention concerning the) 114

Page

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) *(continued)*.

(*f*) Ninth Session (Geneva, June 7th-24th, 1926):

Articles of Agreement (Convention concerning Seamen's) 115
Repatriation of seamen (Convention concerning the) 115

(*g*) Tenth Session (Geneva, May 25th-June 16th, 1927):

Sickness insurance for agricultural workers (Convention concerning) 116
Sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants (Convention concerning) 116

(*h*) Eleventh Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 16th, 1928):

Minimum-wage-fixing machinery (Convention concerning the creation of) 116

(*i*) Twelfth Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 21st, 1929):

Heavy Packages transported by vessels (Convention concerning the marking of the weight on) . . 117
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the) 117

(*j*) Fourteenth Session (Geneva, June 10th-28th, 1930):

Forced or compulsory labour (Convention concerning) 118
Hours of work in commerce and offices (Convention concerning the regulation of) 119

(*k*) Fifteenth Session (Geneva, May 28th-June 18th, 1931):

Hours of work in coal-mines (Convention limiting) 119

(*l*) Sixteenth Session (Geneva, April 12th-30th, 1932):

Age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (Convention concerning the) 119
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the). Revised 1932 119

(*m*) Seventeenth Session (Geneva, June 8th-30th, 1933):

Agencies (Convention concerning fee-charging employment) 119
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity). 120
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity) 120
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 120
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 120
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans'). 120
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans') 120

(*n*) Eighteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-23rd, 1934):

Automatic sheet-glass works (Convention for the regulation of hours of work in) 121
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational). Revised 1934 . . . 120
Night (Convention concerning employment of women during the). Revised 1934 120
Unemployed (Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily) 121

(*o*) Nineteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-25th, 1935):

Hours of work (Convention concerning the reduction of) to forty a week 121
Hours of work in coal mines (Convention limiting). Revised 1935 121
Hours of work in glass-bottle works (Convention concerning the reduction of) 121
Employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (Convention concerning the) . . 121
Scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance (Convention concerning the establishment of an international) 121

LABOUR PART OF THE TREATIES OF PEACE (AMENDMENTS TO THE).
Chapter XLII.

Amendment to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles and to the Corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace, adopted at the fourth session of the International Labour Conference. Geneva, November 2nd, 1922 122
Protocol relative to the above Amendment, opened for signature at Geneva on June 14th, 1923 122

I. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

1. PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[1]

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 4th, 1921)
ALBANIA (July 13th, 1921)
AUSTRALIA (August 4th, 1921)
AUSTRIA (July 23rd, 1921)
BELGIUM (August 29th, 1921)
BRAZIL (November 1st, 1921)
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 4th, 1921)
BULGARIA (August 12th, 1921)
CANADA (August 4th, 1921)
CHILE (July 20th, 1928)
CHINA (May 13th, 1922)
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA (January 12th, 1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 2nd, 1921)
DENMARK (June 13th, 1921)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (May 2nd, 1923)
ETHIOPIA (July 16th, 1926)
FINLAND (April 6th, 1922)
FRANCE (August 7th, 1921)
GERMANY (March 11th, 1927)
GREECE (October 3rd, 1921)
HAITI (September 7th, 1921)
HUNGARY (November 20th, 1925)
INDIA (August 4th, 1921)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY (June 20th, 1921)
JAPAN (November 16th, 1921)
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)
LITHUANIA (May 16th, 1922)
LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
NETHERLANDS (August 6th, 1921)
NEW ZEALAND (August 4th, 1921)
NORWAY (August 20th, 1921)
PANAMA (June 14th, 1929)
PARAGUAY (May 11th, 1933)
PERU (March 29th, 1932)
POLAND (August 26th, 1921)
PORTUGAL (October 8th, 1921)
ROUMANIA (August 8th, 1921)
SALVADOR (August 29th, 1930)
SIAM (February 27th, 1922)
SPAIN (August 30th, 1921)
SWEDEN (February 21st, 1921)
SWITZERLAND (July 25th, 1921)
URUGUAY (September 27th, 1921)
VENEZUELA (December 2nd, 1921)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 12th, 1921)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BOLIVIA
COSTA RICA
GUATEMALA
LIBERIA
NICARAGUA

Other Members or States which may sign the Protocol.

AFGHANISTAN
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
HONDURAS
IRAQ
MEXICO
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VI, p. 379; Vol. XI, p. 404; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XXIV, p. 152; Vol. XXVII, p. 416; Vol. XXXIX, p. 165; Vol. XLV, p. 96; Vol. L, p. 159; Vol. LIV, p. 387; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 435; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 272; Vol. XCII, p. 362; Vol. XCVI, p. 180; Vol. C, p. 153; Vol. CIV, p. 492; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXI, p. 402; Vol. CXVII, p. 46; Vol. CXXVI, p. 430; Vol. CXXX, p. 440; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 392; Vol. CXLVII, p. 318 and Vol. CLII, p. 282.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Final Act of the Conference of States signatories of the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Geneva, September 23rd, 1926.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications

Union of South Africa (April 7th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

Albania (September 17th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 5 years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 of the Statute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, other than:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Albania;

(*b*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Albania;

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification

Costa Rica

Reciprocity.

Czechoslovakia

Reciprocity, 10 years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement, and subject to the right, for either of the parties to the dispute, to submit the dispute, before any recourse to the Court, to the Council of the League of Nations.

Guatemala

Reciprocity.

Liberia

Reciprocity.

Nicaragua

Unconditional.

Poland

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any future disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to such ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of peaceful settlement.

The present declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) With regard to matters which, by international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; or,

(2) Arising between Poland and States which refuse to establish or maintain normal diplomatic relations with Poland; or,

(3) Connected directly or indirectly with the world war or with the Polono-Sovietic war; or,

(4) Resulting directly or indirectly from the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed at Riga, on March 18th, 1921; or,

(5) Relating to provisions of internal law connected with points (3) and (4).

Other Members or States which may sign the Clause

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Brazil
Chile
China
Cuba
Ecuador
Honduras
Iraq
Japan
Mexico
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

(*c*) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by the Kingdom of Albania and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

Australia (August 18th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

Austria (March 13th, 1927)

Reciprocity, 10 years.

Belgium (March 10th, 1926)

Reciprocity, 15 years, in any disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

United Kingdom (February 5th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Bulgaria (August 12th, 1921)
Reciprocity.

Canada (July 28th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to said ratification, other than:

Disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in Canada reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Colombia (January 6th, 1932)
Reciprocity.

Denmark (June 13th, 1926)
Reciprocity, 10 years.

Dominican Republic (February 4th, 1933)
Reciprocity.

*Estonia (May 2nd, 1928)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in any future dispute in respect of which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

**Ethiopia* (September 18th, 1934)
Reciprocity, 2 years, as from September 18th, 1934, with retroactive effect covering the period comprised between July 16th, 1933, and this date, excepting future disputes in respect of which the parties should have agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*Finland (April 6th, 1927)
Reciprocity, 10 years.

France (April 25th, 1931)
Reciprocity, 5 years, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, and which could not have been settled by a procedure of conciliation or by the Council according to the terms of Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant, with reservation as to the case where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration. This declaration replaces the declaration of October 2nd, 1924, which has now lapsed.

Germany (July 5th, 1933)
Reciprocity, 5 years, from March 1st, 1933, as regards disputes which might have arisen after February 29th, 1928, date of the ratification of the declaration made on this subject at Geneva on September 23rd, 1927, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification. Cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement are excepted.

Greece (July 19th, 1935)
Reciprocity, 5 years, as from September 12th, 1934.
For the classes of disputes mentioned in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication;

(*b*) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Greece and providing for another procedure.

This acceptance is effective as from the date of signature of the present declaration.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Haiti (September 7th, 1921)
Unconditional.

Hungary (August 9th, 1934)
Reciprocity, 5 years, with effect as from August 13th, 1934.

India (February 5th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of India,

And subject to the condition that the Government of India reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

Iran (September 19th, 1932)
Reciprocity in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations of facts relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Iran and subsequent to the ratification of this declaration, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Iran, including those concerning the rights of sovereignty of Iran over its islands and ports;

(*b*) Disputes in regard to which the Parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*c*) Disputes with regard to questions which by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Persia.

However, the Imperial Government of Iran reserves the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

The present declaration is made for a period of six years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effects until notification is given of its abrogation.

Irish Free State (July 11th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 20 years.

Italy (September 7th, 1931)
Reciprocity, 5 years, subject to any other method of settlement provided by a special convention, and in any case where a solution through the diplomatic channel or, further, by the action of the Council of the League of Nations could not be reached, on the following classes of legal disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration, and concerning:

(*a*) The interpretation of a treaty,

(*b*) Any question of international law,

(*c*) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation,

(*d*) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Latvia (February 26th, 1935)
Reciprocity, 5 years, over all disputes which might have arisen after February 26th, 1930, date of deposit of the ratification of the declaration made at Geneva on September 10th, 1929, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration is made for a period of five years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effect until notification is given of its abrogation.

**Lithuania* (January 14th, 1935)
Reciprocity, 5 years.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)

Reciprocity, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the Parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

*Netherlands (August 6th, 1926)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any future disputes, excepting those in regard to which the parties would have agreed after the coming into force of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

New Zealand (March 29th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of New Zealand,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in New Zealand reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Norway (October 3rd, 1926)

Reciprocity, 10 years.

*Panama (June 14th, 1929)

Reciprocity.

*Paraguay (May 11th, 1933)

Unconditional.

Peru (March 29th, 1932)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any dispute arising with regard to situations and facts subsequent to ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed either to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration, or to submit the dispute previously to the Council of the League of Nations.

*Portugal (October 8th, 1921)

Reciprocity.

Roumania (June 9th, 1931)

Reciprocity, 5 years, in respect of the Governments recognised by Roumania and on condition of reciprocity in regard to legal disputes arising out of situations or facts subsequent to the ratification by the Roumanian Parliament of this accession and with the exception of matters for which a special procedure has been or may be established and subject to the right of Roumania to submit the dispute to the Council of the League of Nations before having recourse to the Court.

The following are, however, excepted:

(*a*) Any question of substance or of procedure which might directly or indirectly cause the existing territorial integrity of Roumania and her sovereign rights, including her rights over her ports and communications, to be brought into question;

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which, according to international law, fall under the domestic jurisdiction of Roumania.

*Salvador (August 29th, 1930)

The provisions of this Statute do not apply to any disputes or differences concerning points or questions which cannot be submitted to arbitration in accordance with the political Constitution of this Republic.

The provisions of this Statute also do not apply to disputes which arose before that date or to pecuniary claims made against the Nation, it being further understood that Article 36 binds Salvador only in regard to States which accept the arbitration in that form.

Siam (May 7th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in all disputes as to which no other means of pacific settlement is agreed upon between the Parties.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Spain (September 21st, 1928)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the Parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*Sweden (August 16th, 1926) — Reciprocity, 10 years.

Switzerland (July 24th, 1926) — Reciprocity, 10 years.

*Uruguay (September 27th, 1921) — Reciprocity.

Yugoslavia (November 24th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 5 years, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State the Government of which is recognised by the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration, except disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and except in cases where the Parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement.

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

1. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (November 15th, 1923)	China	Union of South Africa
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	Ethiopia (*a*)	Argentine Republic
British Empire, including	Guatemala	Australia
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)	Lithuania	Brazil
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.	Panama	Canada
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	Peru (*a*)	Colombia
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	Portugal	Costa Rica
Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)	Uruguay	Cuba
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)		Dominican Republic
India (August 2nd, 1922)		Ecuador
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Irish Free State
		Liberia
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Paraguay
		Salvador
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

1 This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 11; Vol. XI, p. 407; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XIX, p. 279; Vol. XXIV, p. 155; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 166; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 181; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393 and Vol. CXLII, p. 340.

1. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia (October 29th, 1923)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 3rd, 1925 *a*)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Estonia (June 6th, 1925)
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (September 19th, 1924)
Syria and Lebanon (French Mandate) (February 7th, 1929 *a*)
Germany (April 9th, 1924 *a*)
Greece (February 18th, 1924)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Iran (January 29th, 1931)
Iraq (March 1st, 1930 *a*)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (February 20th, 1924)
Latvia (September 29th, 1923)
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (April 17th, 1924)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Poland (October 8th, 1924)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
Spain (December 17th, 1929)
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)
Switzerland (July 14th, 1924)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Belgium	Afghanistan
Austria (November 15th, 1923)	Bolivia	Union of South Africa
British Empire, including Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)	China	Argentine Republic
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.	Colombia *(a)*	Australia
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	Estonia	Brazil
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	Guatemala	Canada
Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)	Lithuania	Costa Rica
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)	Panama	Cuba
India (August 2nd, 1922)	Peru *(a)*	Dominican Republic
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)	Poland	Ecuador
	Portugal	Ethiopia
	Spain	Germany
	Uruguay	Haiti
		Honduras
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Mexico
		Netherlands
		Nicaragua
		Paraguay
		Salvador

[1] This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 35; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 306; Vol. XIX. p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. XCVI, p. 182 and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393.

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*The Convention is open to Accession by*
Chile (March 19th, 1928)	Switzerland
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)	Venezuela
Finland (January 29th, 1923)	Yugoslavia
France (December 31st, 1926)	
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)	
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)	
Italy (August 5th, 1922)	
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)	
Norway (September 4th, 1923)	
Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*) In so far as its provisions are not in conflict with the principles of the new Danube Statute drawn up by the International Commission which was appointed in accordance with Articles 349 of the Treaty of Versailles, 304 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, 232 of the Treaty of Neuilly and 288 of the Treaty of Trianon.	
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)	
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)	
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)	

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Belgium Accepting paragraph (*a*).	Afghanistan
Austria (November 15th, 1923 *a*) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.	Peru *(a)*	Union of South Africa
British Empire (August 2nd, 1922) In respect of the United Kingdom only accepting paragraph (*a*).	Portugal	Argentine Republic
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).	Spain Accepting paragraph (*a*).	Australia
Nyasaland Protectorate and Tanganyika Territory (August 2nd, 1922) To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*b*).		Bolivia
Bahamas, Barbados, British Guiana, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Leeward Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent), Gibraltar, Malta (August 2nd, 1922 *a*) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*)		Brazil
		Bulgaria
		Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		France
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Mexico
		Netherlands

[1] The Convention being in force, this Protocol became operative after it had been ratified by two Powers. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VII, p. 65; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 437; Vol. XCVI, p. 182 and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394.

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Cyprus
Gambia Colony and Protectorate
Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate
Nigeria Colony and Protectorate
Gold Coast: Ashanti and northern territories of the Gold Coast
Kenya Colony and Protectorate
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar
St. Helena
Ceylon
Mauritius
Seychelles
Hong-Kong
Straits Settlements
Fiji
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
British Solomon Islands
Tonga Islands

(August 2nd, 1922 *a*) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Poland
Salvador
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

Federated Malay States:

Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Non-Federated Malay States:

Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.

Bermuda (December 27th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

India (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of India only accepting paragraph (*a*).

Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Finland (January 29th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Greece (January 3rd, 1928)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930 *a*)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
Is unable to accept any restriction of her liberty in administrative matters on the waterways which are not of international concern, that is to say, on purely national rivers, while at the same time accepting the principles of liberty in accordance with the laws of the country.

Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*) to the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).
Sweden (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)

4. Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Declaration is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (July 10th, 1924)	China	Argentine Republic
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	Guatemala	Brazil
British Empire, including Newfoundland (October 9th, 1922)	Iran	Colombia
Canada (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Lithuania	Costa Rica
Australia (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Panama	Cuba
Union of South Africa (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Peru	Dominican Republic
New Zealand (October 9th, 1922)	Portugal	Ecuador
India (October 9th, 1922)	Uruguay	Ethiopia
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)		Haiti
Chile (March 19th, 1928)		Honduras
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)		Irish Free State
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (January 10th, 1933 *a*)		Liberia
Denmark (Nov. 13th, 1922)		Luxemburg
*Estonia		Mexico
Finland (September 22nd, 1922 *a*)		Nicaragua
*France		Paraguay
Germany (Nov. 10th, 1931 *a*)		Salvador
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)		Venezuela
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)		
Iraq (April 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*Italy		
Japan (February 20th, 1924)		
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)		
*Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (November 28th, 1921)		
Norway (September 4th, 1923)		
Poland (December 20th, 1924)		
Roumania (Feb. 22nd, 1923 *a*)		
Siam (November 29th, 1922)		
Spain (July 1st, 1929)		
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)		
*Switzerland		
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)		
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (May 16th, 1935 *a*)		
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)		

III. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.[2]

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children.[3]

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935 *a*)	Costa Rica	United States of America
Albania (October 13th, 1924)	Panama *(a)*	Sa'udi Arabia
Austria (August 9th, 1922)	Peru *(a)*	Argentine Republic

---

* Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 73; Vol. XI, p. 411; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 281; Vol. XXIV, p. 159; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 72; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 283; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 183; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; Vol. CXXX, p. 441 and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394.

[2] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, details concerning:

1. The Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 18th, 1904.
2. The Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 4th, 1910.

[3] "The present Convention shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date of the deposit of its ratification or act of accession" (Article 11). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXVII, p. 419; Vol. XXXV, p. 301; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol. XLV, p. 99; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIV, p. 388; Vol. LXIII, p. 378; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p 367; Vol. C, p. 156; Vol. CVII, p. 462; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 49; Vol. CXXII, p. 322; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 399; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 417 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 319.

I. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued).*

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (June 15th, 1922)
Brazil (August 18th, 1933)
British Empire (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the Island of Newfoundland, the British Colonies and Protectorates, the Island of Nauru, or any territories administered under mandates by Great Britain.

Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Nyasaland, Ceylon, Hong-Kong, Straits Settlements, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Southern Rhodesia, Barbados, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Northern Rhodesia, British Honduras (September 18th, 1922 *a*)

British Guiana and Fiji (October 24th, 1922 *a*)
Leeward Islands (March 7th, 1924 *a*)
Jamaica and Mauritius (March 7th, 1924 *a*)
Falkland Islands and Dependencies (May 8th, 1924 *a*)
Gold Coast Colony (July 3rd, 1924 *a*)
Iraq (May 15th, 1925 *a*)
The Government of Iraq desire to reserve to themselves the right to fix an age-limit lower than that specified in Article 5 of the Convention.
Colony of Sierra Leone (November 16th, 1927 *a*)

Colony and Protectorate of Gambia, Protectorate of Uganda, Territory of Tanganyika (April 10th, 1931 *a*)

Palestine (including Trans-Jordan), Protected State of Sarawak, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Zanzibar Protectorate (January 14th, 1932 *a*) (November 2nd, 1931 *a*)

Canada (June 28th, 1922)
Australia (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territory of New Guinea.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Bolivia
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Nicaragua
Paraguay
San Marino
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

I. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (June 28th, 1922)

NEW ZEALAND (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

IRISH FREE STATE (May 18th, 1934 *a*)

INDIA (June 28th, 1922)
Reserves the right at its discretion to substitute the age of sixteen years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limits prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and in Article 5 of the present Convention.

BULGARIA (April 29th, 1925 *a*)

CHILE (January 15th, 1929)

CHINA (February 24th, 1926)

Colombia (November 8th, 1934)

CUBA (May 7th, 1923)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 29th, 1923)

DENMARK (April 23rd, 1931 *a*) [1]
This ratification does not include Greenland, the Convention, in view of the special circumstances, being of no interest for that possession.

EGYPT (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

ESTONIA (February 28th, 1930)

FINLAND (August 16th, 1926 *a*)

FRANCE (March 1st, 1926 *a*)
Does not include the French Colonies, the countries in the French Protectorate or the territories under French mandate.

SYRIA AND LEBANON (June 2nd, 1930 *a*)

GERMANY (July 8th, 1924)

GREECE (April 9th, 1923)

HUNGARY (April 25th, 1925)

IRAN (March 28th, 1933)

ITALY (June 30th, 1924)

ITALIAN COLONIES (July 27th, 1922 *a*)
Subject to the age limit for native women and children, referred to in Article 5, being reduced from twenty-one to sixteen years.

JAPAN (December 15th, 1925)
Does not include Chosen, Taiwan, the leased Territory of Kwantung, the Japanese portion of Saghalien Island and Japan's mandated territory in the South Seas.

LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)

LITHUANIA (September 14th, 1931)

LUXEMBURG (December 31st, 1929 *a*)

MEXICO (May 10th, 1932 *a*)

MONACO (July 18th, 1931 *a*)

NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 19th, 1923)

NORWAY (August 16th, 1922)

POLAND and FREE CITY OF DANZIG (October 8th, 1924)

PORTUGAL (December 1st, 1923)

ROUMANIA (September 5th, 1923)

SIAM (July 13th, 1922)
With reservation as to the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of 1910 and Article 5 of this Convention, in so far as concerns the nationals of Siam.

SPAIN (May 12th, 1924 *a*)
Does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

SUDAN (June 1st, 1932 *a*)

SWEDEN (June 9th, 1925)

SWITZERLAND (January 20th, 1926)

URUGUAY (October 21st, 1924 *a*)

YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929 *a*)

---

[1] According to a reservation made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE.[1]

(Geneva, October 5th, 1921.)

9. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.[2]

(First Paragraph to be inserted after the First Amended Paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
Union of South Africa (August 12th, 1924)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Australia (August 12th,1924)	Costa Rica	Albania
Austria (August 29th, 1927)	Cuba	Argentine Republic
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)	Haiti	Dominican Republic
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)	Liberia	Ecuador
British Empire (August 12th, 1924)	Panama	Ethiopia
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Paraguay	France
Canada (August 12th, 1924)	Peru	Germany
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Venezuela	Guatemala
China (July 4th, 1923)		Honduras
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)		Iran
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)		Iraq
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)		Irish Free State
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)		Luxemburg
Finland (June 25th, 1923)		Mexico
Greece (January 20th, 1925)		Nicaragua
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)		Poland
India (August 12th, 1924)		Salvador
Italy (August 5th, 1922)		Spain
Japan (June 13th, 1923)		Turkey
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)		Yugoslavia
Netherlands (April 4th,1923)		
New Zealand (August 12th,1924)		
Norway (March 29th, 1922)		
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)		
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)		
Siam (September 12th, 1922)		
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)		
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)		
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)		

10. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Second Paragraph to be inserted after the First Amended Paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
Union of South Africa (August 12th, 1924)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Australia (August 12th, 1924)	Costa Rica	Albania
Austria (August 29th, 1927)	Cuba	Argentine Republic
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)	Haiti	Dominican Republic
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)	Liberia	Ecuador
British Empire (August 12th, 1924)	Panama	Ethiopia
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Paraguay	France
Canada (August 12th, 1924)	Peru	Germany
	Venezuela	Guatemala
		Honduras

[1] Article 26 of the Covenant provides: " Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Assembly ".

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1929 (document A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the amendments to Articles 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 of the Covenant. These amendments being now in force, no reference is made to them in the present document.

[2] The Assembly adopted at its fifth ordinary session (1924) a resolution according to which it is no longer opportune to ratify the first amendment to Article 16 of the Covenant adopted in 1921. As a consequence of this resolution, the first amendment to Article 16 adopted by the Assembly at its second ordinary session does not appear in the present report. See under No. IX the new amendment adopted in 1924.

10. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16 *(continued)*.

(Second Paragraph to be inserted after the First Amended Paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Iran
China (July 4th, 1923)	Iraq
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)	Irish Free State
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)	Luxemburg
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)	Mexico
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)	Nicaragua
Finland (June 25th, 1923)	Poland
Greece (January 20th, 1925)	Salvador
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)	Spain
India (August 12th, 1924)	Turkey
Italy (August 5th, 1922)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Japan (June 13th, 1923)	Yugoslavia
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)	
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)	
Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)	
New Zealand (August 12th, 1924)	
Norway (March 29th, 1922)	
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)	
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)	
Siam (September 12th, 1922)	
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)	
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)	
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)	

11. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Paragraph to be inserted between the New Third Paragraph and the Original Second Paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
Union of South Africa (August 12th, 1924)	Albania	Afghanistan
Australia (August 12th, 1924)	Bolivia	Argentine Republic
Austria (August 29th, 1927)	Costa Rica	Dominican Republic
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)	Cuba	Ecuador
Brazil (July 7th, 1923)	Haiti	Ethiopia
British Empire (August 12th, 1924)	Latvia	France
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Liberia	Germany
Canada (August 12th, 1924)	Panama	Guatemala
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Paraguay	Honduras
China (July 4th, 1923)	Peru	Iran
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)	Venezuela	Iraq
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)		Irish Free State
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)		Luxemburg
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)		Mexico
Finland (June 25th, 1923)		Nicaragua
Greece (January 20th, 1925)		Poland
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)		Salvador
India (August 12th, 1924)		Spain
Italy (August 5th, 1922)		Turkey
Japan (June 13th, 1923)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)		Yugoslavia
Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)		
New Zealand (August 12th, 1924)		
Norway (March 29th, 1922)		
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)		
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)		
Siam (September 12th, 1922)		
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)		
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)		
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)		

12. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.
(First Paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.

Afghanistan
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.
(Adding a New Paragraph after the First Paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (Febr. 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26 *(continued)*. *(Adding a New Paragraph after the First Paragraph).*

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
Netherlands (April 4th,1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

14. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26. *(Second Paragraph.)*

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)	Costa Rica	Albania
Austria (August 29th, 1927)	Iran	Argentine Republic
Belgium (September 28th, 1923)	Liberia	Dominican Republic
Brazil (July 7th, 1923)	Panama	Ecuador
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)	Paraguay	Ethiopia
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Peru	Germany
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)		Guatemala
Chile (August 1st, 1928)		Honduras
China (July 4th, 1923)		Iraq
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)		Irish Free State
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)		Luxemburg
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)		Mexico
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)		Nicaragua
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)		Salvador
Finland (June 25th, 1923)		Turkey
France (August 2nd, 1923)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Greece (August 20th, 1923)		Yugoslavia
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)		
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)		
India (February 3rd, 1923)		
Italy (August 5th, 1922)		
Japan (June 13th, 1923)		
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)		
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)		
Netherlands (April 4th,1923)		
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)		
Norway (March 29th, 1922)		
Poland (December 15th, 1922)		
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)		
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)		
Siam (September 12th, 1922)		
Spain (January 15th, 1930)		
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)		
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)		
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)		
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)		

V. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.[1]

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
ALBANIA (October 13th, 1924)	COSTA RICA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRIA (January 12th, 1925)	FRANCE	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BELGIUM (July 31st, 1926) Includes also the Belgian Congo and the mandated territory of Ruanda-Urundi.	HAITI	SA'UDI ARABIA
	HONDURAS	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931)	JAPAN Is not binding in respect of Taiwan, Chosen, the leased territory of Kwantung, Karafuto or the territories under Japanese mandate, and that the provisions of Article 15 of the Convention are in no way derogatory to the acts of the Japanese judicial authorities in the application of Japanese laws and decrees.	BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (December 11th, 1925) Does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions, Protectorates or Territories under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority.		CHILE
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Australia (June 29th, 1935 *a*) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.		ECUADOR
		ESTONIA
NEWFOUNDLAND (December 31st, 1925 *a*)		ETHIOPIA
		ICELAND
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate. Seychelles British Honduras Ceylon Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) Mauritius British Solomon Islands Protectorate Gilbert and Ellice Islands Fiji Uganda Trinidad and Tobago Zanzibar Tanganyika Territory Leeward Islands Windward Islands Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Nyasaland Straits Settlements Federated Malay States Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei Johore Kedah Kelantan Trengganu Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Northern Rhodesia (November 3rd, 1926 *a*)	PANAMA	LIBERIA
	PERU *(a)*	LIECHTENSTEIN
	SALVADOR	MEXICO
	URUGUAY	NICARAGUA
		SWEDEN
		VENEZUELA

[1] The present Convention came into force on August 7th, 1924, viz., on the thirtieth day following that on which the deposit of the second ratification took place (Article 11). See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XXVII, p. 213; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 122; Vol. LIV, p. 391; Vol. LIX, p. 357; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 313; Vol. XCII, p. 368; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXXVI, p. 433; Vol. CXLII, p. 341 and Vol. CLII, p. 294.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

Barbados, Gold Coast, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Malta, Somaliland, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Hong-Kong (Nov. 3rd, 1926 *a*)

Bermuda, Bahamas, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, St. Helena, Palestine, Trans-Jordan (May 23rd, 1927 *a*)

Jamaica (August 22nd, 1927 *a*)

British Guiana (September 23rd, 1929 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (December 31st, 1925 *a*)

CANADA (May 23rd, 1924 *a*)

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, including SOUTH WEST AFRICA (Mandated) (December 11th, 1925)

NEW ZEALAND, including the Mandated Territory of Western Samoa (December 11th, 1925)

IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)

INDIA (December 11th, 1925)

BULGARIA (July 1st, 1924)

CHINA (February 24th, 1926)

Colombia (November 8th, 1934)

Cuba (September 20th, 1934)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 11th, 1927)

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 31st, 1926)

DENMARK (May 6th, 1930)

With regard to Article IV, see also Article I. The acts mentioned in Article I are punishable under the rules of Danish law only if they fall within the provisions of Article 184 of the Danish Penal Code, which inflicts penalties upon any person publishing obscene writings, or placing on sale, distributing, or otherwise circulating or publicly exposing obscene images. Further, it is to be observed that the Danish legislation relating to the Press contains special provisions on the subject of the persons who may be prosecuted for Press offences. The latter provisions apply to the acts covered by Article 184 in so far as these acts can be considered as Press offences. The modification of Danish legislation on these points must await the revision of the Danish Penal Code, which is likely to be effected in the near future.

EGYPT (October 29th, 1924 *a*)

FINLAND (June 29th, 1925)

GERMANY (May 11th, 1925)

GREECE (October 9th, 1929)

GUATEMALA (October 25th, 1933 *a*)

HUNGARY (February 12th, 1929)

IRAN (September 28th, 1932)

IRAQ (April 26th, 1929 *a*)

ITALY (July 8th, 1924)

LATVIA (October 7th, 1925)

*LUXEMBURG (August 10th, 1927)

Subject to reservation " that, in the application of the penal clauses of the Convention, the Luxemburg authorities will observe the closing paragraph of Article 24 of the Constitution of the Grand-Duchy, which provides that proceedings may not be taken against the publisher, printer or distributor if the author is known and if he is a Luxemburg subject residing in the Grand-Duchy ".

SAN MARINO (April 21st, 1926 *a*)

MONACO (May 11th, 1925)

---

* This ratification, given subject to reservation, has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 13th, 1927)
NORWAY (May 8th, 1929 *a*)
PARAGUAY (October 21st, 1933 *a*)
POLAND (March 8th, 1927)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 7th, 1926)
SIAM (July 28th, 1924)
The Siamese Government reserve full right to enforce the provisions of the present Convention against foreigners in Siam in accordance with the principles prevailing for applying Siamese legislation to such foreigners.
SPAIN (December 19th, 1924)
SWITZERLAND (January 20th, 1926)
TURKEY (September 12th, 1929)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929)

VI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

1. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES.[1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

ALBANIA (August 29th, 1924)
AUSTRIA (January 25th, 1928)
BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1924)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
BRAZIL (February 5th, 1932)
Subject to the condition that the arbitral agreement or the arbitration clause mentioned in Article 1 of this Protocol should be limited to contracts which are considered as commercial by the Brazilian legislation.
BRITISH EMPIRE (September 27th, 1924)
Applies only to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and consequently does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority or any territory in respect of which His Majesty's Government exercises a mandate.
SOUTHERN RHODESIA (December 18th, 1924 *a*),
NEWFOUNDLAND (June 22nd, 1925 *a*)
British Guiana
British Honduras
Jamaica:
Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands
Leeward Islands
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
(March 12th, 1926 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA
CHILE
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
India
This signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Protocol upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
India reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
LATVIA
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
LITHUANIA
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
LIBERIA
MEXICO
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1924, date of the second deposit of ratification (Article 6). See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XXVII, p. 157; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 116; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 355; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 393; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 312; Vol. XCVI, p. 190; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CIV, p. 499; Vol. CVII, p. 470; Vol. CXI, p. 403 and Vol. CXVII, p. 55.

I. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES *(continued)*.
(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications

Gold Coast (including Ashanti and the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast and Togoland)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Zanzibar
Northern Rhodesia
Ceylon
Mauritius
Gibraltar
Malta
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
IRAQ
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Trans-Jordan
(March 12th, 1926 *a*)

Tanganyika (June 17th, 1926 *a*)
St. Helena (July 29th, 1926 *a*)
Uganda (June 28th, 1929 *a*)
Bahamas (January 23rd, 1931 *a*)

NEW ZEALAND (June 9th, 1926)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic will regard itself as being bound only in relation to States which will have ratified the Convention of September 26th, 1927, on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, and the Czechoslovak Republic does not intend by this signature to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it which regulate the questions referred to in the present Protocol by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Protocol.

DENMARK (April 6th, 1925)

Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary courts of law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such Courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.

ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)

Limits, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of this Protocol, the obligation mentioned in paragraph 1 of the said article to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

FINLAND (July 10th, 1924)

FRANCE (June 7th, 1928)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its own national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates or Territories in respect of which France exercises a mandate.

GERMANY (November 5th, 1924)

GREECE (May 26th, 1926)

ITALY (July 28th, 1924)

Except Colonies

JAPAN (June 4th, 1928)

Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the leased territory of Kwantung, and the territories in respect of which Japan exercises a mandate (February 26th, 1929 *a*).

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MONACO (February 8th, 1927)

Reserves the right to limit its obligation to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 6th, 1925)

The Government of the Netherlands reserves its right to restrict the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under Netherlands law.

Further, it declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.

NORWAY (September 2nd, 1927)

POLAND (June 26th, 1931)

Under reservation that in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 1, the undertaking contemplated in the said article will apply only to contracts which are declared as commercial in accordance with national Polish law.

PORTUGAL (December 10th, 1930)

(1) In accordance with the second paragraph of Article 1, the Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

I. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications

(2) According to the terms of the first paragraph of Article 8, the Portuguese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include its colonies.

ROUMANIA (March 12th, 1925)
Subject to the reservation that the Royal Government may in all circumstances limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

SIAM (September 3rd, 1930)

SPAIN (July 29th, 1926)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa, or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

SWEDEN (August 8th, 1929)

SWITZERLAND (May 14th, 1928)

VII. CUSTOMS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES AND PROTOCOL. [1]

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (September 11th, 1924)

BELGIUM (October 4th, 1924)

BRAZIL (July 10th, 1929)

BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)
It is stated in the instrument of ratification that this ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia (or any territory under its authority) or the Irish Free State or in the case of India, and that in pursuance of the power reserved in Article XXIX of the Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Island of Newfoundland or of the territories: Iraq and Nauru, in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate. It does not apply to the Sudan.

AUSTRALIA (March 13th, 1925)
Excluding Papua, Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 29th, 1924)

NEW ZEALAND (August 29th, 1924)
Includes the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

INDIA (March 13th, 1925)

BULGARIA (December 10th, 1926)

CHINA (February 23rd, 1926)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 10th, 1927)

DENMARK (May 17th, 1924)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

CHILE
JAPAN
LITHUANIA
PARAGUAY
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CANADA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRISH FREE STATE
LIBERIA
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PERU
SALVADOR
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

[1] The present Convention came into force on November 27th, 1924, ninety days after the deposit of the fifth ratification (Article 26). The Protocol came into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 371; Vol. XXXV, p. 324; Vol. XXXIX, p. 208; Vol. XLV, p. 140; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 398; Vol. LIX, p. 365; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 319; Vol. XCII, p. 370; Vol. CXI, p. 404; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 401 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 322.

International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities and Protocol *(continued)*.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Egypt (March 23rd, 1925)
Estonia (February 28th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (May 23rd, 1928)
France (September 13th, 1926)
Does not apply to the Colonies under its sovereignty.
Syria and Lebanon (March 9th, 1933 *a*)
Germany (August 1st, 1925)
Greece (July 6th, 1927)
Hungary (February 23rd, 1926)
Iran (May 8th, 1925 *a*)
Iraq (May 3rd, 1934 *a*)
Italy (June 13th, 1924)
Latvia (September 28th, 1931 *a*)
Luxemburg (June 10th, 1927)
French Protectorate of Morocco (November 8th, 1926)
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1925)
Norway (September 7th, 1926)
Poland (September 4th, 1931)
Roumania (December 23rd, 1925)
Under the same reservations as those formulated by the other Governments and inserted in Article 6 of the Protocol, the Royal Government understands that Article 22 of the Convention confers the right to have recourse to the procedure provided for in this article for questions of a general nature solely on the High Contracting Parties, private persons being only entitled to appeal to their own judicial authorities in case any dispute arises with the authorities of the Kingdom.
Siam (May 19th, 1925)
Sweden (February 12th, 1926)
Switzerland (January 3rd, 1927)
Regency of Tunis (French Protectorate) (November 8th, 1926)
Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929)

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

5. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Railways and Protocol of Signature.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (January 20th, 1927)
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
British Empire (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territo-

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Brazil
Bulgaria
Chile
China *(a)*
The Chinese Government, subject to the declarations made in its name by the delegates whom it instructed to take part in the discussions on this Convention, confirms the said declarations regarding:
(1) The whole of Part III: "Relations between the railway and its users", Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17;
(2) In Part VI: "General Regulations", Article 37, relating to the conclusion of special agreements for the purpose of putting the provisions of the Statute into force in cases where existing agreements are not adequate for this purpose.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Canada
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Liberia
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force (Article 6) on March 23rd, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XLVII, page 55; Vol. L, p. 180; Vol. LIX, p. 383; Vol. LXIII, p. 417; Vol. LXIX, p. 92; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 472; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 403; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 336; Vol. XCII, p. 381 and Vol. XCVI, p. 191.

5. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Railways and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
ries in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate ; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or territories. Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*) Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*) British Guiana British Honduras Brunei Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate Hong-Kong Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Trans-Jordan Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory (September 22nd, 1925 *a*) New Zealand (April 1st, 1925) Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. India (April 1st, 1925) Denmark (April 27th, 1926) Estonia (September 21st, 1929) Ethiopia (September 20th, 1928 *a*) *France* (August 28th, 1935) Subject to the reservation contained in Article 9 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	Colombia *(a)* Czechoslovakia Finland Lithuania Panama *(a)* Portugal Salvador Uruguay	Paraguay Peru Turkey Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Venezuela

5. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Railways and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GERMANY (December 5th, 1927)
GREECE (March 6th, 1929)
HUNGARY (March 21st, 1929)
Italy (December 10th, 1934)
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
JAPAN (September 30th, 1926)
Latvia (October 8th, 1934)
NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (February 22nd, 1928)
NORWAY (February 24th, 1926)
POLAND and FREE CITY OF DANZIG (January 7th, 1928)
ROUMANIA (December 23rd, 1925)
SIAM (January 9th, 1925)
SPAIN (January 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (September 15th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (October 23rd, 1926)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports and Protocol of Signature.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927*a*)
BELGIUM (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
With regard to Article 12 of the Statute, the Belgian Government declares that legislation exists in Belgium on the transport of emigrants, and that this legislation, whilst it does not distinguish between flags and consequently does not affect the principle of equality of treatment of flags, imposes special obligations on all vessels engaged in the transport of emigrants.
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and that, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CHILE
LITHUANIA
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
PANAMA *(a)*
SALVADOR
SPAIN
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LUXEMBURG
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. LVIII, p. 285; Vol. LXIX, p. 102; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXVII, p. 184; Vol. CXXII, p. 349; Vol. CXLII, p. 342 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 332.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Brunei
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Federated Malay States:
Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Grenada
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (excluding Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher-Nevis
Virgin Islands
Non-Federated Malay States:
Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu
Mauritius
Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
St. Helena
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Somaliland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Zanzibar

(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Malta (November 7th, 1925 *a*)

Australia (June 29th, 1925 *a*)
Does not apply in the case of Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Czechoslovakia (July 10th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Excluding Greenland, the maritime ports of which are subject to a separate regime.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

ESTONIA (November 4th, 1931)
The Estonian Government reserves the right regarding emigration provided for in Article 12 of the Statute.

FRANCE (August 2nd, 1932)
Shall have the power, in conformity with Article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.
Does not include any of the Protectorates, Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

GERMANY (May 1st, 1928)
In conformity with Article 12 of the Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, the German Government declares that it reserves the right of limiting the transport of emigrants, in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, to vessels which have been granted special authorisation as fulfilling the requirements of the said legislation.
In exercising this right, the German Government will continue to be guided as far as possible by the principles of this Statute.

GREECE (January 24th, 1927)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

HUNGARY (March 21st, 1929)
With reservation as to the right regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

IRAQ (May 1st, 1929 *a*)
With reservation as to all the rights regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

ITALY (October 16th, 1933)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
This ratification cannot be interpreted as implying the admission or the recognition of any reservation or declaration made with a view to limiting in any way the rights granted by Article 12 of the Statute to the High Contracting Parties.

JAPAN (September 30th, 1926)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

MEXICO (March 5th, 1934 *a*)

NETHERLANDS (February 22nd, 1928)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (February 22nd, 1928 *a*)
The Netherlands Government reserves the right mentioned in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Statute annexed to the Convention, it being understood that no discrimination shall be made against the flag of any contracting State which in regard to the transport of emigrants does not discriminate against the Netherlands flag.

NORWAY (June 21st, 1928)

SIAM (January 9th, 1925)

SWEDEN (September 15th, 1927)

SWITZERLAND (October 23rd, 1926)

YUGOSLAVIA (November 20th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

7. Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of Electric Power and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927)	BELGIUM	AFGHANISTAN
BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1st, 1925) This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. It shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories	BULGARIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	CHILE	ALBANIA
	FRANCE Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
		AUSTRALIA
		BOLIVIA
		BRAZIL
		CANADA

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. LVIII, p. 315; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. XCII, p. 399 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 333.

7. Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of Electric Power and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions, or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates, or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.	Hungary	China
Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Italy	Colombia
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Lithuania	Costa Rica
British Guiana	Poland	Cuba
British Honduras	Uruguay	Dominican Republic
Brunei	Yugoslavia	Ecuador
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang		Estonia
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		Ethiopia
Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate		Finland
Hong-Kong		Germany
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		Guatemala
Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis Kelantan, Trengganu		Haiti
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate		Honduras
Northern Rhodesia		India
Nyasaland		Iran
Palestine		Irish Free State
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)		Japan
Straits Settlements		Latvia
Tanganyika Territory		Liberia
Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*)		Luxemburg
New Zealand (April 1st, 1925) Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.		Mexico
Czechoslovakia (November 30th, 1926)		Netherlands
Denmark (April 27th, 1926)		Nicaragua
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934)		Norway
Greece (February 15th, 1929)		Paraguay
Iraq (August 2nd, 1935 *a*)		Peru
Panama (July 7th, 1934 *a*)		Portugal
Spain (January 15th, 1930)		Roumania
(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela

8. Convention relating to the Development of Hydraulic Power affecting more than one State and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (January 20th, 1927)	Belgium	Afghanistan
British Empire (April 1st, 1925)	Bulgaria	Union of South Africa
This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.	Chile	Albania
	France	United States of America
	Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	Argentine Republic
		Australia
		Bolivia
		Brazil
		Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Czechoslovakia
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
	Italy	Luxemburg
	Lithuania	Mexico
	Poland	Netherlands
	Uruguay	Nicaragua
	Yugoslavia	Norway
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Roumania
		Salvador
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)		
Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)		
British Guiana British Honduras Brunei Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate Hong-Kong Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British mandate Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Palestine Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory		
(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)		

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on June 30th, 1925. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 75; Vol. XLV, p. 170; Vol. L, p. 166; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 395; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 405; Vol. CXLVII, p. 322 and Vol. CLII, p. 295.

8. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE STATE AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934)
DENMARK (April 27th, 1926)
HUNGARY (March 20th, 1933)
GREECE (March 14th, 1929)
PANAMA (July 7th, 1934 *a*)
SIAM (January 9th, 1925)

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

15. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Latter Part of First Paragraph of Article 16.)

(Geneva, September 27th, 1924.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

ESTONIA (September 18th, 1926)
NETHERLANDS (February 8th, 1926)
ROUMANIA (March 12th, 1925)
SALVADOR (June 4th, 1925)
SIAM (September 30th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CUBA
GREECE
NEW ZEALAND
PERU
POLAND
URUGUAY

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.

AFGHANISTAN
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
BRITISH EMPIRE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

X. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

1. International Opium Convention. The Hague, January 23rd, 1912.[1]

Schedule[2] *containing the signatures of the Convention, the signatures of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the First Opium Conference, provided for in the penultimate paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention, the ratifications of the Convention, and the signatures of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention provided under "B" of the Final Protocol of the Third International Opium Conference.*

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
Albania	—	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925
United States of America	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	Feb. 11, 1915
Argentine Republic	—	Oct. 17, 1912	—	—
Austria	—	—	July 16, 1920*	July 16, 1920*
Belgium[3]	—	June 18, 1912	June 16, 1914	May 14, 1919
Bolivia	—	June 4, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Brazil	—	Oct. 16, 1912	Dec. 23, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Great Britain[4]	Jan. 23, 1912	April 24, 1922	July 15, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Bulgaria	—	March 2, 1914	Aug. 9, 1920*	Aug. 9, 1920*
Chile	—	July 2, 1913	Jan. 16, 1923	May 18, 1923
China	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Feb. 9, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
Colombia[5]	—	Jan. 15, 1913	June 26, 1924	June 30, 1924
Costa Rica	—	April 25, 1912	August 1, 1924	July 29, 1925
Cuba	—	May 8, 1913	March 8, 1920*	March 8, 1920*
Czechoslovakia	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	—	Nov. 8, 1921	April 18, 1922	March 5, 1931
Denmark[6]	—	Dec. 17, 1912	July 10, 1913	Oct. 21, 1921
Dominican Republic	—	Nov. 12, 1912	June 7, 1923	April 14, 1931
Ecuador	—	July 2, 1912	Feb. 25, 1915	August 23, 1923
Estonia	—	Jan. 9, 1923	April 20, 1923	January 21, 1931
Finland	—	April 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec. 1, 1922
France[7]	Jan. 23,1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Germany	Jan. 23,1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Greece	—	—	March 30, 1920*	March 30, 1920*

---

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VIII, p. 187; Vol. XI, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol.. LIX, p. 346; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXVII, p. 48 and Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 416.

[2] This Schedule which appeared in the annexes to the supplementary report on the work of the Council and the Secretariat is reproduced here for purposes of information.

[3] Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards the Belgian Congo.

[4] In accordance with the following reservation:

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Wei-hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said Convention in the name of any Dominion, Colony, Dependency, or Protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

In virtue of the above-mentioned reservation, Great Britain signed the Convention for the following Dominions, Colonies, Dependencies, and Protectorates:

On December 17th, 1912, for Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Brunei, Cyprus, the East Africa Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Malay Protectorates, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, Malta, Northern Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Somaliland, Southern Nigeria, Trinidad, Uganda; on February 27th, 1913, for the Colony of Fiji; on April 22nd, 1913, for the Colony of Sierra Leone, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate and the Solomon Islands Protectorate; on June 25th, 1913, for the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Bahamas Islands and for the three Colonies of the Windward Islands, that is to say, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent; on January 30th, 1914, for the Leeward Islands; on February 11th, 1914, for British Guiana as well as for British Honduras; on March 11th, 1914, for the Government of the Union of South Africa; on March 28th, 1914, for Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland; on April 4th, 1914, for the Colony of Barbados; on April 8th, 1914, for Mauritius and its dependencies; on July 11th, 1914, for the Bermuda Islands; on August 21st, 1924, for Palestine and together with France for the New Hebrides; on October 20th, 1924, for Iraq.

[5] Subject to the approval of the Colombian Parliament.

[6] The signature of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the Conference as well as its ratification were given by Denmark for Iceland and the Danish Antilles; the signature of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention was given separately by Denmark and Iceland.

[7] With the reservation that a separate and special ratification or denunciation may subsequently be obtained for the French Protectorates. France and Great Britain signed the Convention for the New Hebrides, August 21st, 1924.

1. International Opium Convention. The Hague, January 23rd, 1912 *(continued)*.

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
Guatemala	—	June 17, 1912	Aug. 27, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
Haiti	—	Aug. 21, 1912	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
Honduras	—	July 5, 1912	Aug. 29, 1913	April 3, 1915
Hungary	—	—	July 26, 1921*	July 26, 1921*
Iran [1]	Jan. 23,1912	—	—	—
Italy	Jan. 23,1912	—	June 28, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Japan	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Latvia	—	Feb. 6, 1922	March 25, 1924	Jan. 18, 1932.
Liberia	—	—	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
Lithuania	—	April 7, 1922	—	—
Luxemburg	—	June 18, 1912	Aug. 21, 1922	Aug. 21, 1922
Mexico	—	May 15, 1912	April 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
Monaco	—	May 1, 1923	Feb. 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
The Netherlands	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 28, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
Nicaragua	—	July 18, 1913	Nov. 10, 1914	Nov. 3, 1920
Norway	—	Sept. 2, 1913	Nov. 12, 1914	Sept. 20, 1915
Panama	—	June 19, 1912	Nov. 25, 1920*	Nov. 25, 1920*
Paraguay	—	Dec. 14, 1912	—	—
Peru	—	July 24, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Poland	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Portugal	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	April 8, 1920*
Roumania	—	Dec. 27, 1913	Sept. 14, 1920*	Sept. 14, 1920*
Russia	Jan. 23,1912	—	—	—
Salvador	—	July 30, 1912	Sept. 19, 1922	May 29, 1931
Siam [2]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 10, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
Spain	—	Oct. 23, 1912	Jan. 25, 1919	Feb. 11, 1921
Sweden [3]	—	Aug. 27, 1913	April 17, 1914	Jan. 13, 1921
Switzerland [4]	—	Dec. 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1925	Jan. 15, 1925
Turkey	Sept. 15, 1933	—	Sept. 15, 1933	Sept. 15, 1933
Uruguay	—	March 9, 1914	April 3, 1916	Jan. 10, 1920*
Venezuela	—	Sept. 10, 1912	Oct. 28, 1913	July 12, 1927
Yugoslavia	—	—	Feb. 10, 1920*	Feb. 10, 1920*

2. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, Protocol and Final Act. [5]

(Signed at Geneva, February 11th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*Other State to whose Signature the Agreement is open.*
British Empire (February 17th, 1926) The signature of this Protocol is subject, in respect of British Protectorates, to the conditions contained in Article XIII of the Agreement.	China
India (February 17th, 1926)	
France (April 29th, 1926)	
Japan (October 10th, 1928)	
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (March 1st, 1927)	

[1] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Persia having no treaty with China) and paragraph (*a*) of Article 3.

[2] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Siam having no treaty with China).

[3] Subject to the following declaration: " Opium not being manufactured in Sweden, the Swedish Government will for the moment confine themselves to prohibiting the importation of prepared opium, but they declare at the same time that they are ready to take the measures indicated in Article 8 of the Convention if experience proves their expediency."

[4] Subject to ratification and with the declaration that the Swiss Government will be unable to issue the necessary legal enactments within the terms fixed by the Convention.

[5] The Agreement and the Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1926. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. LI, p. 337; Vol. LIX, p. 401 and Vol. LXXVIII, p. 489.

2. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, Protocol and Final Act *(continued)*.

(Signed at Geneva, February 11th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

PORTUGAL (September 13th, 1926)

While accepting the principle of a monopoly as formulated in Article I, does so, as regards the moment at which the measures provided for in the first paragraph thereof shall come into force, subject to the limitation contained in the second paragraph of the article.

The Portuguese Government, being bound by a contract consistent with the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912, will not be able to put into operation the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article VI of the present Agreement so long as its obligations under this contract are in force.

SIAM (May 6th, 1927)

Under reservation of Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), with regard to the time when this provision shall come into force, and of Article V. The reason for these reservations had been stated by the First Delegate of Siam on November 14th, 1924. The Siamese Government is hoping to put into force the system of registration and rationing within the period of three years. After that date, the reservation in regard to Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), will fall to the ground.

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations

International Opium Convention.[1]

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (November 25th, 1927)

BELGIUM (August 24th, 1927)

Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

BOLIVIA (April 15th, 1932 *a*)

1. Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population.
2. The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the Bolivian Government, by means of export certificates.
3. The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported:

   Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.

BRAZIL (June 10th, 1932)

BRITISH EMPIRE (February 17th, 1926)

His Britannic Majesty's ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada or the Irish Free State and, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 39 of the Convention, the instrument shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Colony of the Bahamas or the State of Sarawak under His Britannic Majesty's protection.

CANADA (June 27th, 1928)

AUSTRALIA (February 17th, 1926)

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1926)

NEW ZEALAND, (February 17th, 1926)

Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

IRISH FREE STATE (September 1st, 1931)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC (*a*)

IRAN

Ad referendum and subject to the League of Nations complying with the request made by Iran in the Memorandum O.D.C.24.

NICARAGUA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
CHINA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
ICELAND
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
MEXICO
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force September 25th, 1928 (Article 36). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXI, p. 317; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 390; Vol. XCII, p. 409; Vol. XCVI, p. 204; Vol. C, p. 249; Vol. CIV, p. 516; Vol. CVII, p. 525; Vol. CXI, p. 411; Vol. CXVII, p. 290; Vol. CXXII, p. 355 and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 407.

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations.
International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 16th, 1927 *a*)
Denmark (April 23rd, 1930)
Dominican Republic (July 19th, 1928 *a*)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
France (July 2nd, 1927)
The French Government is compelled to make all reservation, as regards the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing, within the strictly prescribed time-limit, the quarterly statistics provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 22.
Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Subject to the reservation annexed to the Procès-verbal of the plenary meeting of February 16th, 1925. (The validity of the signature and ratification of this Convention are subject to the condition that a German expert will be appointed as a member of the Central Board.)
Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Hungary (August 27th, 1930)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Italy (for the Kingdom and Colonies) (December 11th, 1929 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Lithuania (February 13th, 1931 *a*)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
Monaco (February 9th, 1927 *a*)
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
New Hebrides (December 27th, 1927 *a*)
Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)
Poland (June 16th, 1927)
Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
San Marino (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (June 22nd, 1928)
Includes also the Spanish Colonies and the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Sweden (December 6th, 1930 *a*)

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Switzerland (April 3rd, 1929)
With reference to the declaration made by the Swiss delegation at the 36th plenary meeting of the Conference concerning the forwarding of the quarterly statistics provided for in Article 22, paragraph 2.
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Uruguay (Sept. 11th, 1930)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (September 4th, 1929)

Protocol.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
(Same reservation as for the Convention.)
Canada (June 27th, 1928)
Australia (Febr. 17th, 1926)
Union of South Africa (February 17th, 1926)
New Zealand (February 17th, 1926)
India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
Portugal (Sept. 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (April 19th, 1930 *a*)
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Venezuela (June 19 th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (Sept. 4th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Argentine Republic (*a*)
Iran
Nicaragua

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Austria
Belgium
Brazil
China
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ethiopia
France
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
Iceland
Irish Free State
Italy
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Mexico
Monaco
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
San Marino
Sweden
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay

XI. SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

1. CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.[1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRITISH EMPIRE
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Convention.
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the said Convention by all the following Powers — *i.e.*, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and United States of America — have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

AUSTRALIA (*a*)
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

CHINA

DENMARK
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Convention, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

EGYPT

FRANCE
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the Convention by Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the United States of America have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

IRAQ (April 8th, 1934 *a*)
In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 28 of the Convention, Iraq assume with regard to its territory the undertakings set forth in paragraph I of Article 28 and the obligations of Articles 19 to 26 inclusive of that Convention, in so far as they are applicable.

LATVIA
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Latvia in Article 29.

LIBERIA (*a*)

NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Poland in Article 29.

SPAIN

SWEDEN
Subject to the condition that this ratification will only take effect when the other producing States shall have ratified the convention.

VENEZUELA

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

AUSTRIA

BELGIUM
To the same extent as does the effect of the Convention apply in the States named hereafter: the United States of America, Austria, France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

BRAZIL
Reserves, during the whole period of application of the present Convention, the right of fulfilling it, as regards the part that concerns Brazil, according to the spirit of the provisions having for their object the generalisation of control both as concerns the commerce as well as concerns the manufacture of armaments.

BULGARIA

CANADA

CHILE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ESTONIA
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Estonia in Article 29.

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Finland in Article 29.

GERMANY

HUNGARY

INDIA

ITALY

JAPAN

LUXEMBURG

NORWAY

ROUMANIA
Ad referendum with the reservation provided in Article 29 of the Convention, in virtue of which the application of Articles 6 and 9, as far as they concern exports consigned to Roumania by the High Contracting Parties and as far as they concern imports manufactured in Roumania, will be suspended until the date of the accession of Russia to the present Convention, as also to the Annex.

SALVADOR

SIAM

SWITZERLAND

URUGUAY

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

GREECE

IRAN

IRISH FREE STATE

LITHUANIA

MEXICO

NICARAGUA

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

PORTUGAL

TURKEY, and all other States invited to adhere in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

---

[1] "A first procès-verbal of the deposit of ratifications will be drawn up by the Government of the French Republic as soon as the present Convention shall have been ratified by fourteen Powers.

"The Convention shall come into force four months after the date of the notification of this procès-verbal by the Government of the French Republic to all signatory Powers" (Article 41).

2. Declaration regarding the Territory of Ifni.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Declaration is open to Accession by:*
Australia *(a)* Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.	Austria	United States of America
China *(a)*	Belgium	Argentine Republic
Denmark The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Declaration, as far as Denmark is concerned subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.	Brazil	Colombia
Egypt	British Empire: Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Declaration.	Germany
France	Canada	Greece
Liberia *(a)*	India	Hungary
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)	Bulgaria	Iran
Poland	Chile	Irish Free State
Spain	Czechoslovakia	Lithuania
Venezuela	Estonia	Mexico
	Ethiopia	Nicaragua
	Finland	Norway
	Italy	Panama
	Japan	Paraguay
	Latvia	Portugal
	Luxemburg	Siam
	Roumania	Sweden
	Salvador	Turkey
	Switzerland	Uruguay
	Yugoslavia	And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. [1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Austria (May 9th, 1928)	United States of America	Argentine Republic
Belgium (December 4th, 1928) (1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Belgian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it. (2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Belgian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.	Brazil	Colombia
	Czechoslovakia	Hungary
	Ethiopia	Panama
	Japan	Paraguay
	Luxemburg	And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.
	Nicaragua	
	Salvador	
	Uruguay	
British Empire (April 9th, 1930) Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Protocol. (1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol, or have finally acceded thereto; (2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.		

[1] This Protocol came into force February 8th, 1928. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XCIV, p. 65; Vol. C, p. 262; Vol. CIV, p. 528; Vol. CVII, p. 437; Vol. CXI, p. 416; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXVI, p. 451; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 446 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 336.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Canada (May 6th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any State at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or whose allies *de jure* or in fact fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Australia (January 22nd, 1930 *a*).

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

New Zealand (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Union of South Africa (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Irish Free State (August 18th, 1930 *a*)

The Government of the Irish Free State does not intend to assume, by this accession, any obligation except towards the States having signed and ratified this Protocol or which shall have finally acceded thereto, and

Should the armed forces of an enemy State or of the Allies of such State fail to respect the said Protocol, the Government of the Irish Free State would cease to be bound by the said Protocol in regard to such State.

India (April 9th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Iraq (September 8th, 1931 *a*)

On condition that the Iraq Government shall be bound by the provisions of the Protocol only towards those States which have both signed and ratified it or have acceded thereto; and that they shall not be bound by the Protocol towards any State at enmity with them whose armed forces, or the forces of whose allies, do not respect the dispositions of the Protocol.

Bulgaria (March 7th, 1934)

The said Protocol is only binding on the Bulgarian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.

The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Bulgarian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Chile (July 2nd, 1935)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Chilian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may definitely accede to it.

(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Chilian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

China (August 7th, 1929 *a*)

Denmark (May 5th, 1930)

Egypt (December 6th, 1928)

Estonia (August 28th, 1931)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Estonian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.

(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Estonian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Finland (June 26th, 1929)

France (May 9th, 1926)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the French Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.

(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the French Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

3. PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS AND OTHER GASES AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GERMANY (April 25th, 1929)
GREECE (May 30th, 1931)
IRAN (July 4th, 1929 *a*)
ITALY (April 3rd, 1928)
LATVIA (June 3rd, 1931)
LIBERIA (April 2nd, 1927 *a*)
LITHUANIA (June 15th, 1933)
MEXICO (March 15th, 1932 *a*)
NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (October 31st, 1930)
Subject to the reservation that, as regards the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, this Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Royal Netherlands Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
POLAND (February 4th, 1929)
PORTUGAL (July 1st, 1930)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.
ROUMANIA (August 23rd, 1929)
Subject to the reservation:
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Roumanian Government in relation to States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol;
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Roumanian Government in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose Allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect the restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.
SIAM (June 6th, 1931)
SPAIN (August 22nd, 1929)
Declares this Protocol as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting and executing the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity.
SWEDEN (April 25th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 12th, 1932)
TURKEY (October 5th, 1929)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 5th, 1928 *a*)
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Government of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to the States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol.
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose Allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.
VENEZUELA (February 8th, 1928)
YUGOSLAVIA (April 12th, 1929)

XII. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

16. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.
(Second Paragraph of the Original Text.)
(Geneva, September 21st, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	AFGHANISTAN
DENMARK (March 28th, 1926)	ALBANIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
ESTONIA (September 18th, 1926)	BOLIVIA	AUSTRALIA
NETHERLANDS (August 20th, 1926)	BRAZIL	AUSTRIA
	BULGARIA	BELGIUM
	CANADA	BRITISH EMPIRE
	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	CHINA

16. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16 *(continued)*.

(Second Paragraph of the Original Text.)

(Geneva, September 21st, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open.*
JAPAN	COLOMBIA
NEW ZEALAND	CUBA
NORWAY	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
PERU	ECUADOR
PORTUGAL	ETHIOPIA
SALVADOR	FINLAND
SIAM	FRANCE
URUGUAY	GERMANY
	GREECE
	GUATEMALA
	HAITI
	HONDURAS
	HUNGARY
	INDIA
	IRAN
	IRAQ
	IRISH FREE STATE
	ITALY
	LATVIA
	LIBERIA
	LITHUANIA
	LUXEMBURG
	MEXICO
	NICARAGUA
	PANAMA
	PARAGUAY
	POLAND
	ROUMANIA
	SPAIN
	SWEDEN
	SWITZERLAND
	TURKEY
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	VENEZUELA
	YUGOSLAVIA

XIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

9. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE. [1]

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (July 4th, 1927)	FINLAND	ALBANIA
BELGIUM (July 2nd, 1927)	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	DENMARK
BRITISH EMPIRE (for Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (June 14th, 1927)		ESTONIA
BULGARIA (July 2nd, 1927)		IRAN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (January 17th, 1929)		IRISH FREE STATE
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (July 23rd, 1930 *a*)		LATVIA
		LITHUANIA
		LUXEMBURG
		NORWAY
		PORTUGAL
		SWEDEN
		TURKEY

[1] The Convention came into force on October 1st, 1927, in conformity with Article 12. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. LXVII, p. 63; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 443; Vol. XCVI, p. 201; Vol. C. p. 228; Vol. CIV. p. 511 and Vol. CXXVI, p. 448.

9. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

FRANCE (July 2nd, 1927)
It being understood on behalf of the French Government, and as provided for in Article 6 of the Protocol of Signature, that in the event of a re-measurement of a vessel originally measured by its own officials the original indelible marks, when they are not intended solely to indicate that the vessel has been measured, shall have added to them an indelible cross having arms of equal length, and that this addition shall be regarded as equivalent to the removal described in Article 10 of the Annex to the Convention; that the old measurement plates shall be marked with a cross instead of being withdrawn; and that, if new plates are affixed, the old plates shall be placed at the same level and near to the new ones. In the case provided for above, the notification provided for in the third paragraph of Article 5 and in Article 6 of the Convention shall also be addressed to the original office of inscription.

GERMANY (July 2nd, 1927)
GREECE (February 6th, 1931)
HUNGARY (January 3rd, 1928)
ITALY (September 27th, 1932)
NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 2nd, 1927)
POLAND (June 16th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (May 18th, 1928)
SPAIN (July 11th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (July 2nd, 1927)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)
Under Clause IV of the Protocol of Signature.

XIV. SLAVERY.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.[1]

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (March 21st, 1929 *a*)
Subject to the reservation that the Government of the United States, adhering to its policy of opposition to forced or compulsory labour except as punishment for crime of which the person concerned has been duly convicted, adheres to the Convention except as to the first sub-division of the second paragraph of Article five, which reads as follows:
"(1) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes."[2]

AUSTRIA (August 19th, 1927)
BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1927)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 18th, 1927)
CANADA (August 6th, 1928)
AUSTRALIA (June 18th, 1927)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (*a*)
ETHIOPIA
IRAN
Ad referendum and interpreting Article 3 as without power to compel Iran to bind herself by any arrangement or convention which would place her ships of whatever tonnage in the category of native vessels provided for by the Convention on the Trade in Arms.

LITHUANIA
PANAMA
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CHILE
COSTA RICA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
GUATEMALA
HONDURAS
ICELAND
JAPAN
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBURG
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

---

[1] This Convention came into force March 9th, 1927, according to its Article 12. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. LX, p. 253; Vol. LXIX, p. 114; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 356; Vol. XCVI, p. 192; Vol. C, p. 221; Vol. CIV, p. 511; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXXX, p. 444; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 440 and Vol. CLII, p. 296.

[2] This accession, given subject to reservation, has been communicated to the signatory States for acceptance.

SLAVERY CONVENTION *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including South West Africa) (June 18th, 1927)
NEW ZEALAND (June 18th, 1927)
INDIA (June 18th, 1927)

Under the terms of Article 9 of this Convention, the signature of the Convention is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of Article 2, sub-section (*b*), Articles 5, 6 and 7 of this Convention upon the following territories, namely: in Burma, the Naga tracts lying west and south of the Hukawng Valley bounded on the north and west by the Assam boundary, on the east by the Nanphuk River and on the south by the Singaling Hikamti and the Somra tracts; in Assam, the Sadiya and Balipara frontier tracts, the tribal area to the east of the Naga Hills district, up to the Burma boundary, and a small tract in the south of the Lushai Hills district; or on the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

Further, the signature of the Convention is not binding in respect of Article 3 in so far as that article may require India to enter into any convention whereby vessels, by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Indians, or of the fact that one-half of the crew is Indian, are classified as native vessels, or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of such other States are not subject.

IRISH FREE STATE (July 18th, 1930 *a*)
BULGARIA (March 9th, 1927)
CUBA (July 6th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 10th, 1930)
DENMARK (May 17th, 1927)
ECUADOR (March 26th, 1928 *a*)
EGYPT (January 25th, 1928 *a*)
ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)
FINLAND (September 29th, 1927)
FRANCE (March 28th, 1931)
SYRIA and LEBANON (June 25th, 1931 *a*)
GERMANY (March 12th, 1929)
GREECE (July 4th, 1930)
HAITI (September 3rd, 1927 *a*)
HUNGARY [1] (February 17th, 1933 *a*)
IRAQ (January 18th, 1929 *a*)
ITALY (August 25th, 1928)
LATVIA (July 9th, 1927)
LIBERIA (May 17th, 1930)
Mexico (September 8th, 1934 *a*)
MONACO (January 17th, 1928 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 7th, 1928)
NICARAGUA (October 3rd, 1927 *a*)
NORWAY (September 10th, 1927)
POLAND (September 17th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)
SPAIN (September 12th, 1927)

For Spain and the Spanish Colonies, with the exception of the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.

SUDAN (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
SWEDEN (December 17th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (November 1st, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (July 24th, 1933 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (September 28th, 1929)

---

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. CXXX, p. 444.

XV. INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION. [1]

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

ALBANIA (August 31st, 1929)
BELGIUM (May 9th, 1929)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (January 9th, 1929 *a*)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
NEW ZEALAND (December 22nd, 1928 *a*)
On the understanding that no contribution to the initial fund of the Union will fall due by New Zealand before the commencement of the next financial year in that country, viz., April 1st, 1929.
INDIA (April 2nd, 1929)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1931)
China (May 29th, 1935 *a*)
CUBA (June 18th, 1934)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (August 20th, 1931)
ECUADOR (July 30th, 1928)
EGYPT (August 7th, 1928)
Subject to later acceptance by the Egyptian Government of the decisions of the Executive Committee fixing its contribution.
FINLAND (April 10th, 1929)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1932)
GERMANY (July 22nd, 1929)
GREECE (January 16th, 1931)
HUNGARY (April 17th, 1929)
It being understood that "the most extensive immunities, facilities and exemptions" mentioned in Article 10 of the present Convention shall not include exterritoriality or the other rights and immunities enjoyed in Hungary by duly accredited diplomatic agents.
IRAN (September 28th, 1932 *a*)
IRAQ (June 12th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (August 2nd, 1928)
Applies also to the Italian Colonies.
LUXEMBURG (June 27th, 1929 *a*)
MONACO (May 21st, 1929)
POLAND AND FREE CITY OF DANZIG (July 11th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (September 11th, 1928)
SAN MARINO (August 12th, 1929)
SUDAN (May 11th, 1928 *a*)
SWITZERLAND (January 2nd, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (March 10th, 1932)
VENEZUELA (June 19th, 1929)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 28th, 1931 *a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
GUATEMALA
LATVIA
NICARAGUA
PERU
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NETHERLANDS
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] The present Convention entered into force on December 27th, 1932, in accordance with its Article 18. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. CXXXV, p. 247 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 353.

XVI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

2. CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

AUSTRIA (July 18th, 1930)

BELGIUM (April 27th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Belgian Congo, Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (June 5th, 1930 *a*)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (July 2nd, 1930)

Bahamas
British Guiana
British Honduras
Falkland Islands
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya
Palestine (excluding Transjordan)
Tanganyika Territory
Uganda Protectorate
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar

(May 26th, 1931 *a*)

Mauritius
Northern Rhodesia

(July 13th, 1931 *a*)

Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher-Nevis
Virgin Islands

(March 9th, 1932 *a*)

Malta (October 11th, 1934 *a*)

NEW ZEALAND (Western Samoa included) (April 9th, 1929)

NEWFOUNDLAND (January 7th, 1931 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic does not intend to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it with various States, which regulate the questions referred to in the present Convention by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Convention.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

India

This signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

NICARAGUA

PERU

The Convention is open to Signature by:

BRAZIL
CHILE
IRAQ
JAPAN
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
MONACO
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
POLAND
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

And all the other States which may sign the Protocol of September 24th, 1923.

---

[1] The Convention came into force July 25th, 1929 (Article 8). See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XCII, p. 301; Vol. XCVI, p. 205; Vol. C, p. 259; Vol. CIV, p. 526; Vol. CVII, p. 528; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 303 and Vol. CXXX, p. 457.

2. Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Denmark (April 25th, 1929)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary Courts of Law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such Courts without further examination as a basis for the final judgment in the affair.

Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Finland (July 30th, 1931)

France (May 13th, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Germany (September 1st, 1930)

Greece (January 15th, 1932)
The Hellenic Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Italy (November 12th, 1930)

Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Netherlands (August 12th, 1931) (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (January 28th, 1933 *a*)

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)
(1) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.
(2) The Portuguese Government declares, according to the terms of Article 10, that the present Convention does not apply to its colonies.

Roumania (June 22nd, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Siam (July 7th, 1931)

Spain (January 15th, 1930)

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (September 25th, 1930)

XVII. EXPORTATION.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.

Turkey [2]
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XCV, p. 357; Vol. C, p. 264 and Vol. CVII, p. 537.

[2] The reservation to which this signature is subject has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins *(cont.)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive accessions.

Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement as regards Hungary is subject to its ratification by Austria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

2. Protocol to the International Agreement.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.
Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures, as from October 1st, 1929.

2. Protocol to the International Agreement *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
Same reservations as for the Agreement.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.
Turkey
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti

---

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series* of the *League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 373; Vol. C, p. 264 and Vol. CVII, p. 537.

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)
The obligations resulting from this Agreement shall be binding for Yugoslavia only as regards signatory States which do not render exportation impossible, either by formal prohibitions or by prohibitive duties (duties considered as prohibitive are duties imposing a tax of 5 Swiss francs or more per hundred kilogrammes).

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

4. Protocol to the International Agreement.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.
Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures as from October 1st, 1929.

4. PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
NORWAY (September 26th, 1930)	JAPAN
POLAND (August 8th, 1931)	LATVIA
ROUMANIA (June 30th, 1929) Same reservation as for the Agreement.	LIBERIA
SWEDEN (June 27th, 1929)	LITHUANIA
SWITZERLAND (June 27th, 1929)	MEXICO
YUGOSLAVIA (September 30th, 1929)	NEW ZEALAND
	NICARAGUA
	PANAMA
	PARAGUAY
	PERU
	PORTUGAL
	SALVADOR
	SIAM
	SPAIN
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	URUGUAY
	VENEZUELA

XVIII. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.[1]

GENERAL ACT.[2]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions			*This Act is open to Accession by:*
A	B	C	All the Members of the League of Nations, with the exception of those mentioned in the preceding columns, and:
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BELGIUM (May 18th, 1929) Subject to the reservation provided in Article 39 (2) (*a*), with the effect of excluding from the procedures described in this Act disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession of Belgium or prior to the accession of any other Party with whom Belgium may have a dispute.	THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 8th, 1930)		BRAZIL
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (May 21st, 1931) Subject to the following conditions: 1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation: (*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of	NORWAY[3] (June 11th, 1929)		COSTA RICA
	SWEDEN (May 13th, 1929)		EGYPT

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the work of the Council and the Secretariat for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Protocol for the pacific settlement of international disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

[2] The General Act came into force August 16th, 1929 (Article 44). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 343; Vol. C, p. 260; Vol. CVII, p. 529; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 304 and Vol. CLII, p. 297.

[3] Norway having acceded on June 11th, 1929, to Chapters I, II and IV, and thereafter having extended its accession to Chapter III, on June 11th, 1930, has therefore accepted all the provisions of the Act. However, it has been deemed necessary to make it appear also under "B" in the present list, so as to make it clear that Norway had already accepted the provisions provided under that heading as from June 11th, 1929.

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

CANADA (July 1st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession in respect of Canada to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in Canada and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty in respect of Canada reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

AUSTRALIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

NEW ZEALAND (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in New Zealand and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	C Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).
All the provisions of the Act.		

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

IRISH FREE STATE (September 26th, 1931)

INDIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between the Government of India and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

DENMARK (April 14th, 1930)

ESTONIA (September 3rd, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Estonia or to the accession of another Party with whom Estonia might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

Ethiopia (March 15th, 1935)

FINLAND (September 6th, 1930)

FRANCE (May 21st, 1931)

The said accession concerning all disputes that may arise after the said accession with regard to situations or facts subsequent thereto, other than those which the Permanent Court of International Justice may recognise as bearing on a question left by international law to the exclusive competence of the State, it being understood that in application of Article 39 of the said Act the disputes which the parties or one of them may have referred to the Council of the League of

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	C Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).
All the provisions of the Act.		

Nations will not be submitted to the procedures described in this Act unless the Council has been unable to pronounce a decision under the conditions laid down in Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant.

Furthermore, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations " on the submission and recommendation of the General Act ", Article 28 of this Act is interpreted by the French Government as meaning in particular that " respect for rights established by treaty or resulting from international law " is obligatory upon arbitral tribunals constituted in application of Chapter III of the said General Act.

GREECE (September 14th, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation referred to in Chapter I:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Greece or to the accession of another Party with whom Greece might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States and in particular disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication.

ITALY (September 7th, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. The following disputes shall be excluded from the procedure described in the said Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which international law leaves to the sole jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Italy and any third Power.

II. It is understood that, in conformity with Article 29 of the said Act, disputes for the solution of which a special procedure is provided by other conventions shall be settled in accordance with the provisions of those conventions; and that, in particular, disputes which may be submitted to the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations in virtue of one of the provisions of the Covenant shall be settled in accordance with those provisions.

III. It is further understood that the present accession in no way affects Italy's accession to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and to the clause in that Statute concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)

NORWAY (June 11th, 1930)

PERU (November 21st, 1931)

Subject to reservation (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SPAIN (September 16th, 1930)

Subject to reservations (*a*) and (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

Switzerland (December 7th, 1934)

Turkey (June 26th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession:

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Turkey and any third Power.

XIX. ECONOMIC STATISTICS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS. [1]

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (March 27th, 1931)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)

Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)

[2] Returns provided for in Article 2, III (B), will not contain information with regard to areas under crops on native farms, and in native reserves, locations and mission stations.

CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Does not apply to the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island, New Guinea and Nauru.

(1) [3] The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I (*b*), for separate returns for direct transit trade shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

(2) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I, Paragraph IV, that when the quantity of goods of any kind is expressed in any unit or units of measure other than weight, an estimate of the average weight of each unit, or multiple of units, shall be shown in the annual returns, shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)

IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

In pursuance of Article 11 of the Convention, the Belgian Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that it cannot accept, in regard to the Colony of the Belgian Congo, the obligations arising out of the clauses of the present Convention.

BRAZIL

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

ESTONIA

FINLAND

GERMANY

HUNGARY

JAPAN

In virtue of Article 11 of the present Convention, the Japanese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Convention does not extend to its Territories mentioned below: Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung, the Territories under Japanese mandate.

LATVIA

LUXEMBURG

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force December 14th, 1930, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series* Vol. CX, p. 171; Vol. CXVII, p. 330; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXVI, p. 454; Vol. CXXX, p. 463; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427.

[2] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)

A. Under the terms of Article 11, the obligations of the Convention shall not extend to the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty the King Emperor.

B[1](1) Article 2 I (*a*). — The provisions for returns of "transit trade" made in Annex 1, Part 1, 1 (*b*) shall not apply to India nor shall returns of the "land frontier trade" of India be acquired.

(2) Article 2. II (*a*). — The question whether a general census of agriculture can be held in India and, if so, on what lines and at what intervals still remains to be settled. For the present, India can assume no obligations under this article.

(3) Article 2. III (*b*). (1). — For farms in the "permanently settled" tracts in India, estimates of the cultivated areas may be used in compiling the returns.

(4) Article 2. III (*b*). (2). — The returns of quantities of crops harvested may be based on estimates of yield each year per unit area in each locality.

(5) Article 2. III (*d*). — Complete returns cannot be guaranteed from Burma, and in respect of the rest of India the returns shall refer to Government forests only.

The Government of India further declared that, with regard to the second paragraph of Article 3 of the Convention, they cannot, with the means of investigation at their disposal, usefully undertake to prepare experimentally the specified tables, and that for similar reasons they are not in a position to accept the proposal contained in Recommendation II of the Convention.

BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)

Chile (November 20th, 1934 *a*)

CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)

DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)

In pursuance of Article 11, Greenland is excepted from the provisions of this Convention. Furthermore, the Danish Government, in accepting the Convention, does not assume any obligation in respect of statistics concerning the Faroe Islands.

EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)

FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)

By its acceptance, France does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

GREECE (September 18th, 1930)

ITALY (June 11th, 1931)

In accepting the present Convention, Italy does not assume any obligation in respect of her Colonies, Protectorates and other Territories referred to in the first paragraph of Article 11.

THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932)

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)

1. The following shall not be applicable:
   (*a*) The provisions of Article 2, III, E) and V;
   (*b*) The provisions concerning the system of valuations known as "declared values" mentioned in Annex I, Part I, § II (See Article 3);
   (*c*) Article 3, paragraph 2.
2. The returns mentioned in Article 2, IV, shall only apply to coal, petroleum, natural gas, tin, manganese, gold and silver.
3. The statistics of foreign trade mentioned in Article 3 shall not comprise tables concerning transit.[1]

NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)

In accordance with Article 11, the Bouvet Island is excepted from the provisions of the present Convention. Furthermore, in ratifying the Convention, Norway does not assume any obligation as regards statistics relating to the Svalbard.

POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)

PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)

In accordance with Article 11, the Portuguese Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that the present Convention does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)

SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)

SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)

---

[1] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (March 27th, 1931)	BELGIUM	AFGHANISTAN
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ALBANIA
Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)	ESTONIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)	FINLAND	BOLIVIA
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)	GERMANY	CHINA
IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)	HUNGARY	COLOMBIA
INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)	JAPAN	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)	LATVIA	ECUADOR
Chile (November 20th, 1934 *a*)	LUXEMBURG	ETHIOPIA
CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)	YUGOSLAVIA	GUATEMALA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)		HAITI
DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)		HONDURAS
EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)		IRAN
FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)		IRAQ
GREECE (Sept. 18th, 1930)		LIBERIA
ITALY (June 11th, 1931)		LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932)		MEXICO
This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.		NICARAGUA
Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)		NEW ZEALAND
NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)		PANAMA
POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)		PARAGUAY
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)		PERU
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)		SALVADOR
SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)		SIAM
SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)		SPAIN
		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

XX. SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY. [1]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935)
The procedure provided by Article 19 of the Convention, for the settlement of any disputes which might arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or the application of the said convention, shall not be applied in the case of a dispute between Poland and the Free City of Danzig.
DENMARK (February 19th, 1931) [2]
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)
IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)
In view of the provisions of Article 176, paragraph 2, of the Norwegian Ordinary Criminal Code and Article 2 of the Norwegian Law on the Extradition of Criminals, the extradition provided for in Article 10 of the present Convention may not be granted for the offence referred to in Article 3, No. 2, where the person uttering the counterfeit currency himself accepted it *bona fide* as genuine.[3]
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[4] (July 13th, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.
INDIA
As provided in Article 24 of the Convention, this signature does not include the territories of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
CHINA
FRANCE
ITALY
JAPAN
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA
ROUMANIA
SWITZERLAND

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SAN MARINO
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
TURKEY
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on February 22nd, 1931, in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. CXII, p. 371; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 450; Vol. CXLVII, p. 351 and Vol. CLII, p. 301.

[2] According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[3] As this reservation has not given rise to any objection on the part of the States to which it was communicated in accordance with Article 22, it may be considered as accepted.

[4] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)	GREAT BRITAIN and NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		AUSTRALIA
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)		BOLIVIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)		BRAZIL
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935).		CANADA
DENMARK[1] (February 19th, 1931)	INDIA	CHILE
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)	CHINA	COSTA RICA
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)	FRANCE	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)	ITALY	ECUADOR
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)	JAPAN	EGYPT
IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)	LUXEMBURG	ETHIOPIA
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)	PANAMA	FINLAND
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)	ROUMANIA	GUATEMALA
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)	SWITZERLAND	HAITI
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		HONDURAS
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		ICELAND
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		IRAN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[2] (July 13th, 1931)		IRAQ
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		LATVIA
		LIBERIA
		LIECHTENSTEIN
		LITHUANIA
		MEXICO
		NICARAGUA
		NEW ZEALAND
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SAN MARINO
		SALVADOR
		SIAM
		SWEDEN
		TURKEY
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

OPTIONAL PROTOCOL.[3]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)	PANAMA	The Members of the League of Nations who did not sign it and the non-member States having signed or who have been invited to accede to the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency.
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)		
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)		
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)		
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)		
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		
ROUMANIA (November 10th, 1930)		
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		

[1] Same note as for the Convention.
[2] Instrument deposited in Berlin.
[3] This Protocol came into force on August 30th, 1930. See *Treaty Series*. Vol. CXII, p. 395; Vol. CXXII, p. 367; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 428 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 351.

XXI. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.[1]

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

In Force.

Definitive signatures.	*Signatures* ad referendum.	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
AUSTRIA (February 3rd, 1930)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	ALBANIA
BELGIUM (June 14th, 1929)	HUNGARY	BULGARIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 14th, 1929)	SWITZERLAND	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FINLAND (October 9th, 1929)		DENMARK
FRANCE (June 14th, 1929)		ESTONIA
GERMANY (May 12th, 1930)		IRISH FREE STATE
GREECE (June 22nd, 1931)		LATVIA
ITALY (June 14th, 1929)		LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 3rd, 1930)		LUXEMBURG
POLAND (December 23rd, 1929)		NORWAY
ROUMANIA (November 26th, 1929)		PORTUGAL
SAAR TERRITORY GOVERNING COMMISSION (June 14th, 1929)		SWEDEN
SPAIN (December 17th, 1929)		YUGOSLAVIA

XXII. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

3. PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[2]

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1930)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA (September 12th, 1930)	BOLIVIA	COSTA RICA
AUSTRALIA (August 28th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ECUADOR
AUSTRIA (February 26th, 1930)	GUATEMALA	IRAQ
BELGIUM (November 18th, 1929)	NICARAGUA	MEXICO
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (February 12th, 1930)	PANAMA	TURKEY
BULGARIA (April 27th, 1931)	PERU	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
CANADA (August 28th, 1930)		
CHILE (November 20th, 1933)		
CHINA (October 14th, 1930)		

---

[1] This Agreement is not subject to ratification. It came into force, September 12th, 1929, in accordance with its Article 11. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XCIV, p. 277; Vol. C, p. 263 and Vol. CXI, p. 416.

[2] Under the terms of Article 4 of the Protocol, the condition necessary for the coming into force of the amendments is ratification by those Members of the League of Nations and States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant which have ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920. For the purposes of the Protocol of 1929, the United States of America shall be in the same position as a State which has ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920.

3. PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA [1] (January 5th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 30th, 1930)
DENMARK (March 11th, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (September 8th, 1930)
Ethiopia (March 30th, 1935)
FINLAND (August 28th, 1930)
FRANCE (May 8th, 1931)
GERMANY (August 13th, 1930)
GREECE (August 29th, 1930)
HAITI (September 30th, 1930)
HUNGARY (August 13th, 1930)
INDIA (February 26th, 1930)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE (August 2nd, 1930)
ITALY (April 2nd, 1931)
JAPAN (November 14th, 1930)
LATVIA (August 29th, 1930)
LIBERIA (August 29th, 1930)
LITHUANIA (January 23rd, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 8th, 1930)
NEW ZEALAND (June 4th, 1930)
NORWAY (April 10th, 1930)
PARAGUAY (May 11th, 1933)
POLAND (May 13th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (June 12th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (August 4th, 1930)
SALVADOR (August 29th, 1930)
SIAM (June 2nd, 1930)
SPAIN (July 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (March 20th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 5th, 1930)
URUGUAY (September 19th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (August 4th, 1933)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 27th, 1930)

4. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE. [2]

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1930)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA (Sept. 12th, 1930)	BOLIVIA	COSTA RICA
AUSTRALIA (August 28th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ECUADOR
AUSTRIA (February 26th, 1930)	CHILE	IRAQ
BELGIUM (October 5th, 1931)	GUATEMALA	MEXICO
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (February 12th, 1930)	HAITI	TURKEY
	LIBERIA	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	NICARAGUA	
	PARAGUAY	
	PERU	
	SALVADOR	

[1] The reservation made by the Cuban Government when ratifying the Protocol was withdrawn by this Government by an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on March 14th, 1932.

[2] The present Protocol shall come into force as soon as all States which have ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, and also the United States, have deposited their ratifications (Article 7).

4. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

BULGARIA (April 27th, 1931)
CANADA (August 28th, 1930)
CHINA (October 14th, 1930)
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA (November 26th, 1930)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 30th, 1930)
DENMARK (March 11th, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (September 8th, 1930)
Ethiopia (March 30th, 1935)
FINLAND (August 28th, 1930)
FRANCE (May 8th, 1931)
GERMANY (August 13th, 1930)
GREECE (August 29th, 1930)
HUNGARY (August 13th, 1930)
INDIA (February 26th, 1930)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE (August 2nd, 1930)
ITALY (April 2nd, 1931)
JAPAN (November 14th, 1930)
LATVIA (August 29th, 1930)
LITHUANIA (January 23rd, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (November 3rd, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 8th, 1930)
NEW ZEALAND (June 4th, 1930)
NORWAY (April 10th, 1930)
Panama (May 2nd, 1935)
POLAND (May 13th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (June 12th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (August 4th, 1930)
SIAM (June 2nd, 1930)
SPAIN (July 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (March 20th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 5th, 1930)
URUGUAY (September 19th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 14th, 1932)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 27th, 1930)

XXIII. PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

1. CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
With reservations as regards Articles 5, 6, 7, 16 and 17, which Brazil will not adopt owing to difficulties with which it has to contend in connection with principles forming the basis of its internal legislation.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
CHILE

The Convention is open to Accession by :

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
COSTA RICA

[1] A procès-verbal shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 25, § 1).
The present Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the procès-verbal mentioned in Article 25 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the procès-verbal (Article 26, § 1).

1. Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws *(continued)*.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations (April 6th, 1934)	COLOMBIA Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
CANADA (April 6th, 1934)	CUBA Subject to reservation as regards Articles 9, 10 and 11.	ECUADOR
China (February 14th, 1935) Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ETHIOPIA
MONACO (April 27th, 1931 *a*)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	FINLAND
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931 *a*)	DENMARK Subject to reservation as regards Articles 5 and 11.	GUATEMALA
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)	EGYPT	HAITI
SWEDEN (July 6th, 1933) The Swedish Government declares that it does not accept to be bound by the provisions of the second sentence of Article 11, in the case where the wife referred to in the article, after recovering the nationality of her country of origin, fails to establish her ordinary residence in that country.	ESTONIA	HONDURAS
	FRANCE	IRAN
	GERMANY	IRAQ
	GREECE	LIBERIA
	HUNGARY	LITHUANIA
	ICELAND	NEW ZEALAND
	INDIA In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	NICARAGUA
	IRISH FREE STATE	PANAMA
	ITALY	PARAGUAY
	JAPAN Subject to reservation as regards Articles 4 and 10 and as regards the words "according to its law" of Article 13.	ROUMANIA
	LATVIA	SAN MARINO
	LUXEMBURG	SIAM
	MEXICO Subject to reservation as regards paragraph 2 of Article 1.	TURKEY
	THE NETHERLANDS (1) Exclude from acceptance Articles 8, 9 and 10; (2) Do not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	PERU Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.	VENEZUELA
	PORTUGAL	
	SALVADOR	
	SPAIN	
	SWITZERLAND Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.	
	URUGUAY	
	YUGOSLAVIA	

2. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
United States of America (August 3rd, 1932)	Austria	Afghanistan
Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	Belgium Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.	Union of South Africa
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)	Canada	Albania
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)	Chile	Argentine Republic
India (September 28th, 1932) In accordance with the provisions of Article 15, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Colombia	Bolivia
Sweden (July 6th, 1933)	Cuba	Bulgaria
	Denmark	China
	Egypt	Costa Rica
	France	Czechoslovakia
	Germany	Free City of Danzig
	Greece	Dominican Republic
	Irish Free State	Ecuador
	Luxemburg	Estonia
	Mexico	Ethiopia
	The Netherlands (1) Exclude from acceptance Article 3; (2) Do not intend to assume any obligation as regards Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	Finland
	Peru	Guatemala
	Portugal	Haiti
	Salvador	Honduras
	Spain	Hungary
	Uruguay	Iceland
		Iran
		Iraq
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Monaco
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Poland
		Roumania
		San Marino
		Siam
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] A procès-verbal shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 11, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the procès-verbal mentioned in Article 11 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the procès-verbal (Article 12, § 1).

3. Protocol relating to a Certain Case of Statelessness.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Australia (July 8th, 1935) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)	Belgium Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.	Albania
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)	Canada	United States of America
Chile (March 20th, 1935)	Colombia	Argentine Republic
China (February 14th, 1935)	Cuba	Austria
India (September 28th, 1932) In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Czechoslovakia	Bolivia
	Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	Bulgaria
Poland (June 15th, 1934)	Denmark	Costa Rica
	Egypt	Dominican Republic
	Estonia	Ecuador
	France	Ethiopia
	Greece	Finland
	Irish Free State	Germany
	Japan	Guatemala
	Latvia	Haiti
	Luxemburg	Honduras
	Mexico	Hungary
	The Netherlands Do not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	Iceland
	Peru	Iran
	Portugal	Iraq
	Spain	Italy
	Uruguay	Liberia
		Lithuania
		Monaco
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Roumania
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] A procès-verbal shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 9, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the procès-verbal mentioned in Article 9 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the procès-verbal (Article 10, § 1).

4. Special Protocol concerning Statelessness.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)	Austria	Albania
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)	Belgium With the reservation that the application of this Protocol will not be extended to the Colony of the Belgian Congo or to the Territories under mandate.	United States of America
China (February 14th, 1935)	Canada	Argentine Republic
India (September 28th, 1932) In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Colombia	Bolivia
	Cuba	Bulgaria
	Egypt	Chile
	Greece	Costa Rica
	Irish Free State	Czechoslovakia
	Luxemburg	Free City of Danzig
	Mexico	Denmark
	Peru	Dominican Republic
	Portugal	Ecuador
	Salvador	Estonia
	Spain	Ethiopia
	Uruguay	Finland
		France
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		Iran
		Iraq
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Monaco
		The Netherlands
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Poland
		Roumania
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] A procès-verbal shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 9, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the procès-verbal mentioned in Article 9 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the procès-verbal (Article 10, § 1).

XXIV. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

I. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles, 6, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the utilisation of the rights provided in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention. As regards the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government intends to reserve all the rights provided in the Annex in question, with the exception of the right mentioned in Article 21 of that Annex.

**Free City of Danzig* (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The undertaking by the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 of Annex II of the said Convention.
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex, to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II of the Convention.

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
Subject to the following reservations with regard to Annex II:
Article 8: Paragraphs 1 and 3.
Article 9: As regards bills payable at a fixed date, or at a fixed period after date or after sight.
Article 13.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ECUADOR
FRANCE
HUNGARY
LUXEMBURG
PERU
POLAND
SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article VI of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 257.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Article 15: (*a*) Proceedings against a drawer or endorser who has made an inequitable gain;

(*b*) Same proceedings against an acceptor who has made an inequitable gain.

"These proceedings shall be taken within a period of five years counting from the date of the bill of exchange".

Article 17: The provisions of Greek law relating to short-term limitations shall apply.

Article 20: The above-mentioned reservations apply equally to promissory notes.

ITALY (August 31st, 1932)

The Italian Government reserves the right to avail itself of the right granted in Articles 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the right referred to in the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention, in virtue of Article 1, paragraph 2.

MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)

NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II of the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II of the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15 and 17 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Annex II.

It will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (August 31st, 1932)	Brazil	Afghanistan
Belgium (August 31st, 1932)	Colombia	Union of South Africa
**Free City of Danzig* (through the intermediary of Poland (June 24th, 1935)	Czechoslovakia	Albania
	Ecuador	United States of America
	France	Sa'udi Arabia
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)	Hungary	Argentine Republic
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	Luxemburg	Australia
	Peru	Bolivia
	Poland	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Spain	
Finland (August 31st, 1932)	Turkey	Bulgaria
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)	Yugoslavia	Canada
Greece (August 31st, 1931)		Chile
Italy (August 31st, 1932)		China
Japan (August 31st, 1932)		Costa Rica
Monaco (January 25th, 1934 *a*)		Cuba
Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)		Dominican Republic
		Egypt
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)		Estonia
		Ethiopia
Norway (July 27th, 1932)		Guatemala
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934)		Haiti
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.		Honduras
		Iceland
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)		India
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932)		Iran
This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Roumania
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Uruguay
		Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 15 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 317.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. Convention on the Stamp Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by*
Austria (August 31st, 1932)	Brazil	Afghanistan
Belgium (August 31st, 1932)	Colombia	Union of South Africa
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 18th, 1934 *a*) His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His Colonies or Protectorates or any territories under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.	Czechoslovakia	Albania
	Ecuador	United States of America
	France	Sa'udi Arabia
	Hungary	Argentine Republic
Newfoundland (May 7th, 1934 *a*) Subject to the provision D. I. in the Protocol of the Convention.	Luxemburg	Australia
	Peru	Bolivia
	Poland	Bulgaria
**Free City of Danzig* (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)	Spain	Canada
	Turkey	Chile
	Yugoslavia	China
Denmark (July 27th, 1932) The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
Finland (August 31st, 1932)		Egypt
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)		Estonia
Italy (August 31st, 1932)		Ethiopia
Japan (August 31st, 1932)		Greece
Monaco (January 25th, 1934*a*)		Guatemala
Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)		Haiti
		Honduras
Netherlands Indies and Caraçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)		Iceland
		India
Norway (July 27th, 1932)		Iran
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Latvia
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)		Liberia
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932) This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Roumania
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Uruguay
		Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 337.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

XXV. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.[1]

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

DENMARK (May 15th, 1931)
FINLAND (July 30th, 1931)
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification

ALBANIA
AUSTRIA
Subject to the reservation that this signature shall only take effect when an agreement with the States concerned has removed the obstacles which still stand in the way of the application of the Convention as regards Austria —*i.e.*, the supervision of credit exercised by the Committee of Control and the general lien belonging to the States which have granted reconstruction credits.
BELGIUM
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations
AUSTRALIA
IRISH FREE STATE
BULGARIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FRANCE
GERMANY
GREECE
ITALY
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
NORWAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
SWEDEN
In virtue of the constitutional laws of Sweden, loan operations are entrusted to a special authority (Riksgäldskontoret) appointed direct by Parliament.
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAQ
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

[1] The present Convention shall not come into force until it has received ratifications or accessions resulting in causing a sum of not less than 50 million gold francs, for the annual service of loans, to be covered by ordinary guarantees and also by the special guarantees of not less than three Governments. It shall enter into force ninety days after the date on which the conditions provided above are satisfied and subject to the provisions of Article 35.

XXVI. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS. [1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.

BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932)
Belgium cannot undertake, for the present, to apply the provisions relating to "Warning of gale expected to affect the locality" which form the first chapter of the Regulations of this Agreement.
Further, the ratification by Belgium of the provisions which are the object of Chapter II (Tide and depth signals), and Chapter III (Signals concerning the movement of vessels at the entrances of harbours or important channels), will only take effect when Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Norway shall have themselves notified their effective ratifications of the provisions contained in these two chapters.
This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)
China (May 29th, 1935)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
FRANCE (July 13th, 1931)
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:
French West Africa
French Equatorial Africa
Togoland
Cameroons
Madagascar
French Settlements in India
Indo-China
Reunion
French Coast of Somaliland
New Caledonia
Oceania
Martinique
Guadeloupe
Guiana
St. Pierre and Miquelon
(October 28th, 1933 *a*)
GREECE (September 14th, 1932)
MONACO (November 3rd, 1933)
MOROCCO (September 3rd, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (August 24th, 1931 *s*)
Including the Netherlands Indies.
POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)
SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)
TUNIS (October 27th, 1931)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)

Signatures or Accessions subject to Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
CUBA
ESTONIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
SWEDEN
YUGOSLAVIA

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA
IRISH FREE STATE
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
TANGIER
TURKEY
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on November 22nd, 1931, on the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by five Governments. (Article 5.) See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXV, p. 95; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 453 and Vol. CXLII, p. 379.

2. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.	*Signatures or Accessions subject to Ratification.*	*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932) This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.	CUBA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)	ESTONIA	ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) Does not include any Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate of His Britannic Majesty.	GERMANY	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
INDIA (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) Does not include any of the Indian States under British suzerainty.		AUSTRALIA
		BULGARIA
China (May 29th, 1935)		CANADA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)		CHILE
		COLOMBIA
DENMARK (April 29th, 1931 *s*)		COSTA RICA
FINLAND (May 23rd, 1934)		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
FRANCE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		EGYPT
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows: (October 28th, 1933 *a*)		ECUADOR
French West Africa		GUATEMALA
French Equatorial Africa		HAITI
Togoland		HONDURAS
Cameroons		ICELAND
Madagascar		IRAN
French Settlements in India		IRAQ
Indo-China		IRISH FREE STATE
Reunion		ITALY
French Coast of Somaliland		JAPAN
New Caledonia		LATVIA
Oceania		LIBERIA
Martinique		LITHUANIA
Guadeloupe		MEXICO
Guiana		NEW ZEALAND
St. Pierre and Miquelon		NICARAGUA
MOROCCO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		NORWAY
TUNIS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		PANAMA
GREECE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		PERU
MONACO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		SALVADOR
THE NETHERLANDS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) Including the Netherlands Indies.		SIAM
		TANGIER
POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)		TURKEY
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		URUGUAY
ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)		VENEZUELA
SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)		
SWEDEN (February 3rd, 1933)		
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)		
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)		

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on January 21st, 1931, on the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by five Governments. (Article 4.) See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 21; Vol. CXVII, p. 331; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 449; Vol. CXLII, p. 371 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 350.

XXVII. DECLARATION BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE POWERS WHICH ARE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION INSTITUTING THE DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE DANUBE.

(Geneva, December 5th, 1930.)

Signatures.

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
FRANCE
ITALY
ROUMANIA
YUGOSLAVIA

Signatures ad referendum.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
GERMANY
GREECE
HUNGARY

XXVIII. UNIFICATION OF RIVER LAW.

1. CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
PORTUGAL (March 1st, 1932 *a*) Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.	AUSTRIA Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14, of the Protocol Annex. BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland). Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol Annex. FRANCE GERMANY Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol Annex. HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG THE NETHERLANDS Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol Annex. POLAND ROUMANIA SWITZERLAND Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol Annex. YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK ESTONIA FINLAND GREECE IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LITHUANIA NORWAY SPAIN SWEDEN TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 17).

2. CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *in rem* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	AUSTRIA Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol Annex. BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland): Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol Annex. FRANCE GERMANY Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol Annex. HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG THE NETHERLANDS Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol Annex. POLAND SWITZERLAND Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol Annex. YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK ESTONIA FINLAND GREECE IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LITHUANIA NORWAY PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SPAIN SWEDEN TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

3. CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [2]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FRANCE HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under IV, *ad* Article 8, of the Protocol Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG POLAND YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA AUSTRIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK FREE CITY OF DANZIG ESTONIA FINLAND GERMANY GREECE IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LITHUANIA THE NETHERLANDS NORWAY PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SPAIN SWEDEN SWITZERLAND TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Convention shall enter into force six months after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 53).
[2] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 11).

XXIX. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

1. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
**Free City of Danzig* (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935) This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, para. 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to this Convention.	AUSTRIA	AFGHANISTAN
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932) The undertaking of the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14 (paragraph I, 16*a*), 18, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of Annex II to the said Convention. The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	BELGIUM	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ALBANIA
	ECUADOR	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
	FRANCE	SA'UDI ARABIA
	HUNGARY	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	LUXEMBURG	AUSTRALIA
	MEXICO	BOLIVIA
	POLAND	BRAZIL
	ROUMANIA	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
	SPAIN	BULGARIA
	TURKEY	CANADA
	YUGOSLAVIA	CHILE
		CHINA
		COLOMBIA
		COSTA RICA
		CUBA
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		EGYPT
		ESTONIA
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932) This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14 (paragraph I, 16*a*), 18 and 27 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex, to legislate on the matters referred to therein.		ETHIOPIA
		GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		ICELAND
		INDIA
		IRAN
		IRAQ
		IRISH FREE STATE
		LATVIA
		LIBERIA
		LIECHTENSTEIN
		LITHUANIA
		NEW ZEALAND
		PANAMA
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
		SUDAN
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933) This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16 (paragraph 2), 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II of the Convention.		
*GREECE (June 1st, 1934) Subject to the following conditions: A. The Hellenic Government does not avail itself of the reservations provided in Articles 1, 2, 5-8, 10-14, 16, paragraph 1 (*a*) and (*b*), 18, paragraph 1, 19-22, 24 and 26, paragraph 2, of Annex II. B. The Hellenic Government avails itself of the following reservations provided in Annex II: (1) The reservation in Article 3, paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the Uniform Law being replaced by the words: " A cheque which does not specify the place of payment shall be regarded as payable at the place where it was drawn ". (2) The reservation in Article 4, the following paragraph being added to Article 3: " A cheque issued and payable in Greece shall not be valid as a cheque unless it is drawn on a banking Company or Greek legal person having the status of an institution of public law, engaging in banking business ".		

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article VI of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 355.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

I. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

(3) The reservation in Article 9, the following provision being added to paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Uniform Law: "But in such exceptional case the issue of the cheque to bearer is prohibited."

(4) The reservation in Article 15, the following paragraph being added to Article 31 of the Uniform Law: "By presidential decree, promulgated at the instance of the Ministers of Justice and National Economy, it may be decided what institutions in Greece are to be regarded as clearing-houses."

(5) The reservation in the second paragraph of Article 16, it being laid down that "provisions with regard to the loss or theft of cheques shall be embodied in Greek law."

(6) The reservation in Article 17, the following paragraph being added at the end of Article 35: "In exceptional circumstances connected with the rate of exchange of Greek currency, the effects of the stipulation contained in paragraph 3 of the present Article may be abrogated in each case by special legislation as regards cheques payable in Greece. The above provision may also be applied as regards cheques issued in Greece."

(7) The reservation in Article 23, the following being added to No. 2 in Article 45 of the Uniform Law: "which, however, in the case of cheques issued and payable in Greece, shall be calculated in each case at the legal rate of interest in force in Greece." Similarly, the following is added to No. 2 of Article 46 of the Uniform Law: "except in the special case dealt with in No. 2 of the preceding Article."

(8) The reservation in Article 25, the following Article being added to the National Law: "In the event of forfeiture of the bearer's rights or limitation of the right of action, proceedings may be taken against the drawer or endorser on the ground of his having made an inequitable gain. The right to take such proceedings lapses after three years from the date of the issue of the cheque."

(9) The reservation in the first paragraph of Article 26, a provision being enacted to the following effect: "The causes of interruption or suspension of limitation of actions enacted in the present law shall be governed by the rules regarding limitation and short-term limitation of actions."

(10) The reservation in Article 27, a separate Article being appended in the following terms: "Legal holidays within the meaning of the present law shall be all Sundays and all full days of rest observed by public offices."

(11) The reservation in Article 28 and the reservation in Article 29.

(12) The reservation in Article 30.

ITALY (August 31st, 1933)

In accordance with Article 1 of this Convention, the Royal Italian Government intends to avail itself of the rights provided in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16 (paragraph II) 19, 20, 21 (paragraph II) 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

In connection with Article 15 of Annex II to this Convention, the institutions referred to in the said article are, in Italy, solely the "Stanze di compensazione".

JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)

By application of Article 1, paragraph II, of the Convention, this ratification is subject to the benefit of the provisions mentioned in Annex II of this Convention.

MONACO (February 9th, 1933)

*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II of the Convention.

NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14 (paragraph I), 16*a* and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14 (paragraph I), 16*a* and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 4, 8, 15, 16 (paragraph II), 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

It will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
**Free City of Danzig* (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)	Austria	Afghanistan
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)	Belgium	Union of South Africa
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	Czechoslovakia	Albania
Finland (August 31st, 1932)	Ecuador	United States of America
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)	France	Sa'udi Arabia
*Greece (June 1st, 1934)	Hungary	Argentine Republic
Italy (August 31st, 1933)	Luxemburg	Australia
Japan (August 25th, 1933)	Mexico	Bolivia
Monaco (February 9th, 1933)	Poland	Brazil
*The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)	Roumania	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)	Spain	Bulgaria
Norway (July 27th, 1932)	Turkey	Canada
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934)	Yugoslavia	Chile
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.		China
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)		Colombia
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932)		Costa Rica
This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		New Zealand
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Uruguay
		Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 407.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (January 13th, 1932) This ratification does not include any British Colony or Protectorate or any mandated territory in respect of which the mandate is exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.	Austria Belgium Czechoslovakia Ecuador France Hungary Luxemburg Mexico Poland Roumania Spain Turkey Yugoslavia	Afghanistan Union of South Africa Albania United States of America Sa'udi Arabia Argentine Republic Australia Bolivia Brazil Bulgaria Canada Chile China Colombia Costa Rica Cuba Dominican Republic Egypt Estonia Ethiopia Guatemala Haiti Honduras Iceland India Iran Iraq Irish Free State Latvia Liberia Liechtenstein Lithuania New Zealand Panama Paraguay Peru Salvador San Marino Siam Sudan Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Uruguay Venezuela
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)		
Denmark (July 27th, 1932) The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.		
Finland (August 31st, 1932)		
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)		
*Greece (June 1st, 1934)		
Italy (August 31st, 1933)		
Japan (August 25th, 1933)		
Monaco (February 9th, 1933)		
*The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)		
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)		
Norway (July 27th, 1932)		
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.		
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)		
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932) This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.		

XXX. ROAD TRAFFIC.

1. Convention concerning the Unification of Road Signals.[2]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
France (October 11th, 1934) Does not assume any obligation in regard to Algeria, colonies, protectorates and territories under its mandate.	Belgium Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.	Afghanistan Union of South Africa Albania Argentine Republic Australia
Algeria (July 22nd, 1935 *a*)	Czechoslovakia	

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on November 29th, 1933, in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 7.

[2] This Convention came into force on July 16th, 1934, in accordance with its Article 11. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CL, p. 247.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS (*continued*).
(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
ITALY (September 25th, 1933)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland).	AUSTRIA
MONACO (January 19th, 1932*a*)	DENMARK	BOLIVIA
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)	GERMANY	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
	HUNGARY	BULGARIA
	LUXEMBURG	CANADA
POLAND (April 5th, 1934)	TURKEY	CHILE
PORTUGAL (April 18th, 1932 *a*) Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.	YUGOSLAVIA	CHINA
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)		COLOMBIA
SPAIN (July 18th, 1933)		CUBA
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)		ECUADOR
		ESTONIA
		ETHIOPIA
		FINLAND
		GREECE
		GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		INDIA
		IRAN
		IRAQ
		IRISH FREE STATE
		JAPAN
		LATVIA
		LIBERIA
		LITHUANIA
		MEXICO
		NEW ZEALAND
		NICARAGUA
		NORWAY
		PANAMA
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		SIAM
		SWEDEN
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

2. CONVENTION ON THE TAXATION OF FOREIGN MOTOR VEHICLES, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [1]
(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (November 9th, 1932) Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	AFGHANISTAN
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 20th, 1932) Does not include any colonies, protectorates or overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or mandate.	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	TURKEY	ALBANIA
Southern Rhodesia (August 6th, 1932 *a*)		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
NEWFOUNDLAND (January 9th, 1933 *a*)		AUSTRALIA
Ceylon, *Cyprus*, *Gold Coast: Colony, Ashanti, Northern Territories, Togoland under British mandate* (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)		AUSTRIA
		BOLIVIA
		CANADA
		CHILE
		CHINA
		COLOMBIA
		CUBA
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		ECUADOR
		ESTONIA
		ETHIOPIA
		FRANCE
		GERMANY
		GREECE
		GUATEMALA

[1] This Convention entered into force on May 9th, 1933, in accordance with its Article 14. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 149; Vol. CXLII, p. 393 and Vol. CXLVII, p. 356.

2. CONVENTION ON THE TAXATION OF FOREIGN MOTOR VEHICLES, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Hong-Kong, *Jamaica*, *Malta*, *Windward Islands: Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent* (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)
BULGARIA (March 5th, 1932 *a*)
DENMARK (December 4th, 1931)
FINLAND (May 23rd, 1934 *a*)
IRISH FREE STATE (November 27th, 1933 *a*)
ITALY (September 25th, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (March 31st, 1933)
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)
PORTUGAL (January 23rd, 1932)
Does not assume any obligation as regards its Colonies.
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
SPAIN (June 3rd, 1933)
SWEDEN (November 9th, 1933)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 9th, 1933 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
MONACO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

3. AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS.[1]

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

AUSTRIA (August 4th, 1931)
BELGIUM (March 28th, 1931)
GREAT BRITAIN and NORTHERN IRELAND (March 28th, 1931)
BULGARIA (February 27th, 1932)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (June 28th, 1933)
DENMARK (March 28th, 1931)
FRANCE (April 15th, 1931)
GERMANY (March 28th, 1931)
GREECE (August 18th, 1931)
HUNGARY (August 14th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE (May 6th, 1931)
ITALY (May 27th, 1931)
LUXEMBURG (March 28th, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (June 11th, 1931)
NORWAY (September 27th, 1932)
POLAND (September 9th, 1932)
PORTUGAL (August 26th, 1931)
Roumania (June 19th, 1935)
SPAIN (July 8th, 1931)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (March 28th, 1931)
TURKEY (May 15th, 1932)

Signatures ad referendum.

YUGOSLAVIA

The Agreement is open to Signature by:

ALBANIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
ESTONIA
FINLAND
ICELAND
LATVIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MONACO
SAN MARINO
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Agreement entered into force on June 26th, 1931, on the ninetieth day after its signature on behalf of three Customs administrations (Article III). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXIX, p. 47; Vol. CXXVI, p. 460 and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 432.

XXXI. INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY.

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY,[1] WITH CHARTER AND STATUTES.

(Geneva, May 21st, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
GREECE (August 31st, 1931)	AUSTRIA	1. The European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *a*.
LATVIA (September 28th, 1931)	BELGIUM	2. The non-European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *b*.
POLAND (April 22nd, 1932)	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	
ROUMANIA (February 4th, 1932)	BULGARIA	
SWITZERLAND (December 31st, 1931)	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)	DENMARK The Danish Government reserves the right to make the entry into force of this Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being ratified and also put into force by Norway and Sweden.	
	ESTONIA	
	FINLAND	
	FRANCE	
	GERMANY	
	HUNGARY	
	ITALY	
	LITHUANIA	
	LUXEMBURG	
	THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe only)	
	PORTUGAL	
	SPAIN	
	SWEDEN [2]	

XXXII. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS. [3]

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (June 21st, 1935 *a*)	SA'UDI ARABIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (April 28th, 1932) 1. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purpose of internal control and control of import into, and export from, territory under its jurisdiction, of opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures stricter than the provisions of the Convention.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	ALBANIA
	BOLIVIA	FINLAND
	DENMARK	ICELAND
	ETHIOPIA	LATVIA
	LIBERIA	LIECHTENSTEIN
	LUXEMBURG	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	PARAGUAY	YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The present Convention shall come into force as soon as the amount of the contributions, whether obligatory or voluntary, to the Special Reserve due from the Governments which have ratified the Convention attains the sum of twenty-five million francs. If this condition is not realised before December 31st, 1931, a Conference of the Governments which have ratified the Convention shall be called by the Council of the League of Nations. This Conference will determine new conditions for the coming into force of the Convention (Article 16).

[2] On signing this Convention the Swedish Plenipotentiary made the following declaration:

"The Swedish Government reserves the right to make its ratification of this Convention depend on the attitude which the Governments of Denmark and Norway shall adopt towards it."

[3] The present Convention entered into force on July 9th, 1933, in accordance with its Article 30. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXIX, p. 301; Vol. CXLVII, p. 361 and Vol. CLII, p. 344. Provided always that the provisions of the Convention other than Articles 2 to 5 shall only be applicable from the first of January in the first year in respect of which estimates are furnished in conformity with Articles 2 to 5 (Article 30).

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

2. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purposes of controlling transit through its territories of raw opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures by which the production of an import permit issued by the country of destination may be made a condition precedent to the granting of permission for transit through its territory.
3. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to send statistics of import and export to the Permanent Central Opium Board short of 60 days after the close of the three months' period to which such statistics refer.
4. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to state separately amounts of drugs purchased or imported for Government purposes.
5. Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs by them on the part of the United States of America on this date is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognises a regime or entity which signs or accedes to the Convention as the Government of a country when that regime or entity is not recognised by the Government of the United States of America as the Government of that country.
6. The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed on this date, does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country represented by a regime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognise as the Government of that country until such country has a Government recognised by the Government of the United States of America.

Austria (July 3rd, 1934)

Belgium (April 10th, 1933)

This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo, nor the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

Brazil (April 5th, 1933)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 1st, 1933)

His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates and overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.

Canada (October 17th, 1932)

Australia (January 24th, 1934)

This accession applies to Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

Irish Free State (April 11th, 1933 *a*)

India (November 14th, 1932)

Bulgaria (March 20th, 1933 *a*)

Chile (March 31st, 1933)

China (January 10th, 1934 *a*)

Colombia (January 29th, 1934 *a*)

Costa Rica (April 5th, 1933)

Cuba (April 4th, 1933)

Czechoslovakia (April 12th, 1933)

Dominican Republic (April 8th, 1933)

Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)

Egypt (April 10th, 1933)

Ecuador (April 13th, 1935 *a*)

Estonia (July 5th, 1935 *a*)

France (April 10th, 1933)

The French Government makes every reservation, with regard to the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated Territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13, within the strict time-limit laid down.

Germany (April 10th, 1933)

Greece (December 27th, 1934)

Guatemala (May 1st, 1933)

Haiti (May 4th, 1933 *a*)

Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)

Hungary (April 10th, 1933 *a*)

Iran (September 28th, 1932)

Iraq (May 30th, 1934 *a*)

Italy (March 21st, 1933)

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Japan (June 3rd, 1935)

The Japanese Government declare that, in view of the necessity of close co-operation between the High Contracting Parties in order to carry out most effectively the provisions of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931, they understand that the present position of Japan, regardless of whether she be a Member of the League of Nations or not, is to be maintained in the matter of the composition of the organs and the appointment of the members thereof mentioned in the said Convention.[1]

Lithuania (April 10th, 1933)

Mexico (March 13th, 1933)

The Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory—as it has already done—measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the preparation, use, possession, importation, exportation and consumption of the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Monaco (February 16th, 1933)

The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)

New Zealand (June 17th, 1935 *a*)

Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

Norway (September 12th, 1934 *a*)

Panama (April 15th, 1935)

Peru (May 20th, 1932 *a*)

Poland (April 11th, 1933)

Portugal (June 17th, 1932)

The Portuguese Government makes every reservation with regard to its colonies as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Roumania (April 11th, 1933)

Salvador (April 7th, 1933 *a*)

(*a*) The Republic of Salvador does not agree to the provisions of Article 26, on the ground that there is no reason why the High Contracting Parties should be given the option of not applying the Convention to their colonies, protectorates, and overseas mandated territories.

(*b*) The Republic of Salvador states that it disagrees with the reservations embodied in Nos. 5 and 6 of the declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America regarding Governments not recognised by the Government of that country; in its opinion, those reservations constitute an infringement of the national sovereignty of Salvador, whose present Government, though not as yet recognised by the United States Government, has been recognised by the majority of the civilised countries of the world. Their recognition is due to their conviction that that Government is a perfectly constitutional one and affords a full and complete guarantee of the performance of its international duties, inasmuch as it enjoys the unanimous, decided and effective support of all the inhabitants of the Republic, whether citizens of the country or foreigners resident therein.

As it respects the internal regimes of other nations, the Republic of Salvador considers that the Convention in question, being of a strictly hygienic and humanitarian character, does not offer a suitable occasion to formulate such political reservations as have called forth this comment.

San Marino (June 12th, 1933)

Siam (February 22nd, 1934)

As its harmful-habit-forming drugs law goes beyond the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the present Convention on certain points, the Siamese Government reserves the right to apply its existing law.

Spain (April 7th, 1933)

Sudan (August 25th, 1932 *a*)

Sweden (August 12th, 1932)

Switzerland (April 10th, 1933)

Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)

Uruguay (April 7th, 1933)

Venezuela (November 15th, 1933)

---

[1] Before ratifying the Convention with the declaration here set out, the Japanese Government consulted the Contracting Parties, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General. A summary of the correspondence which took place will be published in the League of Nations *Official Journal* for September 1935 (16th Year, No. 9).

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (April 28th, 1932)
AUSTRIA (July 3rd, 1934)
BELGIUM (April 10th, 1933)
BRAZIL (April 5th, 1933)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 1st, 1933)
Same reservation as for the Convention.
CANADA (October 17th, 1932)
IRISH FREE STATE (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
INDIA (November 14th, 1932)
CHILE (November 20th, 1933)
COLOMBIA (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
COSTA RICA (April 5th, 1933)
CUBA (April 4th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 12th, 1933 *a*)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (April 8th, 1933)
Ecuador (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
EGYPT (April 10th, 1933)
Estonia (July 5th, 1935 *a*)
FRANCE (April 10th, 1933)
GERMANY (April 10th, 1933)
Greece (December 27th, 1934)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
HUNGARY (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)
ITALY (March 21st, 1933)
Japan (June 3rd, 1935)
LITHUANIA (April 10th, 1933)
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
MONACO (March 20th, 1933)
THE NETHERLANDS [1] (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)
New Zealand (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
PERU (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
POLAND (April 11th, 1933)
PORTUGAL (June 17th, 1932)
ROUMANIA (April 11th, 1933)
SAN MARINO (June 12th, 1933)
SIAM (February 22nd, 1934)
SPAIN (April 7th, 1933)
SUDAN (January 18th, 1933 *a*)
SWEDEN (August 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (April 10th, 1933)
TURKEY (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
URUGUAY (April 7th, 1933)
Venezuela (September 11th, 1934)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification

SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
DENMARK
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA
PARAGUAY

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
AUSTRALIA
BULGARIA
CHINA
FINLAND
HAITI
ICELAND
IRAQ
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
SALVADOR
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The instrument of ratification specifies that the reservation relating to paragraph 2 of Article 22, as formulated by the Netherlands representative at the time of signature of the Protocol, should be considered as withdrawn.

XXXIII. WHALING.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING. [1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (January 11th, 1933)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (July 7th, 1932)
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (October 18th, 1934)
His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 20th, 1933)
DENMARK (including Greenland (June 26th, 1934)
Ecuador (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
EGYPT (January 25th, 1933 *a*)
France (May 16th, 1935)
ITALY (June 12th, 1933)
The accession of the Italian Government to this Convention can in no way constitute a precedent for future agreements providing for the limitation of fishing in extra-territorial sea.
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
MONACO (June 7th, 1932 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)
NICARAGUA (April 30th, 1932*a*)
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)
POLAND (September 27th, 1933)
SUDAN (April 13th, 1932 *a*)
SPAIN (August 2nd, 1933)
SWITZERLAND (February 16th, 1933)
TURKEY (May 28th, 1934)
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
AUSTRIA (*a*)
BELGIUM
CANADA
AUSTRALIA
NEW ZEALAND
INDIA
COLOMBIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GREECE
ROUMANIA

The Convention is open to Accession by :

AFGHANISTAN
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
CHILE
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SWEDEN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] This Convention came into force on January 16th, 1935, in accordance with its Article 17.

XXXIV. MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

GENERAL CONVENTION TO IMPROVE THE MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by t*
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
Nicaragua (April 1st, 1935 *a*)	AUSTRIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)	BELGIUM	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PERU (March 29th, 1932)	BULGARIA	SA'UDI ARABIA
	COLOMBIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	AUSTRALIA
	DENMARK	BOLIVIA
	FRANCE	BRAZIL
	Ratification cannot take place until it has been possible for the Government of the Republic to ascertain that the regulations provided for in Article 4, and which must be elaborated in order to enter into force at the same time as the Convention, ensure the guarantees of control which are deemed necessary by the French Government.	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
	GERMANY	CANADA
	GREECE	CHILE
	LITHUANIA	CHINA
	LUXEMBURG	COSTA RICA
	PANAMA	CUBA
	This signature does not affect in any way the provisions of the treaties of conciliation and arbitration concluded up to this date by the Republic of Panama with other Powers.	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	PORTUGAL	ECUADOR
	SIAM	EGYPT
	SPAIN	ESTONIA
	SWEDEN	ETHIOPIA
	SWITZERLAND	FINLAND
	URUGUAY	GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		HUNGARY
		INDIA
		IRAN
		IRAQ
		IRISH FREE STATE
		ITALY
		JAPAN
		LATVIA
		LIBERIA
		MEXICO
		NEW ZEALAND
		PARAGUAY
		POLAND
		ROUMANIA
		SALVADOR
		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		VENEZUELA
		YUGOSLAVIA

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States have been deposited (Article 13, § 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will then enter into force as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 14, § 1).

XXXV. — SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM-SMOKING.

AGREEMENT.[1]

(Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 3rd, 1933)	INDIA Subject to the understanding that this Agreement does not apply at present to the territory known as the Shan States and that it applies, so far as India is concerned, only to the Province of Burma, excluding the Shan States.
FRANCE (May 10th, 1933)	JAPAN
THE NETHERLANDS (May 22nd, 1933)	
PORTUGAL (January 27th, 1934)	
Siam (November 19th, 1934) With a reservation to Article I.	

XXXVI. WHEAT.

FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE OF WHEAT EXPORTING AND IMPORTING COUNTRIES, WITH APPENDICES AND MINUTES OF FINAL MEETING. [2]

(London, August 25th, 1933.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.	*Signatures* ad referendum.	*This Act is open to signature by :*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	IRISH FREE STATE [3]	All States with the exception of those mentioned in the preceding columns.
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC		
AUSTRALIA		
AUSTRIA		
BELGIUM		
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND		
BULGARIA		
CANADA		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA [4]		
FRANCE		
GERMANY		
GREECE		
HUNGARY		
ITALY		
POLAND		
ROUMANIA		
SPAIN		
SWEDEN		
SWITZERLAND		
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS		
YUGOSLAVIA		

---

[1] The Agreement shall not come into force until it has been ratified by all the High Contracting Parties. The date of its coming into force shall be the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of the last ratification. (Article VI.)

[2] Came into force August 25th, 1933.

The signatures are to be regarded as affixed in the light of the statements made during the discussions by the representatives of the various countries; these statements are contained in the Minutes of the Conference, and are to be interpreted in the sense of paragraph IV of Article 6 of the Final Act.

[3] The Government of the Irish Free State has informed the Secretariat that it regrets not to be in a position to accept this Act which it had signed *ad referendum*.

[4] The Czechoslovak Government informed the Secretariat that it is unable to take a decision as regards its signature given *ad referendum* before September 22nd, 1933. The Czechoslovak Government further informed the Secretariat, on September 21st, 1933, of its acceptance of the Act, calling attention at the same time to the declaration made by the Czechoslovak delegate at the Wheat Conference, by which the Czechoslovak Government reserved the right to make further reservations on approval of its signature, and added that it agrees to the reduction of Customs duties, provided that such reduction shall not affect the maintenance of remunerative prices for home-grown cereals. A decision regarding the remunerative level of prices can only be taken with due consideration of the conditions prevailing in Czechoslovakia.

XXXVII. FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (August 26th, 1935)
With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

BULGARIA (July 10th, 1934 *a*)

Chile (March 20th, 1935)
With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

Denmark (July 10th, 1935)
In conformity with paragraph 1 of Article XX of the Convention, Denmark does not assume any obligation as regards Greenland.

India (October 17th, 1934)
Under the terms of Article XX of the Convention, this signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of the Convention in the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

Iran (April 12th, 1935 *a*)

IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)

Italy (November 21st, 1934)

Monaco (September 11th, 1934)

Norway (June 26th, 1935)

Roumania (June 19th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX.

SWITZERLAND (April 20th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Under the terms of Article XX of this Convention, the Government of the United States of America assume no obligation in respect of the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Island of Guam.

BELGIUM
The Belgian Government reserve the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending their market against invasion by films of foreign origin.
The Belgian Government declare that they do not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.

EGYPT

FINLAND

FRANCE
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX, and declaring that the signature of the Convention shall be effective only as regards the home territory of France.

GREECE

HUNGARY
With reservation, for the Hungarian Government, of the right provided in Article IX to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

LATVIA

NICARAGUA

PANAMA

POLAND
Subject to the reservation, provided for in Article IX, of the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

SWEDEN

URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAQ
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] This Convention came into force on January 15th, 1935, in accordance with its Article XVIII.

XXXVIII. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN.

2. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935*a*)
Bulgaria (December 19th, 1934)
Chile (March 20th, 1935)
Czechoslovakia (July 27th, 1935)
Hungary (August 12th, 1935)
Iran (April 12th, 1935 *a*)
Norway (June 26th, 1935)
Roumania (June 6th, 1935)
Sudan (June 13th, 1934 *a*)
Sweden (June 25th, 1934)
Switzerland (July 17th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification

Albania
Austria
Belgium
With reservation as regards Article 10.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.
Australia
Union of South Africa
China
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)
France
Germany
Greece
Latvia
Lithuania
Monaco
The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)
Panama
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Yugoslavia

The Convention is open to Accession by:

United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Egypt
Ecuador
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iraq
Irish Free State
Iceland
Italy
Japan
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Luxemburg
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
San Marino
Siam
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

[1] The Convention came into force on August 24th, 1934, in accordance with its Article 8.

XXXIX. REFUGEES.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

Bulgaria (December 19th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. Article 1. — The Bulgarian Government maintains the reservations made by the Bulgarian delegate on signing the Arrangement of June 30th, 1928[2], concerning the extension to other categories of refugees of certain measures taken in favour of Russian and Armenian refugees.

II. Article 2. — The departure from the country of refugees in possession of Nansen certificates (passports) shall be governed by the general regulations in force in this respect. Bulgarian consuls will be empowered in cases of *force majeure* to extend Nansen certificates issued in Bulgaria for a period of three months. The cost of visas for Nansen certificates shall be fixed in accordance with the tariff applicable to the nationals of the country by which the certificate was issued.

III. Article 6. — Exemption from *cautio judicatum solvi* shall be at the discretion of the courts in each individual case.

IV. Article 7. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept points *(a)* and *(d)*.

V. Articles 8 and 10 (formerly 7 and 9). — Disability and old-age pensions shall be paid (regard being had to the possibilities of the fund concerned) to the persons entitled, their heirs and assigns, provided always that such persons are resident in the country.

VI. Article 13. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept the first paragraph, as refugees resident in Bulgaria are subject to the same treatment in fiscal matters as other foreign nationals resident in the country.

VII. Article 15. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept paragraphs 2 and 3.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification

BELGIUM

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 2, paragraph 3, relating to the right conferred on consuls to extend Nansen certificates, cannot be accepted by the Belgian Government;

(2) Article 9, in so far as it concerns the application of the provisions of the domestic legislation relating to "unemployment insurance", cannot be accepted;

(3) Article 10, concerning social insurance laws, cannot be favourably received;

(4) Article 14, which concerns the enjoyment of the rights and favours accorded to foreigners, subject to reciprocity, cannot be admitted;

(5) The Belgian Government in accepting the present Convention is not assuming any obligation as regards the colony of the Congo or the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

EGYPT

Article 1:

Apart from such modifications or amplifications as each Contracting Party may introduce in this definition, my Government reserves the right to extend or limit the said definition in any way.

Article 2:

Bearers of Nansen certificates may not be admitted into Egypt unless the said certificates contain a visa for return to the countries by which they were issued. If these refugees are authorised to sojourn in Egypt, the competent local authorities reserve the right to issue to them Egyptian travel papers.

Article 3:

These authorities reserve the right to expel such refugees at any moment for reasons of public security.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
DENMARK
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
MONACO
NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY

---

[1] This Convention came into force on June 13th, 1935, in accordance with its Article 20.
[2] This reservation was worded as follows:

"On the understanding that the present Arrangement applies only to such refugees as are at the present date on Bulgarian territory."

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Czechoslovakia (May 14th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the following reservations:

"A. The Czechoslovak Government will regard as refugees within the meaning of Article 1 only such persons as formerly actually possessed Russian or Turkish nationality, lost it before January 1st, 1923, and have not acquired any other nationality.

"B. The accession of the Czechoslovak Republic does not apply to:

"(*a*) Paragraph 3 of Article 2, whereby consuls are qualified to extend Nansen certificates;

"(*b*) Paragraph 3 of Article 3, so far as it limits the power of the national authorities to expel persons who constitute a danger to the safety of the State and public order; nor, of course, do the provisions of Article 3 in any way affect expulsions by order of the courts, or obligations deriving from extradition treaties or from the Czechoslovak laws regarding the extradition of aliens;

"(*c*) The whole of Article 7, which exempts refugees from the application of the provisions of laws and decrees for the protection of the national labour market;

"(*d*) The whole of Article 14, which waives the condition of reciprocity;

"(*e*) The whole of Article 15, which deals with the creation of local committees.

"C. Articles 4 and 5, dealing with the juridical condition of refugees, and Articles 8, 9, 10 and 11, dealing with industrial accidents and welfare and relief, will be applied in Czechoslovakia only so far as the laws of the country permit."

Norway (June 26th, 1935)

With reservation as regards the provisions of Article 2, para. 3, and Article 14.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Article 4:

Moreover, as regards the acquired rights referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the draft Convention, it should be stipulated that in order to ensure respect for such rights due account must be taken of international public order and of internal public order as the latter is conceived and applied in Egyptian law. Further, in order to dispel any misunderstanding, it should be stipulated that the rights in question are only those relating to personal status.

Article 13:

This article must not in any case invalidate or impair our reservation relating to Egyptian travel papers together with the consequences involved in the application of that reservation.

Article 14:

Our signature does not apply to this article.

Article 15:

The Egyptian Government wishes it to be understood that the committees referred to in Article 15 will not be invested with the powers laid down in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said article in the event of its desiring to reserve the said powers for the representatives of the local authority.

* * *

The Egyptian Government reserves the right to substitute, should the case arise, and whenever it may think fit, assimilation to nationals, for the most favourable treatment granted to nationals of a foreign country, in all the provisions of the Convention in which such treatment is stipulated.

FRANCE

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 7 shall not preclude the application of the laws and regulations fixing the proportion of wage-earning foreigners that employers are authorised to employ in France;

(2) The organisation, in France, of committees such as are provided for in Article 15 shall not, if it takes place, confer on them powers incompatible with the existing laws in the matter of finding employment;

(3) The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Convention, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

XL. VETERINARY QUESTIONS.

I. International Convention for the Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals, with Declaration attached.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force

Ratifications	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Signature by:*
	Austria	Afghanistan
	Bulgaria	Union of South Africa
	Czechoslovakia	Albania
	France	United States of America
	Italy	Argentine Republic
	Latvia	Australia
	Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Belgium
	Poland	Bolivia
	Roumania	Brazil
	Switzerland	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Canada
		Chile
		China
		Colombia
		Cuba
		Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Greece
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Spain
		Sweden
		Turkey
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions have been received (Article 13, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will come into force on that date (Article 14, paragraph 1).

2. International Convention concerning the Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin, with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Signature by:*
	Austria	Afghanistan
	Bulgaria	Union of South Africa
	Czechoslovakia	Albania
	The Czechoslovak Government does not consider that it can waive the right to make the transit of animals across its territory subject to a previous authorisation. It intends, in practice, to exercise the right so reserved in as liberal a spirit as possible, in conformity with the principles which are at the basis of the present Convention, the object of which is to facilitate the transit of animals and of animal products.	United States of America
		Argentine Republic
		Australia
		Belgium
		Bolivia
		Brazil
		Great Britain and Northern Ireland
		Canada
		Chile
		China
		Colombia
		Cuba
		Free City of Danzig
	France	Denmark
	Italy	Dominican Republic
	Latvia	Ecuador
	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Egypt
	Poland	Estonia
	Roumania	Ethiopia
	Switzerland	Finland
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Germany
		Greece
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Spain
		Sweden
		Turkey
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the conditions laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 18 and in paragraph 3 of Article 19 have been received (Article 20, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 20. It will come into force on that date (Article 21, paragraph 1).

3. International Convention concerning the Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products), with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Signature by:*
	Austria	Afghanistan
	Bulgaria	Union of South Africa
	Czechoslovakia	Albania
	France	United States of America
	Italy	Argentine Republic
	Latvia	Australia
	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Belgium
	Poland	Bolivia
	Roumania	Brazil
	Switzerland	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Canada
		Chile
		China
		Colombia
		Cuba
		Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Greece
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Spain
		Sweden
		Turkey
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

---

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the condition laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 12 and in paragraph 3 of Article 13 have been received (Article 14, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 14. It will come into force on that date (Article 15, paragraph 1).

XLI. — INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS.[1]

(*a*)

1. Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA [2]	June 12th, 1924
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM	September 6th, 1926
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
Canada	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	September 20th, 1934
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
FRANCE [3]	June 2nd, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
ITALY [4]	October 6th, 1924
LATVIA [5]	August 15th, 1925
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN [6]	February 22nd, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

2. Convention concerning unemployment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	February 20th, 1924
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BELGIUM [7]	August 25th, 1930
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
DENMARK	October 13th, 1921
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FINLAND	October 19th, 1921
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning: The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of White Phosphorus in the Manufacture of Matches, Berne, September 26th, 1906.

[2] "As regards Austria, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified by those European Members of the International Labour Organisation which are of the chief industrial importance (Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy) and by all the States, bordering upon Austria, with whom the latter has economic relations (Yugoslavia, Poland, Switzerland, the Czechoslovak Republic and Hungary) . . . ".

[3] This ratification is subject to the condition that the obligations it entails for France shall not take effect until the Convention has been ratified by Germany and Great Britain.

[4] Subject to the condition that it shall only come into force when the ratifications, without reservations or other conditions, of the following Members of the International Labour Organisation have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations: Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Switzerland.

[5] "The Convention shall come into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Draft Convention, after the ratifications of three of the Powers which are of the chief industrial importance, as laid down in Article 393, paragraphs 5 and 6, of the Treaty of Peace of Versailles, shall have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations."

[6] The reservation by which Spain made its ratification subject to the ratification of Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy was withdrawn on October 1st, 1931.

[7] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	February 6th, 1932
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

3. Convention concerning the employment of women before and after childbirth, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 29th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
GERMANY	October 31st, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	June 3th, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

4. Convention concerning the employment of women during the night, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	November 1st, 1921
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1*]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FRANCE	May 14th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	September 4th, 1922
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] *Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.*

[*] *As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.*

[2] *This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.*

5. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
JAPAN	August 7th, 1926
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	July 21st, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

6. Convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 17th, 1924
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

(*b*)

7. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to employment at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
Australia [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	July 14th, 1932
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 26th, 1925
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	May 8th, 1922
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

8. Convention concerning unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
Australia [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
GREAT BRITAIN	March 12th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FRANCE	March 21st, 1929
GERMANY	March 4th, 1930
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA [3]	August 29th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
Sweden	January 1st, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] Latvia had ratified this Convention on August 5th, 1926, subject to the following reservation: "The Convention shall enter into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of this Convention, when the States which are of chief importance in maritime commerce shall have sent their ratifications for registration by the Secretariat of the League of Nations." By an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on August 29th, 1930, this reservation was withdrawn.

9. Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 10th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA	August 3rd, 1925
BELGIUM [1]	February 4th, 1925
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 7th, 1922
FRANCE	January 25th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

(c)

10. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to employment in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 16th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	June 13th, 1928
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
Cuba	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
HUNGARY	February 2nd, 1927
IRISH FREE STATE	May 26th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	December 19th, 1923
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

11. Convention concerning the rights of association and combination of agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Austria	June 12th, 1924
Belgium [1]	July 19th, 1926
Great Britain	August 6th, 1923
Bulgaria	March 6th, 1925
Chile	September 15th, 1925
China	April 27th, 1934
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 22nd, 1935
Czechoslovakia	August 31st, 1923
Denmark [2]	June 20th, 1930
Estonia	September 8th, 1922
Finland	June 19th, 1923
France	March 23rd, 1929
Germany	June 6th, 1925
India	May 11th, 1923
Irish Free State	June 17th, 1924
Italy	September 8th, 1924
Latvia	September 9th, 1924
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Norway	June 11th, 1929
The Netherlands	August 20th, 1926
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Poland	June 21st, 1924
Roumania	November 10th, 1930
Spain	August 29th, 1932
Sweden	November 27th, 1923
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Yugoslavia	September 30th, 1929

12. Convention concerning workmen's compensation in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Belgium [1*]	October 26th, 1932
Great Britain	August 6th, 1923
Bulgaria	March 6th, 1925
Chile	September 15th, 1925
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 22nd, 1935
Denmark	February 26th, 1923
Estonia	September 8th, 1922
France	April 4th, 1928
Germany	June 6th, 1925
Italy [3]	September 1st, 1930
Irish Free State	June 17th, 1924
Latvia	November 29th, 1929
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
The Netherlands	August 20th, 1926
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Poland	June 21st, 1924
Spain	October 1st, 1931
Sweden	November 27th, 1923
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.
[1*] As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation as been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.
[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.
[3] This ratification does not apply to Italian colonies and possessions.

13. Convention concerning the use of white lead in painting, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 19th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND [2]	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE	February 19th, 1929
GREECE	December 22nd, 1926
HUNGARY [3]	January 4th, 1928
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	December 4th, 1925
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	April 28th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

14. Convention concerning the application of the weekly rest in industrial undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 17th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
Canada	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA [4]	May 17th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
ESTONIA	November 29th, 1923
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	September 3rd, 1926
GREECE	May 11th, 1929
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRISH FREE STATE	July 22nd, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
Switzerland [5]	January 16th, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

---

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] Effective as from October 1st, 1929.

[3] The Convention shall not come into force as regards Hungary until it has been ratified by France, Great Britain and Germany.

[4] Article I of the Chinese " Amended Factory Laws " promulgated on December 30th, 1932, provides that " this Act shall apply to all factories using machines driven by motor-power and regularly employing thirty workers or more."

[5] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from September 1st, 1934.

15. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers or stokers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Australia [1]	June 28th, 1935
Belgium [2]	July 19th, 1926
Great Britain	March 8th, 1926
Bulgaria	March 6th, 1925
Canada	March 31st, 1926
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	July 7th, 1928
Denmark	May 12th, 1924
Estonia	September 8th, 1922
Finland	October 10th, 1925
France	January 16th, 1928
Germany	June 11th, 1929
Greece	June 14th, 1930
Hungary	March 1st, 1928
India	November 20th, 1922
Irish Free State	June 5th, 1930
Italy	September 8th, 1924
Japan [3]	December 4th, 1930
Latvia	September 9th, 1924
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
The Netherlands	June 17th, 1931
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Norway	October 7th, 1927
Poland	June 21st, 1924
Roumania	August 18th, 1923
Spain	June 20th, 1924
Sweden	July 14th, 1925
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Yugoslavia	April 1st, 1927

16. Convention concerning the compulsory medical examination of children and young persons employed at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Australia [1]	June 28th, 1935
Belgium [2]	July 19th, 1926
Great Britain	March 8th, 1926
Bulgaria	March 6th, 1925
Canada	March 31st, 1926
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	July 7th, 1928
Estonia	September 8th, 1922
Finland	October 10th, 1925
France	March 22nd, 1928
Germany	June 11th, 1929
Greece	June 28th, 1930
Hungary	March 1st, 1928
India	November 20th, 1922
Irish Free State	July 5th, 1930
Italy	September 8th, 1924
Japan	June 7th, 1924
Latvia	September 9th, 1924
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
The Netherlands	March 9th, 1928
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Poland	June 21st, 1924
Roumania	August 18th, 1923
Spain	June 20th, 1924
Sweden	July 14th, 1925
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Yugoslavia	April 1st, 1927

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung or the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

(*d*)

17. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]*	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	May 29th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929
SPAIN	February 22nd, 1929
SWEDEN	September 8th, 1926
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

18. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	September 29th, 1928
BELGIUM [1]*	October 3rd, 1927
GREAT BRITAIN	October 6th, 1926
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	September 19th, 1932
DENMARK	June 18th, 1934
FINLAND	September 17th, 1927
FRANCE	August 13th, 1931
GERMANY	September 18th, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA [3]	September 30th, 1927
IRISH FREE STATE	November 25th, 1927
ITALY [4]	January 22nd, 1934
JAPAN [5]	October 8th, 1928
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	November 1st, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	October 15th, 1929
SWITZERLAND	November 16th, 1927
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

---

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] Subject to subsequent decisions as regards the application of the Convention to the Italian Colonies and Possessions.

[5] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

19. Convention concerning equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 5th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Union of South Africa	March 30th, 1926
Austria	September 29th, 1928
Belgium [1]	October 3rd, 1927
Great Britain	October 6th, 1926
Bulgaria	September 5th, 1929
Chile	October 8th, 1931
China	April 27th, 1934
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 6th, 1928
Czechoslovakia	February 8th, 1927
Denmark [2]	March 31st, 1928
Finland	September 17th, 1927
France	April 4th, 1928
Estonia	April 14th, 1930
Germany	September 18th, 1928
Hungary	April 19th, 1928
India [3]	September 30th, 1927
Irish Free State	July 5th, 1930
Italy	March 15th, 1928
Japan [4]	October 8th, 1928
Latvia	May 29th, 1928
Lithuania	September 28th, 1934
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	May 12th, 1934
The Netherlands	September 13th, 1927
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Norway	June 11th, 1929
Poland	February 28th, 1928
Portugal [5]	March 27th, 1929
Spain	February 22nd, 1929
Sweden	September 8th, 1926
Switzerland	February 1st, 1929
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Yugoslavia	April 1st, 1927

20. Convention concerning night work in bakeries, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 8th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Bulgaria	September 5th, 1929
Chile	May 31st, 1933
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 6th, 1928
Estonia	December 23rd, 1929
Finland	May 26th, 1928
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Spain	August 29th, 1932
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933

(*e*)

21. Convention concerning the simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighth Session on June 5th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Albania	March 17th, 1932
Australia	April 18th, 1931
Austria	December 29th, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[5] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	February 15th, 1928
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	September 16th, 1927
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	May 25th, 1928
FINLAND	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE [3]	January 13th, 1932
HUNGARY	February 3rd, 1931
INDIA	January 14th, 1928
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
JAPAN [4]	October 8th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SWEDEN [5]	October 15th, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*f*)

22. Convention concerning seamen's articles of agreement, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 24th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Australia [6]	April 1st, 1935
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	May 10th, 1929
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	September 20th, 1930
INDIA	October 31st, 1932
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

23. Convention concerning the repatriation of seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 23rd, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	July 9th, 1928
FRANCE	March 4th, 1929
GERMANY	March 14th, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] As regards Great Britain and Northern Ireland, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by France, Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Norway and Spain.

[3] The ratification of this Convention will only take effect as regards France from the date on which the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall have registered the ratifications without reservation of Poland, Spain and Italy.

[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[5] As regards Sweden, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by Denmark, Finland and Norway.

[6] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[7] This ratification applies also to the Italian colonies.

(*g*)

24. Convention concerning sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 18th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 28th, 1929
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

25. Convention concerning sickness insurance for agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 18th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*h*)

26. Convention concerning the creation of minimum-wage-fixing machinery, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eleventh Session on June 16th, 1928.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	December 28th, 1932
AUSTRALIA	March 9th, 1931
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
Bulgaria	June 4th, 1935
Canada	April 25th, 1935
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	May 5th, 1930
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
FRANCE	September 18th, 1930
GERMANY	May 30th, 1929
HUNGARY	July 30th, 1932
ITALY	September 9th, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	June 3rd, 1930
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 7th, 1933
SPAIN	April 8th, 1930
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*i*)

27. Convention concerning the marking of the weight on heavy packages transported by vessels, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session, on June 21st, 1929.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA[1]	February 21st, 1933
AUSTRALIA[2]	March 9th, 1931
Austria	August 16th, 1935
BELGIUM[3]	June 6th, 1934
Bulgaria	June 4th, 1935
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	June 24th, 1931
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	March 26th, 1934
DENMARK[4]	January 18th, 1933
ESTONIA	January 18th, 1932
FINLAND[5]	August 8th, 1932
France	July 29th, 1935
GERMANY	July 5th, 1933
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
INDIA	September 7th, 1931
ITALY	July 18th, 1933
JAPAN[6]	March 16th, 1931
Lithuania	September 28th, 1934
LUXEMBURG	April 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	January 4th, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
POLAND	June 18th, 1932
PORTUGAL[7]	March 1st, 1932
ROUMANIA	December 7th, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	April 11th, 1932
Switzerland[8]	November 8th, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	December 17th, 1932
YUGOSLAVIA	April 22nd, 1933

28. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session, on June 21st, 1929.[9]

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 1st, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN[10]	August 29th, 1932

---

[1] The ratification by the Union of South Africa shall not take effect unless and until the ratifications of Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy have been registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in terms of Article 406 of the Treaty of Versailles.

[2] The Convention applies to the Territory Nauru.

[3] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[4] This ratification does not include Greenland.

The Danish Government makes the entry into force of the Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being also ratified by Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy and The Netherlands.

[5] This Convention shall be put into force in Finland as from January 1st, 1933.

[6] This ratification includes Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[7] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

[8] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from October 1st, 1934.

[9] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1932 involves, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirement of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 21 of the present Convention. The present Convention has ceased to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1932 (October 30th, 1934). It remains, nevertheless, in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

[10] This Convention is denounced as regards Spain as from October 30th, 1934, date of the coming into force of the revising Convention of 1932, Spain having ratified the latter Convention on July 28th, 1934.

(*f*)

29. Convention concerning forced or compulsory labour, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [1]	January 2nd, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	June 3rd, 1931
BULGARIA	September 22nd, 1932
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
DENMARK	February 11th, 1932
IRISH FREE STATE	March 2nd, 1931
ITALY	June 18th, 1934
JAPAN [3]	November 21st, 1932
LIBERIA	May 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS [4]	March 31st, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
YUGOSLAVIA	March 4th, 1933

---

[1] This ratification applies also to the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and to the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland is accompanied with a Declaration, as provided for in Article 26 of the Convention, that the provisions of the Convention shall be applied without modification to the following Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under mandate:

Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Ashanti
  (*c*) Northern Territories
  (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
  Antigua
  Dominica
  Montserrat
  St. Christopher and Nevis
  Virgin Islands
Malay States:
  (*a*) Federated Malay States:
    Negri Sembilan
    Pahang
    Perak
    Selangor
  (*b*) Unfederated Malay States:
    Johore
    Kedah
    Kelantan
    Perlis
    Trengganu
    Brunei
Malta
Mauritius
Nigeria:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Protectorate
  (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine
St. Helena and Ascension
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
South Africa High Commission, Territories of the:
  Basutoland
  Bechuanaland Protectorate
  Swaziland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Trans-Jordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Western Pacific, Islands of:
  British Solomon Islands Protectorate
  Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
  Tonga
Windward Islands:
  Grenada
  St. Lucia
  St. Vincent
Zanzibar Protectorate

The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland applies also to: Newfoundland, November 13th, 1931, and to Southern Rhodesia, March 20th, 1933.

[3] This ratification applies also to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[4] I. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention integrally in the Kingdom in Europe, in Surinam and in Curaçao;

II. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention to the Netherlands Indies with the following modifications:

(*a*) Article 3 will not be applied; nevertheless, the competent central authorities will be responsible for the employment of forced or compulsory labour;

(*b*) Article 4 will not be applied to services rendered to owners by persons living in the so-called " particuliere landerijen " in the Island of Java.

30. Convention concerning the regulation of hours of work in commerce and offices, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA [1]	February 16th, 1933
BULGARIA	June 22nd, 1932
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*k*)

31. Convention limiting hours of work in coal-mines, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fifteenth Session, on June 18th, 1931.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932

(*l*)

32. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (revised 1932), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 27th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	January 10th, 1935
ITALY	October 30th, 1933
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
SPAIN	July 28th, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

33. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to non-industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 30th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [2]	June 6th, 1934
The Netherlands	July 12th, 1935
SPAIN	June 22nd, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*m*)

34. Convention concerning fee-charging employment agencies, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Spain	April 27th, 1935

---

[1] The ratification by Austria shall only become effective from the date on which the Secretary-General shall have registered the ratification of Germany.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

35. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

36. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

37. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

38. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

39. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

40. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

(n)

41. Convention concerning employment of women during the night (revised 1934), adopted as Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 19th, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Union of South Africa	May 28th, 1935

42. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases (revised 1934), adopted as Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Hungary	June 17th, 1935
Norway	May 21st, 1935

43. Convention for the regulation of hours of work in automatic sheet-glass works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Norway	May 21st, 1935

44. Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily unemployed, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 23rd, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

(o)

45. Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

46. Convention limiting hours of work in coal mines (revised 1935), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

47. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work to forty a week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

48. Convention concerning the establishment of an international scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

49. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in glass-bottle works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 25th, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

XLII. AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOUR PART OF THE TREATIES OF PEACE.

(a) Amendment to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles and to the Corresponding Articles of the Other Treaties of Peace.

(Adopted at the Fourth Session of the International Labour Conference, Geneva, November 2nd, 1922.[1])

In Force.

Has been ratified by	*Has been ratified by*
Albania (November 26th, 1924)	Italy (July 19th, 1932)
Argentine Republic (June 4th, 1934)	Latvia (March 16th, 1925)
Austria (October 9th, 1924)	Lithuania (May 25th, 1928)
Belgium (October 29th, 1924)	Luxemburg (April 5th, 1928)
Bulgaria (March 6th, 1925)	The Netherlands (August 14th, 1924)
Chile (August 23rd, 1928)	Panama (April 18th, 1934)
Czechoslovakia (September 30th, 1924)	Peru (July 6th, 1931)
Denmark (June 20th, 1924)	Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
Estonia (April 12th, 1926)	Roumania (July 19th, 1923)
Finland (March 25th, 1924)	Salvador (May 4th, 1928)
Germany (June 6th, 1925)	Spain (July 5th, 1924)
Guatemala (July 6th, 1932)	Sweden (May 15th, 1924)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)	Switzerland (November 1st, 1924)
Hungary (May 14th, 1925)	Uruguay (April 28th, 1928)
Iran (August 14th, 1928)	Venezuela (August 11th, 1931)
Irish Free State (June 26th, 1925)	

(b) Protocol relative to this Amendment opened for Signature at Geneva on June 14th, 1923.

Signatures	*Ratifications*	*Signatures*	*Ratifications*
Union of South Africa	Union of South Africa (October 20th, 1923)	India	India (October 20th, 1923)
Australia	Australia (October 20th, 1923)	Japan	Japan (May 11th, 1925)
		Mexico	Mexico (May 12th, 1934)
British Empire	British Empire (October 20th, 1923)	New Zealand	New Zealand (October 20th, 1923)
Canada	Canada (October 20th, 1923)	Norway	Norway (April 8th, 1924)
China	China (June 3rd, 1926)	Paraguay	—
Cuba	Cuba (September 7th, 1925)	Poland	Poland (February 10th, 1925)
France	France (June 2nd, 1925)	Siam	Siam (March 18th, 1924)
Greece	Greece (June 8th, 1927)	Yugoslavia	Yugoslavia (March 11th, 1927)

[1] The amendment entered into force on June 4th, 1934, in accordance with the provisions of Article 422 of the Treaty of Versailles and of the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 17.** 1935. V.

Geneva, September 10th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Results of the Fifth Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL.
1935. V. 4.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

Under the Assembly's resolution of October 3rd, 1930, it is the duty of the Secretary-General:

(a) *(Point I of the resolution)*

Annually to ask those Members of the League and non-member States which, having signed a Convention concluded under the League's auspices, have not ratified it within one year from the date at which it ceased to be open for signature, to inform him of their intentions with regard to ratification; and

(b) *(Point II of the resolution)*

At such intervals as he considers suitable, to ask those Members of the League which have neither signed nor acceded to Conventions concluded under the League's auspices within five years from the date at which they became open for signature to inform him of their views with regard to those Conventions.

In the present year, the Secretary-General has taken action under both points of the above-mentioned resolution. As regards Point I, it was only necessary to ask the Governments whether they had anything to add to the statements already made by them, as this part of the resolution has not, since last year, become applicable to any new Convention.

* * *

The present document contains the replies received this year by the Secretary-General to these two enquiries.

This document is in continuation of documents A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V and A.13.1934.V, which contain the results of the preceding enquiries made by the Secretary-General.

Part I.

(Point I of the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.)

RATIFICATION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND NON-MEMBER STATES OF CONVENTIONS SIGNED BY THEM BUT NOT RATIFIED WITHIN ONE YEAR FROM THE EXPIRY OF THE TIME-LIMIT FOR SIGNING SUCH CONVENTIONS.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON FREEDOM OF TRANSIT.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V and A.13.1934.V :

Bolivia, Guatemala, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Portugal.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V and A.13.1934.V :

Belgium, Bolivia, Estonia, Guatemala, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Spain.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, Colombia.

S. d. N. 1.050 (F.) 715 (A.) 9/35. Imp. Réunies, Chambéry.

ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1933.V :

Belgium, Peru, Portugal, Spain.

DECLARATION RECOGNISING THE RIGHT TO A FLAG OF STATES HAVING NO SEA-COAST.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Uruguay.

This Declaration was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Bolivia, Guatemala, Iran, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Portugal.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Costa Rica, Panama, Peru.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF, AND TRAFFIC IN, OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Japan.

This Convention has now been submitted for consideration by H.M. the Emperor's Privy Council with a view to its ratification (letter of August 19th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Costa Rica, Lithuania, Peru,
France, Panama, Salvador.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Haiti, Honduras.

PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES.[1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Uruguay.

This Protocol was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

India.

This Protocol was signed on behalf of India on April 9th, 1935. The question of ratification is under consideration (letter of July 8th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Bolivia, Latvia, Nicaragua, Peru,
Chile, Lithuania, Panama, Salvador.
Free City of Danzig,

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Paraguay.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL RELATING THERETO.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Chile.

After careful consideration, the Government of Chile has decided not to ratify this Convention (letter of February 12th, 1935).

---

[1] As this Protocol is still open for signature, the communication prescribed in the Assembly's resolution was sent to all the States which had signed before January 1st, 1934.

Japan.

The Japanese Government had taken preparatory measures for the ratification of this Convention. In view of the commercial policy recently pursued by most countries in the world, however, it has decided, for the moment, to postpone this ratification (letter of August 19th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.25.1932.V :

Lithuania, Portugal, Spain.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Paraguay.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Chile.

The Government of Chile, after carefully considering this Convention, has decided not to ratify it for various reasons, one of which is the fact that the Governments of Argentina, Bolivia and Peru are not contracting parties to the Convention and are the only countries with which Chile is connected by international railways (letter of February 12th, 1935).

Finland.

The Finnish Government has decided to submit this Convention again to the competent authorities for their opinion as to the possibility of putting it into force in Finland (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Panama, Portugal, Salvador.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, Colombia.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF MARITIME PORTS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Chile, Lithuania, Panama, Salvador, Spain.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE TRANSMISSION IN TRANSIT OF ELECTRIC POWER, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Chile.

After carefully considering this Convention, the Government of Chile has come to the conclusion that it is unable to ratify it, the Convention being contrary to the provisions of the Chilian legislation regarding this matter (letter of December 17th, 1934).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.25.1932.V. :

Belgium, France, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE STATE, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Chile.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has carefully considered this Convention and has come to the conclusion that, in view of the geographical situation of Chile, the provisions of the Convention are of no interest for this country (letter of December 13th, 1934).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.25.1932.V :

Belgium, Italy, Poland,
France, Lithuania, Yugoslavia.

INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION. ADOPTED BY THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Albania, Iran, Nicaragua.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Argentine Republic.

CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United States of America.

This Convention was ratified by the United States of America on June 21st, 1935, " subject to the reservation that the said Convention shall not come into force so far as the United States of America is concerned until it shall have come into force in respect to Belgium, the British Empire, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ". The instrument of ratification will shortly be forwarded to the American Ambassador at Paris for deposit with the Government of the French Republic, subject to the aforesaid reservation (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Finland.

With regard to this Convention, the Finnish Government sees no reason to make any change in the attitude of strict reserve which it has always adopted towards any project for regulating only the trade in these products without introducing a similar control of the corresponding industry (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.25.1932.V.

Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, Norway, Roumania, Salvador, Switzerland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia, Siam.

DECLARATION REGARDING THE TERRITORY OF IFNI.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Declaration (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Bulgaria.

This Declaration is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Finland.

(See reply regarding the above Convention.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.25.1932.V ;

Austria, Belgium, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, India, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxemburg, Roumania, Salvador, Switzerland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia.

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS AND OTHER GASES AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United States of America.

There has been no change in the situation regarding this Protocol, with respect to the United States of America, since the last report to the Secretariat (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Protocol (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Protocol was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Czechoslovakia, Japan, Luxemburg, Nicaragua, Salvador.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia.

CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

As Finnish ships very seldom navigate the inland waterways of other countries, and foreign ships equally seldom visit those of Finland, the Convention in question would be of very little practical importance to Finland. It would, moreover, entail considerable changes in existing Finnish legislation. For the moment at least, therefore, the Finnish Government does not consider it expedient to ratify the Convention (letter of July 8th, 1935).

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Albania, Colombia, Iran, Panama.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Lithuania.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Guatemala, Nicaragua, Portugal,
Latvia, Peru, Spain.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia.

CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Bolivia, Free City of Danzig, Nicaragua, Peru.

---

[1] As this Convention is still open for signature, the communication prescribed in the Assembly's resolution was sent to all States which had signed before January 1st, 1934.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF HIDES AND SKINS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Bulgaria.

This Agreement is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.30.1931.V:

Turkey.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF BONES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Bulgaria.

This Agreement is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.30.1931.V:

Turkey.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Finland.

The Finnish Government contemplates seeking the sanction of the House of Representatives for the ratification of this Convention. The Government proposal to the House of Representatives on the subject is in preparation (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Japan.

The Japanese Government, after thorough examination of the Convention by the authorities concerned, has decided not to ratify it (letter of August 19th, 1935).

Latvia.

The ratification of this Convention in the near future is contemplated (letter of July 13th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V:

Belgium, Estonia, Hungary, Yugoslavia.
Free City of Danzig, Germany, Luxemburg,

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY, AND PROTOCOL

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

United States of America.

There has been no change in the situation regarding this Convention, with respect to the United States of America, since the last report to the Secretariat (letter of June 26th, 1935).

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention was adopted by the Chamber of Deputies and is now pending before the Senate (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Japan.

The entry into force of this Convention in Japan must be preceded by certain amendments to national laws. These amendments will form part of the general revision of the Japanese criminal code which is at present being carried out by the Japanese Government. In these circumstances, the Japanese Government will not be able to ratify the Convention until after the entry into force of the new criminal code in question (letter of August 19th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V:

Albania, India, Panama,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Italy, Roumania,
Luxemburg, Switzerland.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

China.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.[1]

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.17.1933.V:

Free City of Danzig, Hungary, Switzerland.

---

[1] As this Agreement is still open for signature, the communication prescribed in the Assembly's resolution was sent to all the States which had signed before January 1st, 1934.

CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

The ratification of this Convention would necessitate the passing of legislation which the Union Government do not, at present, propose to introduce (letter of June 12th, 1935).

Australia.

A Bill for the implementation of the provisions of Chapter III of the Convention was introduced in the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia during the last Parliament, but lapsed with prorogation. A second and similar Bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on November 29th, 1934, and was in the second reading stage when Parliament went into recess on April 11th, 1935. This Bill will probably be proceeded with in due course, and when it has been passed, ratification of the Convention will be effected (letter of May 2nd, 1935).

Belgium.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention will be placed before the Chambers in the near future (letter of May 9th, 1935).

Japan.

The Japanese Government intends to ratify this Convention. As, however, the entry into force of the Convention must be preceded by certain amendments to national laws, the Government proposes to ratify it after these amendments have been made, and this has not yet been done (letter of August 19th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

A Bill was placed before the States-General on June 13th, 1935 (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria,	**Denmark,**	**Iceland,**	**Luxemburg,**
Chile,	**France,**	**India,**	**Mexico,**
Cuba,	**Germany,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Peru,**
Czechoslovakia,	**Greece,**	**Italy,**	**Portugal,**
Free City of Danzig,	**Hungary,**	**Latvia,**	**Switzerland.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia,	**Estonia,**	**Spain,**
Egypt,	**Salvador,**	**Yugoslavia.**

PROTOCOL RELATING TO MILITARY OBLIGATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES OF DOUBLE NATIONALITY.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill for the approval of this Protocol will be placed before the Chambers in the near future (letter of May 9th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

A Bill was placed before the States-General on June 13th, 1935 (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Protocol was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Irish Free State, Luxemburg, Mexico, Peru, Portugal.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Egypt, Salvador, Spain.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have decided to ratify this Protocol and the necessary steps to that end are now being taken (letter of June 12th, 1935).

Japan.

The Japanese Government intends to ratify this Protocol. As, however, the entry into force of the Convention concerning nationality must be preceded by certain amendments to national laws, the Government proposes to ratify it after these amendments have been made, and this has not yet been done (letter of August 19th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

A Bill was placed before the States-General on June 13th, 1935 (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Protocol was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V:

Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Free City of Danzig, Denmark, France, Greece, Irish Free State, Latvia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Peru, Portugal.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Colombia, Egypt, Estonia, Spain.

SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have decided to ratify this Protocol and the necessary steps to that end are now being taken (letter of June 12th, 1935).

Belgium.

A Bill for the approval of this Protocol will be placed before the Chambers in the near future (letter of May 9th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Protocol was submitted to Parliament for consideration; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V:

Austria, Canada, Cuba, Greece, Irish Free State, Luxemburg, Mexico, Peru, Portugal.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Colombia, Egypt, Salvador, Spain.

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention and of the Protocol was adopted by the Senate and is now pending before the Chamber of Deputies (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The national law on this Convention has already been approved by Parliament. As soon as it has received the sanction of the Senate, the Convention will be legalised and ratified probably before the end of the current year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1933.V:

Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Poland.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Colombia, Spain, Turkey,

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention and of the Protocol was adopted by the Senate and is now pending before the Chamber of Deputies (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The national law on this Convention has already been approved by Parliament. As soon as it has received the sanction of the Senate, the Convention will be legalised and ratified probably before the end of the current year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1933.V:

Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Poland.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Brazil.

The National Congress will be invited to take a decision as regards this Convention (letter of March 27th, 1935).

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention and of the Protocol was adopted by the Senate and is now pending before the Chamber of Deputies (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The national law on this Convention has already been approved by Parliament. As soon as it has received the sanction of the Senate, the Convention will be legalised and ratified probably before the end of the current year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1933.V :

Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Poland.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Australia.

The Commonwealth of Australia does not at present see its way to proceed with the ratification of this Convention (letter of May 2nd, 1935).

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

The position regarding this Convention is the same as last year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Sweden.

The Swedish Government, for the reasons previously given, does not contemplate ratifying this Convention at the present time (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The Royal Government maintains the view it has already expressed in the notes previously addressed to the Secretariat of the League of Nations on this subject (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Spain.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Irish Free State, Italy, Latvia, Peru.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

The Finnish Government contemplates ratifying this Agreement, and is accordingly preparing a request to the House of Representatives for the supplementary credits required for putting it into force (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Sweden.

The Swedish Government, for the reasons previously given, does not contemplate ratifying this Agreement at the present time (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The Marine Department of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia is gradually, as funds permit, converting the beacons and signals in order to bring them into line with the provisions of the Agreement in question, which will be legalised and ratified shortly (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Union of South Africa, Estonia, Germany.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Cuba.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT AT THEIR STATIONS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Estonia, Germany.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Cuba.

CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic has not yet completed the Bill regulating the Conditions of Inland Navigation from the point of view of Private Law. The ratification of this Convention is subject to the adoption of this Bill (letter of June 19th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

A Bill was placed before the States-General on November 16th, 1934 (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Switzerland.

Certain unexpected difficulties have prevented the competent authorities to complete the " Message " to Parliament regarding this Convention. These authorities are hoping, however, that the Convention can be submitted to the Legislative Council during the course of the present year (letter of April 6th, 1934).

Yugoslavia.

The Inland Waterways Department of the Royal Ministry of Communications has accomplished the preliminary work for the legalisation of this Convention. The text is now under consideration by the Royal Ministry of Justice, which will take, so far as it is within its province, the necessary steps to put this Convention into effect and to supplement the existing national laws and bring them into line with the provisions of this Convention. As soon as the joint work of the aforesaid Department and the Ministry of Justice is completed, the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs will submit this Convention to Parliament for approval, after which it will be ratified (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria, Belgium, Free City of Danzig, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Roumania.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *IN REM* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic has not yet completed the Bill regulating the Conditions of Inland Navigation from the point of view of Private Law. The ratification of this Convention is subject to the adoption of this Bill (letter of June 19th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

A Bill was placed before the States-General on November 16th, 1934 (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Switzerland.

Certain unexpected difficulties have prevented the competent authorities to complete the " Message " to Parliament regarding this Convention. These authorities are hoping, however, that the Convention can be submitted to the Legislative Council during the course of the present year (letter of April 6th, 1934).

Yugoslavia.

The Inland Waterways Department of the Royal Ministry of Communications has accomplished the preliminary work for the legalisation of this Convention. The text is now under consideration by the Royal Ministry of Justice, which will take, so far as it is within its province, the necessary steps to put this Convention into effect and to supplement the existing national laws and bring them into line with the provisions of this Convention. As soon as the joint work of the aforesaid Department and the Ministry of Justice is completed, the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs will submit this Convention to Parliament for approval, after which it will be ratified (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria, Belgium, Free City of Danzig, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic has not yet completed the Bill regulating the Conditions of Inland Navigation from the point of view of Private Law. The ratification of this Convention is subject to the adoption of this Bill (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The Inland Waterways Department of the Royal Ministry of Communications has accomplished the preliminary work for the legalisation of this Convention. The text is now under consideration by the Royal Ministry of Justice, which will take, so far as it is within its province, the necessary steps to put this Convention into effect and to supplement the existing national laws and bring them into line with the provisions of this Convention. As soon as the joint work of the aforesaid Department and the Ministry of Justice is completed, the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs will submit this Convention to Parliament for approval, after which it will be ratified (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Belgium, France, Hungary, Poland.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention has already been approved by the Chamber of Representatives and is now before the Senate (letter of May 9th, 1935).

Czechoslovakia.

It has not yet been possible to ratify this Convention, because the work connected with the new Czechoslovak Bill on Cheques has not yet been completed (letter of June 19th, 1935).

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention and of the Protocol was adopted by the Senate and is now pending before the Chamber of Deputies (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The national law on this Convention has already been approved by Parliament. As soon as it has received the sanction of the Senate, the Convention will be legalised and ratified probably before the end of the current year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria, Ecuador, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention has already been approved by the Chamber of Representatives and is now before the Senate (letter of May 9th, 1935).

Czechoslovakia.

It has not yet been possible to ratify this Convention, because the work connected with the new Czechoslovak Bill on Cheques has not yet been completed (letter of June 19th, 1935).

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention and of the Protocol was adopted by the Senate and is now pending before the Chamber of Deputies (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The national law on this Convention has already been approved by Parliament. As soon as it has received the sanction of the Senate, the Convention will be legalised and ratified probably before the end of the current year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria, Ecuador, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention has already been approved by the Chamber of Representatives and is now before the Senate (letter of May 9th, 1935).

Czechoslovakia.

(See the reply given regarding the two preceding Conventions.)

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention and of the Protocol was adopted by the Senate and is now pending before the Chamber of Deputies (letter of June 19th, 1935).

Yugoslavia.

The national law on this Convention has already been approved by Parliament. As soon as it has received the sanction of the Senate, the Convention will be legalised and ratified probably before the end of the current year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Austria, Ecuador, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Yugoslavia.

The Royal Ministry of Public Works has now completed all the operations entailed by the provisions of this Convention, and all the international signs have been placed in position on the public highways ; the Convention will accordingly be legalised and ratified very shortly (letter of June 26th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Free City of Danzig, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Turkey.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON THE TAXATION OF FOREIGN MOTOR VEHICLES, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRY AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.17.1933.V:

Czechoslovakia, **Free City of Danzig.**

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Turkey.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Yugoslavia.

The Royal Government maintains the view it has already expressed in the notes previously addressed to the Secretariat of the League of Nations on this subject (letter of June 26th, 1935).

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY, WITH CHARTER AND STATUTES.

(Geneva, May 21st, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Finland.

The Finnish Government's present opinion is that this Convention cannot be ratified until the participation of certain other States in which economic conditions are similar is assured (letter of July 8th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

The position regarding this Convention is the same as last year (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Sweden.

The Swedish Government, for the reasons previously given, does not contemplate ratifying this Convention at the present time (letter of June 8th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V:

Belgium,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
Czechoslovakia,
Denmark,
Estonia,
France,
Germany,
Hungary,
Lithuania,
Portugal,
Spain.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Liberia.

The Senate of the Republic ratified this Convention on December 15th, 1934, and the instrument of ratification shall be forwarded to the Secretariat (letter of January 16th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Bolivia, Denmark.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Sa'udi Arabia, Argentine Republic, Ethiopia, Luxemburg, Paraguay.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Australia.

The Commonwealth Government has been in consultation with the State Governments so far as the control of whaling within territorial waters is concerned, and it is proposed that a Bill for giving effect to the provisions of the Convention so far as the matter comes within the powers of the Commonwealth will be introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament as soon as possible. It is hoped that the Commonwealth will be able subsequently to ratify this Convention (letter of May 2nd, 1935).

Austria.

The Federal Government has decided to ratify this Convention and the instrument of ratification relating thereto will be deposited with the Secretariat in the near future (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Finland.

The Finnish Government is contemplating ratifying this Convention and has already put the necessary technical preparations in hand (letter of July 8th, 1935).

India.

As stated in the letter of May 3rd, 1935, it will be impossible to deposit the instrument of ratification until certain legislation to give effect to the Convention in India has been passed. It has not yet been found possible to pass this legislation, and the Government of India regret that they cannot at present indicate when it will be possible (letter of July 8th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRY AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.13.1934.V :

Albania, Belgium, Greece, Roumania.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Canada, Colombia, Germany, New Zealand.

GENERAL CONVENTION TO IMPROVE THE MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Sweden.

The Swedish Government, for the reasons previously given, does not contemplate ratifying this Convention at the present time (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Albania,	**Denmark,**	**Greece,**	**Portugal,**
Belgium,	**France,**	**Lithuania,**	**Spain,**
Czechoslovakia,	**Germany,**	**Panama,**	**Switzerland.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, Colombia, Luxemburg, Siam.

SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM-SMOKING. AGREEMENT.

(Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

India.

This Agreement will be ratified if and when the assent of the Burma Legislature is obtained to the requisite legislation (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Japan.

The Japanese Government is now taking the necessary steps with a view to ratifying this Agreement (letter of August 19th, 1935).

Part II.

(*Point II of the Assembly Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.*)

SIGNATURE OR ACCESSION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN THE CASE OF CONVENTIONS WHICH THEY HAVE NOT SIGNED OR TO WHICH THEY HAVE NOT ACCEDED WITHIN A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE ON WHICH THE CONVENTIONS BECAME OPEN FOR SIGNATURE.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The position of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to its accession to this Convention is unaltered. The accession of the Soviet Government to this Convention is therefore not contemplated at the present time (letter of July 7th, 1935).

Venezuela.

The considerations which have prevented the Government of Venezuela from acceding to this Convention are based on the fact that the political constitution, in enumerating the guarantees which it accords to citizens, contains the following provision : " Personal freedom and hence . . . *(b)* slavery is permanently proscribed, and slaves setting foot on the soil of the Republic shall be free ", and on the fact that forced labour does not exist in Venezuela outside the penitentiaries. Further, in view of its geographical position and of the fact that it is bordered by countries in which slavery is also prohibited, the Republic offers no possibility of slave traffic (letter of June 25th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Chile, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Luxemburg, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Siam.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government regret that they are unable to vary their previous decision not to become a party to this Convention (letter of June 24th, 1935).

Australia.

The Commonwealth Government does not see its way at present to accede to this Convention (letter of May 2nd, 1935).

Austria.

Considerations of a financial order prevent at present the accession of Austria to this Convention (letter of May 10th, 1935).

Denmark.

The Danish Government does not consider that it can, under the present circumstances, accede to this Convention (letter of July 15th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Canada, Colombia, Germany, New Zealand.

GENERAL CONVENTION TO IMPROVE THE MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

This Convention is now being examined by the competent authorities with a view to its ratification (letter of June 4th, 1935).

Sweden.

The Swedish Government, for the reasons previously given, does not contemplate ratifying this Convention at the present time (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to ratify it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Albania,	**Denmark,**	**Greece,**	**Portugal,**
Belgium,	**France,**	**Lithuania,**	**Spain,**
Czechoslovakia,	**Germany,**	**Panama,**	**Switzerland.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, Colombia, Luxemburg, Siam.

SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM-SMOKING. AGREEMENT.

(Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

India.

This Agreement will be ratified if and when the assent of the Burma Legislature is obtained to the requisite legislation (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Japan.

The Japanese Government is now taking the necessary steps with a view to ratifying this Agreement (letter of August 19th, 1935).

Part II.

(*Point II of the Assembly Resolution of October 3rd*, 1930.)

SIGNATURE OR ACCESSION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN THE CASE OF CONVENTIONS WHICH THEY HAVE NOT SIGNED OR TO WHICH THEY HAVE NOT ACCEDED WITHIN A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE ON WHICH THE CONVENTIONS BECAME OPEN FOR SIGNATURE.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The position of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to its accession to this Convention is unaltered. The accession of the Soviet Government to this Convention is therefore not contemplated at the present time (letter of July 7th, 1935).

Venezuela.

The considerations which have prevented the Government of Venezuela from acceding to this Convention are based on the fact that the political constitution, in enumerating the guarantees which it accords to citizens, contains the following provision : " Personal freedom and hence . . . *(b)* slavery is permanently proscribed, and slaves setting foot on the soil of the Republic shall be free ", and on the fact that forced labour does not exist in Venezuela outside the penitentiaries. Further, in view of its geographical position and of the fact that it is bordered by countries in which slavery is also prohibited, the Republic offers no possibility of slave traffic (letter of June 25th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Afghanistan,	**Chile,**	**Japan,**	**Peru,**
Argentine Republic,	**Guatemala,**	**Luxemburg,**	**Salvador,**
Bolivia,	**Honduras,**	**Paraguay,**	**Siam.**

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government regret that they are unable to vary their previous decision not to become a party to this Convention (letter of June 24th, 1935).

Australia.

The Commonwealth Government does not see its way at present to accede to this Convention (letter of May 2nd, 1935).

Austria.

Considerations of a financial order prevent at present the accession of Austria to this Convention (letter of May 10th, 1935).

Denmark.

The Danish Government does not consider that it can, under the present circumstances, accede to this Convention (letter of July 15th, 1935).

Estonia.

It is only owing to budgetary questions that the accession of Estonia to this Convention has been postponed (letter of September 3rd, 1935).

Irish Free State.

The Government of the Irish Free State, after careful reconsideration, are at present unable to hold out any prospect of their accession to this Convention (letter of April 25th, 1935).

The Netherlands.

The Government of the Netherlands does not contemplate acceding to this Convention. The Government is of opinion that the advantages resulting from the conclusion of this Convention are not sufficient to justify, at a time when strict economy is essential, the financial obligations it involves for the High Contracting Parties (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Norway.

The Norwegian Government regrets that, owing to the financial situation, it does not consider it possible to ask the Storting to vote the measures necessary for the accession of Norway to this Convention (letter of April 15th, 1935).

Panama.

This Convention will be submitted for the approbation of the National Assembly with a view to accession (letter of April 22nd, 1935).

Sweden.

The accession of Sweden to this Convention is not contemplated at present (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The position of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to its accession to this Convention is unaltered. The accession of the Soviet Government to this Convention is therefore not contemplated at the present time (letter of July 7th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan,	**Chile,**	**Honduras,**	**Mexico,**
Argentine Republic,	**Dominican Republic,**	**Japan,**	**Paraguay,**
Bolivia,	**Ethiopia,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Canada,	**Haiti,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam.**

CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Latvia.

The accession to this Convention necessitates certain amendments of the Latvian legislation. The accession is, however, contemplated and the preliminary work connected therewith is already in course (letter of July 13th, 1935).

Norway.

The laws in force in Norway prevent the accession of Norway to this Convention. The Norwegian Government is, however, considering the question of proposing a modification of the law on this subject (letter of April 15th, 1935).

Panama.

Instructions will be given in due course to the representative of the Republic of Panama to the League of Nations to sign this Convention, which will then be submitted to the National Assembly for ratification (letter of April 22nd, 1935).

Poland.

The Polish Government does not intend to accede to this Convention (letter of May 1st, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to accede to it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Chile, Iraq, Japan, Lithuania, Paraguay, Salvador.

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES. GENERAL ACT.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

The arrangements to which the Union is a party are considered to provide adequate means for the settlement of international disputes. The Union Government do not, therefore, intend to accede to the General Act (letter of June 24th, 1935).

Austria.

The Austrian Government considers it necessary to postpone examination of its possible accession to this Act, pending the result of the negotiations now taking place between the interested States with a view to reinforcing security in the Danube Basin (letter of May 10th, 1935).

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic has decided, in principle, to accede to this Act. As to the date of its accession, however, the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic desires to choose the time which will seem to it most appropriate, in view of the fact that this matter entails for Czechoslovakia a question of a practical nature entirely independent from the principle of the General Act (letter of May 15th, 1935).

Ecuador.

If the Government of Ecuador has not yet acceded to this Act, this delay is due to the somewhat complicated procedure instituted by the Constitution of the Republic for the ratification of such instruments. These necessitate the preliminary examination of the Senate, whose considerable amount of work causes very often these questions to be discussed and settled with some delay (letter of April 29th, 1935).

Hungary.

Hungary is unable, at the present time, to accede to this Act (letter of July 11th, 1935).

Latvia.

It is contemplated to accede to this Act in the near future (letter of July 13th, 1935).

Panama.

This Act will be submitted for the approbation of the National Assembly with a view to accession (letter of April 22nd, 1935).

Poland.

The Polish Government does not intend to accede to this Act (letter of May 1st, 1935).

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The position of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to its accession to this Act is unaltered. The accession of the Soviet Government to this Act is therefore not contemplated at the present time (letter of July 7th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Act was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to accede to it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

Venezuela.

Although the Government of Venezuela has not yet acceded to this Act, it has taken it as a model in arbitration treaties recently concluded by it with several countries. Accession to this Act is only a question of time, and it will in all probability be laid before the Legislative Chambers at their sessions next year (letter of June 25th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan,	**Colombia,**	**Iran,**	**Paraguay,**
Albania,	**Cuba,**	**Iraq,**	**Portugal,**
Argentine Republic,	**Dominican Republic,**	**Japan,**	**Roumania,**
Bolivia,	**Germany,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Bulgaria,	**Guatemala,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Chile,	**Haiti,**	**Mexico,**	**Yugoslavia.**
China,	**Honduras,**	**Nicaragua,**	

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United States of America.

This Convention is under consideration and will probably be laid before the President within a short time for transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to adherence (letter of June 26th, 1935).

Ecuador.

If the Government of Ecuador has not yet acceded to this Convention, this delay is due to the somewhat complicated procedure instituted by the Constitution of the Republic for the ratification of such instruments. These necessitate the preliminary examination of the Senate, whose considerable amount of work causes very often these questions to be discussed and settled with some delay (letter of April 29th, 1935).

Panama.

This Convention will be submitted for the approbation of the National Assembly with a view to accession (letter of April 22nd, 1935).

Turkey.

The Government of the Turkish Republic was unable to sign the Convention at the time, as the reservations which were presented by its delegation were not accepted by the Conference. The Government of the Republic desires, however, to study the question again and to consider whether it would now be in a position to accede to this Convention (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The position of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to its accession to this Convention is unaltered. The accession of the Soviet Government to this Convention is therefore not contemplated at the present time (letter of July 7th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to accede to it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

Venezuela.

This Convention is at present being examined by the competent services. The Government's accession to it is only a matter of time, and the Convention will in all probability be submitted to the Legislative Chambers at their sessions next year (letter of June 25th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan, Albania, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Lithuania, Mexico, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Siam, Spain.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

After careful reconsideration of the matter, the conclusion has been reached that, owing to certain difficulties which prevent the Union Government from ratifying and becoming a party to the above-mentioned Convention, as stated in a letter of July 27th, 1929, the Union Government are not yet in a position to accede to the Convention or to the Protocol.

The question how these difficulties can be met will in the near future be discussed; and as soon as they have been overcome, the Union Government will reconsider the matter of acceding to the Convention (letter of June 24th, 1935).

Australia.

This Convention is still under consideration, and the Commonwealth Government hopes to be able to advise the Secretariat about it at an early date (letter of May 2nd, 1935).

Ecuador.

If the Government of Ecuador has not yet acceded to this Convention, this delay is due to the somewhat complicated procedure instituted by the Constitution of the Republic for the ratification of such instruments. These necessitate the preliminary examination of the Senate, whose considerable amount of work causes very often these questions to be discussed and settled with some delay (letter of April 29th, 1935).

Finland.

The Finnish Government is considering the question of acceding to this Convention. The necessary technical arrangements to this effect will probably be completed during the course of this year (letter of July 8th, 1935).

Latvia.

The competent authorities have declared themselves in favour of accession to this Convention. It is presumed that the formalities shall be accomplished in the near future (letter of July 13th, 1935).

Mexico.

The Mexican Government has approved Mexico's accession to this Convention and the instrument of accession will shortly be forwarded in order to be deposited with the Secretariat by the Mexican representative accredited to the League of Nations (letter of March 27th, 1935).

Sweden.

The question of the possible accession of Sweden to this Convention is at present under consideration by the competent Swedish authorities (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Turkey.

The Government of the Turkish Republic intends to accede to this Convention and to the Protocol relating thereto in the near future. The delay in acceding is only due to the accomplishment of the necessary legislative formalities in order to render the national Turkish legislation to conform with the provisions of the Convention. These formalities have just been completed (letter of June 8th, 1935).

Uruguay.

This Convention was submitted to Parliament for consideration ; it is now being examined by the competent technical authorities, and the Government of Uruguay intends to accede to it as soon as the necessary legislative approval has been received (letter of May 14th, 1935).

Venezuela.

This Convention is at present being examined by the competent services. The Government's accession to it is only a matter of time, and the Convention will in all probability be submitted to the Legislative Chambers at their sessions next year (letter of June 25th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Lithuania, New Zealand Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Siam.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

This Agreement will shortly be submitted to the Government for approval and for decision with regard to the signature to be affixed (letter of May 15th, 1935).

Estonia.

The Estonian Government was in favour of acceding to this Agreement, but, for reasons of a purely practical character, it has thought it preferable to wait for the accessions of Latvia and Sweden, as these two countries would be crossed by the majority of people leaving Estonia for European or overseas countries.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is however of opinion that the reconsideration of this point of view seems at present possible, and it will inform the Secretariat as soon as the question of the accession of Estonia to the Agreement is favourably settled (letter of September 3rd, 1935).

Irish Free State.

The attitude of the Government of the Irish Free State in regard to this Agreement is conditioned by the consideration that, as emigrants in transit do not pass through the Irish Free State, and as the number of emigrants from the Irish Free State passing in transit through other countries is thought to be negligible, the Agreement could only have a very limited, if any, application in respect of the Irish Free State. The Government of the Irish Free State are, however, submitting the question of the signature of this Agreement to a further examination (letter of April 25th, 1935).

Latvia.

The Latvian Government does not consider it expedient to accede to this Agreement, in view of the objections to which its contents have given rise on the part of the competent authorities (letter of July 13th, 1935).

Norway.

The Norwegian Government, being of opinion that this Agreement does not contain any improvement to the present conditions, does not consider that it can accede to it (letter of April 15th, 1935).

Sweden.

The accession of Sweden to this Agreement is not contemplated at present (letter of June 8th, 1935).

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Bulgaria, Denmark, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Portugal, Yugoslavia.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 19.** 1935. V.

Geneva, August 30th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF WOMEN

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S ORGANISATIONS

CONTENTS.

Page

Note by the Secretary-General 2

Statements from:

International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship 2

Annex: Women's Suffrage 9

World's Young Women's Christian Association 10

Annexes:

1. Opinion of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations (United Kingdom) 12
2. Extract from Report presented by the Delegates of the British Labour Party to the Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International at its Meeting on January 11th and 12th, 1930 . . . 12
3. Opinion of the National Women's Trade Union League of America . 12

Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality 15

Annex: Classified List of Sources 28

Joint Standing Committee of Women's International Organisations 32
International Co-operative Women's Guild 33
International Federation of Business and Professional Women 35
International Federation of University Women 38

Annex: Resolution adopted by the Council of the Federation 40

Open Door International 41

Annex: Examples of International Conventions and of National Laws . . 44

St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance 47
Union internationale des Ligues féminines catholiques 48

S. d. N. 1.230 (F.) 1.200 (A.). 9/35. Imp. du J. de G.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935. V. 5.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

On January 14th, 1935, the Council approved a proposal of the Secretary-General to the effect that, in view of the fact that the questions of the nationality and of the status of women had been placed on the agenda of the Assembly, the Secretariat should be authorised to circulate to the Assembly " statements from the women's international organisations, or any committee of representatives of those organisations, setting out their views and desiderata on either of the above subjects ".

In view of the number and length of the statements received, the Secretary-General has felt unable to reproduce in the present document separate statements from organisations whose views are also expressed in the joint statement presented by the " Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality ". Such separate statements were received from the Equal Rights International and the International Council of Women. They have been filed in the archives of the Secretariat.

The Secretary-General has also felt himself precluded by the terms of the Council's resolution and the practice of the League from including statements from national associations. Such a statement, opposing as ineffective and dangerous to the real interests of women a treaty by which States would bind themselves to accord " equal rights " to men and women, and in general any attempt to deal with the status of women by a single general legislative formula, and asking for preliminary enquiry into so-called discriminations between the sexes, was received from the National League of Women Voters of the United States of America. The National Consumers' League (U.S.A.) has submitted a statement opposing the so-called "equal rights" treaty, on the ground that it endangers protective labour legislation for women.

INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF WOMEN FOR SUFFRAGE AND EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THE LAW OF THE NATIONALITY OF WOMEN SHOULD BE BASED.

The International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship is composed of national auxiliaries in thirty-nine countries and numbers among its members millions of women who belong to all races, classes, creeds and political parties. Since 1917, it has been working systematically and continuously, both internationally and through its national auxiliaries, to secure for the married woman under the laws of every state her own independent nationality and the same right as a man to retain or to change her nationality.

The following are the principles on which the law of the nationality of women should be based :

A. *Independent Nationality of the Married Woman.*

In matters of nationality, the married woman should not be treated as dependent on her husband, but should be recognised as an independent person, and to this end legislation should be based on the following principles :

(*a*) That the nationality of a woman should not be changed by reason only of marriage, or a change during marriage in the nationality of her husband;

(*b*) That the right of a woman to retain her nationality or to change it by naturalisation, denationalisation or denaturalisation shall not be denied or abridged because she is a married woman, and

(*c*) That the nationality of a married woman shall not be changed without her consent, except under conditions which would cause a change in the nationality of a man without his consent.

Under legislation based on these principles, a husband and wife would, in some cases, be of different nationalities and, in others, of the same nationality. But in no case would they be compelled to be of the same nationality, since each would have an independent nationality in his or her own person.

B. *Special Facilities for One Spouse to acquire the Nationality of the Other.*

It often happens that a man who marries a wife of a nationality different from his own wishes to and does take by naturalisation the nationality of his wife, and many States give him facilities for doing so. And where a woman has a similar choice, as she already has in some States, she may take her husband's nationality by naturalisation. In this connection, it is desirable in national laws :

(*d*) That special facilities should be given for one spouse to take the nationality of the other.

C. *Derivation of Nationality equally from Both Parents.*

Nationality at birth is in general derived from the place of birth (*jus soli*) and/or from the father, or, in a few cases, from the mother (*jus sanguinis*). It is not desirable that the nationality of the father should be treated as of greater importance than that of the mother. National laws should provide :

(*e*) That the nationality of the mother should be transmitted to a child under the same conditions as that of the father.

Under such a provision, the child of parents of two different nationalities derives at birth, under *jus sanguinis*, both the nationality of its father and that of its mother. It has double nationality with its advantages and disadvantages, just as does a child which at birth takes both its father's nationality and that of the place where it is born.

D. *Equal Nationality Conditions for Both Sexes.*

Already the universal rule is (there are no exceptions, so far as we are aware) that the unmarried woman has independent nationality in her own person on the same terms as a man. But a complete statement of the principles essential in legislation for the woman, both married and unmarried, must include :

(*f*) That there shall be no distinction based on sex.

Present Position, National and International.

A. *Present National Position: Reforms adopted between* 1917 *and* 1935.

(a) *The Married Woman's Personal Independent Nationality.* — In 1917, apart from some of the South-American Republics, the nationality of a married woman as a general rule followed that of her husband. It had not always been so. These South-American Republics had retained an old rule that a woman kept her own nationality after marriage with a foreigner. This old rule had formerly been in force in a number of countries of Europe and of European civilisation, but they had changed it during the nineteenth or in the beginning of the twentieth century.

The nineteen years between 1917 and 1935 have seen a revolution in the application of the rule that the nationality of a married woman follows that of her husband. And, in 1935, this rule can no longer be properly described as general. To-day States comprising almost half the population of the world permit a woman national with a foreign husband to retain her own nationality after marriage : in some cases, she does so automatically, in others, subject to her making an application to retain it or a declaration of her intention to retain it. These States include the Argentine, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Belgium, Colombia, Guatemala, Irish Free State, Panama, Ecuador, Luxemburg, Albania, China, Cuba, Estonia, Liberia, Roumania, Spain, Turkey and Yugoslavia. The first fourteen of these States go further in the direction of recognising the independent personal nationality of the married woman in that none of them confers its nationality on a foreign woman who marries one of its nationals, except with her consent. China does not confer its nationality on the foreign woman who marries a Chinese national unless she loses her own nationality by such marriage. The first seven of these States put the married woman in the same position as a man as regards her nationality. Then too, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden do not deprive a woman national of her nationality when she marries a foreigner when she continues to reside or is domiciled in her own country. A French woman keeps her nationality on marriage with a foreigner unless either on her own initiative she acquires her husband's or if her first matrimonial domicile is outside France and her husband's State automatically confers his nationality upon her. French nationality is not conferred upon a foreign woman who marries a Frenchman unless she has either (*a*) lost her own nationality or (*b*) applies for naturalisation.

(b) *Special Facilities for One Spouse to acquire the Nationality of the Other.* — The desirability of giving facilities to a husband to acquire the nationality of his wife has been recognised in some countries where the law is equal between husband and wife, such as the Argentine ; in some where the married woman's independent nationality is partly recognised, as in China and France, and, in some in which the wife's nationality follows that of her husband, such as Italy and Japan. These five countries reduce the number of years required for naturalisation of a foreign man who marries a woman national.

The most significant change in the direction of giving special facilities for one spouse to acquire the nationality of the other was made in the United States of America in 1934, when the law was made equal as between husband and wife. The United States Act provides

(*a*) that, except in time of war, a man or woman citizen on marriage with a foreigner may renounce his or her citizenship, and (*b*) that the time of residence in the United States before naturalisation is reduced from five years to three in the case of a foreign man or woman married to a United States citizen.

(c) *Derivation of Nationality from Father and Mother on the Same Terms.* — In cases where nationality is dependent on the place of birth (*jus soli*), the question of equality of derivation of nationality from father and mother does not arise. And in States in which nationality is derived both from the place of birth and from a parent, the question of equality arises only in the case of children born outside the country. States which to-day provide in their law for transmission of nationality on the same terms from a mother as from a father include the Argentine, Chile, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America and Uruguay.

(d) *Equality of Conditions as between Men and Women together with the Independent Nationality of the Married Woman.* — The countries where the married woman has independent nationality and where there is no distinction based on sex, either with respect to her nationality or the derivation of nationality from a parent, include the Argentine, Chile, Paraguay, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America and Uruguay.

B. *Present International Position: Three International Conventions open for Ratification.*

Any international consideration of the question of the nationality of women involves the consideration of whether it is or is not desirable for States to ratify one or more of the three international Conventions dealing with the matter, or whether a new convention is needed. These three international Conventions which are now open for ratification either by all States or by the American Republics included in the Pan-American Union are : (1) the Hague Nationality Convention 1930, (2) the Nationality Convention adopted at Montevideo in 1933 and (3) the Nationality of Women Convention adopted at Montevideo in 1933.

(a) *The Hague Convention* 1930. — The Hague Nationality Convention of 1930 contains four articles (8, 9, 10 and 11) specially dealing with the married woman.

Under Article 8, many women are enabled to retain their own nationality on marriage with a foreigner. But the article is designed, not to recognise the right of the woman to her own nationality, but to prevent statelessness. While it prevents a woman from losing her nationality on marriage with a foreigner when she does not acquire her husband's nationality, it does not give her the right to retain her nationality on marriage with a foreigner whose nationality she thereby acquires. It makes her nationality depend, not on herself, but on her husband's nationality or the law of his country.

It is only Article 10 that recognises the independent nationality of the married woman and only in the particular case of a husband who changes his nationality during marriage.

Articles 8, 9 and 11 are applicable as between two States, one of which in general deprives a woman national of her nationality when she marries a foreigner and the other of which imposes its nationality automatically on a foreign woman who marries one of its nationals. A State which ratifies the Convention therefore recognises the dependence of a woman's nationality on her husband's as an accepted principle of the law of nationality.

The first chapter of the Convention deals with general principles. By Article 1, each State is allowed to determine who are its own nationals, and other States are to recognise this so far as is consistent with " the principles of law generally recognised with regard to nationality ", one of which is the principle of the dependence of the wife's nationality on her husband's. Then, by Article 4, a State may not afford diplomatic protection to one of its nationals against a State whose nationality such person also possesses, and, by Article 5, within a third State, a person with double nationality may in certain cases be treated by that third State as of either of these nationalities. The woman who has kept her own nationality and also had her husband's imposed upon her has double nationality. If her own State has ratified the Convention, it has waived its right to give her protection as its national against her husband's State, and in certain cases even against a third State. Only in very rare cases does marriage give a man double nationality, so that men are not affected by ratification of the Convention in the same way as women.

A woman to whom the Convention applies who has kept her own nationality and also by marriage automatically acquired her husband's may find herself when abroad in her husband's country, or even in a third country, deprived of the privileges belonging to her own nationality and without redress, because her own State, by ratifying the Convention, has waived its right to protect her in some particular difficulty in which she may find herself. Ratification of this Convention is therefore against the interests of women.

(b) *The Montevideo Nationality Convention*, 1933. — Two separate Conventions dealing with women were adopted by the States represented at the Pan-American Conference at Montevideo in 1933. The Nationality Convention also dealt with other aspects of nationality, but contained the following article :

> " *Article VI.* — Neither matrimony nor its dissolution affects the nationality of the husband, or wife or of their children."

The Convention therefore lays down one of the essential principles—namely, that the married woman shall have independent nationality in her own person unaffected by her marriage. The fact that this Article VI appears in one of the Conventions signed by the States present at the Montevideo Conference is important as indicating that these States are in favour of recognising the independent personal nationality of the married woman.

(c) *The Montevideo Nationality of Women Convention* 1933. — The second Convention dealing with the nationality of women adopted at Montevideo is that referred to in the agenda of the Assembly. In addition to the formal articles about ratification, etc., it contains one effective article as follows :

> " There will be no distinction based on sex as regards nationality in their legislation or in their practice."

This article so far as it applies to the nationality of the married woman lays down only one of the two essential principles. It provides that there shall be equality between the sexes, but it fails to provide that that equality shall be on the basis of the independent nationality of the married woman. If does not provide as does the other Montevideo Nationality Convention of 1933 that matrimony shall not affect nationality. It is possible for a State under this Convention to base its law on both these principles of equality and independent nationality for husband and wife, but it is not required to do so. This has been done, for example, by Chile and the United States of America, which have both ratified. But it is also possible under the Convention to leave the married woman without her own independent nationality. For example, if, in a State in which the domicile of the married woman follows that of her husband, nationality were made to depend on domicile, this would be legal equality, but, in fact, the woman's nationality would follow her husband's : equality *de jure* but not equality *de facto*. To take another example in which under the Convention there would be equality but not independent nationality for either husband or wife : under it legislation might make it compulsory for husband and wife to take the same nationality, that of either the husband or the wife, to be agreed upon at marriage. Such a law is equal for both but denies independent nationality to both. It does not give to either a real choice of nationality. For one, at least, it is a choice between nationality and marriage. The ratification of this Convention, therefore, is not a step in the right direction, for it does not ensure improvement in the position of the married woman.

C. *Summary of the Indications of a Growing Acceptance of the Principle of the Independent Nationality of the Married Woman*, 1917-1935.

We have given above [1] a list of States (which may not be complete) which have recognised to a greater or less extent the independent nationality of the married woman. Some of the South-American States there named had never made marriage the deciding factor in a married woman's nationality. The other States there named, between 1917 and 1935, have adopted legislation to make the nationality of the married woman wholly or partly independent of marriage. These are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Belgium, Irish Free State, Luxemburg, Albania, China, Cuba, Estonia, Liberia, Roumania, Spain, Turkey, Yugoslavia and France, and, subject to conditions as to residence or domicile, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

It is to be noted too that many of these States, including the most populous, not only permit a woman national to keep her own nationality after marriage with a foreigner, but also do not, without her consent, confer their nationality on a foreign woman who marries one of their nationals.

While the Hague Codification Conference in 1930 did not incorporate in its Nationality Convention the principle of the independent nationality of the married woman, it did foreshadow development on the lines of the adoption of this principle in its recommendation VI which reads :

> " The Conference recommends to States the study of the question whether it would not be possible :
>
> " (1) To introduce into their law the principle of the equality of the sexes in matters of nationality, taking particularly into consideration the interests of the children, and,
>
> " (2) Especially to decide that, in principle, the nationality of the wife shall henceforth not be affected without her consent either by the mere fact of marriage or by any change in the nationality of the husband."

---

[1] See page 3.

Another indication of this tendency is the declaration of policy made by the delegate from the United Kingdom in the 1931 Assembly of the League as follows :

> " The United Kingdom Government consider that it is right that all disabilities in matters of nationality should be removed, and that in so far as nationality is concerned, a married woman should be in the same position as a man—married or unmarried—or any single woman."

Then, too, the fact that the States present at the Pan-American Conference at Montevideo in 1933, including South-American Republics and the United States of America, signed two Conventions dealing with nationality, one of which is based on the principle of the independent nationality of the married woman and the other on the principle of equality between the sexes, is an indication of the support there is for the international acceptance of the principle of the independent nationality of the married woman on the basis of equality between the sexes.

New Convention needed.

In order to promote the universal adoption, nationally and internationally, of both these essential principles in regard to nationality, the Alliance, in accordance with the resolution adopted at its twelfth congress, held in Istanbul in April 1935, asks for the adoption of an international convention to provide in matters of nationality :

> " That husband and wife should each enjoy independently their own personal nationality ; that a woman whether married or unmarried should have the same right as a man to retain or to change her nationality, and that, in every respect, there should be equality of the sexes and such as to include the following :
>
> " I. *Retention of Nationality.*
>
> " 1. A woman shall not lose her nationality by reason
>
> " (*a*) That she married a foreigner, or,
>
> " (*b*) That, during her marriage, her husband loses his nationality by naturalisation in another country or otherwise.
>
> " 2. Where, before the coming into force of legislation based on this Convention, a woman has lost her nationality by reason of the fact that she married a foreigner or that her husband had lost his nationality by naturalisation or otherwise, she shall, on her own application, reacquire her nationality.
>
> " II. *Acquisition of Nationality.*
>
> " 1. A foreign woman shall not, by reason of marriage, acquire the nationality of her husband.
>
> " 2. Naturalisation of the husband during marriage shall not involve naturalisation of the wife.
>
> " 3. A married woman shall be naturalised under the same conditions as a man.
>
> " 4. Special facilities shall be given for one spouse to acquire the nationality of the other.
>
> " 5. Where, before the coming into force of legislation based on this Convention, a woman by marriage or by the naturalisation of her husband acquires his nationality, she shall retain it unless she makes a formal declaration of alienage.
>
> " III. With respect to derivation of nationality from a parent, the nationality of one parent shall be given no preference over that of the other."

STATUS OF WOMEN.

Other international women's organisations with more specialised programmes will doubtless be submitting memoranda to the League on specific points. The main object of the Alliance is the attainment of " a real equality of liberties, status and opportunities between men and women " (Article II of its Constitution). We have therefore dealt mainly with the question of equal political rights for men and women, as underlying all other forms of equality, with only a brief reference to other questions.

Political Rights.

Until recently, the trend of political evolution was towards a system of government based on direct representation of the people through delegates elected to some form of Parliament. It would be true to say that in every country which had adopted this principle, the consequence of its application to men was that women demanded the same right of representation. That demand was an inevitable and logical consequence because representative government rests upon a *democratic* basis, and it cannot be denied that women form half of the human race and therefore of the *people* of any country. As far, therefore, as the arguments for democratic government are concerned, it cannot be contested that it is essential for the reality of the system that women should have the same rights as men.

In recent years, the representative form of government has been challenged by other systems, corporative, collective or authoritarian. But whatever system is considered or adopted, whether it be one of these conceptions or the representative form of government, it will not fulfil itself if women, who are otherwise qualified under the system itself, are excluded from participation on the grounds of sex alone.

Other Electoral Rights.

There are other less important electoral rights (for various forms of local government) where the same principle applies. If they are less vital in theory, in practice they are often no less important for women than direct participation in the central government. But we do not propose to deal with this question in detail, because the lesser right would surely be included in the larger, and the principle of equal status once adopted, would inevitably apply in such cases.

Present Position.

We attach to this Memorandum two documents prepared by Alliance members, which illustrate our thesis :

(*a*) A summary in tabular form, showing the countries where women enjoy suffrage rights, in varying degrees of completeness, and those where such rights exist for the male citizen but are not extended to women ;

(*b*) A pamphlet embodying a study of women's rights in the existing Constitutions of modern States, with brief excerpts from those Constitutions. [1]

This latter pamphlet shows that in the Constitutions dealt with in thirty-two States of Europe, five in Africa, four in North America, twenty in Central and South America, and twelve in Asia, there are seven in Europe, two in Africa, one in North America, thirteen in Central and South America and eight in Asia which make no direct reference to women's rights. Moreover, it would not be correct to deduce by a simple process of subtraction that the remaining States in these continents give equal rights to men and women. On the contrary in some States, the rights rest only on laws which are subject to repeal, or are limited by special qualifications as to age, education, good conduct, etc., which are not demanded from male citizens. In others of the States, the clauses of the constitution establishing equality between the sexes are no longer observed. It will be seen therefore that there is a wide field in which women have still to gain political equality.

Eligibility to Public Offices.

The right to the franchise is closely bound up with the right to stand for election, and in the above remarks we intend to make no distinction between what is known as the active and passive franchise—*i.e.*, the right to vote and the right to stand for election. It is against the interests of the community that the choice of individuals best qualified to represent different interests and to take a direct and active share in the government of the country should be limited on the grounds of sex alone.

But apart from membership, whether by election or by nomination, of the governing bodies of the State and of the community, there are other functions of equal importance which are filled by nomination or by public examination, as, for instance, posts in the civil and diplomatic services, seats on special commissions, delegation to international meetings, etc. The full and active participation of women in the government of their country fails of attainment so long as they are excluded, by statute or by custom, from such posts or from the necessary preparation for such posts.

Value of Women's Participation in Public Life.

We cannot doubt that the real inclusion of women in important posts of administration would be to the good of humanity, always provided that they had first been given full opportuntiy of preparation for such posts. The removal of an injustice is in itself a good to the State. Moreover, the exclusion of women must often mean the exclusion of a highly gifted and competent *individual ;* it means the exclusion of the direct experience of maternity, with its consequent concern with youth. Much is said about the importance to a nation of its children, but too much weight is laid on the function of the woman in bearing children.

---

[1] This document has been filed in the archives of the Secretariat.

It is essential to utilise her experience in planning for the child's life, which enables her to see how the laws of the State may best be adjusted to meet the needs of the new generation. Study of social legislation adopted by countries where women vote and sit in Parliament will afford ample proof of the value of this experience.

It is a commonplace that the woman who takes an enlightened interest in public affairs is a factor for peace, but she can only be an important factor when she exercises a direct influence.

Lastly, the practical knowledge of women in the economics of daily life cannot be disregarded, since economic questions vitally affect national and international well-being. Women as a sex cannot be consulted as a specialised trade, industrial or professional organisation is consulted. The sum of their experience can only be available through their normal and natural status as citizens on identical terms with their fellow-men.

Inequalities in Other Spheres.

We would very briefly point out that most legal systems discriminate against women in regard to their position in the family, in regard to their earnings and property and in regard to their nationality. On the latter point, the League of Nations possesses a mass of documentation in support of this statement.

In the domain of morals, inequality is universal. There exists to some extent in every country a class of women, the prostitute, who is subject to special laws which make her more or less of an outcast. We appreciate very highly the action taken by the last Assembly in adopting the resolutions presented by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and Children pointing out the injustice and uselessness of the system of regulation of prostitution. That system or other special legislation directed solely against the immorality of women, which cannot exist without the corresponding immorality of men, still, alas, continues.

In the economic sphere, equality is still further to seek. We constantly see attacks made on the fundamental right of every woman of freedom to earn a livelihood by her own labour. All other workers are helped, not hindered, by their Governments ; women alone are restricted and hampered, and refused free access to fields of labour, not on the grounds of incapacity, but on those of sex alone. We are aware that consideration of these questions in the international sphere comes within the scope of the International Labour Office ; but in national legislation there is no hard and fast line to be drawn, and Governments, when considering the question of equal status between men and women, cannot ignore this vital question.

In all these matters, for the reasons stated in our introductory paragraphs, we forbear to give details, but ardently desire that they be taken into careful consideration in the light of the full information which we count upon our fellow societies to provide. Every disability tends to make harder for women their share in both home and public life, and those who call them the weaker sex are most ready to add to their disadvantages and handicaps. In a complex civilisation, it is vital that a woman as mother, wife or worker should be allowed to develop freely her talents and capacities and to exercise her full responsibility.

Conclusion.

On the grounds thus presented, we respectfully beg the League of Nations to give this question of the status of women the attention which it deserves. We believe that the increasing closeness of international relations, the growing exchange of populations, has made this question ripe for more than national consideration. It is in this belief that the Congress recently held by the Alliance at Istanbul, at which representatives from thirty-one countries were present, adopted the following resolution :

> " The Alliance, considering that the equality of the sexes in all departments of life is the aim towards which all women's efforts should be directed, decides to support by all the means in its power the principle embodied in Article I of the Treaty signed at Montevideo in December 1933, the text of which is as follows :
>
> > " ' The contracting States agree that, upon the ratification of this Treaty, men and women shall have equal rights throughout the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions.' "

We believe that for the League of Nations to draw up an International Convention which, without in any way infringing on national sovereignty, should ask the contracting States to agree that the participation of their citizens in the affairs of the State shall not depend on sex, would be truly in the interests of international life. It is surely an essential basis for all

international co-operation between States that Governments should speak in the name of their entire peoples, and no Government which refuses to count all its adult inhabitants as citizens can so speak with any degree of reality.

We are aware that the view has been expressed that the status of women is a purely national question which cannot be dealt with internationally without curtailing the sovereign rights of the States. We cannot seee that this question differs from many others which have been dealt with by international agreements. Take notably the question of nationality, the very basic right underlying all other rights in the State, since it determines to whom any national rights shall belong. And yet this question has formed the subject of many international agreements.

No international agreement can properly be said to infringe national sovereignty if it merely asks of the States ratifying it that they shall at their discretion accept certain lines of common agreement to be incorporated in their national law.

The true view is, therefore, that each ratifying nation accepts as its own a common standard, recognised as necessary in view of the close interdependence of modern States.

(*Signed*) Margery I. CORBETT ASHBY,

President.

Annex.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Franchise same as for Men.

1. *Equality.* — South Africa [1] (white population), South West Africa [1] (white population), Germany [1] (suspended for men and women since 1933, except in case of plebiscite), Australia [1], Austria [1] (suspended for men and women), Brazil [1], United Kingdom [1], Canada [1] (except Quebec, provincial vote), Ceylon, China [1], Cuba [1], Czechoslovakia [1], Denmark [1], Danzig [1], Ecuador [1], Estonia [1], Finland [1], Hawaii, Iceland [1], Isle of Man, India [2] (British India and the majority of the native States), Ireland [1], Kenya, Latvia [1], Liechtenstein [1], Lithuania [1], Luxemburg [1], Memel [1], Netherlands [1], New Zealand [1], Norway [1], Philippines, [3] Poland [1], Southern Rhodesia [1] (white population), Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [1], Siam, Spain [1], Sweden [1], Turkey [1], United States of America [1], Uruguay [1].

2. *Partial Equality.* — Belgium [4], Hungary, Channel Islands, Windward Islands, Leeward Islands [5], Porto Rico, Portugal, Northern Rhodesia, Newfoundland (suspended for men and women) Trinity and Tobago.

Municipal Franchise only.

1. *Equality.* — Chile, Gold Coast, Cyprus, Monaco, Peru.

2. *Partial Equality.* — Greece, Italy (suspended), Palestine, Roumania.

Neither Right to Vote nor Eligibility (countries having nevertheless an electoral system).

Andorra, Argentine [6], Bahamas, Barbadoes, Bermuda, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Fiji, France, Guatemala, British Guiana, Haiti, Iraq, Netherlands Indies (eastern), Japan, Liberia, Malta (in suspense), Mauritius, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Persia, San Domingo, San Marino, San Salvador, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Syria and Lebanon, Trans-Jordan, the Vatican, Venezuela, Virgin Islands (U.S.A.), Yugoslavia.

Most striking Suffrage Gains, 1929-1934.

Canada — eligibility for Senate ; Ceylon — equal rights ; South Africa — equal rights for European women ; Spain — equal rights ; Brazil — equal rights ; Uruguay — equal rights ; Turkey — equal rights.

---

[1] Universal suffrage.

[2] The draft new federal Constitution proposes special conditions for women.

[3] Women's right to vote has never been exercised. It is feared it may be withdrawn under the new Constitution.

[4] For war victims only : eligibility on equal terms for Senate and Chamber of Deputies. Equal municipal franchise.

[5] Dominica gives equal rights to men and women.

[6] The provinces of San Juan and Santa Fé have granted certain rights to women.

WORLD'S YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

STATUS OF WOMEN.

Concern of the World's Y.W.C.A. for the Improvement of the Status of Women.

The World's Young Women's Christian Association has always been vitally concerned with questions relating to the responsibilities and the contribution of women in every walk of life and to the improvement of their whole status. It therefore welcomes the opportunity provided by the Council of the League of Nations of stating its views on the question of the whole status of women, with special reference to a convention on the subject of equality of rights as between men and women which was signed at Montevideo in December 1933, by Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay.

Proposed International Convention not a Solution of the Problem.

The Association considers that the adoption of an international draft Convention, drawn in general terms on lines similar to the text of the Equality of Rights Treaty proposed at the Montevideo Conference, is not an adequate method of dealing with so complicated a problem as that of equality of status as between men and women in all departments of life. Such a method cannot take into account the claims of motherhood and of the family nor can it allow for the great variety of social and economic conditions in different countries; nevertheless the status of all the citizens of these countries must depend to a large extent on these conditions and moreover must be greatly influenced by the stage of development in each country.

Protective Laws Overridden by the Draft Convention as Proposed.

Among the members of the Association—who number nearly a million and are drawn from fifty-one countries—there are many young women in industry; it is therefore in close touch with the lives and working conditions of these women. The Association has always stood with women in industry in opposing any movement to deprive them of the protection they have secured by means of special legislation. National bodies of organised industrial women have repeatedly stated that they set a high value on the protection this legislation affords, and the arguments advanced by some non-industrial groups in favour of its abolition have at no time been accepted by the qualified representatives of the women workers concerned. [1] It has been ascertained from experts in international law that an international draft Convention introducing equality as between men and women in general terms, such as Article I of the text of the Equal Rights Treaty proposed to the Montevideo Conference, would override the existing International Labour Conventions applying to women and so deprive women in industry of their protection. This reason alone would make it impossible for the Association to support a draft Convention covering the whole status of women.

The Right of Women to Work.

At the same time, the Association vigorously opposes the growing tendency to restrain women from entering employment hitherto deemed suitable for them and to prohibit their continuing in employment in which they have already proved their competence.

In particular, it desires to record its concern in regard to restrictive legislative measures passed and applied within the last two years (in seven European countries and one Australian State) limiting the careers to which women have access, excluding women from admission to posts for which their training had fitted them or compelling them to resign posts which they were actually occupying when the legislation in question was introduced. These measures exclude married intellectual workers (such as teachers, public servants and medical women) from employment or severely curtail their opportunities of employment; some countries restrict their salaries. In one leading industrial

[1] See annexed quotations from pamphlets issued.

country, [1] discrimination may be legally exercised against all women in industry ; in another, [2] the Government has asked that wherever possible women shall be replaced by men. In a number of other countries, including the United States of America, where special legislation has not yet been introduced to restrict the right of women to work, there is a noticeable tendency to resort to discrimination ; this is being directed against all women in some cases ; in others, against married women only. The Association views the adoption of this policy with great and increasing anxiety, and, since the principle of equality of treatment as between men and women is to be examined, it would urge that a tendency so gravely endangering the position of women should not escape attention.

A True Equality of Opportunity.

The World's Y.W.C.A. holds that women have a special contribution to make to the solution of the problems of to-day, recognising that, on occasion, this may call for joint action by women on some point which particularly concerns them. The Association strongly supports the principle that in political and civil life a *true equality of opportunity* should be open to men and women, and works for the realisation of this principle through educational programmes. But the Association firmly believes that while it is to the general interest that the field of women's activities should be enlarged, it is by working in close co-operation that men and women alike can best serve the common good.

Need of an Enquiry into the Status of Women in Different Countries.

The Association is of opinion that the only logical method of approach to so large a question would be to explore the ground nationally, so as to determine more fully than has yet been done incontrovertible facts, *both in law and practice*, in regard to the status of women in each country. It must be remembered that " equality before the law ", or even suffrage, does not necessarily imply equal opportunities for training, or for entry into occupations, professions or civil services. It must therefore be ascertained what special difficulties need to be overcome in order to effect a real improvement in the status of women. The character and degree of these difficulties are bound to differ widely from one country to another, but, whether they are social, civil, political or economic, it would seem that definite national action might best be stimulated by preliminary work undertaken within the country.

The Association suggests that Governments should undertake to enquire into the actual status and position of women in their countries and that this enquiry should be placed under the authority of an International Commission.

Such work would facilitate the preparation of a comparative study on the status of women, and it is the view of the Association that if the results of such a study were brought together they would provide a basis for eventual international action in the matter of the status of women in the various departments of their present or future activities. Recommendations on specific points could then be made with much greater confidence.

When the proposal for a draft international Convention was taking shape, the Association at once put forward this view and has maintained it throughout the discussions of the women's organisations.

Conclusion.

The World's Y.W.C.A. desires to record its satisfaction that this question has been brought forward. The Association once more impresses upon the Assembly the urgent need for the improvement of the status of women and reiterates its conviction that such improvement can best be achieved by specific international agreements based upon careful comparative study.

When such a study is undertaken, the Association will be ready to co-operate in any possible way.

---

[1] Belgium : Decree (December 8th, 1934) authorising the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare to fix by quota the percentage of women (married or single) in each branch of industry in order to secure that posts exceeding this quota shall be filled by men.

[2] Netherlands.

Annex 1.

OPINION OF THE STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE OF INDUSTRIAL WOMEN'S ORGANISATIONS (UNITED KINGDOM).

(Pamphlet published in October 1927 by the Labour Party.)

Women and Night-Work.

The experience in munition factories during the war brought once more into evidence the half-forgotten facts of unregulated nightwork—deterioration in health caused by the difficulty of securing sufficient rest by day ; disturbance of home life with its injurious effects upon the children, and diminished value of work done (Report on Women's Employment by the Health of Munition Workers Committee).

If women could be relieved of domestic duties, it may be that their resistance to industrial fatigue would approximate more nearly to that of men, but legislation has to deal with things *as they are.*

Women and Lead-Poisoning.

The restrictions, for example, of women employed in certain painting processes where lead is used are due, not to fear of the women, but to the definite medical belief that women are more subject to lead-poisoning than men.

The greater susceptibility of women to lead-poisoning has been the subject of very careful examination in the Potteries. The evidence of Dr. T. M. Legge, Medical Inspector of Factories, given before the Departmental Committee in 1908 was conclusively borne out by the figures of the greater incidence of lead-poisoning amongst women. His opinion is the opinion of the organised workers in the trade represented by the National Society of Pottery Workers, of whom the majority are women.

Effects of Special Regulations.

In our opinion, the position of women in the industrial world during the last hundred years has been strengthened by every regulation for their protection which has been adopted.

The worker who cannot be exploited at the employers' will because the law does not permit it, gains a stronger and not a weaker position in the industrial world. Legislation has had to step in to give women a chance of achieving a more equal footing with men. Without such protection, it is not equality that the man achieves but far greater inequality.

Annex 2.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT PRESENTED BY THE DELEGATES OF THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY TO THE WOMEN'S COMMITTEE OF THE LABOUR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL AT ITS MEETING ON JANUARY 11TH AND 12TH, 1930.

Working women's demands for equality are tempered with a knowledge of the facts of industry, and while now and again they may agree in some demand for equality they cannot too strongly condemn the reactionary and disastrous theory that all protective legislation should be swept away unless men and women can be included in it on the same terms.

The Office of the Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations of Great Britain stated, on May 31st, 1935, that, in regard to protective legislation, their " opinion is quite unchanged ".

Annex 3.

OPINION OF THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE OF AMERICA.

This organisation has a direct and affiliated membership of over a million persons. It is a federation of trade unions with women members, and with a membership of persons who endorse its principles and accept its platform. Many national and international unions and state federations of labour are linked to the League by affiliation and help to further its aims, and by financial assistance, to accomplish its purpose. It is endorsed by the American Federation of Labour. The fundamental principle upon which the National Women's Trade Union League of America bases its work is the organisation of women wage-workers into trade unions. Throughout the thirty-one years of its existence, it has been the spokesman of the women wage-earners in the United States and the interpreter of their problems, which have grown in complexity with mass production, modern speed, mechanisation and the depression, and which should not be further complicated by the equal rights issue.

WHY THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE OF AMERICA OPPOSES BOTH A CONVENTION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN BY THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS TREATY.

The National Women's Trade Union League of America which has always opposed in its own country the very debatable issue of " equal rights between women and men " through a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution of the United States, wishes to file with the League of Nations this special protest against an international movement of this sort, considering such procedure even more complicated and more undesirable than national action on this subject.

International Blanket Action on Equal Rights for Women is full of Pitfalls.

Such a blanket attempt to give women a status equal to that of men would be fraught with difficulties and conducive to confusion since conditions and needs of women vary greatly from country to country. Such an effort to cover at one fell stroke conditions in various and varied fields, aiming as it does to give women equality in all rights under the law—in the economic field, in labour legislation, in political rights, in educational opportunities, in civil rights, in nationality rights—seems impracticable and detrimental to the real interests of women. The pitfalls of any such general programme are not all easily perceptible before it is put into effect. Where legal injustices obviously exist for women as compared with men, a much safer remedial course would be to conduct special campaigns or drives to adjust specific injustices or inequalities.

Equal Rights Movement aims to abolish Special Labour Laws for Women.

One avowed purpose of this international movement is to abolish special labour legislation for women enacted in various countries over a long period of years, because of definite need of such laws. The National Women's Trade Union League of America is thoroughly familiar with this field, has made a special study of the disastrous effects that would result from the achievement of such purpose, and is therefore deeply concerned about this whole matter.

Status of Women Convention would lead to Abolition of Special Conventions for Women of the International Labour Organisation.

If the League of Nations were to adopt the proposed Convention on the status of women it would apparently lead to the abolition of the following Conventions adopted by the International Labour Conference in its effort to build up international standards along such lines :

1. *The Child-birth Convention* adopted in 1919 in an effort to establish international standards to safeguard women at the most crucial time of their lives—the maternity period—in the interests, not only of women, but also of the race. This type of legislation obviously can apply only to women, but the whole issue is a broader one than that of women's rights. Even from the viewpoint of the woman as an individual worker, this Convention tends, not only to protect her health and that of her children but also to guarantee her a job and income during the maternity period instead of permitting her to be deprived of such by the actions of individual employers.

2. *The Night-work Convention* adopted in 1919 to safeguard women against night employment, which authorities definitely agree is an abnormal activity with harmful physiological, psychological and social effects for all workers, but particularly detrimental to women, so many of whom are home makers and mothers and who tend to perform household and family duties by day instead of getting as much rest as men night-workers do. (This Convention, as revised in 1934, exempts women holding responsible positions of management who are not ordinarily engaged in manual work.)

3. *The clause which is contained in the White-lead Convention (regulating the use of white lead by all persons and adopted in* 1921) *and which prohibits the employment of women at industrial painting involving the use of white lead.* It is particularly imperative to protect women against lead poisoning because of the detrimental effects of this disease on women's reproduction functions.

Equal Rights Ttreaty would abolish National Labour Laws for Women.

Furthermore, one purpose of the Equal Rights Treaty, upon which the proposed Convention on the status of women would be founded, is to try to bring about the abolition of special labour legislation for women in every country which might ratify this Treaty. Therefore, the National Women's Trade Union League of America fears that, if the League of Nations were to adopt the above-mentioned Convention, this would stimulate an interest in the Equal Rights Treaty on the part of individual countries and encourage them to ratify the Treaty.

The Situation in the United States of America would be particularly serious.

Ratification of the Treaty by the United States, for example, would be particularly serious. It is feared that such a step would not only prevent the enactment of any special labour laws for women in the future, but would almost inevitably lead to the abolition of all such laws including the hour and minimum wage legislation for women in industry now on the statute books of various States. Such a result would mean that women in industry in the United States would not be safeguarded by any permanent legal standards—either State or national or international—on such important matters as working hours and minimum wage. Since, according to the Constitution, the power to enact labour legislation rests almost entirely with the States, permanent national laws along these lines for both sexes or ratification of the Conventions of the International Labour Organisation which apply to both men and women are difficult to attain. (The N.R.A. hour and wage provisions covering both sexes in the United States were temporary.)

Moreover, though the proponents of special labour laws agree that, wherever feasible, these should apply to both sexes, it is a well-known fact that, in the United States, general hour and wage standards for men have been considered extremely difficult to establish through legislation in view of the constitutional amendment prohibiting restriction of freedom of contract. Such laws for women have been easier to enact because, in some cases, when tried in the courts as to constitutionality they have been upheld on the basis of the right of the police power of the State to safeguard the health and morals of women workers, in view of the fact that they are different from men, in being the mothers of the race and also the greater victims of excessive exploitation by unscrupulous employers.

Abolition at one fell stroke of the special labour legislation for women in the various States, that has been built up during a century, would work great hardship to women in industry and to their families.

Equal Rights Proponents have Misunderstanding as to Needs of Industrial versus Professional Women.

The proponents of equal-rights legislation have a misunderstanding as to the types of women covered by the laws, and as to the special needs of industrial women. In the United States, special labour legislation applies to industrial women who have declared themselves in favour of it. These laws do not cover women in the professions and in supervisory and executive business positions, yet the sponsors of the Equal Rights Treaty belong to these ranks. On the other hand, important organisations of business and professional women are definitely opposed to the Treaty and in favour of special labour laws.

There are striking differences in the needs and environments of the women in industry on the one hand and the women in business and the professions on the other. The problems of the former are the collective problems of a great mass of women doing similar or identical work, largely routine with practically no opportunity for a career, and no outlook for anything but a monotonous job, and too often a prey to exploitation unless safeguarded. The business or professional woman has an individualised job in most instances, which naturally develops in her an individualistic viewpoint ; and her education and acquired experience furnish her with valuable equipment with which to forge ahead and reach a desired goal. She should not try to impose her individualism upon the woman in industry, thereby causing her serious hardships. She should not combat special labour legislation for women in industry, but she can aim rather to have women of her own type specifically exempted from these laws if she wishes.

The women in industry and their allies in favour of the laws are willing to let the business and professional women be the judges of their own needs, and, in return, ask that industrial women be allowed to speak for themselves, without interference from women who oppose the laws though not affected by them.

Equal Rights Proponents have Misunderstanding as to Industrial Conditions.

The proponents of the equal-rights legislation are opposed to special labour laws due to misunderstandings about industrial conditions. They object on the basis that these interfere with women's freedom of contract. Though these laws may limit the workers' freedom of contract they limit the employer's as well, his freedom to exploit women, to work them for overlong hours, at a mere pittance. Moreover, a worker dependent upon earnings has no real freedom of contract beyond the purchasing power of these earnings. Wage-workers must have jobs to live, and their freedom of choice of jobs is determined by the amount of money they possess to buy the wherewithal for living. Freedom of contract under such circumstances does not exist. In fact, workers think so little of this freedom of contract that they voluntarily surrender it and join trade unions.

Equal Rights Proponents have Misunderstanding as to Effects of Special Labour Laws for Women.

The proponents of equal-rights legislation object to the special labour laws on the basis that they cause discrimination against women. Experience and investigation do not substantiate this opinion. A report of the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labour on a detailed investigation of the subject conducted several years ago shows that women are necessary to industry, and when the laws are properly and carefully written, women are not barred or dismissed from industrial work because of hour and wage legislation, except perhaps in very rare instances. Although women may be barred from some jobs because of night-work prohibition by law, the social and health benefits of such legislation seem to make it advisable.

The proponents of the equal-rights legislation fail to realise what great benefits women in industry have derived from special labour laws. Wage-earning women are generally less able than men to combat injustices and build up employment standards for themselves, because women are less extensively organised, are assigned more often to unskilled jobs, have in many cases the additional time-consuming burden of home and family duties to perform, and, in general, have a weaker economic status. Women have therefore greater need of legislation to safeguard their interests.

Equality of Rights is an Indefinite Term.

The proponents of equal rights do not realise the uncertainty involved in the term equality between men and women in the matter of labour legislation. This term is really meaningless, there is so much inequality among different groups of wage-earning men in the labour world that there are no definite standards for men on which to base the equality of women with men in the field of industry.

Equal Rights Proponents stress Legal Rights in preference to Human Rights.

Proponents of the equal-rights legislation make the mistake of stressing legal rights in preference to human rights. Experience in the United States has proved that special labour legislation has been a great benefit, not only to women as workers and as human beings but also to their families and to the communities. Legal standards for women workers mean, not only better standards and conditions of employment for women, but often for men also, who in many instances have profited indirectly by requirements to improve standards for women. The legal standards for women's employment make for better standards of living for women and their families.

Legal Equality prevents Industrial Equality.

Proponents of legal equality between men and women in clinging to an abstract principle and refusing to face facts fail to perceive the pitfall—that legal equality does not mean industrial equality. Legal equality of women with men does not achieve, but in reality prevents, industrial equality. Because women in industry have, in view of reasons given above, a weaker economic status than have men, who have gained certain definite standards through organisation, special labour laws establishing for women better employment standards serve to bridge the differences between them and men and to prevent exploitation of women.

Laws cannot prevent all Discrimination against Women.

The proponents of the equal rights fail to realise that all discrimination against women cannot be abolished by law. Neither treaty nor a status of women convention could guarantee to put women on an equal basis with men in the field of employment, since there are many discriminations due, not to law, but to prejudice. Though all legislation relating to labour and employment were the same for the two sexes, this would not prevent employers from employing men instead of women for various jobs. Nor could such legislation compel the public, when seeking professional service of various types, to engage women to the same degree as men.

WOMEN'S CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON NATIONALITY CREATED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. [1]

I. STATEMENT.

Believing that the pronouncements of the League of Nations and the enactment of world conventions may have far-reaching consequences for women—for greater freedom or greater subjection—various Women's International Organisations have been instrumental in bringing to the attention of the delegates to the League of Nations the Equal Nationality Treaty and the Equal Rights Treaty. These have been placed on the Agenda of the sixteenth Assembly.

The International Organisations of Women forming this Committee ask the Assembly to give its approval to the Equal Nationality Treaty that was signed at Montevideo in December 1933, by nineteen American Republics and has since been ratified and incorporated into the law in the United States, Chile, Mexico, and Honduras, and which in its principle clause reads as follows :

> " There shall be no distinction based on sex as regards nationality, in their legislation or in their practice,"

and to the Equal Rights Treaty, which was signed by representatives of the Governments of Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay, and in its principle clause reads as follows :

> " The contracting States agree that, upon ratification of this Treaty, men and women shall have equal rights throughout the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions."

They further ask that these Treaties be submitted to all the Members of the League that are not already signatories.

This Committee wishes to reaffirm the principles set forth in its Reports to the Assembly in September 1931, 1932, 1933 and 1934 in the matter of equality in nationality, and asks the Assembly to delete or amend those articles of the Hague Nationality Convention that are in conflict with the principle of equality embodied in the Montevideo Nationality Treaty, and to ensure that all future codification of international law undertaken under the auspices of the League shall be free from inequalities based on sex (*vide* our report of 1932).

It further wishes to state that it considers the question of nationality as only one phase of the whole issue of equality between men and women and that in its present report it will deal in its arguments, facts and conclusion with the larger problem involved in the Montevideo Equal Rights Treaty.

---

1 *Note by the Secretariat.* — The title assumed by this Committee does not indicate that it is a technical advisory committee of the League. It consists of representatives of five of the eight organisations which, in 1931, accepted the League's invitation to set up a committee which was to consist of their representatives and was to formulate on their behalf joint proposals regarding the nationality of women for communication to the Assembly (see introductory note to the communication from the Committee reproduced in the Minutes of the First Committee of the Assembly for the year 1933, page 45). In the Assembly Minutes, the original Committee is described as the " Committee of Representatives of Women's International Organisations ".

II. ARGUMENTS FOR EQUAL RIGHTS.

The world-wide acceptance of the principle of equality embodied in the Equal Rights Treaty is demanded by eleven of the largest and most important International Women's Organisations comprising a membership of over fifty million women.

The world needs the wisdom of women in all departments of life quite as much as it needs that of men. Men and women must go forward together as human beings, as entities, above sex distinctions. Only through the co-operation of men and women as citizens and workers and their united action can world betterment be achieved.

In the past, the liberation of men from serfdom and slavery brought about great advance in civilisation. We declare that the liberation of women from their inferior position, which in some cases even amounts to slavery, will bring about equal advancement for the world.

We appreciate that, in different countries of the world, civilisation is at different stages of development, and we know the League of Nations as a body cannot legislate nationally, it can only lay down fundamental principles through its world conventions and the conventions of its organ, the International Labour Office. But these conventions of the League of Nations become guiding principles for the Member States of the League. Therefore, the need for the League to take a stand for equality is very great, at the present time, when women in many countries are being deprived of their essential human rights.

We endorse the passionate appeal of the Inter-American Commission of Women made in their report to the seventh international Conference of American States at Montevideo, December 1933, where the Equal Rights Treaty was signed by four countries :

> " The Inter-American Commission of Women bases its recommendations of a Treaty guaranteeing to women absolute legal equality with men upon the single principle of liberty. By liberty is understood the opportunity for all individuals to achieve the greatest development of their faculties. We believe that this should be the sacred objective of all politics . . . In the fundamental law of the American nations, it is recognised that, among males, no man possesses the right to rule over other men except by their explicit consent."

In National Legislation there has been a gradual tendency within the last fifty years all over the world to regard a woman as a citizen, a person capable of independent control of her own life and property, a responsible parent. There have been new laws granting women suffrage, equal educational opportunities, and there have been Sex Disqualification Removal Acts—laws giving married women equal property, guardianship and nationality rights.

There are prominent women in the professions, women bankers, women lawyers, women scientists and women artists. There are a number of women in the National Legislature of various countries, and some have become members of the Government and ambassadors. There are women governors and mayors and women magistrates and judges. The United States to-day has a woman Cabinet Member, a woman Ambassador, a woman Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and a woman Director of the Mint.

Yet in spite of this progress throughout the world, there is a rising tide everywhere of unjust discrimination against women ; discriminations in every department of life, the tendency to exclude them from public office, from the higher civil service posts, from opportunities for higher education enjoyed by men, from the labour markets by replacing women by men, in fact, a universal attempt to force women back into the home.

Henri Fuss, Chief of the Unemployment Section of the International Labour Office, points out that in statistics gathered in thirty-four countries in November 1934, in the autumn of the year about 4,000,000 women were out of employment. He says in an article in the *International Labour Review*, April 1935, Vol. XXXI, No. 4 :

> " In consequence of the economic depression, there has been a growing demand during the last few years for restrictions on the employment of women ; and although sometimes moral and practical reasons based on women's duty in the home are alleged, *the principle aim is to make room for men in vacancies produced by the exclusion of women.* Measures of this kind have in fact been taken recently in certain countries, applying, in the first place, to married women and women in public service.
>
> " In *Germany*, an Act of June 30th, 1933, provided for the dismissal of married women civil servants whose material support was permanently secured by the income of their family. It also stipulated that no woman could be permanently appointed to a Government service before the age of 35.
>
> " In *Austria*, a Decree of December 15th, 1933, provided for the dismissal of every married woman engaged as a public official or wage-earning or salaried employee in the service of the State if and when her husband, provided he also was in the service of the State, attained a salary exceeding

a fixed amount. The Decree allowed one exception, however—namely, that any woman with more than three children might keep her post. *This would be curious if the principal object was to enable mothers of families to fulfil their home duties*, but can easily be explained by the need for earning money in large families.

" The restrictions on the employment of married women soon spread from public services to other branches of activity. The first measures adopted in this respect were directed against what are sometimes called multiple earnings—that is to say, the simultaneous employment of several persons belonging to the same household . . .

" The measures for the exclusion of women which aims at giving men preferential rights to employment have not been limited to married women, and, in certain countries, apply to all women whatever their conjugal condition . . .

" In *Italy*, a legislative Decree of November 28th, 1933, authorised Government departments to limit the number of women allowed to compete for posts or to exclude them altogether from competing. These measures were soon extended from public departments to private industry . . .

" A similar tendency is shown in the *Yugoslav* Order of March 31st, 1934, which limited the number of posts reserved for women in the postal, telegraph and telephone services. The maximum proportion of women in posts requiring a university degree was fixed at 30%, in that of posts requiring a certificate of complete secondary studies 25% and in lower posts for which four years of secondary study is required 10%.

" In the *Netherlands*, a circular of the Minister of the Interior, dated March 19th, 1934, recommended the local authorities, not only to observe strictly the provisions concerning dismissal on marriage, but also as far as possible to replace women by men in posts not specifically requiring female labour.

" In *Luxemburg*, a Grand Ducal Order of April 14th, 1934, . . . provided that a special permit must be obtained from the Director-General of Labour and Social Welfare for the engagement of female office staff, not only in public administrative departments, but also in private undertakings.

" Finally in *Belgium*, Father Rutten, Senator, introduced a Bill on February 13th, 1934, to limit the employment of married women in factories, workshops, workyards and offices. On April 12th, 1934, a circular of the Prime Minister stated that the Government had decided until further notice to reserve for men all available posts in public administrative departments, including shorthand-typists' posts. On top of these there came . . . the Royal Order of December 8th, 1934, which authorises the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare ' to fix a percentage for the number of married and unmarried women in each branch of industry, with a view to the possible replacement of the surplus by involuntarily unemployed men.' "

M. Henri Fuss gives many other facts which are too lengthy to quote here. But his conclusions are interesting. He says, in part :

" From the economic standpoint, women workers are still indispensable in the overwhelming majority of industries, not only because without them these industries would suffer from a shortage of labour . . . but also because the wages of every woman worker represent purchasing power . . . Contrary to a rather widespread belief, persons who work for remuneration do not deprive some one else of employment, because their own earnings give them the power to purchase goods or services that give employment to other persons. Finally, it may be recalled that many women, single, widowed or divorced, alone or with dependents, are obliged to earn their livelihood . . . According to a detailed enquiry in the Union of South Africa, out of 343 employed women who replied to a questionnaire, 34% belonged to families without a male breadwinner, 6% were the principal breadwinner of the family, 40% helped to support the family and, in addition, over 11% who lived alone nevertheless helped to support certain relatives . . . Even as things are at present it would be a step in the wrong direction to regard openings for employment as a matter of rivalry between men and women. There are already sufficient elements of discord in human society without adding to them in this way."

Thus, while the International Labour Office has stood for protection of women in certain industries, it does not endorse the policy of restricting women's work or replacing women by men.

Miss Grace Abbott, the Government representative from the United States of America at the recent International Labour Conference, June 1935, says :

" Women work for the same reasons as men . . . They must work to live . . . A very small minority of women who are engaged in gainful employment might live comfortably without working. So could a small minority of men. We do not criticise the young man of independent means who applies himself seriously and effectively to business or the professions . . . The members of this Conference also know, I think, that gainful employment of women is no new development. In the days when subsistence farming was universal, men and women both worked on the home farm . . . Men and women have from necessity and not from choice followed their work from the home to the factory. Forces over which they have no control have compelled them to, and the world has profited . . . If, in our industrial society the opportunity of work is denied them, all that is offered to women, married or unmarried, or at least to many of them, is the alternative of destitution or the pursuit of that ancient but outlawed profession for women." (Provisional Record of the International Labour Office, June 15th, 1935.)

Answering Miss Abbott's speech, the Director of the International Labour Office, Mr. Butler, said :

" I entirely agree with Miss Abbott that women's work is not only an individual necessity in most cases but that it also has the same economic value as the work of men." (Provisional Record of the International Labour Office, June 17th, 1935.)

Legal Endorsement of the Treaties.

Both Equality Treaties were endorsed by the Governing Board of the American Institute of International Law at its meeting at Havana, Cuba, October 31st, 1929. They were endorsed a second time by the Governing Board of the American Institute of International Law in Washington, October 31st, 1931. On the latter occasion, the Institute also recommended the adoption of the two Treaties by the seventh Conference of American Republics, to be held at Montevideo in November 1933.

Support by Women's Organisations.

The principle embodied in the Equal Rights Treaty has been endorsed by :

International Women's Organisations :

(1) The Inter-American Commission of Women (Montevideo meeting, December 1933) ;
(2) The International Soroptimists Clubs (Paris Congress, July 1934) ;
(3) Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality created by the Council of the League of Nations (Geneva meeting, July 1934) ;
(4) World Committee of Women against War and Fascism (Paris Congress, August 1934) ;
(5) Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Zurich Congress, September 1934) ;
(6) Equal Rights International (General Meeting, Geneva, September 1934) ;
(7) All-Asian Conference of Women (Executive Committee Meeting, Karachi, January 2nd, 1935) ;
(8) International Council of Women at its Board of Officers meeting in Paris, February 1935, and at its Executive Meeting in Brussels, June 1935 ;
(9) The International Alliance for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship, Istanbul Congress, April 1935 ;
(10) The International Federation of University Women at a board meeting in London, April 1935 ;
(11) The International Federation of Women Lawyers at a meeting in London, May 15th, 1935.

National Bodies of Women :

Australia : United Associations, Sydney, New South Wales ;

Austria : Oesterreichische Frauenschaft (in twelve districts in Vienna ; National Council of Austria ; Wiener Call Club ; Zonta Club) ;

Canada : Vancouver, British Columbia Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ;

Czechoslovakia : Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (three groups, Czechs, Germans and Jews) ;

Egypt : Federation of University Women (Cairo Branch) ;

England : Suffragette Fellowship ; Women's Guild of Empire ; Six-Point Group, United Kingdom ;

Finland : National Council of Women (twenty-two groups) ; Finnish Branch Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ;

Hungary : Feministah Egyesulete ;

Ireland : Irish Women Workers' Union ; Federation of University Women ;

Latvia : Federation of University Women ;

Lithuania : Federation of University Women ; National Council of Women ;

Netherlands : International Suffrage Alliance (Dutch Branch) ; National Union for Women's Work ; Women's League of the Liberal Party ;

Norway : National Council of Women ;

Scotland : Glasgow and West Scotland Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ;

Sweden : Federation of University Women ; Fredrika-Bremer-Union ; Women's Christian Temperance Union, Stockholm ; Swedish Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ;

United States : California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs ; Business Women's Legislative Council of California ; Illinois Council of Professional and Business Women ; Affiliated Teachers Organisation of Los Angeles ; Board of Directors of California Teachers' Association, representing 35,000 teachers ; Pasadena Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ; Chicago Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ; Business and Professional Women's Club, Wilmington, Delaware ; the National Women's Party (the Delaware County Branch, Pennsylvania ; the Baltimore County [Branch ; the Maryland State Branch ; Massachusetts Branch ; the New York City Branch ; Syracuse Branch ; Pennsylvania State Branch, Dayton Ohio Chapter) ; Soroptimists Club of New York City ; Brooklyn Manhattan Transit Women's League ; Women's Legislative Council of Washington ; National Association of College Women, Washington.

National endorsements of the Treaty continue to come in daily.

In view of the foregoing facts, and the many discriminations against women shown in the reports which follow from different countries, which are evidence of the crying need of women

everywhere to be upheld in their campaign for social, political and economic justice, we ask the Assembly of the League of Nations to give its approval to the Montevideo Equal Rights Treaty and submit it to all Members of the League not already signatories.

III. THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES. [1]

The Women's Consultative Committee has had reports from groups and organisations of women throughout the world showing discriminations against women in every field of life—political, economic and social. Space is too limited to give these reports in full ; therefore a brief digest of some of the reports has been made. Needless to say, this does not give a complete picture in any country and may not contain the latest enactments ; but it is sufficient to show the many discriminations against women and the need for the adoption of the principle of equality as between men and women.

Nor have we attempted to deal with the shameful *double moral standard* and the consequent inequality, unfairness and indignity to which women are subjected. This would need a seperate report. We declare, however, that laws concerning prostitution should be applied to men as well as to women. There will never be a new and better world until there is one moral standard, without distinction of sex. One of the main reasons for demanding an Equal Rights Treaty is that it would put an end to the double moral standard, and combat the White Slave Traffic.

A. Europe.

Suffrage. — There are eighteen countries where women can vote on equal terms with men : Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Danzig, England, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In five countries, women have limited suffrage : Belgium, Greece, Hungary, Portugal, Roumania. In four countries, women cannot vote on any terms : Bulgaria, France, Monaco, Switzerland. In two countries where women had the right to vote, suffrage has practically been suppressed—*i.e.*, Austria and Germany. In Italy, women had a limited suffrage, but here the right is no longer made use of.

France.

A digest of a report by Maria Vérone, representative of the International Council of Women says :

Nationality. — Unless she expressly declares otherwise, a Frenchwoman who marries a foreigner keeps her nationality on condition that the first home of the married couple is in France.

Married Women. — In marrying, the woman loses her civil rights. She can neither make contracts nor plead in court, nor be a guardian without the authorisation of her husband. She cannot enter into commerce or a profession without his consent. In the matter of property, the husband has the right to administer it whether held in common or separately ; even in the case of a separation or divorce, the wife cannot sell or mortgage real estate which belongs to her without marital authorisation. The parental rights belong only to the father.

Salaries of Married Women. — According to the law of 1907, the married woman who enters a profession which is distinct from that in which her husband is engaged has the right to her own earnings. She can with the money she has saved from her work buy furniture or real estate and she can sell or mortgage these without the consent of her husband. Also, this law gives her the advantage under the given circumstances of pleading in court, if necessary, without the consent of her husband.

Industry. — There are numerous restrictive laws regulating women's work ; as for instance, in the matter of night-work, except that in certain inferior work, badly paid, and which men do not wish to undertake, these restrictions are not imposed. Women can elect and be elected to professional bodies, such as an industrial board of arbitration, workers' councils and tribunals or chambers of commerce.

Professions. — Women can enter all the professions. They can be doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers and public officials. The mixed civil service competitions permitted women sometimes to be placed ahead of men. These mixed competitions have been replaced by separate competitions for each sex, and the possibility of advancement has been limited or suppressed for women.

Teachers. — Women may be teachers in all the school grades and may be members of the faculty of a university.

Germany.

The following facts are taken from many sources which are given in the appendix :

When the German Republic was established in 1919, the Constitution provided equal rights for men and women, but the period of economic depression and the Hitler regime have practically deprived women of all these rights. Hitler, addressing 35,000 women in the fall of 1934 said, according to an article in the *New York Times*, September 9th, 1934 :

> " The idea of political and economic equality for women is a product of decadent Jewish intellectualism and unworthy of the German women. There can be no antagonism between the sexes if each remembers the mission and function that God gave them. We have but one message for women, that is the child. The two worlds must not mix. Man's world is the nation. The woman's field is husband and child."

---

[1] Information from Australia, Belgium, Canada, Japan and Latvia was received too late for inclusion in this statement.

Yet there are 2 million more women in Germany than men. These women must support themselves. In an article in the American magazine *Equal Rights*, of October 6th, 1934, by Miriam Beard, the noted writer and author of " America through Women's Eyes " says :

" Under the Nazi regime, Aryan women suffer as well as Jewish women, peasants suffer as well as emancipated career carvers ; all girls endure discrimination, all mothers must face the loss of their children, who at almost every waking hour are snatched from them by Brown drill-masters who prepare them for war . . . Listen to Minister Goebbels : ' We Nazis have put women out of public life, nature fits women for life behind house walls and not in the open '.

" But even in those cramped quarters she is to be denied her children ; Goebbels tells her to give them cheerfully to the Nazis who would know better than she does how to steel them to ' heroic sacrifices ' on the battlefields . . . In other words, Hitler has undone in a single year the achievements of a decade of Republican Germany. He has rendered valueless the vote which Social Democracy gave women in 1919. He has made useless the legislatures to which women were just admitted. He has been squeezing women out of the thousands of government posts they had just won and he has abolished the Constitution's provision for protecting women office-holders. He is pushing them from the professions, law, medicine, teaching, social service, to which they had just won entry and from the German universities whose barriers they had just climbed. Their influence is wiped from public life where it had scarcely begun to spread."

It is stated that, in one year, unemployment was reduced from 5 to $2^1/_2$ millions. What is not stated is that in that year the number of women employed decreased from 11.5 to 6 million. The State Secretary of the Board of Finance, Reinhardt, declared in May 1934 that the figure of 6 millions of employed women must be lowered as speedily as possible to 3 million. In March 1934, there were 575,074 women on the unemployment list according to the Central Office of Labour Exchanges, yet the Board of Finance insists : " Cases of an employer taking on women in positions which might be filled by males will no longer be permitted ". In an attempt to induce women to leave employment, a marriage loan was instituted whereby on marriage a thousand or more marks were to be given to the newly married couple on condition that the woman gave up her work. But as the loan was only a loan and had to be paid back little by little, it has not proved an unmitigated blessing. In Easter 1934, 600,000 girls left elementary schools. The household year was established for their benefit whereby they were to work in homes for a year without pay. This has resulted in the complete undermining of domestic service as a wage earning occupation. The German Labour Front in June 1934 admitted that more than 25% of these girls get no holiday. In January 1934, there were as many as 242 labour camps for women. In the textile industry, replacement of the women workers by men is taking place on a big scale. The Federation of German Hosiery Manufacturers decided that by June 30th, 1934, all women engaged on hosiery were to be replaced by men. In the numerous work schemes drawn up by the assimilated unions and the authorities, only one exception to the universal dismissal of women is permitted—namely, where the requirements of industry make woman's labour indispensable.

It is this fact, that women are essential in certain industries, that has prevented a greater dismissal. It is interesting to note that in the first year of the Hitler regime in the munition factory of Wistengers more than 1,400 employees were engaged, nearly all of them women or young girls. In the chemical industry at Mainz on the Rhine at that time 1,300 employees were taken on and they were nearly all women. In Germany, as elsewhere, women are not so largely driven out of inferior jobs as out of the better paid places and positions. Women in the medium and higher official positions are liable to arbitrary dismissal. The authorties are to be guided by the principle that in the National-Socialist State women officials and employees are to be eliminated as far as possible from the public service or are to be moved to lower-paid grades. This follows on a law of May 1933 which expressly declared that women officials could be paid at a lower rate than men. They cannot hold any municipal posts except under less favourable conditions than men.

United Kingdom.

A digest of a report edited by Miss Dorothy Evans, representative of the Equal Rights International, reads as follows :

Since 1928, women have exercised the same political rights as men, except that peeresses may not sit in the House of Lords.

The professions are all open to women except the Army, Navy and Air Force, and women may not be ministers in some of the churches. They may not be members of the Stock Exchanges. But all judiciary positions are open to them and they are required to serve on juries.

State Services. — Women are required to resign on marriage. The diplomatic and certain technical posts are reserved for men. The higher civil positions, though nominally open to both sexes, tend to be filled by men.

Industrial women workers find the opportunities of earning a living curtailed by a number of laws which apply only to women and which shut them out from any trade using the three-hour shift system, from all night-work, from work under ground, from industries in the white-lead processes, from weight lifting, etc. By trade union agreements, women are excluded altogether from certain trades and processes, for instance, in the printing, clothing, tailoring, textile and building trades, where competition with men is feared.

There is a strong and growing prejudice against the increase of women in lucrative employment. It has been publicly claimed that to turn out the women workers would solve the unemployment problem. In July 1934, there were 3,524,800 insured women workers. If this great army of self-supporting women were turned out there would indeed be a critical unemployment problem and many more persons who are now assisted by the employed women would be thrown on to public assistance. As it is, the unemployment insurance funds are fed by women workers, the premium required being proportionately higher for the restricted benefits which they are entitled to draw than the premium the men pay for their greater benefits.

Inequality of pay is general, except in the medical profession. In the two professions which absorb the largest number of women, education and the civil service, the salary of the woman averages four-fifths that of a man in the same grade. This affects their pensions which are based on salary.

In agriculture, women's wages are often as low as half those of men, and even in certain industries where trades boards and joint industrial councils have been set up to protect the sweated workers, these boards have stabilised this gross differentation of pay. The result is that underpaid workers tend to oust men and the whole standard of living in an industry is lowered.

There are over 15,000,000 *women in England to-day doing a hard day's work in the home. Yet these housewives are not regarded as workers but appear in the census and the law as " dependants " of some male worker. They are in truth his employees but have no rights as such, as other workers have, no regulation of hours, no provisions as to holidays, no guarantee of remuneration. There is no national insurance for the health of housewives beyond maternity benefit.* [1]

Married Women. — Many discriminations in the law touch the married woman, putting her in an invidious position in the matter of her liability to income tax, legal domicile, her property rights and her power to make a contract.

If a British woman marries an alien and thereby gains his nationality, she loses her own. She is thus bereft of her citizenship rights in her own country and its protection abroad. A married woman is ineligible for naturalisation.

Hungary.

A digest of the report of Frau Meller, representative of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, says :

The right to vote for women is restricted. There are educational and other qualifications and she cannot vote before the age of 30. A woman cannot become a judge or member of a jury. She is shut out from the law faculty of the universities and academies. She cannot enter the legal profession and this prevents her from occupying the higher posts in the civil service.

A married woman automatically has her husband's citizenship and domicile. In the family life, the husband is the head of the family and his word is " decisive ". The legal effect of this is that the father can independently and according to his own discretion take measures in regard to the child's person or property—namely, concerning the child's education and training and way of life. According to the Guardianship Law, the father by a will or document can exclude the mother from the right of guardianship without giving motives. A woman, except in her quality of mother or mother by adoption, cannot be a guardian. If as a mother she is a guardian, she can handle the child's property without liability only during her widowhood and until she remarries. There is, of course, no such restriction for the father. The mother, if she is the natural and legal guardian, has no right to appoint a guardian in case of her death. She cannot exclude any one who is lawfully a legal guardian.

The wife's occupation and her liberty of choice is determined by the " decisive " word of the husband. According to the Domestic Labour Law, if the husband objects, the wife cannot go into service. If the wife goes into service in spite of her husband's objection and he claims her back the contract is broken. In all occupations, even the professions, the wife is restricted in her choice by the " decisive " word of the husband. There is no legal discrimination between men and women as to the salary of civil employees except that the " rent " of a married woman is half that of a man or unmarried woman. But the advancement of women in the civil service is barred by the exclusion of women from the legal profession.

Irish Free State.

In a digest of a report drawn up by a Conference of Women's Organisations, which was convened by the Irish Women Workers' Union, Louie Bennet, Secretary, says :

The Constitution provides that " every person, without distinction of sex . . . is a citizen of the Irish Free State and shall enjoy the privileges and be subject to the obligations of such citizenship ". In spite of the Constitution, discrimination on a purely sex basis does exist.

Nationality. — There is equality in nationality, except that the father only transmits nationality. Widows obtain concessions not applicable to men.

Jury service is not compulsory for women, only voluntary, with the result that women litigants and culprits find themselves almost always before an entire male jury.

Criminal Law. — The Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1935 is based on a double standard of morality.

Employment, Civil Service. — Women must retire on marriage. Widows are not allowed to re-enter the service. Married men with dependants receive additional allowances. There is no such provision for women with dependants. The lowest rates of pay are in the grades confined to women. Equal opportunity for promotion is not given. There is sex differentiation in wages in several departments.

Teachers. — The salaries of women teachers in primary schools are less for women than for men. The lowest wage for women is £128 and for a man £140. The maximum salary for a woman is £295 and for a man £377 per annum. All women teachers are compelled to retire on marriage.

---

[1] This might be said of housewives in practically all countries.

Industry. — Recent legislation gives women an inferior economic status to that of men. In the Unemployment Assistance Bill of 1933, widows and spinsters were completely omitted from benefits. After an agitation, unemployed women were included but not on a basis of equality with men. Discrimination is also shown in the rates of assistance.

Section 12 of the Employment Bill now before the Dail gives the Minister for Industry power to make at his discretion regulations prohibiting the employment of female workers in any form of industrial work or fixing the number of females who may work in a given industry. This legislation is fraught with danger, not only for women workers but also for men.

Lithuania.

The report from the National Council of Women, the Catholic Women's Organisations and the University Women says :

The State Constitution provides for equal rights for both sexes in all spheres of legislation with one exception which concerns nationality. A woman who marries a foreigner loses her nationality.

But the equality principle is not strictly observed and particularly in the matter of paid work. In May 1933, a decree was passed against " multiple earnings ". This decision resulted in the married woman being obliged to give up her work. This Act was due to two causes—the economic crisis and to secure for men some of the positions filled by women. Generally, it is very difficult for an intellectual woman to secure work. Women are not usually appointed to the higher and more responsible and better paid employments.

It is to be noted that the present position of women in Lithuania is not intolerable . . . but we are frightened by the attempts to restrict women's right to work and yet more that public opinion; supplied by the example of other countries, will support the idea that women should return to the kitchen and the nursery and so make it more difficult to fight against this opinion.

Netherlands.

In a brief report from the Netherlands, the following facts are given :

Since 1922, when the *Constitution* was revised, a woman has the same constitutional rights as man. She may vote for the representative bodies. She has also, on the whole, the same civic rights as long as she is not married, the one exception being that she is still excluded from certain professions. She may not be appointed as a notary or judge, nor can she officiate as an arbiter.

For a *married woman* the situation is totally different. She then comes under the authority of the husband. She is barred from civic rights, just as children and lunatics. Her private property and income come under her husband's management and are at his disposal, unless before marriage she has stipulated that she shall retain the right to manage her own property. The father has complete parental rights over the minor children. Although the Matrimonial Law has remained unchanged since 1838, all attempts thus far to improve it have failed.

The *economic position* of women was satisfactory up to the economic crisis. She was free to choose the position for which she was qualified. Now this is changed, not only for married women, who are discharged from all government posts on the day of their marriage, but also for the women who are not married. The woman has hardly any chance of appointment to public posts, however qualified she may be. Both married and unmarried women are being replaced by men. This is not only true of women in government posts and as teachers, but also for workers in private employment. Although the struggle to earn a living in the Netherlands is difficult for a man, it is infinitely worse for a woman.

Scandinavian Countries.

Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland have been noted for some years for their progressive legislation in regard to women. Perhaps in these countries more than anywhere else, there more nearly exists equality between the sexes. We give reports from two of these countries as illustrating the large measure of equality which women enjoy.

Denmark.

In response to a questionnaire sent out by the International Council of Women, the National Council sent answers. A digest of these answers is given below :

Political Rights. — They are equal for men and women. Women have the same legislative rights and may be elected to both houses of Parliament. They may be Government Ministers, may hold office as mayor or judge and serve as a juror.

Property Rights are the same for men and women. A woman may inherit, make contracts and bring actions before the court.

Nationality. — A Danish woman loses her nationality by marrying a foreigner, if, by the marriage, she acquires a foreign nationality and leaves the country. The father transmits his nationality to legitimate children.

Economic Status. — A woman has the same rights as a man to Government posts, with the exception of Military and Ecclesiastical positions. She receives the same pay and has the same chance for promotion. In the professions and business, the status is the same for women as for men. The position of women in banks is lower than that of men, even if in principle there is equality. Some institutions dismiss their women employees on marriage. In industry, the position is the same for both, except that women's wages are generally lower than those of men.

Agriculture. — About one-fifth of the persons employed in agriculture are women. Women are proprietors of farms of all types and sizes and run them well.

In closing their report, the Danish section said : " Denmark no doubt belongs to the countries where equality between men and women exists to a great extent ; and we should like to stress the fact that we

have not many special regulations for women. In our opinion there is a connection between these two facts. However, traditional and sex prejudice still exist; the higher administrative posts are occupied by men, and we sometimes see that the formal equality is not put into practice, especially in the case of married women."

Finland.

A digest of a report sent by Mme Tilma Hainari, President of the National Council of Women in Finland, says :

There is *women's suffrage* on the same basis as for men. On general principles, women are qualified, according to a law enacted in April 1924, to hold public office in Finland the same as men. They may be appointed to every public office and function. They may be appointed judges and may enter the diplomatic or consular service. However, certain restrictions were made by a Government Ordinance of November 1927 at present in force. By that ordinance, certain posts, because of their special character, were reserved only for men—all posts in the Ministry of Defence, except minor office jobs. Other posts, for instance, only to be held by men are that of a prosecutor in court martial proceedings, director in prisons for men, county governor, chief of police, manager of the Customs House, inspector of education in boys' schools, locomotive-engine driver, chief factory inspector, naval officials, etc. On the other hand, certain posts are reserved only for women—chief warder in the women's prison, inspector of education in the girls' schools, inspector of domestic economy, etc. The above Law does not distinguish between married and unmarried women.

Although the law legally grants wide possibilities to women to hold Government offices, women have not thus far obtained the highest administrative offices or judiciary positions, because the law has only been in force a short time. In the field of *education*, women have long had equal standing with men both in official positions and in remuneration. In the Ecclesiastical law of 1869, still in force, no distinction as to sex is made, but up to the present, because of long-established custom, no woman has been ordained minister of a church.

The *Labour Legislation* in Finland has hitherto followed the principle that adult men and women needed equal protection against dangers which growing industrialism creates. All provisions concerning working-hours, periods of rest, extra work, night-work, etc., applied in the same way to every employee 18 years of age or over, independent of sex. Owing to Finland having ratified some *international Conventions*, a few special rules have been added for women. Women under 20 are not allowed to work as seamen on Atlantic traffic ships. All females are prohibited from any painting work of an industrial character involving the use of white lead. Women under 21 are not to be employed loading or unloading vessels, and there are certain regulations in regard to women about to become mothers.

As regards the *status of married women*, the Marriage Law of 1930 is based on equality between husband and wife. It abolished the guardianship of the husband over the wife and granted her equal property rights. The married woman can make wills, draw up contracts in financial transactions, and both plead and prosecute in court. She has also equal rights with the father as the guardian of their children. It is to be noted, however, that the father determines the nationality of the legitimate child. A Finnish woman does not lose her citizenship by marrying a foreigner unless she has moved out of the country and become the citizen of another country.

Switzerland.

From the eleventh report, prepared by the Swiss Associations of University Women in 1935, a few facts are taken and given in brief :

Women engage in public work because of economic necessity. In 1888, for 100 men in professions or trades there were 33 women ; in 1900, the proportion of women was 30; in 1914 to 1920, 34; and in 1934, it was 32. This indicates that women working in the professions or trades have not greatly increased and have not therefore replaced men workers.

Of the women working, 70% are single, or widows, or divorced. According to the census of 1929, women's work was divided up as follows : for every 100 women, 40 were engaged in agriculture, 30 in industry, 11 in hotels, 10 in commerce, 1 in transport and 3 in other professions. The statistics of 1930 show hardly 3.8% of the single women working in administrative posts or the liberal professions. Among married women, the rate was 2%. The case of both husband and wife holding an administrative position is very rare.

The economic crisis has had a twofold menace for women : she is not only a victim of unemployment, but her place is demanded by an unemployed man. This attack against women's work, however, is chiefly directed against the women who hold posts of some importance and not against women working on the farms or in industry.

In the teaching profession and the administrative posts, the economic crisis has been used to make a big attack against " multiple earnings " in the same family. This attack has been both Federal and by cantons.

In many cantons, a law has been proposed to prevent married women from teaching. In the Canton of Geneva, a law of May 1933 proposed that all women in administrative posts should give up their positions if they were married. By a law enacted December 1934 to secure reduction in expenses, men's salaries were to be cut 10%, while those of women were to be cut from 16 to 50%.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In a digest of a report by Mme. Duchêne, the representative of the " World Union of Women against War and Fascism ", she says :

The Russian dictatorship of the proletariat declares complete social, economic and political equality between men and women. They have the same political rights, the same right to use and share the land, the same marriage rights, the same parental rights, the same rights in the matter of divorce (Soviet Code, Article 33).

Women in Industry. — In the case of employment in trades or industries, the conditions are the same for both and the same salary for the same work is given. Until recently, there were no laws especially for the protection of women in industry, but some have lately been enacted, while, at the same time, efforts are being made to increase the work available for women.

International Labour Office. — Mme. Thibert, in answer to a letter, says: "There is special protection for women in Russia . . . in difficult and dangerous trades . . . A Decree of May 9th, 1931, sets forth the conditions under which a woman may drive a tractor. This decree calls for medical examination . . . If a woman drives a tractor without springs, she is entitled to three days' rest a month. But if women's work is restricted for motives of health, hygiene or danger, there are, on the other hand, certain types of work and professions which are reserved especially for women. Two decrees: December 8th, 1930, and January 16th, 1931, listed such positions, most of them requiring high qualifications, and it was recommended that women be especially employed in these occupations.

B. Asia.

According to the Constitutions of China, Ceylon, India, and Mongolia, women have voting rights, and, in Palestine and Siam, limited voting rights.

India.

A brief digest of the report by the All-Asian Women's Association, sent by Rani L. Rajwade, organising secretary, follows:

It is agreed by all that the progress of the Indian women during the last twenty years has been incredibly swift. All kinds of outworn conventions have been set aside and every kind of social reform and advancement for the country has had enormous impetus, though this advancement is still held to be far below that of the Buddhist and Vedic eras, when women seemed to have had complete equality with men and were held in the highest honour.

Education. — The customs of child marriage and consummation immediately after puberty and the Purdah system are the causes of a low standard of physique and health among Indian women, and a concerted effort is being made to rid the country of these evils. In some parts of India, Purdah is rapidly disappearing. The average literacy (in their own mother tongue) of the Indian people is only about 10%. The rate of literacy of the Indian women is only 3%. In Madras, there is only one educated girl to six educated boys. The Government is to be criticised for not providing sufficient money for girls' education. The higher education is open to boys and girls equally, but only a small percentage of girls continue their education to the end of the college course. Co-education is gaining ground. It is general in the universities. There are now women doctors, lawyers, teachers, scientists, accountants, journalists, poets, artists, musicians, philosophers, politicians and sannyasinis.

Economic Status. — There are nine million more men than women in India, therefore there is no surplus of unmarried women seeking employment. In the teaching profession, women are paid higher than men owing to the shortage of good women teachers. In other positions, women get paid less than men for the same work and are generally debarred from the better paid work. All trades are, however, open to women. In agriculture, which is the occupation of 80% of India's population, men and women work together as comrades. The 90,000 women who used to work underground in mines are being rapidly eliminated from that work, much against their wish, as no substitute source of employment has been provided.

Property Rights. — The Moslem laws are the best concerning the rights of inheritance and the possession of property by women. The laws relating to Hindu women are out of gear, caused by the introduction and the development of modern conditions into the individual and group life of India. Things must work themselves out. In Baroda and Mysore, great reforms in the legal position of women have recently been instituted. A similar revision in the legal position of Hindu women in the British provinces is being clamoured for all over India. The six million people of Malabar are an exception to the present state of affairs. Matriarchy has held its sway there for thousands of years, and under that system women hold all the property and it descends through the female line.

Political Status. — The present-day Government has accepted the principle that women should have the same rights as men of voting and of being elected to the various legislative and local government bodies. While this position is satisfactory in theory, in practice the Government has given the franchise to only about a million women as compared with ten million men. The chief reason for this disparity is the undue emphasis laid on qualifications based on property and education. The success with which Indian women have taken on the full responsibilities and duties of citizenship has been exceptional and quite surprising. There are women members of the legislative councils and there are also members of municipal councils and district boards. One woman was Deputy Speaker of the Madras Legislative Council for three years and one woman Minister for Health in Travancore State.

Mr. S. C. Bose, in an address in Vienna, March 3rd, 1935, says: "Indian women have an advantage over European women in as much as they do not have to fight for their rights as the suffragettes had to in Europe. What slender rights men have in India to-day are shared by women . . . By participating in the freedom movement in all its aspects, women have made their position unassailable and their demands (for equality) irresistible."

Hindu Women's Disabilities. — V. V. Joishi, High Court Pleader, of Baroda, says: "The Hindu law declares that women are incapable of enjoying certain rights which men possess. The son inherits the property of his father, but the daughter does not . . . Girls have absolutely no voice in the selection of their husband and they are completely at the mercy of their parents or guardians. She is treated as a chattel, a thing to be given away or disposed of . . . If the wife refuses to live with her husband, he can keep her even by force. She cannot dissolve the marriage . . . Man can marry as many wives as he likes during the life of the first wife. But a woman cannot marry a second husband and if she does so, she is

punished by the criminal law . . . The right to property and the right to inheritance are more or less denied to women. The wife may have her deceased husband's property taken from her by sons, brothers or cousins; she has only right to maintenance. She is not the full owner of property and can therefore only enjoy the income of property and must keep it intact for the heirs."

Palestine.

A report of Dr. Rosa Welt-Straus, delegate of the All-Asian Women's Conference to this Committee, reads as follows :

Personal Status: The personal status of a Palestinian woman varies with the religious community to which she belongs. In 1922, the ecclesiastical courts of the three religious faiths were granted jurisdiction and executive power in the matter of personal status, which, according to law, comprises inheritance, marriage, divorce, guardianship, testimony, wage-earning and property rights. Antiquated laws deprive women of even the most elementary liberty, according to the religious community to which she belongs. As some women under these laws were entirely deprived of the right to inherit and were thus often exposed to want and misery, the Government introduced new enactments which give Jewish and Christian women the right to appeal to the civil courts in matters of inheritance. A woman, since last year, is not forced to return to her husband against her will.

Suffrage. — General suffrage has not been introduced in Palestine. All Jewish women, however, since 1920 have the vote and the right to be elected to the Jewish National Assembly on equal terms with men.

Municipal Suffrage. — Only the women of Tel Aviv, the all-Jewish and largest city in Palestine, have been granted this right on equal terms with men. In all other cities, only men have the municipal vote.

Nationality. — There is gross discrimination against women in the matter of nationality. In the regulations under the Palestine Citizenship Order, *Official Gazette*, September 16th, 1934 : " Disability means the status of being a married woman or a minor, lunatic or idiot or otherwise legally incompetent ". Wife and minor children take automatically the husband's and father's citizenship and lose it automatically if his is revoked. In a later enactment, exception is made in case the wife is a Palestinian by birth.

Education. — Literacy is making rapid progress. It is still very low among the Moslem Arab women, much higher in the Christian Arab population. There the Government law schools are open to men and women of the entire population on equal terms for both sexes.

Professions. — Men and women are admitted to practise on the same terms as physicians, dentists, lawyers, architects, chemists, etc. Women teachers work on equal terms with men teachers.

Industry. — The Government introduced a number of regulations restricting women. (Industrial Employment of Women and Children Ordinance, *Official Gazette*, November 29th, 1927.) There is no minimum wage ordinance. Generally, women are paid less than men for the same work. The Jewish Labour Union with 80,000 men and women members stands for complete equality for men and women.

Agriculture. — The small farms are worked by families, the women usually doing a great part of the work. In the Jewish colonies, men and women work on equal terms. The Jewish National Fund has recently introduced a change in its contracts. Instead of the husband only, now both husband and wife are leaseholders. Women also may apply for a leasehold on the same terms as men. Thus it appears that some measure of equality has within the last years been introduced in Palestine.

C. South Africa.

Suffrage. — There is women's suffrage in South Africa for the white race. In Rhodesia and Kenya, men and women have equal voting rights irrespective of race.

A brief report from the Association of University Women says :

Discriminations:

(1) All civil service posts are not open to women ;
(2) Women teachers are paid on a lower scale than men and must resign on marriage ;
(3) In some universities, women are paid lower salaries than men for the same work ;
(4) Women are prevented from obtaining employment underground in mines.

D. South and Central America.

Suffrage. — In four countries, women vote on the same terms as men : Jamaica, Porto Rico, Ecuador and Uruguay. In two countries, the vote is limited : Brazil and Peru ; and in fifteen countries, they have no vote : Argentine, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Venezuela.

We give in brief some facts taken from a report of the Inter-American Commission of Women, prepared for the seventh international Conference of States at Montevideo, December 1933 (Doris Stevens, Chairman) :

The Right to hold Public Office. — Women cannot hold public office on the same terms as men in sixteen countries, but can do so in three countries—namely, Brazil, Ecuador and Uruguay.

Right to enter Professions. — Women may not do so in twelve countries ; the law is silent on the matter in five countries, and women may enter the professions on the same terms as men in two countries —Colombia and Cuba.

Right to engage in Business. — A married woman cannot engage in business without the consent of her husband or the court in twelve countries ; the law is silent about the matter in three countries, and in four countries—Argentine, Colombia, El Salvador and Nicaragua—she may do so without the consent of her husband or the court.

Conjugal Domicile. — A wife has no voice in determining the conjugal domicile in any of the nineteen countries while she and her husband live together.

Married Woman's Property. — A wife may not administer her own separate property on the same terms as her husband in thirteen countries ; she may do so in five countries—Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. In one country, the information is inconclusive.

Parental Rights. — The mother has not joint authority with the father over their common legitimate children in any of the nineteen countries. In the case of illegitimate children, the mother has greater responsibility in fourteen countries and there is equal responsibility in five countries—Argentine, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras and Paraguay.

It will be seen from the above that the women suffer the greatest injustice with regard to their *legitimate children.* The Inter-American Commission report says :

> " In nineteen countries of the Americas, we find it set forth in the law that mothers do not have the joint right equally with fathers to determine the future of their common offspring. Nature's law says woman is fit to bear children ; man's law says she is not fit to direct them."

E. North America.

Suffrage. — Women can vote on the same terms as men im Canada, Newfoundland and the United States.

United States of America.

The following statement as to conditions in the United States is taken from many sources, which are given in the annex :

According to the Law in many states, the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to enter the professions, the right to engage in business, the right to witness public documents—all these are the same for women as for men ; there is no sex distinction.

Right to serve on Juries. — Women may not serve on juries in twenty-seven States, and they may do so in twenty-one States and the District of Columbia.

Married Women. — In most states the wife may administer her own separate property on the same terms as her husband administers his. She has with him joint control over their common legitimate children and has greater responsibility than the father over her illegitimate children. But the wife has legally no voice in any state in determining the conjugal domicile. The Federal law gives the woman complete equality in nationality with man. She may keep her nationality after marriage to an alien, and may on equal terms with the husband transmit her nationality to her children.

Economic Rights. — More than ten million women were listed as wage-earners in 1930. Of these, about a million and a half, practically as many women as men, were engaged in the professions. The rest were working as servants, as factory hands, in agriculture and as clerks and stenographers. Yet, in spite of this great advance of American women, there is to-day in the United States, as everywhere, an attempt to force women out of public positions and back into the home. In the matter of discrimination against married women, in an investigation of 6,117 cases, about a fifth reported discriminations. And of these, only a quarter had no dependants ; almost a third had the entire responsibility for others of their families ; well over half shared the responsibility with others.

Congress in 1932 succumbed to the depression crisis, and the House slipped a Marital Status Clause into the Economy Act. This Clause 213 provided that in any reduction of personnel in any branch of the service, if married persons were living together, that one or the other be dismissed from Government service. The obvious intent of this clause, though written in terms of sex equality, was the ousting of married women. Immediately 45 women, all of them highly efficient workers, whose term of service averaged fifteen years and all of them with dependants, were dismissed from the service, losing, not only their income, but also the right to reappointment and to a civil pension. Privation and financial loss followed upon these dismissals. Payment on homes which were being bought by instalments could not be kept up. Many dependants were thrown on public or private charity, and there have been serious social results. At first couples, terrified by impending financial disaster, separated in order to keep their jobs. When the Civil Service Commission ruled that this would not prevent dismissals, they resorted to divorce. Engagements were broken up. Young couples in the civil service are living together without any legal marriage.

The Government, by the Economy Act Clause 213, has set a pattern which is being followed by private employers, and by State, county and local governments, as a justification for dismissing married women. Dismissals are spreading from married women to women in general. The check girls and cigarette saleswomen protested to the New York State Department of Labour, because under a new law they were forbidden to work after 10 p.m.

In any statement about equal rights for women in the United States it must be pointed out that, while the laws of most states as stated above put women in a very good position, the laws in some States are often very far behind the times. There are more than a thousand laws in the United States discriminating

against women. These laws cover more than sixty points of inequality. These discriminations touch women in every sphere of life and activity. There are, for instance, still States where the father may will away the child from the mother, where the child's earnings belong to the father alone, where the wife's earnings belong to the husband, where women teachers in school have not the same pay as men. In order that women may not be subject to the idiosyncrasies of the various States' legislatures, a *Federal Equal Rights Amendment* wa sintroduced into the United States Congress in January 1935, and reads as follows : " Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and in every place subject to its jurisdiction. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." This amendment is now before Congress.

There has been discussion as to whether the discriminations against women should not be eliminated one by one by specific laws in the various States, rather than by a constitutional amendment. The women point to the extreme slowness of doing it State by State. In ten years, from 1920 to 1930, one organisation secured the removal of 141 discriminatory laws in the States. A splendid achievement, but there remain still about a thousand discriminations. In Maryland, in 1920, there were thirty-four discriminatory laws against women. In fifteen years, through a devoted group of feminists, eight have been removed but twenty-six still remain. Obviously, therefore, to remove a thousand discriminations in forty-eight States, generations of women must be born, live and die without seeing the job accomplished, unless there is a Constitutional Amendment.

F. Women under Alien Rule.

A digest of a report by Miss Monica Whatley, secretary of the Six Point Group, United Kingdom, gives some facts concerning the status of native women in lands under alien rule. The United Kingdom has not created the conditions described in foreign lands under her rule, but those conditions continue to exist in spite of British rule.

British Territories (Africa).

In many parts of Africa the native woman is so completely " property " that she is not only purchased and bartered but inherited. The father has absolute right to choose the husband for the daughter. An unmarried girl whose father dies is assessed as " goods " and shared by the male heirs. No man may have a wife without paying her owner a price.

In *Rhodesia,* though the law does not recognise the girl's right to her own body, there is a law to protect her from coercion.

In *Natal,* the Native Code lays down the price that may be asked for a girl wife.

Union of South Africa. — The " ownership " of girls is upheld by the courts, but the purchase does not confer wifehood under the law. In *Basutoland,* a reservation over which the British Colonial Office still keeps a measure of control, a measure was passed in 1915 by which no native woman may cross the frontiers into Union territories without the sanction of her " natural guardian "—namely, her owner. If she does, she is liable to fine or imprisonment. This Act was signed by Lord Buxton, Governor-General, and Sir Cecil Rodwell, Imperial Secretary. By the Treaty of Protectorate, the Bechuana chiefs stipulated there should be no coming of age for women. In 1868, by a High Court Decree, it was declared *contra honor mores* to countenance polygamy. But the purchase of girls continued. It was decided that none of the purchased girls could be wives; they are therefore in the position of purchased concubines. The purchased girls have no redress and the men still have the right to own and sell their daughters. Purchased wives are not supported by their purchaser. They have to support him and have no claim on his wages if he works.

Southern Nigeria. — Here slavery still exists. Lord Lugard, Governor of Southern Nigeria, says in dealing with the freeing of slaves : " The male slaves are at liberty to assert their freedom and offer themselves as labourers for wages . . . The case of women is complicated by questions of marriage, concubinage, dowries and divorce . . . based, it may be, on the payment of the ' dowry '. A woman slave who pays her ransom finds herself not free but in the custody of the Government, who may place her in a Mission or in some other form of restraint until a husband is found for her.

Cameroons. — It is claimed that chiefs have rights of possession over all unmarried girls. Widows are assumed to have caused their husband's death and are subjected to shocking treatment subsequent to the decease of a husband.

British Territories (Asia).

China. — Hong-Kong. — The Chinese custom of keeping Mui Tsai is a system akin to slavery. Slavery was abolished in China years ago, yet every year thousands of women and girl children are openly sold. Hong-Kong was ceded to the United Kingdom in 1842 ; the census of 1921 reckoned there were some 9,000 Mui Tsai or domestic slaves upon the island. In 1923, a law was passed which provided that no more Mui Tsai were to be engaged nor any female servant under ten years old. Those having Mui Tsai must have them registered. At the same time, it is a fact that, in Hong-Kong, the law does allow a girl to be bought and sold under the subterfuge of adoption and her position as the property of her purchaser remains the same as that of the Mui Tsai without the protection of registration. If the child slave does not die of ill usage, her owner can sell her for a wife or to a house of licensed prostitution, where girls frequently suffer terrible beatings.

Cyprus. — During the last three years, Turkish girls in Cyprus have been sold at the rate of twenty a month to Arabs in Palestine in search of wives, and the traffic still continues.

If we accept the definition of slavery as drawn up by the League of Nations Slavery Convention of 1926 that " slavery is the status of a person over whom all or any of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised ", we cannot deny that the status of women in many instances is only that of a slave, since the right of ownership of her own person is denied her.

French Territories (Africa).

A brief report by Maria Vérone, of the International Council, on the status of women in the French colonies, says :

The native woman is subject to the customs of the country, but certain legal provisions have been made which modify a little her very unhappy state.

Algeria. — According to a law of 1930, and a decree of 1931, certain rights have been given the Arab women of Algeria, whose position formerly was worse than that of animals. They can now demand a divorce from their husbands in the case of abandonment, insufficient support, or the disappearance of the husband, for a period of two years. They have the right to inherit, whereas formerly they were disinherited and had no property rights whatever.

West Africa. — In Gabon and the Cameroons, the woman is bought by her future husband. In many places, a rich man can buy as many wives as he likes ; they are in reality his slaves working for their master, who often ill-treats them and underfeeds them. In the Cameroons, on the death of the husband, the wife is the property of the heir. This custom, suppressed in certain places, still exists in the interior.

French Territories (Asia).

Indo-China. — The greatest evil is in connection with the children who are born of the union of natives and Europeans. The latter are usually public officials. These children are generally abandoned by the father and become wretched outcasts, rejected alike by both natives and Europeans.

IV. CONCLUSION.

Enough has been given in the foregoing report to make it quite evident that throughout the world there are unjust discriminations against women. These discriminations have not brought prosperity to the nations. It is to be noted that the countries which are held to be most civilised and progressive are those very countries where some measure of equality has been given. But even in these countries, the status of women is being lowered.

The acceptance of an International Convention establishing the worldwide recognition of complete equality of rights between the sexes is the only remedy for this situation. The slightest breach in the principle of equality means a lowering of women's legal and economic status which renders the rights already won unstable.

The attempt to secure equal rights for women, nation by nation, is not sufficient. It would require generations to bring about a world change by such a method, just as in the United States the method of winning equal rights State by State was found to be an unending task. The Equal Rights Treaty should be approved by the Assembly as a body and then presented to all the Members of the League not already signatories. Each nation could then embody the principle in its laws according to the needs of that nation. As the country developed and men acquired greater rights, women would equally enjoy these rights.

Therefore, the Consultative Committee, representing 45 million women, appeals to the delegates of the Assembly to take this new and forward-looking step of supporting the Equal Rights Treaty, which would make the Assembly of 1935 historic.

International Council of Women :

(*Signed*) Louisa C. A. VAN EEGHEN ;
(*Signed*) Dr. Renée GIROD
(proxy for Maria VÉRONE).

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom :

(*Signed*) Madeleine Z. DOTY ;
(*Signed*) Eugénie M. MELLER.

International American Commission of Women :

(*Signed*) Alice PAUL ;
(*Signed*) Doris STEVENS.

Equal Rights International :

(*Signed*) Dorothy EVANS ;
(*Signed*) Madame HEKIMI
(proxy for Lilian VON MATSCH).

All-Asian Conference of Women :

(*Signed*) Dr. Rosa WELT-STRAUS.

Annex. [1]

CLASSIFIED LIST OF SOURCES.

ARGUMENTS FOR EQUAL RIGHTS.

(*a*) Report : " Civil and Political Rights of Women ", Summary by Inter-American Commission of Women, December 1934.

(*b*) Pamphlet : " Unemployment and Employment among Women ", *Int. Labour Review*, April 1935, Henri Fuss.

(*c*) No. 18, Provisional Record, International Labour Conference, June 15th, 1935.

---

[1] The documents mentioned in this annex have been transmitted to the Secretariat by the Committee and deposited in the archives.

Status of Women in Various Countries.

A. Europe.

Suffrage.

(*a*) "Le Droit des Femmes et les Nouvelles Constitutions", 1935, by Suzanne Grinberg (pamphlet).

France.

(*a*) Report by Maria Vérone, advocate at Paris, representative of the International Council of Women.

Germany.

(*a*) *Equal Rights* magazine, published Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., January 5th, 1935.
(*b*) *Ditto*, October 6th, 1934.
(*c*) "Women under Fascism and Communism", by Hilda Browning; Martin Lawrence, publisher (pamphlet).
(*d*) "Fascisme contre la Femme", document of the Conférence Mondiale des Femmes, August 1934.
(*e*) *The Labour Women* magazine article, "Hitler's Campaign against Women", December 1934.
(*f*) Reports by two German women.

References from the International Labour Office, from "Industrial and Labour Information".

(*g*) Status of women : Domestic service ; barmaids ; marriage loans ; exclusion of married women in Government services ; textile industry ; health measures. Vol. XLVIII, No. 8, November 20th, 1933.
(*h*) Measures to reduce hours of work : Chamber of Industry and Commerce recommends the dismissal of persons with multiple earnings ; replacing of women workers by men ; textile industry ; decision to dismiss all women workers before March 31st, 1934, or June 30th, 1934, occupied in the knitting industry (Saxon). Vol. XLVIII, No. 4, October 23rd, 1933.
(*i*) Measures against unemployment : Daughters and wives of higher officials must give up employment. Vol. XLVIII, No. 6, November 6th, 1933.
(*j*) The position of women : The system of marriage loans ; the position of midwives. Vol. L, No. 7, May 14th, 1934.
(*k*) Decline in the employment of women. Vol. L, No. 12, June 18th, 1934.
(*l*) Restrictions on employment : Act regulating engagement of labour, May 15th, 1934 ; women who have been employed in agricultural work may not be engaged in canning factories nor in hotels, cafés, restaurants, in any capacity. Vol. LI, No. 5, July 30th, 1934.
(*m*) Women workers : Further restrictions on the employment of women (marriage loans amended ; decline in the number of women students ; relative decline in the employment of women ; the year of domestic service. Vol. LIV, No. 6, May 6th, 1935.
(*n*) "Unemployed Women : A Year of Domestic Service for Girls." Vol. L, No. 9, May 28th, 1934.

United Kingdom.

(*a*) Report edited by Dorothy Evans, member of Equal Rights International, based on following sources :
(*b*) *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, April 1935.
(*c*) Figures taken from 1921 census of England and Wales.
(*d*) Report of Joint Standing Committee of Women's Industrial Organisations, March 1935.
(*e*) *Opportunity*, organ, National Association of Women Civil Servants, May 1935.
(*f*) Statement : Sir Herbert Austin, Balliol College, Oxford, November 1933.
(*g*) Regulations Lead Trade, Reg. 17 (1907), Reg. 484 (1908), Reg. 752 (1911), Reg. 2 (1913), Reg. 329 (1922), Reg. 28 (1928).
(*h*) Trade Union Agreements barring women to certain trades and processes.
(*i*) Women's right to work. Resolution adopted at National Labour Conference, May 1935.
(*j*) Minority Report to War Cabinet on Women in Industry, 1919, by Mrs. Sidney Webb.
(*k*) Demand equal pay for equal work — Mass Meeting, March 1934, with forty-two women's organisations.
(*l*) Nationality demand. Eighteen British and international women's organisations organised deputations to members of British Commonwealth of Nations, March and February 1934, March 1935.
(*m*) British Law Sex Discriminations. Domicile : Dicey Conflict of Laws, 5th ed., page 107.
(*n*) Married Women's Property Act, 1882 ; 45 and 46 Vic. cap. 75.
(*o*) Married Women's Property Act, 1893 ; 56 and 57 Vic. cap. 63.
(*p*) Law Revision Committee, 4th Interim Report, 1934, Cmd. 4770.
(*q*) Divorce Supreme Court of Judicature (consolidation) Act 1925, 15 and 16 Geo. V, cap. 49.
(*r*) Sex Disqualification Removal Act.
(*s*) Slander of Women Act, 1891 ; 54 and 55 Vic. cap. 50 and 51.
(*t*) Bankruptcy Act, 1914 ; 4 and 5 Geo V, cap. 59.
(*u*) Maintenance, Married Women Act, 1895 ; 58 and 59 Vic. cap. 39.
(*v*) Separation and Maintenance Act, 1935, 15 and 16 Geo. V, cap. 51.
(*w*) Licensing Act, 1902 ; 2 Edw. VII, cap. 28.
(*x*) British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914.
(*y*) Parliament (Qualification of Women) Act, 1918, 8 and 9 Geo. V, cap. 47.
(*z*) Representation of the People (Equal Franchise) Act, 1928 ; 18 and 19 Geo. V, cap. 12.
(1*a*) Local Government Act, 1894, 56 and 57 Vic. cap. 73.
(1*b*) Women and Young Persons (Employment in Lead Processes) Act, 1920 ; 10 and 11 Geo. V, cap. 62.
(1*c*) Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 ; 1 Edw. VII, cap. 22.
(1*d*) Poor Law Act, 1930 ; 20 Geo. V, cap. 17.
(1*e*) Unemployment Insurance Act, 1920-1934 ; Ministry of Labour Regulations, Sec. 37 and 42.
(1*f*) Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1872 ; 35 and 36 Vic. cap. 65.
(1*g*) Bastardy Act, 1923 ; 13 and 14 Geo. V, cap. 23.
(1*h*) Affiliation Orders (Increase of Maximum Payment) Act, 1918 ; 8 and 9 Geo. V, cap. 49.
(1*i*) Income Tax Act, 1916 ; General Rules. Schedules A, B, C, D and E (No. 16).
(1*j*) Finance Act, 1927 ; 5th Schedule, Part II.

Hungary.

(*a*) Legal Status of Women : " Discriminations against Women ", by Eugenie M. MELLER, representative of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Irish Free State.

(*a*) Report by Women's Organisations convened by Irish Women Workers Union ; Louie Bennett, Secretary.

Lithuania.

(*a*) Report on the Status of Women by the National Council, University Women and Catholic Women.

Netherlands.

(*a*) Report from women's organisation, verified by Miss van Eeghen.

Scandinavian Countries.

Denmark.

(*a*) Report based on answers to questionnaire sent out by International Council of Women.

Finland.

(*a*) Report prepared by Madame Hainari (former delegate to League of Nations) for National Council.

Switzerland.

(*a*) Eleventh Report of " Association Suisse des Femmes universitaires ".

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(*a*) Report by Madame Duchene, representative of World Union of Women against War and Fascism.
(*b*) Letter of Madame Thibert of International Labour Office on protective legislation for women in Russia.
(*c*) Distribution of Labour, 46.9% new workers engaged in 1932 to be women—increase from 30 to 35%. *Industrial and Labour Information*, Vol. XLI, No. 8, page 165, February 1932.
(*d*) Employment of Women : Order issued March 8th, 1935—training women, securing collective farms for women ; adequate political, technical and general education to provide for promotion ; giving them managerial posts ; women to take effective part in local Soviets. Vol. LIV, No. 3. April 15th, 1935, page 114.

B. Asia.

India.

(*a*) Report prepared by All-Asian Conference of Women, sent by Secretary, Rani L. Rajwade.
(*b*) Report before the Indian Franchise Committee ; Lahore, April 1932.
(*c*) Status of Indian Women in New Constitution, Memorandum 1, August 1931.
(*d*) Status of Indian Women in New Constitution, Memorandum 2, June 1933.
(*e*) Memorandum of the All-Indian Women's Conference submitted to Indian Franchise Committee.
(*f*) Report of three Indian women representing National Council, All-Indian Women and the Indian Women's Associations on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1933.
(*g*) Supplementary Statement to above report ; London, July 1933.
(*h*) Extracts from Joint Parliamentary Report relating to Women ; Karachi, 1934.
(*i*) Legal Disabilities of Women ; reprint from *Modern Review*, November 1934.

Palestine.

(*a*) Report by Dr. Rosa Welt-Straus, delegate to the Consultative Committee from the All-Asian Women's Conference.

C. South Africa.

Union of South Africa.

(*a*) Brief report by the Association of University Women.

D. South and Central America.

(*a*) Digest of Civil and Political Rights of Women in South and Central America ; Report of Seventh International Conference of American States, Montevideo.

(*b*) *Argentine :* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women based on the Constitution, Civil Code and Matrimonial Laws.

(*c*) *Bolivia :* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil and Penal Codes.

(*d*) *Brazil :* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and the Civil Code.

(*e*) *Colombia :* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women based on the Constitution, Civil Code and Penal Code.

(f) *Chile:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil, Commercial Code and Matrimonial Laws.

(g) *Costa Rica:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on all laws dealing with women.

(h) *Cuba:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil Code and Divorce Laws.

(i) *Ecuador:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil Code, Law of Civil Marriage, etc.

(j) *Guatemala:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(k) *Haiti:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil, Commercial and Criminal Codes.

(l) *Honduras:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(m) *Mexico:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(n) *Nicaragua:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(o) *Panama:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(p) *Paraguay:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil Code and Matrimonial Laws.

(q) *Peru:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil, Penal and Commercial Codes.

(r) *Dominican Republic:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution, Civil and Commercial Code, Laws of Divorce, Law of Civil Marriage, etc.

(s) *Salvador:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(t) *Uruguay:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(u) *Venezuela:* Report of Inter-American Commission on Civil and Political Rights of Women, based on the Constitution and Civil Code.

(v) *Equal Rights* magazine, special Pan-American edition, Saturday, July 7th, 1934. Published at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

E. North America.

(a) *Equal Rights* magazine. Organ of National Women's Party. March 15th, 1935.
(b) *Equal Rights* magazine. Published at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A. Saturday, May 25th, 1935.
(c) *Equal Rights* magazine. Published at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A. Saturday, June 29th, 1935.

United States Department of Labour, Women's Bureau.

(d) " Women in Industry ", Report by Mary ANDERSON, Director. September 27th, 1934 (pamphlet).
(e) " A Preliminary Study on the Application of Section 213 of the Economy Act of June 30th, 1932 ". April 1935 (pamphlet).
(f) " Gainful Employment of Married Women ". October 1934 (pamphlet).
(g) " Summaries of Studies on the Economic Status of Women ". *Bulletin*, No. 134.

United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education.

(h) " The Legal Status of Married Women Teachers " (pamphlet, No. 47).

American Association of University Women.

(i) " Comparative Salaries of Men and Women Teachers : The Principle of Equal Pay for Equal Services ". November 1934.
(j) " Some Reports on the Placement of Women College Graduates ". December 1934.
(k) " References and Notes relating to the General Subject of Occupational Discrimination against Women ". February 1935.
(l) " Trends in the Gainful Employment of Women in the United States ". May 1935.
(m) " The New Deal that Women Want ". Government Workers' Council, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. (pamphlet).
(n) " Why the Equal Rights Amendment ? " (pamphlet).
(o) " Back to the Kitchen ? Women say ' No ' ". *The New York Times Magazine*, June 9th, 1935.

F. Women under Alien Rule.

British Territories (Africa).

(a) Digest of report by Miss Monica Whatley, secretary of Six-Point Group.
(b) Miss Rathbone's speech, House of Commons, December 11th, 1929.
(c) " What is Slavery ? " by C. Nina BOYLE.
(d) Native Administration Act, 1927.
(e) Reports by Medical Officers on Infantile Mortality. International Conference, June 1931.
(f) Report of Select Committee, Senate of Union Parliament, on Native Customs and Marriage Law, 1913.
(g) Native Women Restriction Act; Basutoland, 1915.
(h) Native Code of Natal.
(i) Native Marriage Ordinance; Southern Rhodesia, 1917.
(j) Native Administration Act of Union of South Africa, 1927.

British Territories (Asia).

(*a*) League of Nations Union. Speakers' notes.
(*b*) Article by Mrs. M. M. DYMOND in the *Slave Market News*, April 1933.
(*c*) "Child Slaves in Hong-Kong". Lt.-Cmdr. and Mrs. H. L. HASLEWOOD.
(*d*) In an interview between Mr. H. D. Vernon, of the Colonial Office of the United Kingdom, and Miss Nina Boyle, he admitted that Turkish girls were sold at the rate of 20 a month to Arabs in Palestine in search of wives, and that this traffic has been going on at this rate for the last three years, and still continues.

French Territories (Africa and Asia).

(*a*) Report by Maria Vérone on conditions in the French colonies.

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE OF WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.[1]

for securing the Appointment of Women to the International and Expert Committees of the League of Nations.

STATUS OF WOMEN.

The Joint Standing Committee of Women's International Organisations has noted that, on the agenda of the Assembly of the League of Nations, there appears the consideration of the status of women.

While the Joint Committee is not concerned to express its views on this question as a whole, it is concerned with the particular question of the equal opportunities of women and men in regard to all posts in or in connection with the League of Nations itself. That equality is guaranteed in the Covenant of the League and its application in practice is the sole matter with which our Joint Committee is concerned.

We are aware that, as regards the appointment of women members to the Committees and other bodies of the League, in some cases it is solely the Governments of the States Members who make such appointments. In other cases where appointments are made by the Council of the League, we are not unaware of the difficulties caused by the comparatively small number of women who, in their respective countries, have access to positions such as would make them specially qualified for appointment to the League Committees. This aspect of the question, therefore, tends to fall under that wider consideration of the status of women which is being dealt with by other bodies.

But my Committee is seriously concerned with the position of women in the Secretariat of the League, not in individual cases, but taking that service as a whole. The study of the staff reveals the fact that, so far from there appearing to be that steady improvement in the relative position of women which might have been expected to occur from the opportunities of acquiring experience provided by time, the number of women in higher posts tends rather to decrease. We are aware that a process of rationalisation has recently been carried out, and we had hoped that this would have reacted favourably by permitting the reasonable promotion of competent and experienced women members of the staff.

We would desire respectfully to emphasise that, in the administration of the League, the ideals of justice and equality for which it stands should consciously be kept in mind alongside the need for a high standard of efficiency. Just as the matter of a certain proportion of nationals of the different States Members is borne in mind, other factors being equal, so surely a certain fair distribution of the posts between men and women would suitably be considered, without detriment to efficiency of the personnel which must, of course, be the first consideration of those responsible for a great service.

(*Signed*) Edith M. H. BIGLAND,
Honorary Secretary.

---

[1] This committee is composed of the following organisations :

World's Women's Christian Temperance Union, International Council of Women, World's Young Women's Christian Association, International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Union of Women for International Concord, International Federation of University Women, St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance, Equal Rights International.

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE WOMEN'S GUILD.

NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF WOMEN.

Immediately after the war, numerous European countries and a few outside Europe accorded to women equal suffrage and the right of election to official bodies. These changes seemed to satisfy the demand for equality between the sexes and many were of the opinion that a definitely feminist movement would no longer be necessary. Soon, however, it became evident that this political equality was not the end and final goal of the equal rights campaign, but only a first step on the road leading to complete sex equality. The fact that women had won equal rights in one sphere of public activity led to an investigation of the opportunities existing in other spheres and an examination of all male rights in order to ascertain what further steps were possible and necessary to achieve complete equality between the sexes.

Certain legal hardships, which women themselves had not realised in the days before they won their independence and entered the ranks of paid workers, now became intolerable, and the new demands were not initiated by organisations but came from the women themselves, because the practical difficulties they experienced showed them that they were not yet completely freed from their shackles. The question of the nationality of married women, for example, assumed special importance owing to the fact that, when new States were created, a great many people were placed in the position of immigrants, the result being that many women either became stateless or, after living in a country with advanced laws and customs favourable to women, found themselves under a backward regime with laws framed according to bygone ideas. It is therefore an error to consider the demands of the women's organisations as purely academic and not based on urgent practical needs.

The civil rights of women are not as yet really secure in any country. The International Co-operative Women's Guild, which carries out its activities within the framework of a great worldwide trading organisation, made an investigation a few years ago into the personal rights of women in the co-operative movements of the various countries. This showed that there are still countries where the provisions of the civil code make it difficult for married women to become members of co-operative societies because they are unable to make a contract without the consent of their husbands and cannot undertake any liabilities which might become a charge on the family income. Conditions differ so widely that almost every country has different laws, and this puts great difficulties in the way of any international agreement.

There are two classes of legislation. In many cases, it is essential that each country must frame and administer independently its own laws, but, on the other hand, certain forms of legislation can only become operative if they are approved by, and also form part of, the code of other States. This applies to the nationality of married women. Within the last few years, for instance, it happened that a country anxious to accord fuller rights to its women could not do so without the collaboration and assistance of other States. National action cannot solve this problem; an international convention forming the basis for a universal settlement is essential. It is for this reason that all the women's organisations have always pressed for an international solution, and during the last few years all the important women's organisations have been forced to give special attention to this question because it has been proved again and again that any insecurity as to nationality affecting any member of the family entails hardships, not only for the wife and children, but also for the husband. We do not wish to trace here the thorny path that the women's organisations had to travel in order to attain their objective, but we should like to explain that, after the Hague Codification Conference of 1930, the International Co-operative Women's Guild did not oppose the decisions of the Conference but supported the ratification of the Hague Convention solely because of its conviction that this did, in fact, bring relief to a number of women. In Austria, for instance, a woman gained the right to resume her own nationality if her marriage with a foreigner were dissolved through death or divorce. Moreover, the Hague decision that a woman shall not lose her own nationality unless she takes that of her husband is decidedly an improvement on existing legislation. Again, Article 10, which provides that a married couple cannot change their nationality during the course of the marriage without the consent of the wife, certainly improves the woman's position, for, if the wife's consent is to be a determining factor, the husband will be forced to consult his wife's wishes before making a decision. No one will maintain that the Convention solves fully all the problems at issue. The Conference itself adopted by twenty-seven votes to two a resolution urging the various States to examine the legal position in their country with a view to ascertaining whether it would not be possible to introduce into their laws the principle of complete equality between the sexes. In this connection, we should like to draw attention to a danger that should not be overlooked when framing national or international legislation to accord the sexes equal rights—namely, the

repeal of absolutely essential laws affecting women in order to bring about complete legal equality with men.

Under the marriage laws obtaining in some European countries, for instance, a husband is responsible for his wife's debts if incurred in providing for the needs of the household, while the wife has no similar liability. In such cases, it would have to be considered whether it would be more advisable to extend the liability to both parties or frame entirely new laws applicable to both sexes and more in harmony with present social and economic conditions. A hard and fast rule as to complete equality can be specially dangerous to protective legislation affecting women as mothers. Here, where there is no equality of function, legal equality cannot exist. Even in the Soviet Union, where the principle of equality between the sexes as regards industrial provisions has been very widely introduced, there has been no attempt made to sweep away all protective legislation applicable to women as mothers and prospective mothers.

We venture to suggest that all these considerations make it imperative that the League of Nations should consider this question in all its bearings and not be content with evolving a mere formula, for we are convinced that great care and foresight will be needed to avoid a solution damaging to the interests of women and children. Unfortunately, the method at present adopted by the League—and it is the League that must conduct any further investigations into the problems at issue—seems too circumscribed to achieve the desired result. The International Co-operative Women's Guild is of the opinion that, instead of setting up a non-statutory committee of women's organisations, it would have been preferable to appoint a Committee answerable to the League which, like any other permanent League Commission, would have the task of making a complete study of the questions included in its terms of reference. This Committee should be composed of both sexes and should include lawyers and statesmen, as in the case of the Health Committee, the Child Welfare Committee and others. An advantage of such a Committee would be that all kinds of women's organisations could be represented on it, whereas, at present, large groups of women, such as those forming the Catholic, Socialist and Trade Union organisations, whose point of view differs from that of the Women's Consultative Committee, are not in a position to collaborate in its work. Success will only be possible if the interests of all the different women's groups, together with the legal and political aspects of the problem, receive full consideration and a policy formulated which will ensure a just and satisfactory solution of the whole question. At present, we feel that it is not receiving from the League the attention it deserves, although we appreciate the fact that the nationality of married women is on the agenda of the 1935 Assembly. If the Assembly would use its powers to set up a special committee composed of prominent jurists, representatives of those countries opposed to equal nationality rights and representatives of all the important women's organisations, there would appear to be a possibility of ultimately framing a Convention that would not take the form of an empty formula but would put forward concrete proposals giving a real lead to the various Governments.

The International Co-operative Women's Guild approves the action of the Consultative Committee in calling for a revision of the Hague Convention's nationality provisions. The Guild agrees that these did not go far enough, although they were undoubtedly a first step towards the solution of a very weighty problem. We should welcome the ratification of a fresh Convention recognising the principle of equality between the sexes, but we are anxious that this should not merely state a theoretical formula but should include proposals for something more definite than a recommendation that all States should seek to abolish, both in law and in practice, all discriminations between men and women as regards nationality. Such a recommendation would, we fear, be interpreted by each State according to its own views and would not lead to the adoption of a common policy by all the women's organisations. The Convention would thus be applied according to the circumstances prevailing in each country and, as at the present time there is in many countries a strong tendency to oppose the principle of equality and still further limit the rights of women, it seems probable that in such cases it would lead to a further curtailment of a married woman's independence and her right to control over her own person. Moreover, from a legal standpoint, it is possible that, even though equal nationality rights might be granted in theory, provisions as to the nationality of the children might make it so difficult for a married woman to exercise her right to decide her own nationality that this would, in fact, prove wholly illusory. The International Co-operative Women's Guild feels, therefore, that it can only endorse the proposals of the Consultative Committee if these are regarded as providing a basis and guiding principles for a complete investigation into all aspects of the problem in order to ensure that, after having won theoretical equality, women do not find themselves in practice in a still more dangerous position than they are at present.

In our opinion, such an investigation should give particular consideration to the following points :

The provisions governing the acquisition of nationality by a woman :

(1) On marriage ;

(2) During the course of the marriage ;

(3) When the marriage is dissolved by divorce or through death.

In this connection, it would be essential that the wife's consent should be asked either verbally or in writing both by the authorities of the country she is leaving and those of the country where she is about to settle. Not until a definite declaration on this point has been obtained can other allied problems be dealt with satisfactorily.

Due consideration must also be given to the interests of the children. In no question affecting the marriage laws must the interests of the children be treated as of secondary importance, for nothing has a worse effect on the physical and mental welfare of young people than for them to be the centre of parental disputes and forced to live in an atmosphere of perpetual conflicts which may give rise to all kinds of cruelties. The parents themselves will not always be influenced by considerations of what will be best in the future interests of their children; they are more likely to be swayed by the question of property rights or a love of their own homeland, even though there may be better social and educational prospects for their children in the new country, and such considerations will often outweigh the question of what is best for the children.

This matter, moreover, is closely bound up with the question of the parents' rights over their children and whether the State or the parents shall decide the nationality of the children. There are instances, for example, where sons of military age who were still minors were not allowed to change their nationality although younger members of the family were permitted to do so, with the result that the family was split in two. In how far the rights of parents are to take precedence of the claims of the State is likely to become a very important question as the State in all countries tends to concern itself more and more with the life and education of the child out of school hours.

We feel, therefore, that it is imperative to ask more from the League of Nations than the elaboration of a mere formula which, however valuable it may have proved as a means of stimulating women's interest and establishing the principle of equality, will not in itself provide a solution of one of the most difficult and complicated of those problems that demand an international solution.

As always, the International Co-operative Women's Guild declares itself ready to give all possible support to the work of the League and places itself and its members at the League's disposal in any way that may help to bring about a satisfactory solution of all the above-mentioned problems.

(*Signed*) Emmy FREUNDLICH,
President.

(*Signed*) A. Honora ENFIELD,
Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN.

STATUS OF WOMEN.

The International Federation of Business and Professional Women welcomes the consideration by the 1935 Assembly of the League of Nations of the question of the " whole status of women, with special reference to a Convention on the subject of the equality of rights for both sexes which was signed at Montevideo in December 1933 by Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay ", and appreciates the opportunity provided by the Council to express its views upon this question.

The Federation primarily concerned with the Economic Status of Women.

As an organisation whose membership is composed of some 100,000 women engaged in earning their living in the professional and commercial field in twenty-two countries of the world, the Federation is primarily concerned with the economic aspect of the status of women. The Federation stands for the establishment of conditions which will assure to women, and to men as well, the fullest possible opportunity for the development of whatever capacities they may possess.

The Federation has long been gravely concerned with the difficulties its members face in their work, difficulties whose fundamental cause lies in the inequalities of status still existing between men and women. Even where equality exists in law, in practice women are often severely handicapped by habit and prejudice. This is particularly apparent in times of economic depression, as evidenced by the reaction against women's right to work during the past three years,

The growing tendency to exclude women from employment is viewed by the Federation with increasing anxiety. Numbers of its own members in all countries cannot find work, whilst the younger generation of women faces an increasing limitation of opportunity both of training and of obtaining work in the future.

Protective Legislation and the Equality of Rights Convention.

While urgently desirous of an improvement in the status of women by international agreement between Governments, the Federation, as early as 1932, declared its position on the question of the adoption of an international convention drafted in similar terms to the text of the Equality of Rights Convention, Article No. 1, by pointing out that, while the Federation was "in favour of equal rights as regards the constitutional and civic rights of women, the social implications of the Equal Rights Bill were so involved and the conditions applicable to the members of the International Federation so diverse that is was felt impossible to take action on the Equal Rights Treaty as a whole".

The Federation has always stood for the maintenance of the just and recognised standards which labour has built up through the years to prevent the exploitation of working men, women and children, and would deplore any breaking down of such standards, which organised industrial women have repeatedly declared to be essential to their welfare. Where, however, the legislation establishing these standards has adversely affected the interests of business and professional women, the Federation has consistently demanded the exemption of such categories of workers.

Need for Investigation into the Whole Status of Women.

Recognising that the usefulness of any international agreement must ultimately depend upon national action, based on a knowledge of the varying social and economic conditions in each country, the Federation considers that the only reasonable method of approach to a solution of so complex a problem as equality of rights between the sexes is by way of investigation into the status of women in each country.

The Federation has already initiated a programme of research into the economic status of women in the countries where its national branches are established. This investigation is only in its elementary stage, but attached to this memorandum is a list of the most important research studies which have already been made by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in the United States of America and published in that country. In general, the aim of these studies has been to discover the psychological and economic factors which govern women's success in and suitability for professional and commercial life, the extent to which they have been affected by unemployment and whether or not age and sex curtail their opportunities for advancement.

Other national federations are at the moment engaged in research on similar lines.

Exclusion of Women from Employment and Increasing Limitation of their Opportunities of Training and Work.

No investigation can be made into the question of the economic status of women without recognising that, whereas formerly much of the work of production was entirely in the hands of women, who were the administrators of household industries, these industries in the modern economic order have been taken out of the home and commercialised.

"In seeking gainful employment to-day, women, like men, are actuated by economic necessity, . . . and by a desire to lift standards of living for themselves, their families and their dependants. . . . It is certain that the necessity to provide for dependants is an important factor for women as well as for men." [1] "As long as men's incomes are insufficient to cover civilised requirements or even elementary necessities, millions of girls and married women are forced to supplement the family income by seeking work. Furthermore, even where there is no economic necessity, there are large numbers of women who would still work for their own satisfaction and whose skill forms a necessary element in the scheme of production." [2]

While there is a mass of evidence to show that women's work is "an essential and not easily dispensable element in the modern economic order", [3] past experience and recent

---

[1] Mrs. G. MacM. BOWMAN, in "Changing Standards": Report of the Fourth Annual *New York Herald-Tribune* Conference on Current Problems, 1934, pages 186 and 187.

[2] See Report of the Director of the International Labour Office, 1935, page 67.

[3] Arthur SALZ, in the "Encyclopædia of Social Sciences",

events have proved that this fact is not yet sufficiently realised. Even in normal times women are often severely handicapped in seeking training and employment by such restrictions as :

(*a*) Non-admittance to the study and practice of certain professions in certain countries ; [1]

(*b*) Denial of opportunity for promotion to higher executive or administrative positions, regardless of ability, qualifications or experience ;

(*c*) Refusal to appoint married women or to allow women to retain their positions after marriage ;

(*d*) Payment of lower salaries than those given to men for similar duties, regardless of ability, qualifications or experience.

Moreover, since the economic depression became acute, not only have these restrictions been more widely applied, as, for instance, in Canada and the United States of America, where there is an increasing tendency to discriminate against women, but women's opportunities for training and employment have been further curtailed by new legislative measures, excluding women from positions which they had already filled with ability, efficiency and even distinction.

This type of legislation has limited salaries, excluded from employment married women, such as lawyers, doctors, public servants and teachers, or has greatly restricted their opportunities of training and work, and, in one country [2], has provided that " wherever possible women shall be replaced by men ".

The Federation, whose membership includes not only the office worker, but also the scientific, technical and administrative woman, considers that, quite apart from all question of right or justice, such action is economically unsound and will prove no solution for the unemployment problem which all countries face to-day.[3] Leaving aside the fact that in many occupations the employment of women is a technical necessity, the Federation is persuaded that their exclusion from employment or from exercising their trades or professions will not only decrease their power of purchasing goods but also of purchasing services, for many women create employment for both sexes in the enterprises which have been built up and maintained by their own initiative and energy.

The Federation stands for a closer working co-operation between men and women and deplores the increasing tendency once more to make sex the criterion in the choice of workers, instead of considerations of ability, qualifications, efficiency and experience.

The Federation trusts that steps will be taken in the near future to explore the whole question of women's work and that Governments will refrain from passing further restrictive legislation until the subject has been more clearly and definitely surveyed and analysed.

Enquiry into the Whole Status of Women by an International Commission.

Recognising the need for definite improvement in the whole status of women, the Federation urges that an enquiry should be made by Governments into the present status and position of women in their countries, taking into account the legal, social, political and economic aspects of the question, and suggests that this enquiry should be placed under the authority of an International Commission appointed by the League of Nations. The aim of this enquiry should be to reveal the best methods of improving the status of women in each country, and to establish the measure of agreement *on definite points* now possible between Governments, taking into account existing difficulties both in law and practice. The results of such an investigation should provide an effective basis for further concerted international action.

The Federation earnestly trusts that such an enquiry will be undertaken at the earliest possible moment, and offers its co-operation wherever possible.

---

[1] For example, in the Province of Quebec, Canada, women are debarred by sex from the practice of law and from the study and practice of architecture.

[2] The Netherlands.

[3] Refer to " The Economic Depression ", *International Labour Review*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4, April, and No. 5, May 1933, pages 30 to 40 ; " Unemployment and Employment among Women ", by Henri Fuss, Chief of the Unemployment, Employment and Migration Section of the International Labour Office, *International Labour Review*, Vol. XXXI, No. 4, April, 1935, pages 30 to 38 ; and Report of the Director of the International Labour Office, 1935, page 76, paragraph 2.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN.

STATUS OF WOMEN.

The International Federation of University Women has noted with interest that the Assembly is asked by certain delegations to examine the status of women as a whole and not merely in relation to nationality. As a member of the Liaison Committee of Women's International Organisations, the Federation has subscribed to the principle of equality set forth in the Treaty signed at Montevideo. This memorandum draws attention to one or two aspects of the question which have a special interest for university women.

Basis of the International Federation of University Women.

If the status of women in the intellectual world had not changed remarkably within the last century, the International Federation of University Women could not exist. Its basis of membership is the possession of a university degree, and it is, roughly speaking, about fifty years since women have been given the freedom of the universities. That means freedom to enjoy the highest academic and professional training available. The opportunity to enter professions for which that training has fitted them has followed at various intervals of time in different countries and in different professions. But at this stage in the world's history it can confidently be stated that in the field of intellectual work women have begun to prove their use to the community. Those of exceptional ability have enjoyed liberty to develop their gifts along the most suitable lines, and a large number of very competent workers have been able to use their intelligence where it can be of most benefit to others—*i.e.*, in the kind of work for which they are best fitted. The International Federation of University Women is mainly composed of women actively engaged in professional work in thirty-seven countries.

The Contribution of University Women to the World's Work.

It is sometimes said that women are well qualified for administrative and organising work, but less gifted for original, independent labour in the high altitudes of the academic or scientific world. It is too early as yet to compile trustworthy statistics to combat this easy generalisation, for the proportion of women able to devote their energies to pure research is still small and only the future can produce the true measurement of their developed ability. But it is permissible to point out that, even in this comparatively early period of more adequate opportunity, women have done first-class original work in many fields.

In science, for instance, we may cite, in addition to the famous name of Mme. Curie, the names of Professor Johanna Westerdyk, Professor Elisabeth Schiemann, Dr. Florence Sabin, Dr. Hariette Chick, Dr. G. Elles, as a few among many who have made valuable contributions to knowledge.

As physicians and surgeons, women have made immense progress within the limited time they have been enabled to practise. In the United Kingdom alone, there were 5,391 women on the Medical Register in 1933. Hospitals staffed entirely by women have worked excellently. The appointment of women as professors in the medical faculty of universities (*e.g.*, Professor Laimi Leidenius, of the University of Helsinki) is itself good evidence of their standing, for it is still true that, in most countries, a woman needs to be better qualified than a man if she is to obtain an appointment open to both sexes on nominally equal terms. The recognition gained by such women as Lady Barrett and Dr. Alice Hamilton is not due to their work having been remarkable as the work of women, but simply to its unqualified merit.

Names of women distinguished for their learning and originality could be cited in many other fields—archæology, anthropology, history, philology, philosophy, jurisprudence, economics. In practical field work, the planning and supervising of important excavations, women such as Miss G. Caton Thompson, Dr. Hanna Rydh and Dr. Dorothy Garrod have been remarkably successful, thus disproving in the most simple and effective manner the hoary theory of women's inability to control and organise male labourers.

In the great profession of teaching, women have been largely occupied for a considerable time. But whereas in the past the majority of women teachers were employed to instruct young children or girls, who were not expected to be much educated, to-day large numbers

of secondary schools of the " lycée " or " gymnasium " class are staffed by women. In the universities themselves, a certain number of women are employed, chiefly as " assistants ", some as lecturers or " dozents ", and a few as professors. The table given below (published by the International Federation of University Women in 1932) shows the general distribution of men and women students and teachers in the universities of a number of countries, as given by returns made in 1929-30. The percentage of women on the teaching staff is low, a fact by no means wholly accounted for by the greater " marriage mortality " among women. The percentage of women professors is very low indeed, but the fact remains that, at the time this table was drawn up, there were seventy-eight women holding professorial appointments in the countries given.

Country	Students		Professors		Lecturers, etc.		Percentage of Women Students	Percentage of Women Professors	Percentage of Women Lecturers,
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women			
Union of South Africa [1]	—	—	225	9	406	66	—	3.84	13.98
Australia [1]	—	—	105	—	458	51	—	—	10.01
Belgium [2]	5,354	849	442	1	331	20	13.68	0.23	5.69
United Kingdom [4]	37,095	13,686	829	13	3,103	585	26.95	1.54	15.86
Bulgaria	4,735	1,626	93	2	133	14	25.56	2.10	9.52
Canada [1]	—	—	811	7	1,008	120	—	0.85	10.63
Denmark	4,095	926	97	—	99	10	18.44	—	9.17
Estonia	2,338	1,157	69	—	90	1	33.10	—	1.09
Finland	4,968	2,655	171	2	321	20	34.82	1.15	5.86
France	55,948	15,184	1,103 [3]	7 [3]	467	59	21.34	0.63	11.21
Germany	64,423	12,884	1,570	5	2,999	54	16.66	0.31	1.76
Irish Free State	3,742	1,669	193	8	221	60	30.84	3.98	21.35
Italy	38,168	5,810	1,478	11	6,255	227	13.21	0.73	3.50
Latvia	6,220	2,259	76	—	233	33	26.64	—	12.40
Lithuania	2,880	1,130	44	—	100 [6]	2 [6]	28.17	—	1.96
Luxemburg	42	12	18	—	—	—	22.22	—	—
Netherlands [5]	6,800	1,450	404	5	188	10	17.57	1.22	5.05
New Zealand	— [7]	— [7]	70	1	144	14	—	1.40	8.85
Norway	3,874	557	125	2	157	9	12.57	1.57	5.42
Roumania	22,951	9,227	502	2	415	4	28.67	0.39	0.95
Sweden	6,803	1,265	211	—	338	9	15.67	—	2.59
Switzerland	6,567	1,098	664	3	382 [8]	15 [8]	14.32	0.44	3.77
Yugoslavia	7,451	1,942	217	—	208	12	20.67	—	5.45

[1] No figures available showing the proportion of women students.
[2] Figures refer only to the universities of Brussels, Ghent, Liége.
[3] This figure includes : Professeurs titulaires, maîtres de conférences, chargés de cours réguliers.
[4] London University Medical Schools not included, as no figures available for the students.
[5] Figures for universities of Leiden, Utrecht, Groningen, Amsterdam, Delft. There are apparently no women lecturers or professors in the other universities and a negligible number of women students.
[6] Readers and assistants not included.
[7] Exact figures for students not available—said to be 50% women.
[8] Readers, assistants, etc., not included.

In Government civil services, university women have obtained the right, in many countries, to hold posts in the higher administrative grades, and have justified the confident expectation that they would do well. In public life, a number have been or are Members of Parliament, and in this connection we may mention Miss Eleanor Rathbone, who herself represents the Combined Universities in the United Kingdom Parliament.

University women are also found in the ranks of engineers and architects, where they are performing very good work. We may instance here the winning of the open competition for designs for the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre at Stratford-on-Avon by a woman architect, Miss Scott. As museum curators and librarians, university women hold a number of highly responsible positions. Very recently, the State of New South Wales appointed a distinguished woman to the important post of Mitchell Librarian.

The few examples cited above might be multiplied indefinitely, for women have shown themselves prompt to respond to the chances they have had of bearing their share in the more " intellectual " kinds of labour. But all we desire to do here is to give a general outline of the present position. There are many departments of intellectual work and in most of them women will be found at work.

The Reaction against Women Intellectual Workers.

The International Federation of University Women has noted, with grave concern, the recent tendency in many countries to arrest the progress of women in the sphere of intellectual work. The replies to an enquiry circulated last year among the National Associations of

University Women made it clear that few countries are free from a tendency to place obstructions in the path of the professional woman. Legislative measures have been enforced by some States, and threatened by more. Municipal and other local authorities have yielded to pressure brought to bear upon them and have sought to palliate the unemployment of men by reducing the possible competition of women. Since questions of employment are matters for the International Labour Office, we do not attempt here to enter in any detail into that question or to quote examples of the restrictions from which our members have suffered. But they are numerous and very serious in their immediate effect on the status of university women as well as ominous for the future. Restrictions imposed on the entrance of women students to the university are a further effort to make doubly sure the elimination of competition in the professions. Economic stress, combined with muddled thinking, has had paralysing effects on the present position and future prospects of women intellectual workers.

The Need for a more Constructive Policy.

The incidence of unemployment is mainly felt, at present, by younger graduates and married women. To deprive young people of the hope of a useful career and to dismiss married women from posts they have proved themselves competent to fill is likely, in the long run, to be an expensive waste of good material. The International Federation of University Women is convinced that such short-sighted policy is fundamentally mistaken. To deny to women intellectual workers the right to earn their living by the practice of a profession and to drive them into household labour, without respect to their vocational abilities, is not the road towards a more civilised world, but a return to primitive conditions. What young women with a capacity for intellectual work *need* is the opportunity of leading an active life in the exercise of a profession, with reasonable security of the tenure of positions honourably obtained by good work.

Not only on economic grounds, but also and even more emphatically on the ground of the common human right to develop natural capacity to the utmost and to use special training in directions where it can be of the fullest service, does the International Federation of University Women urge that every effort should be made to reverse the present tendency to debar women either from obtaining the education suited to their highest capacities or from using that education, when obtained, in the service of the community.

Since the whole question of employment is closely bound up with the status of individuals, it is obvious that the legal and economic status of women in each country is a matter of the first importance to their ultimate welfare. The International Federation of University Women urges, therefore, that all possible steps shall be taken to secure to women the place they have earned in the polity of nations.

The text of a resolution passed by the Council of the International Federation of University Women at Budapest last September is appended.

(*Signed*) Joh. Westerdyk,
President.

(*Signed*) Theodora Bosanquet,
Secretary.

Annex.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE FEDERATION AT BUDAPEST ON SEPTEMBER 4TH, 1934.

Considering the value of work accomplished by women in scholarship and scientific research, in the exercise of the liberal professions, in social work, in highly responsible administrative posts and generally in the departments of public life ;

And considering that, since paid work by women is an integral part of our modern economic organisation, to revert to forms of social organisation of a bygone age will afford no effective solution of the present economic crisis ;

And considering that unemployment is due, not to a shortage of work available, but principally to economic complications for which the remedy cannot be found in limitation of opportunities for work by individuals but rather in international co-operation through which alone a solution of the problem can be reached :

The International Federation of University Women,

Strongly deprecates the tendency increasingly evident in the majority of countries by new regulations to debar women from careers for which they are well qualified, whether on grounds of sex or marriage ;

Considers that such regulations are inimical to the family which is itself the foundation of society ;

And desires to affirm its profound conviction that it is only by permitting and encouraging women to play a full and responsible part in the intellectual life of their country that the civilisation and the prosperity of future generations may be developed on a sound basis of general understanding and enlightenment.

OPEN DOOR INTERNATIONAL FOR THE ECONOMIC EMANCIPATION OF THE WOMAN WORKER.

STATUS OF WOMEN.

This Statement deals mainly with the Rights of the Woman in her Capacity as a Worker for Pay.

While the Open Door International desires to see the women of every country of the world enjoying equality of status and equality of rights as between men and women in all relationships of life, its own special task is to secure equality of status and equality of rights as between men and women in their capacity as workers for pay. This statement, therefore, deals mainly with that aspect of the question.

The Status and Rights of the Man are taken as the Human Normal: the Status and Rights of the Woman are always Lower.

The status of an individual is the sum total of his rights and duties. In every community, it is the status of the man which is taken as the normal. [1] His rights are accepted as those pertaining to the human being. To the woman are always denied some of these human rights. In one country or another, she is denied the right to personal liberty, the right to hold property, to contract, to sue and be sued, the right to education, the right to vote and to eligibility, the right to independent personal nationality, the right to enter trades and professions or to hold public office. In one country or another, the woman is dealt with as a negotiable chattel, or sold into marriage or treated like a slave licensed for the lusts of men. In many countries, marriage itself deprives the woman of human rights. There is no country in which, in her capacity as a worker seeking to sell her labour for gain, the woman is not denied by reason of sex or marriage or childbirth some of the normal human rights enjoyed by the male worker.

The Human Rights which make up the Status of the Man in his capacity as a Worker or Earner.

Among the fundamenfal rights which make up the status of a man in his capacity as a worker or earner are :

(*a*) The right to enter any trade or profession or calling and the opportunity for education and apprenticeship ;

(*b*) The right to sell his labour for gain without requiring an authorisation from a third party ; together with

(*c*) The right to control his own earnings free from the control of another ;

(*d*) The capacity personally to enforce these rights by process of Law.

It is an accepted commonplace that the enjoyment of these rights distinguishes the status of the freeman from that of the slave, which has been defined as " the status or condition of a person over whom any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised ".

It is fundamental, too, that a man can only enjoy the right to work if he exercises it under the same conditions as other workers ; that is, if he is not subject to any restrictions (except such as apply equally to all men alike) as to the kind of work, or the conditions of work, or the materials in which he may work.

Among other rights which a man enjoys to-day in his capacity as an earner in certain communities are those which ensure to him on the same terms and at the same rate as other men minimum rates of pay and benefits or allowances under national insurance schemes for sickness, invalidity, old age and unemployment.

To give Equal Status and Equal Rights as between Men and Women must involve giving to Women the Same Rights as Men enjoy in their Capacity as Earners.

To ask for equal status and equal rights as between women and men means to ask, among other things, for the same rights for women as for men in their capacity as earners, and to ask for these rights irrespective of marriage or childbirth.

---

[1] It is true that in some countries both the males and the females of certain races or communities are denied such normal rights.

It means to ask that a woman shall have the right to enter any trade, profession or calling and be free to sell her labour for gain under the same conditions as a man, without requiring for this an authorisation from her husband, or the court, or any other person.

It means that she shall have personal control of her own earnings and the capacity personally to enforce their payment.

It means that regulations for the health and welfare of the worker shall apply equally to both sexes.

It means that any prohibition or regulation of employment, underground or at night, or where phosphorus or lead compounds or other dangerous materials are used, shall apply equally to both sexes.

It means that the rates of minimum wages and of benefits and allowances and contributions under national insurance schemes for unemployment, sickness, invalidity, or old age shall be the same for women as for men, and be payable on the same conditions.

It means that a woman shall not be prohibited from earning for six weeks after childbirth.

It means that employers shall not be required to make special arrangements for the woman worker, or the child-bearing or nursing woman; but that all regulations to safeguard the health of the worker shall apply equally to both sexes, and that help given in connection with the birth of a child shall not result in any restriction on the freedom and opportunities of the mother to earn.

The Enjoyment by Women in their Capacity as Earners of Equal Status and Equal Rights with Men would benefit and truly protect the Woman.

Nothing but good can result from recognising in legislation that a woman is a human being, and from giving her in her capacity as a worker for pay equality of status and of rights with the man. In this way only can the woman worker be truly protected.

It is as true of a woman as of a man that it is in her interest that she should be free to sell her labour for gain without the authorisation of her spouse or the court, and that she should control her own earnings, and have the capacity personally to enforce their payment.

It is equally true that any restriction on this right, not equally applied to men, is against the economic interest of the woman, and undermines her status as a worker.

It is equally true that special regulations applied to women and not to men—wrongly described by some as "protective" and advocated by many well-meaning philanthropists in the supposed interest of the woman—are in fact against her economic interest. They do not protect her. They facilitate her exploitation. This is true irrespective of marriage, pregnancy or childbrith.

Marriage is not a reason for depriving a woman of any human right. Marriage is not a reason for curtailing her right to earn. To refuse to employ a married woman is to deny the woman earner's right to marriage. It is, moreover, a denial of her common humanity. To restrict the married woman's right to earn is to deal a blow at her right to education, apprenticeship and professional training, and tends to perpetuate the low status of all women earners by encouraging the limitation of their employment to unskilled and consequently low-paid processes.

Neither pregnancy nor childbirth is a reason for curtailing the right of a woman to earn. It is a right she should enjoy as a human being. It is unjust and against the public interest thus to lower her earning capacity at the time of her greatest need. She, as others, should decide for herself. She alone knows her own situation and needs.

It is possible to provide help for a child about to be born or newly born without damaging the mother, but it is always wrong to penalise the mother or to restrict her rights as an earner. Burdens placed on the employer of the pregnant or nursing woman in the supposed interest of the woman and her child are automatically shifted by the employer on to the woman. If he is required to pay wages during absence arising out of childbearing, if he must allow time off to the woman for nursing her child, he takes care that he himself will not suffer. He protects himself by paying women low wages, or by ceasing to employ pregnant or even married women.

Any regulation of the hours or place or conditions or kind of work can only benefit, and therefore can only truly protect, the woman worker, if it applies to all workers, men and women alike. Applied to one sex only, it is economic tyranny. Any regulation or prohibition dealing with health and welfare, heavy or unhealthy work, dangerous materials or processes, night-work, work underground, and conditions and rates of minimum wages, unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old-age benefits, in order really to protect should apply equally to men and women.

A Wrong Interpretation of the Term "Equal Rights" would be a Danger to Women.

The text of an international convention intended to give equality as between men and women must be such that ratification by a State necessarily involves bringing its national legislation into line with equality of rights between men and women ; that is, "denouncing" [1] existing international Treaties or Conventions which are contrary to such equality, and altering existing national laws which are contrary to such equality. For example, three of the States which signed the Convention on Equality of Rights for Both Sexes adopted at Montevideo in December 1933, or requested the President of the Assembly to hold this discussion—Argentine, Cuba and Uruguay—should have to free themselves from the obligations under the Washington Conventions of 1919 to prohibit the employment of women at night and after childbirth, and to alter any legislation giving effect to these prohibitions, so that women should have the same freedom to earn as other workers, and that provision for the child at the time of its birth should not result in restriction on the freedom of the mother (see Annex, for examples of such international Conventions and national laws). It is therefore of the utmost importance that the words used in a convention intended to give equality of rights should be so clear and definite that they can only be interpreted in this sense.

The Convention on Equality of Rights for Both Sexes, adopted at Montevideo in December 1933, is incorrectly described in the letter to the President of the League of Nations Assembly, in which ten States asked for a discussion on this subject, as one "to remove all legal distinctions based on sex". The operative article of that Convention in fact, reads as follows :

> "The Contracting States agree that, upon the ratification of this Treaty, men and women shall have equal rights throughout the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions."

The term "equal rights" includes for women the economic rights advocated in this statement. But some people deny that to place a restriction on the woman worker which they wrongly describe as "protective" is to deprive her of any right. [2]

It would constitute a great danger to the economic position of the woman worker if an international convention, purporting to give equality of rights in all spheres, were to be interpreted so as to make it possible to exclude women from the economic rights advocated in this statement. This would be to deny that these economic rights are rights where women are concerned. It is therefore esssential that the text of any international convention should be clear on this point.

Action the Assembly is asked to take.

The Open Door International therefore asks that, if the Assembly adopts an international convention purporting to give equal status and equal rights as between men and women, such convention shall be so worded as to make it clear :

(*a*) That the equal status and equal rights proposed include for a woman, irrespective of marriage or childbirth, equal status and equality of rights with a man in her capacity as a worker for pay, so that a woman shall be free to work and protected as a worker on the same terms as a man, under legislation and regulations dealing with conditions and hours, entry, training and payment (including minimum wages and insurance), which are based on the nature of the work and not upon the sex of the worker ;

(*b*) That a ratifying State undertakes :

(*i*) To free itself from its obligations under any international convention which it may have ratified and which is inconsistent with the policy laid down in (*a*) above (see Annex below) ;

(*ii*) To repeal all national legislation and regulations inconsistent with this policy (see Annex below) ;

(*iii*) To enact national legislation to give effect to this policy.

(*Signed*) Chrystal MACMILLAN,
President.

(*Signed*) Winifred LE SUEUR,
Hon. Secretary.

---

[1] The method to be employed by a State for releasing itself from obligations following its ratification of a treaty or convention.

[2] There are also some who say that the above quoted text of this particular Convention does not ensure equality of rights as between men and women, but only equality of rights as between one man and another, and equality of rights as between one woman and another.

Annex

EXAMPLES OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS AND OF NATIONAL LAWS SPECIALLY AFFECTING THE WOMAN IN HER CAPACITY AS A WORKER FOR PAY (1) WHICH ARE NOT BASED ON EQUALITY BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN AND THEREFORE PUT WOMEN IN A LOWER STATUS THAN MEN, AND (2) WHICH AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION INTENDED TO GIVE EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN SHOULD REQUIRE A RATIFYING STATE TO DENOUNCE OR REPEAL.

I. Examples of International Conventions

(*a*) The *Berne Convention of* 1906 which prohibits the industrial employment of all women at night in industrial undertakings in which more than ten men or women are employed, and has been ratified by Austria, Belgium, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

(*b*) The *Washington Convention of* 1919 which prohibits the industrial employment of all women at night, and has been ratified by Albania, *Argentina, Austria, Belgium,* Brazil, *United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Chile,* Colombia, *Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, France, Greece, Hungary, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Netherlands,* Nicaragua, Portugal, *Roumania, South Africa,* Spain, *Switzerland,* Uruguay, Venezuela, *Yugoslavia.* (Those in italics have adopted legislation or other measures which carry out the provisions of the Convention.)

(*c*) The *Geneva Draft Convention of* 1934 which prohibits the industrial employment of all women at night except those in responsible positions of management and not ordinarily engaged in manual work.

(*d*) The *Washington Childbirth Convention of* 1919 which prohibits the industrial employment of women for six weeks after childbirth and places burdens on the employers of pregnant women and women with newly-born children, and has been ratified by Argentina, Brazil, *Bulgaria, Chile,* Colombia, Cuba, *Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Luxemburg,* Nicaragua, *Roumania, Spain,* Uruguay, *Yugoslavia.* (Those in italics have adopted legislation or other measures which carry out the provisions of the Convention.)

(*e*) The *Geneva White Lead (Painting) Convention of* 1921 which prohibits the employment of all women in any painting work of an industrial character involving the use of white lead or sulphate of lead or other products containing these pigments and has been ratified by *Austria, Belgium,* Bulgaria, *Chile,* Colombia, Cuba, *Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece,* Hungary (conditionally), *Latvia, Luxemburg,* Nicaragua, *Norway, Poland,* Roumania, *Spain Sweden,* Uruguay, Venezuela, *Yugoslavia.* (Those in italics have adopted legislation or other measures which carry out the provisions of the Convention.)

(*f*) The *Geneva Draft Convention concerning the Employment of Women on Underground Work in Mines of All Kinds of* 1935 which prohibits the employment of women, with certain exceptions, on underground work in any mine.

II. Examples of National Legislation.

(*L.S.* below stands for the *Legislative Series* published by the International Labour Office. *I.L.I.* stands for *Industrial and Labour Information,* published weekly by the International Labour Office).

(*i*) *Argentina.*

Decree of May 16th, under Act No. 11, 317, Section 8. Prohibition of the employment of women, *inter alia,* in the driving and care of cattle and from work in hospitals intended exclusively for infectious and contagious diseases. (*L.S.*, 1927 — Arg. 3.)

(*ii*) *Australia.*

The Queensland Act of December 23rd, 1929 (20 Geo. V, cap. 28). Provision that the minimum wage of an adult male shall be sufficient to maintain himself, his wife and three children, and that the minimum wage of an adult female shall be sufficient to maintain herself. (*L.S.*, 1929 — Austral. 6.)

(*iii*) *Austria.*

Decree of December 15th, 1933, compelling a married woman working in the service of the State to give up her post if her husband is likewise employed in State service and if, *inter alia,* his salary, together with her pension, exceed certain specified sums. (*I.L.I.*, February 19th, 1934, pages 262 and 263.)

(*iv*) *Belgium.*

Royal Decree of December 8th, 1934, authorising the Minister of Labour to lay down in each branch of industry the percentage of women (married or unmarried) to be employed.

(*v*) *United Kingdom.*

National insurance schemes for unemployment [1] sickness and invalidity [2] providing that the contributions paid by and on behalf of insured women and the benefits paid to insured women are lower than those for men, and requiring married women to fulfil more onerous conditions before receiving unemployment benefit. [3] Provisions of the Trade Board Acts and the Orders made under them by which the legal minimum rate of wages for the lowest grade of female worker under more than forty trade boards has been fixed at a very much lower rate than that fixed for the lowest grade of male worker. (For actual rates see *Ministry of Labour Gazette,* September 1934, page 314.)

(*vi*) *Bolivia.*

Presidential Decree of September 21st, 1929. Prohibition of the employment of women in canteens, public houses, or in undertakings specified as unhealthy, and between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. (*L.S.* — Bol. 2.)

---

[1] Unemployment Act, 1935; Sections 8 and 21, Schedule 3, and Section 36, Schedule 4.

[2] National Health Insurance and Old Age Pensions Act, 1932; Section 3.

[3] Unemployment Insurance (Anomalies) (Amendment) Regulations, 1933.

(*vii*) *Brazil.*

New Federal Constitution of July 16th, 1934, prohibiting to women work in unhealthy occupations.

(*viii*) *Canada.*

New Brunswick Act of April 10th, 1930 (20 Geo. V, cap. 11). Provision for the fixing of minimum wages for women and girls. (*L.S.*, 1930 — Can. 11.)

(*ix*) *Chile.*

Legislative Decree No. 178 (49) to ratify the Labour Code of May 13th, 1931. Prohibition of women's employment in works specified as beyond their strength or dangerous to their physical or moral welfare in view of their sex. (*L.S.*, 1931 — July 1st.)

(*x*) *Cuba.*

Legislative Decree of October 16th, 1934. Prohibition of the employment of women during the night in the terms of the Washington Night-work Convention of 1919. " This Decree provides that the admission of women to industrial or commercial employment must be preceded by a medical examination carried out by an official doctor, who will issue free of charge a certificate of fitness for the work they are to do. Women admitted to employment must be examined annually and on the occasion of every change in the nature of their work. Women employed in industrial undertakings may not be given work to do at home . . ." The Decree prohibits the employment of women on certain dangerous and unhealthy work, which it specifies, and on underground work and carrying loads. The National Health Board will periodically specify the classes of work regarded as dangerous and unhealthy in accordance with scientific progress. (*I.L.I.*, June 3rd, 1935. Pages 325 and 326.)

(*xi*) *Ecuador.*

Act of October 6th, 1928, prohibiting the employment of women between 7 p.m. and 6 a.m., but allowing women over 18 years of age in exceptional cases to work at night as nurses or in telephone offices, factories and cinemas. (*I.L.I.*, May 6th, 1929, page 168.)

(*xii*) *Estonia.*

Act relating to the employment of children, young persons and women in industrial undertakings. Power given to the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare to draw up, in agreement with the other Ministers concerned, a list of unhealthy and heavy occupations in which women must not be employed. (*L.S.*, 1924 — Est. 1.)

(*xiii*) *Finland.*

Resolution of the Council of State issuing regulations for work-places in the rubber-goods industry, November 15th, 1927, prohibiting the employment of female workers in the manufacture and packing of surgical goods. (*L.S.*, 1927 — Fin. 2).

(*xiv*) *France.*

Article 217 of the Civil Code prohibits a married woman from signing a contract without her husband's consent, and she consequently cannot exercise a profession without his consent. Article 4 of the Commercial Code forbids a woman to engage in commerce without his consent.

(*xv*) *Germany.*

Act of June 30th, 1933 provides that a woman may not be appointed a permanent member of the Federal Civil Service until she has reached the age of 35. (*I.L.I.*, July 24th, 1933, page 167.)

(*xvi*) *Greece.*

Act. No. 3524 of January 13th, 1910. Consolidated October 28th 1929, Section 50. Prohibition of the employment of women in general on any work in mines and metallurgical establishments. (*L.S.*, 1929 — Gr. 5.)

(*xvii*) *Guatemala.*

Decree No. 1434 of April 30th, 1926. Prohibition of the employment of women for four weeks before and five weeks after childbirth. (*L.S.*, 1926 — Guat. 1.)

(*xviii*) *India* (*Bombay*).

Act gazetted May 9th, 1934. Prohibition of the employment of a woman in a factory for four weeks after childbirth, during which time the employer in whose factory she has been employed for not less than seven months previously is required to pay her a maternity benefit, and a woman who works in any factory during the prohibited time is liable to a fine. (*I.L.I.*, August 6th, 1934, page 202.)

(*xix*) *Italy.*

Decree fixing the proportions of women to be employed in Government services as follows : Vacancies in administrative departments, 5% ; in the telephone service, State manufacturing undertakings and hospitals, 10% ; with the exception of schools or of maternity or children's hospitals. (*I.L.I.*, January 1st, 1934, page 13.)

(*xx*) *Japan.*

Act No. 33 of March 29th, 1923. Prohibition of the employment of women to clean, oil, examine or repair dangerous parts of machinery or transmission apparatus in motion, or to perform any other dangerous work. (*L.S.*, 1923 — Jap. 1.)

(*xxi*) *Latvia.*

Seamen's Order of October 30th, 1928, prohibiting the employment of women under 18 on board ship. (*L.S.*, 1928 — Lat. 4.)

(*xxii*) *Lithuania.*

Requirement that an employer of women in bakeries shall allow breaks amounting in all to not less than half an hour on every working day on which they are employed for more than four hours. (*L.S.*, 1926 — Lith. 3.)

(*xxiii*) *Luxemburg.*

Provision in Grand-Ducal Decree that the employment of women, married or not, is subject to a preliminary authorisation by the Government. Speech of Mr. Krier (Workers' Delegate, Luxemburg) to the eighteenth session of the International Labour Conference. (*Provisional Record*, No. 13, June 15th, 1934.)

(*xxiv*) *Mexico.*

Decree of July 31st, 1934, prohibiting the employment of women in the sale of alcoholic liquor to be consumed on the premises. (*I.L.I.*, November 12th, 1934.)

(*xxv*) *Netherlands.*

Decree of June 13th, 1929, laying down less rigid regulations as to hours of work for a man employed as a barber, hairdresser or a watcher than those stipulated for women. (*L.S.*, 1929 — Neth. 5.)

(*xxvi*) *Peru.*

Decree of December 9th, 1930, requiring that a woman employed as a waitress or chambermaid in a hotel should have a permit, which is given subject to her producing certificates that she is of age and that in the view of the police she is of good conduct, and that the medical officer gives her a certificate of health. (*L.S.*, 1930 — Peru 2.)

(*xxvii*) *Poland.*

Order of the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, of March 11th, 1927. Provision that an employer of more than 100 women must provide at his own expense a crêche for breast-fed infants not more than 15 months old, whose mothers he employs. (*L.S.*, 1927 — Pol.)

(*xxviii*) *Portugal.*

Decree No. 14498, of October 29th, 1927. Prohibits employment of pregnant women and nursing mothers, otherwise than in light work of short duration, not harmful to the physical and intellectual development or their morals. (*L.S.*, 1927 — Por. 6.)

(*xxix*) *Roumania.*

Royal Decree of January 30th, 1929. Prohibits women from working at night between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. in commercial as well as industrial undertakings, except where the Minister of Labour allows an extension of the hours for which they may work (*inter alia*, in restaurants, hotels, theatres and cinemas). (*L.S.*, 1929 — Rum. 1.)

(*xxx*) *Salvador.*

Decree of May 31st, 1927, by which an employer of commercial employees may compel a male employee to work 8 hours a day and a female 7 hours a day. (*L.S.*, 1927 — Sal. 1.)

(*xxxi*) *Union of South Africa.*

Act 22-1931, of May 29th, 1931, prohibiting the employment of women underground in a mine. (*L.S.*, 1931 — S.A. 1.)

(*xxxii*) *Spain.*

Royal Decree of August 23rd, 1926, under which a married woman requires the authorisation of her husband to enter into a contract of employment, and her husband can object to the courts to the payment to her of remuneration for her work, and the court may authorise her to receive her wages herself and utilise them for the requirements of the household. (*L.S.*, 1926 — Sp. 5.)

(*xxxiii*) *Sweden.*

Act of June 29th, 1912, amended by Act of June 12th, 1931, by which the Crown may prohibit the employment of women in occupations involving special risk of accident or which are specially exhausting or dangerous, or may prescribe the conditions under which they may work in such occupations. (*L.S.*, — Swe. 5.)

(*xxxiv*) *Switzerland* (*Glarus*).

An Act of May 5th, 1929, amending Section 6 in the Act of May 6th, 1923, prohibiting the employment on overtime of a woman expecting her confinement. (*L.S.*, 1929 — Switz. 3.)

(*xxxv*) *Turkey.*

Act No. 1593, respecting Public Health, of April 25th, 1930. Prohibiting the employment of a woman in a factory, workshop or public or private undertaking for three weeks before and three weeks after childbirth, unless a medical practitioner certifies that the health of the mother and child will not be prejudiced thereby. (*L.S.*, 1930 — Turk. 1.)

(*xxxvi*) *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.*

Order 177 of the People's Labour Commissariat of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of May 17th, 1930, forbidding seventy-nine employments to women, including work with pneumatic hand-tools, in railway transport (as firemen, stokers, engine-drivers, wheel-examiners, pointsmen), in river transport (as helmsmen, engineers and pilots), and in marine transport (as seamen of all ratings, masters, mates, carpenters). (*L.S.*, 1930 — Russ. 3.)

(*xxxvii*) *United States of America.*

State of Wyoming. — Session laws 1890, ch. 20, December 31st, 1890, prohibiting the employment of women " in or about any coal, iron or other dangerous mine, or underground place whatsoever ", except in an office or in the performance of clerical work.

State of New York. — Session laws 1912 and 1921 prohibiting the employment of a woman in a factory or in a mercantile establishment in towns over 3,000 population within four weeks after she has given birth to a child.

(*xxxviii*) *Venezuela.*

Labour Act of July 23rd, 1928, Section 16, prohibiting the employment of women in the retail sale of drink and in any undertakings likely to be detrimental to their morals or decency. (*L.S.*, 1928 — Ven. 2).

* * *

Note.— The above examples are in many cases taken from the *Legislative Series*, published by the International Labour Office. It is, however, possible that, in some cases, regulations or legislation may have been subsequently amended or repealed.

ST. JOAN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ALLIANCE.

NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance, which is an organisation of Catholic women working to secure the political, social and economic equality of men and women and which is represented in twenty different countries, supports the principle of complete equality in nationality rights for men and women, whether married or unmarried, and views with satisfaction the inclusion of this subject on the agenda of the sixteenth Assembly of the League of Nations.

The Alliance hopes that an international convention may be drawn up incorporating the principle of equality and clearly expressing the right of a married woman to an independent personal nationality on equal terms with men.

The Alliance strongly supports the view expressed in the International Petitions of Catholic Men and Catholic Women (document A.33.1932.V), which were presented to the thirteenth Assembly of the League, begging " that a woman, whether married or unmarried, should have the same right as a man to retain or change her nationality ".

The Alliance is also in complete accord with the detailed resolution on this subject passed by the International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship at their congress at Istanbul, which is appended.[1]

STATUS OF WOMEN.

St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance welcomes the inclusion of the subject of the status of women on the agenda of the sixteenth Assembly of the League of Nations. The Alliance attaches the greatest importance to this question, believing that the raising of the status of women throughout the world is not only a matter of justice but is one of social urgency,

---

[1] The text of this resolution will be found in the statement of the International Alliance for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship.

in that on it depends the release of the full services of women, half of humanity, for work in solving the problems and sufferings of the world.

Knowing that other international women's organisations have prepared for submission to the League a detailed statement concerning disabilities which women suffer in various countries, St. Joan's Alliance has not duplicated such a statement.

St. Joan's Alliance stands for full equality of women (married or unmarried) with men in all matters relating to the enjoyment of civil and political rights, including in particular equal rights of exercising electoral, legislative, juridical, executive or administrative powers and the right of being elected to or sitting on or voting as members of any public body exercising any such powers, and admission to all public employment, functions and honours, or the exercise of any professions or trades, with equal opportunities of advancement and without difference of pay.

In this way, we maintain the ideal may best be realised of giving every human being, man or woman, the opportunity of carrying out their own vocation without artificial obstacle.

The Alliance believes that it is possible to raise the status of women by means of an international convention and it urges that, in any international convention designed to give equal status to women with men, it should be made quite clear that any countries ratifying it accept the principles of equality set out above.

(*Signed*) Vera LAUGHTON MATHEWS,
Chairman.

UNION INTERNATIONALE DES LIGUES FÉMININES CATHOLIQUES.

STATUS OF WOMEN.

[*Translation.*]

The present memorandum is submitted by the Bureau of the Union internationale des Ligues féminines catholiques as a contribution to the work being done by the League of Nations in regard to the legal status of women.

This memorandum does not deal with the problem as a whole, but is intended only as a statement of the attitude adopted by the Union in regard to certain fundamental points.

It cannot be denied that this legislative work is at present urgently needed in many countries.

Whereas, in certain countries, women, even if adults, are deprived of personal freedom or are subjected to the shame of slavery, in other countries their legal status ensures for them, even if married, unlimited personal freedom and absolute economic independence, by which the stability of the family group may be endangered, and, finally, in other countries, the law perpetuates a situation of unjustifiable inequality as between men and women, by placing the married woman, more particularly, in a position of inferiority which is contrary to her personal dignity and by assimilating her to minors in respect of all acts of civil life, the Bureau of the Union internationale des Ligues féminines catholiques considers that laws, the object of which is to ensure for women the place due to them in the world, might with advantage be based upon the following considerations :

Woman is a person created for the attainment of a personal end which it is her right and duty to pursue freely.

Differences of a physiological and psychological character between man and woman do not imply any inferiority of either as compared with the other but lead to natural differences in aptitude for the performance of functions that are different but of equal importance.

The happiness of men and women, no less than the happiness of humanity, demands that each of them should be concerned for the common welfare and should perform those services for which they are respectively fitted by the aptitudes bestowed upon them by the Creator.

Such services cannot be real or complete unless men and women respectively make to society, in all the domains which require it, the human contribution which corresponds to the specific differencies in their natures.

In regard to the domain of the family, which is the basis of society, the welfare of society, the welfare of man and woman united in marriage, the welfare of children, (1) demand the unity, stability and indissolubility of the conjugal union, (2) call for the co-operation of both parties to the marriage in the direction of the family group and in the work of educating the children. Consequently, the law should, in particular :

(1) Guarantee to woman freedom that is consistent with her nature and her dignity, freedom to choose her state of life and, if she chooses to marry, freedom to choose or freedom to accept her husband, respect of her right to provide for her own support by work that is adequately renumerated ;

(2) Recognise in fact the principle of equality in the matter of morals as between the sexes ;

(3) Contain provisions to the effect that a woman may never be deprived of her nationality ; that, in the event of her marriage, her nationality should not be affected

unless she freely consents thereto and that prospective parties to a marriage who are of different nationality shall each be entitled to adopt the nationality of the other, since it is natural that the family should have a common nationality and that such nationality should be determined as is best for the family group ;

(4) Adopt the notion of " co-operation " rather than that of " subordination " as the principle underlying the legal provisions which govern the respective rights and duties of the parties to marriage but, nevertheless, provide for the delegation of authority to the husband and father in the event of disagreement between the parties to the marriage constituting a serious danger to the life of the family group, subject at all times to the wife's right of appeal ;

(5) So regulate the system of property that the management of the family property is effected through the co-operation of the two parties to the marriage ;

(6) Admit the equal rights of man and woman in matters of guardianship and inheritance ;

(7) Intervene, so far as is necessary and possible, in order to create conditions of economic life of such a character that the work of the father may be sufficient to provide the resources that are necessary for the family and thus contribute to the removal of that inequality in the distribution of burdens which too frequently occurs in the families of wage-earners where, in present circumstances, the mother has to discharge, not only the duties of an occupation, but also those of household work.

(*Signed*) F. STEENBERGHE-ENGERINGH,
President.

(Signed) M. ROMME,
Secretary.

(Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League.)

Official No.C.310.M.163.1935.V.

Geneva, August 19th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

SECOND REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE INFORMATION OBTAINED IN EXECUTION OF THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY AND THE COUNCIL.

In documents C.342.M.158, C.342(a).M.158(a), and C.342(b). M.158(b).1934.V, the Secretary-General summarised the information received from Governments down to the close of the fifteenth ordinary session of the Assembly (September 1934) in regard to the Nationality of Women.

Since that date, the Governments of South Africa, Australia, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland and Turkey have transmitted further information which is summarised below:

SOUTH AFRICA.

The ratification of the Hague Nationality Convention would necessitate the passing of legislation which the Union Government does not at present propose to introduce.

AUSTRALIA.

A bill is pending before Parliament to carry out the provisions of the Hague Nationality Convention which relate to the nationality of married women. The bill will probably be passed and the Convention will then be ratified.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

A foreign woman automatically acquires Czechoslovak nationality on marriage with a Czechoslovak national. She keeps such nationality even after a separation has been decreed or the marriage been dissolved by death of the husband or divorce. Annulation of the marriage annuls the acquired nationality.

Where Czechoslovak nationality is granted to the husband (naturalisation), the wife also takes that nationality unless she is separated or divorced.

If a woman has acquired Czechoslovak nationality by naturalisation at a time when she was separated from her husband, she loses the benefit of the nationality on resuming conjugal life with the husband.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL
1935.V.6.

According to a well-established rule, a married woman whose marriage has not been dissolved by separation (de corps et des biens), divorce, or death or presumed death of her husband, is incapable of acquiring Czechoslovak nationality for herself individually by the process of naturalisation.

A Czechoslovak woman automatically loses that nationality on marrying a foreigner. This result follows in all cases; it is not possible for a Czechoslovak woman to marry a foreigner and retain Czechoslovak nationality.

A Czechoslovak woman who has married a foreigner does not recover Czechoslovak nationality on the death of her husband or on separation or divorce; if the marriage is annulled, she is reinstated in Czechoslovak nationality.

DANZIG.

The Senate of the Free City considers that the nationality law of Danzig has proved satisfactory and that any change in its provisions is unnecessary.

Danzig nationality is acquired by a foreigner through marriage with a Danzig national, and also through naturalisation of the husband if naturalisation for the wife is applied for at the same time and she is able to release herself from her former nationality. Acquisition of Danzig nationality through appointment as an official extends to the wife of the official. Danzig nationality is lost by marriage to a foreigner if such marriage confers the foreign nationality on the wife, but the widow or divorced wife of a foreigner who at the time of marriage was a Danzig national can recover Danzig nationality under prescribed conditions. Acquisition by naturalisation of a foreign nationality involves loss of Danzig nationality, and the loss applies also to the wife. Release of a married woman from Danzig nationality can be made only on application by her husband and, if he is a Danzig national, must be accompanied by an application for his release from Danzig nationality; the consent of the wife is necessary.

FRANCE.

The effect of marriage upon a woman's nationality continues to be governed by Article 8 of the law of August 10th, 1927.(1)

A bill was, however, presented on March 6th, 1934, to the Chamber of Deputies for the purpose of altering various provisions of the law of August 10th, 1927, and in particular of repealing paragraph 3 of Article 8 of that law which provides that a Frenchwoman marrying a foreigner loses her French nationality if the couple after marriage establish their first domicile outside France, and the wife necessarily acquires her husband's nationality under the national law of the husband.

---

(1) This article provides that a Frenchwoman marrying a foreigner who establishes his domicile in France shall retain French nationality unless she expressly declares her desire to acquire her husband's nationality under the provisions of the national law of the latter.
The article further provides that a foreign woman marrying a Frenchman shall not acquire French nationality except on her express request or in the case where, under her national law, she necessarily follows the condition of her husband.

If this paragraph were repealed, the law would permit a Frenchwoman marrying a foreigner to retain her original nationality in all circumstances. The change would thus be in conformity with Recommendation No.VI of the Conference of 1930 for the Codification of International Law.

NETHERLANDS.

Bills have been submitted to Parliament to provide for ratification of the Hague Nationality Convention and Protocols and to effect the necessary modifications in Netherlands law.

The Nationality Convention was signed on behalf of the Netherlands with a reservation excluding Articles 8, 9 and 10. The proposed legislation, however, brings the law into conformity with Articles 8 and 9 by providing that a woman shall not lose Netherlands nationality on marriage with a foreigner, or on acquisition of a foreign nationality by her husband, unless and until she acquires her husband's nationality.

NEW ZEALAND.

New Zealand, like the United Kingdom and Canada (document C.342.M.158.1934.V, p.2), while maintaining the general rule that the wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject, and the wife of an alien to be an alien, has enacted legislation bringing her existing law into conformity with the provisions of the Hague Convention dealing with the nationality of married women.

The New Zealand act, however, further provides that every woman who at the time of her marriage to an alien was a British subject and who, by reason of her marriage, has acquired the nationality of her husband may, within a certain time limit, make a declaration in the prescribed form and manner that she desires to retain, while in New Zealand, the rights of a British subject, and thereupon she shall, within New Zealand, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers, and privileges, and be subject to all obligations, duties, and liabilities, to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject.

POLAND.

The existing law of Poland is considered to deal with the nationality of women in a manner which on the whole is satisfactory and by no means prejudicial to women. No changes are expected in the near future. In any case, changes could not be retroactive, since to alter a nationality acquired under a treaty or under Polish law would produce chaos in the legal status of the woman concerned. The general rule under treaties concluded by Poland which affect the nationality of married women is that such women take the nationality of their husbands.

An alien woman who marries a Polish subject acquires Polish nationality. She may, however, lose her Polish nationality at any moment, independently of her husband, by acquiring the nationality of a foreign country or recovering the nationality of the State to which she formerly belonged.

As regards the loss of Polish nationality consequent on acquiring foreign nationality, the rights of married women are

more extensive than those of their husbands. Men must have the special permission of the Polish authorities to acquire foreign or discard Polish nationality. Such permission is not required by women.

In principle, the acquisition of Polish nationality by a husband confers that nationality on his wife, but if the wife does not desire to acquire Polish nationality together with her husband, she may make application to that effect in agreement with her husband.

On the other hand, an alien woman may apply for Polish nationality independently of her husband, in which case it is immaterial whether her husband is a foreigner or a Polish subject, and whether he resides in Poland or abroad.

If a husband loses Polish nationality, whether in consequence of acquiring foreign nationality or of accepting public office or entering military service in a foreign State without the permission of the competent Polish authority, such loss of nationality extends automatically to his wife. Even in such cases, however, there is a possibility of the woman's being exempted from loss of Polish nationality, if she lodges the necessary application. A married woman may also be exempted from losing her Polish nationality where her husband was deprived of such nationality under the provisions of the Ordinance of the Council for Defence of the Realm of August 11, 1920.

A married woman who accepts public office in a foreign country without the approval of the relevant Polish authority, loses her Polish nationality, independently of the nationality of her husband.

A Polish woman marrying a foreigner loses her Polish nationality only if, by the fact of marriage, she acquires the nationality of her husband.

The principle (Recommendation No.VI of the Codification Conference, paragraph 2) that no change should be made in a woman's nationality without her consent finds no support in the provisions of the present Polish Nationality Act. In view of the possibilities that Polish legislation, as the above instances show, already affords of exempting married women from losing or acquiring the Polish nationality of their husbands, and in view of the importance of domestic harmony, the introduction into Polish legislation of the above-mentioned principle of the non-extension of a husband's nationality to his wife, if the wife refuses to consent, is not desirable. If such a rule were introduced into Polish legislation, it would not infrequently react unfavourably on the interests (education) of the children, who would often be deprived of the necessary parental care - for instance, if the mother, being a foreigner, was for any reason (e.g., because of destitution, sickness, etc.) deported from her husband's and her children's country. In the event, again, of the husband - a Polish subject - dying, the mother, who as a foreigner might find it difficult to bring up the children who

(Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League.)

Official No.:C.310(a).M.163(a).1935

Geneva, September 5th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NATIONALITY OF WOMEN

SECOND REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE INFORMATION OBTAINED IN EXECUTION OF THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY AND THE COUNCIL.

A D D E N D U M

BELGIUM.

A bill for the approval of the Hague Nationality Convention is about to be presented to the Chambers.

JAPAN.

The Japanese Government intends to ratify the Hague Nationality Convention, together with the Hague Protocol relating to a particular case of Statelessness, but will not do so until the necessary modifications in Japanese law have been made.

E R R A T U M

In the French of the document C.310.M.163.1935.V, page 4, paragraph 5 - Information given by POLAND - the phrase: "l'ordonnance du Conseil pour la défense du royaume" contains a mistranslation. The words "défense du royaume" should be "défense de l'Etat".

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL 1935.V.6. Addendum

are Polish subjects, could leave her husband's and children's country unhindered, abandoning the children to their fate.

In spite of the statutory possibilities, only a few isolated cases occur of married women asking to be exempted from the acquisition or loss of Polish nationality. It follows, that, on the whole, there is little demand by married women in Poland to possess a different nationality from that of their husbands or children and no need to alter the law on the subject.

TURKEY.

The law on nationality (No.1312) provides (Article 13) that a Turkish woman shall not lose her nationality through marriage with a foreigner unless she expresses the desire to acquire her husband's nationality and is officially authorised to do so (Article 7).

The competent department considers that the above-described provisions are sufficient to safeguard women's rights in connection with nationality and that there is no occasion to contemplate any change in the Turkish law on the subject.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 19 (a).** 1935. V.

Geneva, September 6th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF WOMEN

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S ORGANISATIONS

(Supplement)

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S COMMITTEE OF THE LABOUR AND SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL. [1]

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS FOR WOMEN.

The rights of women in the spheres of nationality and of civil legislation, and in the labour market, are losing ground in certain countries and in others are subject to attacks of some severity. There is reason, therefore, to welcome the initiative taken by the Consultative Committee of Women's Organisations with a view to having women's questions placed on the agenda of the League of Nations.

In all the chief women's organisations, the problem of women's rights has been and still is the object of sustained investigation. The International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International, representing the ensemble of the women's movements of the countries affiliated to the Labour and Socialist International, has not failed to give attention to it, and ever since the Hague Convention (1930) has defined its position on the question of the

NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

It is hardly necessary to dwell upon all the sometimes tragic difficulties which the different state of the law, varying, one might almost say, from one country to another, entails for women and often for their children, nor is there much need to point out the necessity of international agreement.

It is right, therefore, to acknowledge the efforts of the countries which are signatories of the Treaty of Montevideo. It is to be feared, however, that ratification of this Treaty by all States would be in reality a step detrimental to the position of women in certain countries and would prejudice those women whose emancipation is being sought. It appears to the International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International that the text proposed in it (" There shall be no distinction based on sex as regards nationality, in their legislation or in their practice ") undoubtedly constitutes an excellent slogan, but that it would mean a definite disadvantage for the women citizens of countries such as Belgium, France, Luxemburg and Yugoslavia, which grant the right to choose nationality to women marrying one of their nationals, or such as the United States of America, Belgium, France, Luxemburg, Estonia and Roumania, which give the right to women marrying a foreigner.

The International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International has admitted the Hague Convention as a basis, viewing it as an advantage on some existing national laws, in the hope that it would be improved and would lead to a right of choice being introduced in all countries. Accordingly, at its meeting in January 1931, it passed a resolution affirming

---

[1] The letter transmitting this document to the Secretary-General states :

[*Translation.*]

" This memorandum was unanimously adopted by the International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International at a meeting held on August 31st and September 1st, 1935, at Brussels, under the Chairmanship of Mrs. J. L. Adamson, delegate of the Women's Organisations of the British Labour Party.

" It therefore constitutes the expression of the unanimous wishes of the working women organised in the Socialist parties which are affiliated to the Labour and Socialist International."

S.d.N. 1.255 (F.) 1.200 (A.). 9/35. Imp. du J. de G.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935. V. 7.

the wife's right of choice and demanding that she " would have the right to decide, on her marriage to a foreigner, whether or not she wished to accept her husband's nationality, and that she must not run the risk of losing her own nationality and becoming a foreigner without her consent " ; and further renewing its support of the principle that " a woman must be able to keep her nationality even after marriage ".

The question was further discussed by the International Socialist Women's Congress in July 1931, when the following statement was adopted :

" The necessity for the international regulation of the nationality of married women is already recognised.

Independent of the fact that the obtaining or changing of nationality should be made as easy and simple as possible for all men and women by international agreement, and that, in particular, the tragic fate of being without nationality should be avoided, efforts must be made to obtain for women :

" (1) *A right of option at marriage.* In the majority of cases the woman will be desirous of having the same nationality as her husband. This she should be entitled to by a mere declaration of will within a legally stipulated period. But, in order that she shall not be compelled automatically and compulsorily to lose her own nationality and adopt that of her husband, as is the case with regard to the relations between a number of States to-day, *she should herself be able to choose whether* she will retain her own nationality or adopt that of her husband.

" (2) In order that a change of nationality *during the course of married life* on the part of the man shall not automatically apply to the wife should this be contrary to her desire and interests, the woman shall also have the right of option in this eventuality. Should she desire to change her nationality at the same time, however, she shall not be compelled to commence a separate process of nationalisation.

" By simply formally placing the married woman upon an equal plane with the man as regards the obtaining and loss of nationality, the legal position of hundreds of thousands of women would be worsened.

" (3) *The right of the women to repatriation* (the right to the re-acquisition of the former nationality) in consequence of the dissolution of the marriage by legal separation or by the death of the husband, which right already exists in many countries, should be made general by international agreement.

"(4) In order that women ignorant of the law shall also be in a position to benefit from the laws, women must everywhere *be informed of the legal position* upon marriage, as well as in the event of a change of nationality on the part of the husbands, and their declaration demanded. "

In various countries, the same demand has been reiterated by women's organisations. In our view, the position was admirably expressed in the resolution agreed upon by a Committee representative of Belgian Women's Organisations which was adopted on March 22nd, 1932 :

" (1) That a woman's nationality should not be affected by her marriage *unless she expresses a wish to that effect ;*

"(2) That, in order to safeguard the unity of the family, *a right of choice* should be granted to the wife ;

(*a*) At the time of marriage ;

(*b*) During married life, in the event of the husband changing or losing his nationality ;

(*c*) After the dissolution of the marriage ;

" (3) That the choice should be operative free of cost, and that the wife should be asked to declare her wish in full knowledge of the position after a reminder by the competent authority, so that these provisions may not remain a dead letter for the majority of women little versed in the law. "

It is, then, on the basis of its own resolution that the International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International invites the League of Nations to work out the text of a Convention to safeguard the married woman's right of choice and to protect her from a change of nationality without her consent.

Civil and Legal Equality and Equality in the Labour Market.

The International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International is unanimous in demanding the reforms in the sphere of civic rights which are needed in almost every country. A woman must cease to be " the eternal minor ".

Concerning the right of women to work, the Committee holds that the attacks upon this right are unjust and the restrictions imposed in most countries indefensible. It views with serious concern the restrictive measures passed and put into operation within the last two years in seven European countries and New Zealand, to exclude women from posts for which they are fitted by training or in some cases to force them to resign from posts which they actually held when the legislation in question was introduced. It also regards with alarm the tendency in

some countries which have not actually passed restrictive laws against the employment of women to discriminate in certain occupations, sometimes against married women, sometimes against all women.

On the other hand, in view of the declared views of organised women workers, particularly in the highly industrialised countries, it would be impossible for this Committee to agree to any convention which would deprive women workers of the protection which special industrial legislation has given them. The arguments put forward by non-industrial women's organisations in favour of the abolition of protective legislation for women workers have not been accepted by those who are qualified to speak on behalf of the women workers. It is the view of the women workers concerned that such legislation has helped to raise the economic status of women and has been the means of protecting women workers in many industries from excessive exploitation.

In times of crises there is, however, a danger which we must guard against—that, under the guise of laws for the protection of health and motherhood, the field of women's employment may be unjustly restricted.

In the face of all those dangers, the International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International adheres to the declaration of the Montevideo Treaty concerning civil equality and labour equality, whilst reserving the right to support or promote any legislation for the protection of motherhood or the protection of labour in general.

However, the International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International demands that all questions relating to the work and protection of woman wage-earners remain under the competence of the International Labour Organisation.

* * *

The present events having sufficiently proved the magnitude and importance of women's problems, the International Committee supports and endorses the motion of the International Co-operative Women's Guild to ask for the institution of a *Commission on Women's Problems* at Geneva.

This Commission would take the place of the Consultative Committee of Women's Organisations, which does not embrace all such bodies and which includes no representative of the international organisations of working women.

The International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International declares itself in full agreement with the International Women's Co-operative Guild in the latter's demand that this Commission on women's problems should be permanent and that " it should include both men and women members, together with jurists and statesmen, as is the practice on the Commissions for Public Health, Child Protection and others ".

All the leading women's organisations should also be represented on it, such as the Socialist movement, Women Trade Unionists, Co-operative movement and Christian workers movement, who cannot at present make themselves heard at the League of Nations and whose standpoint differs from that expressed by the Women's Consultative Committee.

Only in this way, by a wide and thorough study of all the women's interests concerned, by discussion of them amongst all the parties interested and by representation at the League of Nations of all shades of women's opinion, will it be possible to reach an equitable solution of these highly complex and urgent problems.

The International Women's Committee of the Labour and Socialist International:

(*Signed*) Jennie Laurel ADAMSON, *Chairman.*

(*Signed*) Alice PELS, *Secretary.*

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No. : **A. 19 (b).** 1935. V.

Geneva, September 11th, 1935.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF WOMEN

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S ORGANISATIONS

(Supplement No. 2)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS' INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF TRADE UNION WOMEN.[1]

It has been very satisfactory to note the considerable amount of progress which has been achieved since the war in the way of the political, civil, economic and social rights of women, and in a number of international fields of political, economic and social life.

In some countries, women have attained complete political equality, in others they have also attained complete equality in the way of civil rights. It cannot be denied, however, that in many countries — even those which are considered to be the most enlightened and advanced in the political and social fields — this evolution towards equality between the sexes has not proceeded at the pace set immediately after the war. On the contrary, in some countries, differential treatment and discrimination between the rights of men and women are still practised to such an extent that they arouse indignation each time the attention of public opinion, and especially that of women, is drawn towards them.

POLITICAL AND CIVIL EMANCIPATION.

There is a steady increase in the number of women who are struggling for their political and civil emancipation, and their efforts to attain equality continuously find more support among the whole body of public opinion, men as well as women.

The International Committee of Trade Union Women notes that the League of Nations is again taking up this question by placing the problem of the nationality and the general status of women on the Agenda for the Assembly.

The International Committee of Trade Union Women, in complete agreement with the International Federation of Trade Unions of which it forms a part, holds that :

(a) The married woman should have the right of option either to keep her own nationality or to take her husband's nationality, and that the nationality of a woman shall not be changed for the sole reason of (i) her marriage, (ii) a change in the nationality of her husband made during the marriage.

(b) The right of the woman to repatriation — *i.e.*, the right of the re-acquisition of former nationality, in consequence of the dissolution of the marriage by legal separation or by the death of the husband, which right already exists in many countries — should be made general by international agreement.

(c) In order that women ignorant of the law shall also be in a position to benefit from the laws, women must everywhere be informed of the legal position upon marriage, as well as in the event of a change of nationality on the part of the husband, and their declaration demanded.

---

[1] The letter transmitting this document to the Secretary-General states :

[*Translation.*]

" In this memorandum, the International Federation of Trade Unions' International Committee of Trade Union Women has put forward the point of view and expressed the wishes of nearly two million wage-earning women occupied in industry, commerce and transport, who adhere to the Federations which constitute the International Federation of Trade Unions."

S. d. N. 1.255 (F.) 1.200 (A.) 9/35. — Imp. de la T. de G.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1935. V. 8.

General Status of Women.

On the second point of the general status of women, the Committee is in general agreement with the principle of equality stated in the Treaty of Montevideo, but it would utter a warning against a hasty decision on this Treaty. It notes with alarm that the proposal to remove all legal distinction based on sex may be a menace to the protective legislation already secured for women workers by the movement in some countries.

It realises that the problems which are raised are of considerable complexity and probably of greater scope than is imagined by some organisations which urge the immediate and complete application of their demand. It would therefore recommend the greatest care and caution in the choice of terms and texts, which might easily give rise later on to abuses in the way of interpretation. It is enough to take as an example Article 1 of the Treaty of Montevideo on the subject of the status of women, which demands absolute equality between men and women. Such a formula could be interpreted as applicable also to social legislation and more particularly to legislation for the protection of women and the mothers of the future, which was certainly never intended by the authors of the Treaty.

In this connection, the International Committee of Trade Union Women urgently draws the attention of the League of Nations to the fact that, in any case, the examination of any social aspect, and of labour legislation, is and should remain the exclusive domain of the International Labour Organisation. The International Committee of Trade Union Women is convinced that it speaks on behalf, not only of the women workers it represents, but of nearly all women workers — employees, technicians and others — of the world when it demands the maintenance of social protection for women and mothers and an even more rapid development of protection in industry, commerce, agriculture and in work in the home, where the necessity is making itself felt with even greater urgency.

For all these reasons, the International Committee of Trade Union Women would propose that:

(1) All questions relating to the status of women should be submitted to a more thorough consideration and, if possible, should be examined in the first place by a consultative committee of representatives from international women's organisations.

(2) All aspects of the question relating to social and labour legislation should be remitted to the International Labour Organisation for consideration and report by the appropriate committee of that organisation.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1936

1-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

Ser. L.o.N. P.		Pages
1936.V.1.	Acts relating to the Constitution of the Permanent Court of International Justice.	116-144
1936.V.2.	Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism — Report to the Council adopted by the Committee on January 15th, 1936 — Report adopted by the Council on January 23rd, 1936.	145-152
1936.V.3.	Report of the Committee appointed to study the Composition of the Council (adopted by the Committee on April 28th, 1936).	153-154
1936.V.4.	Ratification of Agreements and Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations — Seventeenth List.	155-220
1936.V.5.	*Idem* — Results of the Sixth Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.	221-232
1936.V.6.	International Repression of Terrorism — Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism — Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court — Observations by Governments — Series I.	233-238
1936.V.7.	*Idem* — Observations by Governments — Series II.	239-240
1936.V.8.	Status of Women — Communications from Governments and Women's International Organisations.	241-255
1936.V.9.	Conditions of voting Requests for Advisory Opinions from the Permanent Court of International Justice — Observations received from Governments and from the International Labour Office.	256-266

[Communiqué au Conseil
et aux Membres de la Société.]

N° officiel : **C. 80. M. 28.** 1936. V

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

ACTES

relatifs à la

CONSTITUTION

de la

Cour permanente de Justice internationale

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ACTS

relating to the

CONSTITUTION

of the

Permanent Court of International Justic

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

ACTES
RELATIFS A LA CONSTITUTION DE
LA COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

Pages

Résolution relative à l'établissement d'une Cour permanente de Justice internationale, approuvée par l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations, Genève, le 13 décembre 1920 . . . 3

Protocole de signature du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale visé par l'article 14 du Pacte de la Société des Nations, Genève, le 16 décembre 1920 4

Résolution relative à la revision du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, adoptée par l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations, Genève, le 14 septembre 1929 . . . 31

Protocole concernant la revision du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, Genève, le 14 septembre 1929. 32

Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale visé par l'article 14 du Pacte de la Société des Nations tel qu'il a été amendé conformément au Protocole du 14 septembre 1929 35

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ACTS
RELATING TO THE CONSTITUTION OF
THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Page

Resolution concerning the Establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice passed by the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva, December 13th, 1920 . . 3

Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, Geneva, December 16th, 1920 4

Resolution concerning the Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva, September 14th, 1929 31

Protocol concerning the Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Geneva, September 14th, 1929 32

Statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations as amended in accordance with the Protocol of September 14th, 1929 35

S.d.N. 2430 + 200 2/36. Imp. Kundig.

RÉSOLUTION
RELATIVE A L'ÉTABLISSEMENT D'UNE
COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

approuvée par l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations, Genève, le 13 décembre 1920.

---

1. L'Assemblée à l'unanimité déclare approuver, avec les amendements qu'elle y a apportés, le projet de Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, qui, préparé par le Conseil aux termes de l'article 14 du Pacte, a été soumis à son approbation.

2. Le Statut de la Cour, vu les termes particuliers dudit article 14, sera soumis, dans le plus bref délai, aux Membres de la Société des Nations pour adoption sous forme de Protocole dûment ratifié constatant qu'ils reconnaissent ce Statut. Le soin de procéder à cette présentation est confié au Conseil.

3. Dès que ce Protocole aura été ratifié par la majorité des Membres de la Société, le Statut de la Cour sera en vigueur et la Cour sera appelée à siéger, conformément audit Statut, dans tous les litiges entre les Membres ou Etats ayant ratifié, ainsi que pour les autres Etats auxquels la Cour est ouverte aux termes de l'article 35, alinéa 2, dudit Statut.

4. Ledit Protocole restera également ouvert à la signature des Etats mentionnés à l'Annexe au Pacte.

RESOLUTION
CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A
PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

passed by the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva, December 13th, 1920.

---

1. The Assembly unanimously declares its approval of the draft Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice — as amended by the Assembly — which was prepared by the Council under Article 14 of the Covenant and submitted to the Assembly for its approval.

2. In view of the special wording of Article 14, the Statute of the Court shall be submitted within the shortest possible time to the Members of the League of Nations for adoption in the form of a protocol duly ratified and declaring their recognition of this Statute. It shall be the duty of the Council to submit the Statute to the Members.

3. As soon as this protocol has been ratified by the majority of the Members of the League, the Statute of the Court shall come into force and the Court shall be called upon to sit in conformity with the said Statute in all disputes between the Members or States which have ratified, as well as between the other States, to which the Court is open under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the said Statute.

4. The said protocol shall likewise remain open for signature by the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

PROTOCOLE DE SIGNATURE DU STATUT DE LA COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

visé par l'article 14 du Pacte de la Société des Nations.

Les Membres de la Société des Nations, représentés par les soussignés dûment autorisés, déclarent reconnaître le Statut[1] ci-joint de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale de la Société des Nations, approuvé par le vote unanime de l'Assemblée de la Société, en date, à Genève, du 13 décembre 1920.

En conséquence, ils déclarent accepter la juridiction de la Cour dans les termes et conditions prévus dans le Statut ci-dessus visé.

Le présent Protocole, dressé conformément à la décision de l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations du 13 décembre 1920, sera ratifié. Chaque Puissance adressera sa ratification au Secrétariat général de la Société des Nations, par les soins duquel il en sera donné avis à toutes les autres Puissances signataires. Les ratifications resteront déposées dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations.

Le présent Protocole restera ouvert à la signature des Etats visés à l'Annexe du Pacte de la Société.

Le Statut de la Cour[1] entrera en vigueur ainsi qu'il est prévu par ladite décision.

Fait à Genève, en un seul exemplaire, dont les textes français et anglais feront foi.

Le 16 décembre 1920.

*Pour l'*UNION SUD-AFRICAINE

Signed subject to the approval of the Government of the Union of South Africa[2]:

R. A. BLANKENBERG.

*Pour l'*ALBANIE

Fan S. NOLI

*Pour l'*ALLEMAGNE

STRESEMANN

[1] Le Statut amendé est reproduit à la page 35 de ce document (*voir le texte original du Statut dans le document C.607. M.212.1924.V*).

[2] Signé sous réserve de l'approbation du Gouvernement de l'Union Sud-Africaine.

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The Members of the League of Nations, through the undersigned, duly authorised, declare their acceptance of the adjoined Statute[1] of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was approved by a unanimous vote of the Assembly of the League on the 13th December, 1920, at Geneva.

Consequently, they hereby declare that they accept the jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with the terms and subject to the conditions of the above-mentioned Statute.

The present Protocol, which has been drawn up in accordance with the decision taken by the Assembly of the League of Nations on the 13th December, 1920, is subject to ratification. Each Power shall send its ratification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations; the latter shall take the necessary steps to notify such ratification to the other signatory Powers. The ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

The said Protocol shall remain open for signature by the Members of the League of Nations and by the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant of the League.

The Statute of the Court[1] shall come into force as provided in the above-mentioned decision.

Executed at Geneva, in a single copy, the French and English texts of which shall both be authentic.

16th December 1920.

For the UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

For ALBANIA

For GERMANY

[1] The amended Statute is reproduced on page 35 of this document (*see original text of the Statute in document C.607. M.212.1924.V*).

Pour les ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE — *For the* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Jay PIERREPONT MOFFAT

Pour la RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE — *For the* ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

Enrique RUIZ GUIÑAZÚ

Pour le COMMONWEALTH D'AUSTRALIE — *For the* COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

W. M. HUGHES

*Pour l'*AUTRICHE — *For* AUSTRIA

Emerich PFLÜGL

Pour la BELGIQUE — *For* BELGIUM

Fernand PELTZER
Ministre de Belgique en Suisse.

Pour la BOLIVIE — *For* BOLIVIA

F. A. ARAMAYO

Pour le BRÉSIL — *For* BRAZIL

Rodrigo OCTAVIO
Gastao DA CUNHA
Raul FERNANDES

*Pour l'*EMPIRE BRITANNIQUE — *For the* BRITISH EMPIRE

Arthur James BALFOUR

Pour la BULGARIE — *For* BULGARIA

S. POMÉNOV

Pour le CANADA — *For* CANADA

Philippe ROY

Pour le CHILI — *For* CHILE

Agustin EDWARDS
Manuel RIVAS-VICUÑA

Pour la CHINE — *For* CHINA

V. K. WELLINGTON KOO
Ts. F. TANG

Pour la COLOMBIE	Francisco José URRUTIA A. J. RESTREPO	*For* COLOMBIA
Pour COSTA-RICA	Manuel M. DE PERALTA	*For* COSTA RICA
Pour CUBA	Aristides DE AGÜERO Rafael MARTINEZ ORTÌZ Ezequiel GARCÍA	*For* CUBA
Pour le DANEMARK	Herluf ZAHLE.	*For* DENMARK
	Por la REPUBLICA DOMINICANA Bajo reserva de ratificación [1]: Jacinto R. DE CASTRO.	
*Pour l'*ESPAGNE	Emilio DE PALACIOS	*For* SPAIN
*Pour l'*ESTHONIE	Ant. PIIP	*For* ESTHONIA
*Pour l'*EMPIRE D'ÉTHIOPIE	LAGARDE duc d'ENTOTTO	*For the* EMPIRE OF ABYSSINIA
Pour la FINLANDE	ENCKELL	*For* FINLAND
Pour la FRANCE	Léon BOURGEOIS	*For* FRANCE
Pour la GRÈCE	N. POLITIS	*For* GREECE
Pour le GUATÉMALA	F. A. FIGUEROA	*For* GUATEMALA
Pour HAÏTI	Dantès BELLEGARDE	*For* HAITI

[1] *Pour la République Dominicaine.*
Sous réserve de ratification.

[1] *For the Dominican Republic.*
Subject to ratification.

Pour la HONGRIE	Sous réserve de ratification[1] Felix DE PARCHER Chargé d'Affaires R.	*For* HUNGARY
*Pour l'*INDE	W. S. MEYER	*For* INDIA
*Pour l'*ITALIE	Carlo SCHANZER	*For* ITALY
Pour le JAPON	HAYASHI	*For* JAPAN
Pour la LETTONIE	M. WALTERS.	*For* LATVIA
Pour le LIBÉRIA	R. LEHMAN,	*For* LIBERIA
Pour la LITHUANIE	GALVANAUSKAS	*For* LITHUANIA
Pour le LUXEMBOURG	LEFORT	*For* LUXEMBURG
Pour le NICARAGUA	Franco TORRES F.	*For* NICARAGUA
Pour la NORVÈGE	F. HAGERUP	*For* NORWAY
Pour la NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE	J. ALLEN.	*For* NEW ZEALAND
Pour le PANAMA	Harmodio ARIAS	*For* PANAMA
Pour le PARAGUAY	H. VELÁSQUEZ	*For* PARAGUAY
Pour les PAYS-BAS	J. LOUDON	*For the* NETHERLANDS

[1] Subject to ratification.

Pour le PÉROU — *For* PERU

Mar. H. CORNEJO

Pour la PERSE — *For* PERSIA

Emir SAHAMEDINE KHAN GAFFARY ZOKA-ED-DOVLEH

Pour la POLOGNE — *For* POLAND

I. J. PADEREWSKI

Pour le PORTUGAL — *For* PORTUGAL

Affonso COSTA.

Pour la ROUMANIE — *For* ROUMANIA

E. Margaritesco GRECIANO
Ministre Plénipotentiaire,
Chargé d'Affaires de Roumanie en Suisse.

Pour le SALVADOR — *For* SALVADOR

J. Gustavo GUERRERO
Arturo R. AVILA

Pour le ROYAUME DES SERBES, CROATES ET SLOVÈNES
For the KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES

M. YOVANOVITCH
Ministre du Royaume des Serbes,
Croates et Slovènes en Suisse.

Pour le SIAM — *For* SIAM

CHAROON

Pour la SUÈDE — *For* SWEDEN

Hj. BRANTING

Pour la SUISSE — *For* SWITZERLAND

MOTTA.

Pour la TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE — *For* CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr Cyrill DUŠEK
Ministre de Tchécoslovaquie en Suisse
pour la Tchécoslovaquie.

*Pour l'*URUGUAY — *For* URUGUAY

J. C. BLANCO
B. FERNANDEZ Y MEDINA

Pour le VENEZUELA — *For* VENEZUELA

Manuel DIAZ-RODRIGUEZ
Santiago KEY-AYALA
Diogenes ESCALANTE

DISPOSITION FACULTATIVE

Les soussignés, dûment autorisés, déclarent en outre, au nom de leur Gouvernement, reconnaître dès à présent, comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour et dans les termes suivants:

OPTIONAL CLAUSE

The undersigned, being duly authorised thereto, further declare, on behalf of their Government, that, from this date, they accept as compulsory "ipso facto" and without special Convention, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, under the following conditions:

Portugal.

Au nom du Portugal je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement [1].

Affonso COSTA.

Suisse.

Au nom du Gouvernement suisse et sous réserve de ratification par l'Assemblée fédérale je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement, pour la durée de cinq années [2].

MOTTA

Danemark.

Au nom du Gouvernement danois et sous réserve de ratification je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement pour la durée de cinq années [3].

Herluf ZAHLE.

Salvador.

Sous réserve de réciprocité [4].

J. Gustavo GUERRERO
Arturo R. AVILA

Costa-Rica.

Sous réserve de réciprocité [5].

Manuel M. DE PERALTA.

Uruguay.

Au nom du Gouvernement de l'Uruguay, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement [6].

B. FERNANDEZ Y MEDINA

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Portugal.)

[1] On behalf of Portugal, I recognise, in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention.

(Switzerland.)

[2] On behalf of the Swiss Government and subject to ratification by the Federal Assembly, I recognise, in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a period of five years.

(Denmark.)

[3] On behalf of the Danish Government and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a period of five years.

(Salvador.)

[4] On condition of reciprocity.

(Costa Rica.)

[5] On condition of reciprocity.

(Uruguay.)

[6] On behalf of the Government of Uruguay, I recognise, in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention.

Luxembourg.

Au nom du Gouvernement luxembourgeois et sous réserve de ratification je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour purement et simplement pour une durée de cinq années [1].

LEFORT.

Finlande.

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République de Finlande et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour purement et simplement pour une durée de cinq années [2].

ENCKELL

Pays-Bas.

La déclaration suivante a été faite par le Chargé d'Affaires des Pays-Bas au moment du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification et se trouve inscrite dans le procès-verbal de dépôt dudit instrument:

« Au nom du Gouvernement néerlandais, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire à condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour la durée de cinq années, sur tout différend futur à propos duquel les parties ne sont pas convenues d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique. » [3]

(Signé) MOSSELMANS
Chargé d'Affaires a. i. des Pays-Bas.

Pour copie conforme:
D. ANZILOTTI

Libéria.

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République de Libéria, et sous réserve de ratification par le Sénat libérien, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat, acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement [4].

R. LEHMAN,

Bulgarie.

Au nom du Gouvernement du Royaume de Bulgarie je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, purement et simplement [5].

S. POMÉNOV

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Luxemburg.)

[1] On behalf of the Government of Luxemburg and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a period of five years.

(Finland.)

[2] On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Finland and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, for a period of five years.

(Netherlands.)

[3] The following declaration was made by the Netherlands Chargé d'Affaires at the moment of the deposit of the deed of ratification and is contained in the Procès-Verbal of Deposit of the deed:

" On behalf of the Government of the Netherlands, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, in conformity with Article 36, § 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years, in respect of any future dispute in regard to which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to some other means of friendly settlement. "

(Liberia.)

[4] On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Liberia, and subject to ratification by the Liberian Senate, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention.

(Bulgaria.)

[5] On behalf of the Government of the Kingdom of Bulgaria, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, unconditionally.

Suède.

Au nom du Gouvernement royal suédois je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour pour une durée de cinq années [1].

Genève, le 16 août 1921. ADLERCREUTZ.

Norvège.

Au nom du Gouvernement norvégien et sous réserve de ratification je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement pour la durée de cinq années [2].

6 septembre 1921. Fridtjof NANSEN

Haïti.

Au nom de la République d'Haïti, je déclare reconnaître la compétence obligatoire de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale [3].

F. ADDOR
Consul

Lithuanie.

Pour la durée de 5 ans [4].

5 octobre 1921. GALVANAUSKAS

Panama.

La déclaration suivante a été transmise par Monsieur R. A. Amador, chargé d'Affaires de la République de Panama à Paris, dans une lettre datée du 25 octobre 1921 et adressée à Sir Eric Drummond, Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations:

« Au nom du Gouvernement de Panama, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour purement et simplement ». [5]

(Signé) R. A. AMADOR
Chargé d'Affaires.

Pour copie conforme:
D. ANZILOTTI

Brésil.

L'instrument de ratification déposé auprès du Secrétariat permanent de la Société des Nations par le Gouvernement du Brésil contient le passage suivant:

« .....declarando acceitar, de accôrdo com a mesma resoluçâo do Poder Legislativo Nacional, a jurisdicçâo obrigatoria da referida Côrte, pelo

---

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Sweden.)

[1] On behalf of the Government of His Majesty the King of Sweden, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, for a period of five years.

Geneva, August 16, 1921.

(Norway.)

[2] On behalf of the Government of His Majesty the King of Norway and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, for a period of five years.

September 6, 1921.

(Haiti.)

[3] On behalf of the Republic of Haiti, I recognise the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice as compulsory.

(Lithuania.)

[4] For a period of five years.

October 5, 1921.

(Panama.)

[5] The following declaration was transmitted by M. R. A. Amador, Chargé d'Affaires of the Republic of Panama at Paris, in a letter dated October 25, 1921, addressed to Sir Eric Drummond, Secretary-General of the League of Nations:

" On behalf of the Government of Panama, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention."

prazo de cinco annos, sob condição de reciprocidade e desde que tambem a acceitem, pelo menos, duas das Potencias com assento permanente no Conselho Executivo da Liga das Nações ». [1]

Pour copie conforme:
D. ANZILOTTI

Autriche.

Au nom de la République d'Autriche je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour permanente purement et simplement pour la durée de cinq années [2].

14 mars 1922. Emerich PFLÜGL

Chine.

Le Gouvernement chinois reconnaît comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation c'est-à-dire à condition de réciprocité la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36 paragraphe 2 du Statut de la Cour pour la durée de cinq années [3].

Le 13 mai 1922. Ts. F. TANG

Lettonie.

Au nom du Gouvernement letton et sous réserve de ratification par la Saeima, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire à condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour la durée de cinq années, sur tout différend futur à propos duquel les parties ne sont pas convenues d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [4].

Genève, le 11 septembre 1923. Z. A. MEIEROVICS.

République Dominicaine.

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République Dominicaine et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement [5].

Genève, le 30 septembre 1924. Jacinto R. DE CASTRO.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Brazil.)

[1] The instrument of ratification deposited with the permanent Secretariat of the League of Nations by the Brazilian Government contains the following passage:

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.	TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.
". . . et déclarons accepter, en vertu de la même résolution du Pouvoir Législatif du Brésil, la juridiction obligatoire de ladite Cour, pour une période de cinq années, sous condition de réciprocité et dès que cette juridiction sera aussi acceptée par deux au moins des Puissances représentées d'une manière permanente au Conseil de la Société des Nations."	". . . we declare to recognise as compulsory, in accordance with the said resolution of the National Legislature, the jurisdiction of the said Court for a period of five years, on condition of reciprocity and as soon as it has likewise been recognised as such by two at least of the Powers permanently represented on the Council of the League of Nations."

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Austria.)

[2] On behalf of the Austrian Republic, I declare that the latter recognises, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, for a period of five years.

March 14, 1922.

(China.)

[3] The Chinese Government recognise as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, in relation to any Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, § 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years.

May 13, 1922.

(Latvia.)

[4] On behalf of the Latvian Government, and subject to ratification by the Saeima, I declare that I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years, in any future dispute in respect of which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, September 11, 1923.

(Dominican Republic.)

[5] On behalf of the Government of the Dominican Republic and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention.

Geneva, September 30, 1924.

France.

Je déclare que le Gouvernement de la République Française adhère à la disposition facultative de l'article 36 paragraphe 2 du Statut de la Cour, sous réserve de ratification, sous réserve de réciprocité, pour une durée de 15 années avec faculté de dénonciation au cas où le Protocole d'arbitrage, de sécurité et de réduction des armements signé en date de ce jour deviendrait caduc, et, d'autre part, sous le bénéfice des observations faites à la Première Commission de la cinquième Assemblée, aux termes desquelles, « l'une des Parties en litige pourra appeler l'autre devant le Conseil de la Société des Nations à l'effet de procéder à l'essai de règlement pacifique prévu au paragraphe 3 de l'article 15 du Pacte, et, pendant ledit essai de conciliation, aucune Partie ne pourra citer l'autre devant la Cour de Justice. » [1]

Le 2 octobre 1924. Aristide BRIAND

Estonie.

Un des instruments de ratification déposés au Secrétariat le 2 mai 1923 par le Gouvernement d'Esthonie contient le passage suivant:

« La République d'Esthonie déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire à condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour la durée de cinq années, sur tout différend futur à propos duquel les parties ne sont pas convenues d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique. » [2]

Pour copie conforme:
Le 28 novembre 1924.
VAN HAMEL.

Belgique.

Au nom du Gouvernement belge, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de quinze années, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette ratification, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [3].

Genève, le 25 septembre 1925. Paul HYMANS

Danemark.

Au nom du Gouvernement danois et sous réserve de ratification je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement, pour une période ultérieure de dix années [4].

Genève, le 11 décembre 1925. A. OLDENBOURG.

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(France.)

[1] I hereby declare that, subject to ratification, the French Government gives its adhesion to the Optional Clause of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, on the condition of reciprocity, for a period of fifteen years, with power of denunciation, should the Protocol of Arbitration, Security and the Reduction of Armaments signed this day lapse, and, further, subject to the observations made at the First Committee of the Fifth Assembly, according to the terms of which " one of the parties to the dispute may bring the said dispute before the Council of the League of Nations for the purposes of the pacific settlement laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 15 of the Covenant, and during such proceedings neither party may take proceedings against the other in the Court."

October 2, 1924.

(Esionia.)

[2] One of the instruments of ratification deposited with the Secretariat of the League of Nations on May 2, 1923, by the Estonian Government contains the following passage:

" The Estonian Republic declares to recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years, in any future dispute in respect of which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement."

(Belgium.)

[3] On behalf of the Belgian Government, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court for a period of fifteen years, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, September 25, 1925.

(Denmark.)

[4] On behalf of the Government of Denmark and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a further period of ten years.

Geneva, December 11, 1925.

Suisse.

Au nom de la Confédération suisse et sous réserve de ratification, le soussigné déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement, pour une nouvelle période de dix années, à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification [1].

Genève, le premier mars 1926. MOTTA.

Suède.

Au nom du Gouvernement royal suédois je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour pour une période de dix années, à compter de la date à laquelle la déclaration du Gouvernement suédois du 16 août 1921 cessera de porter ses effets [2].

Genève, le 18 mars 1926. Einar HENNINGS.

Ethiopie.

Le soussigné déclare au nom du Gouvernement impérial d'Ethiopie, reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36 paragraphe 2 du Statut pour une durée de cinq années en exceptant les différends futurs à propos desquels les parties auraient convenu d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [3].

Genève, le 12 juillet 1926. LAGARDE, duc d'ENTOTTO
etc., etc., etc.

Pays-Bas.

Au nom du Gouvernement néerlandais, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire à condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour la durée de dix années à partir du 6 août 1926, sur tous les différends futurs à l'exception de ceux à propos desquels les parties seraient convenues, après l'entrée en vigueur du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [4].

Genève, le 2 septembre 1926. W. DOUDE VAN TROOSTWYK.

Norvège.

Au nom du Gouvernement Norvégien et sans réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation,

---

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Switzerland.)

[1] On behalf of the Swiss Confederation and subject to ratification, the undersigned recognises, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a period of ten years to be reckoned as from the deposit of the instrument of ratification.

Geneva, March 1, 1926.

(Sweden.)

[2] On behalf of the Royal Swedish Government, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a period of ten years to be reckoned from the date on which the Swedish Declaration of August 16, 1921, ceases to be in force.

Geneva, March 18, 1926.

(Abyssinia.)

[3] On behalf of the Imperial Abyssinian Government, the undersigned recognises as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, for a period of five years, excepting disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, July 12, 1926.

(The Netherlands.)

[4] On behalf of the Netherlands Government, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years as from August 6, 1926, on any future disputes, excepting those in regard to which the parties would have agreed, after the coming into force of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, September 2, 1926.

c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement pour la durée de dix années à compter du 3 octobre 1926 [1].

Genève, le 22 septembre 1926., Fridtjof NANSEN

Guatémala.

Au nom de la République de Guatemala je déclare accepter sous réserve de ratification et sous condition réciprocité la juridiction de la Cour sur toutes catégories de différends d'ordre juridique ayant pour objet:

a) l'interprétation d'un traité;
b) tout point de droit international;
c) la réalité de tout fait qui, s'il était établi, constituerait la violation d'un engagement international;
d) la nature ou l'étendue de la réparation due pour la rupture d'un engagement international [2].

Genève, 17 décembre 1926. F. A. FIGUEROA

Autriche.

Au nom de la République d'Autriche et sous réserve de ratification, le soussigné déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement, pour une nouvelle période de dix années, à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification [3].

Genève, le 12 janvier 1927. Emerich PFLÜGL

Finlande.

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République de Finlande, et à partir du 6 avril 1927, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, purement et simplement, pour une durée de dix années [4].

Genève, le 3 mars 1927. R. ERICH.

Allemagne.

Au nom du Gouvernement allemand, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de cinq années, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette ratification, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [5].

Genève, le 23 septembre 1927. STRESEMANN

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Norway.)

[1] On behalf of the Norwegian Government and not being subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, for a period of ten years as from October 3, 1926.

Geneva, September 22, 1926.

(Guatemala.)

[2] On behalf of the Republic of Guatemala I accept, subject to ratification and on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in all the classes of legal disputes concerning:

(*a*) The interpretation of a treaty;
(*b*) Any question of international law;
(*c*) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(*d*) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Geneva, December 17, 1926.

(Austria.)

[3] On behalf of the Austrian Republic and subject to ratification, the undersigned recognises, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, for a further period of ten years, from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification.

Geneva, January 12, 1927.

(Finland.)

[4] On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Finland and as from April 6, 1927, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention, for a period of ten years.

Geneva, March 3, 1927.

(Germany.)

[5] On behalf of the German Government, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court for a period of five years, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, September 23, 1927.

Hongrie.

Au nom du Gouvernement royal hongrois, je déclare, sous réserve de ratification, reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36 § 2 du Statut, pour une durée de cinq ans à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification [1].

Genève, le 14 septembre 1928. Louis WALKO

Espagne.

Au nom du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté le Roi d'Espagne, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour pour une période de dix années, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la signature de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette signature, sauf le cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [2].

Genève, le 21 septembre 1928. J. QUIÑONES DE LEÓN.

Italie.

Le Gouvernement de l'Italie déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, et pour la durée de cinq ans, sous réserve de tout moyen de solution prévu par une convention spéciale, et dans le cas où une solution par la voie diplomatique ou éventuellement par l'action du Conseil de la Société des Nations n'interviendrait pas, la juridiction de la Cour sur les catégories suivantes de différends d'ordre juridique, qui pourraient se vérifier après la ratification de la présente déclaration, ayant pour objet:

a) Interprétation d'un traité,

b) Tout point de droit international,

c) La réalité de tout fait qui, s'il était établi, constituerait la rupture d'une obligation internationale,

d) La nature ou l'étendue de la réparation due pour la rupture d'une obligation internationale [3].

Genève, le 9 septembre 1929. Vittorio SCIALOJA

Lettonie.

Au nom du Gouvernement letton et sous réserve de ratification par la Saeima, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de cinq années, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits posté-

---

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Hungary.)

[1] On behalf of the Royal Hungarian Government, and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, for a period of five years to be reckoned as from the deposit of the instrument of ratification.

Geneva, September 14, 1928.

(Spain.)

[2] On behalf of the Government of His Majesty the King of Spain, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court for a period of ten years, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, September 21, 1928.

(Italy.)

[3] The Italian Government declares to recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto*, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, and for a period of five years, subject to any other method of settlement provided by a special convention, and in any case where a solution through the diplomatic channel or further by the action of the Council of the League of Nations could not be reached, the jurisdiction of the Court on the following classes of legal disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration, and concerning:

(*a*) The interpretation of a treaty;
(*b*) Any question of international law;
(*c*) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(*d*) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Geneva, September 9, 1929.

meurs a cette ratification, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique. Cette déclaration remplace celle faite le 11 septembre 1923 [1].

Genève, le 10 septembre 1929. A. BALODIS.

Grèce.

Dûment autorisé par le Gouvernement hellénique, agissant en vertu d'une approbation spéciale du pouvoir législatif, je déclare accepter au nom de la Grèce la Disposition facultative prévue à l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, pour une durée de cinq ans et sous condition de réciprocité, pour toutes les catégories de différends énumérées dans ledit article 36, à l'exception:

a) des différends ayant trait au statut territorial de la Grèce, y compris ceux relatifs à ses droits de souveraineté sur ses ports et ses voies de communications;

b) Des différends ayant directement ou indirectement trait à l'application des traités ou conventions acceptés par elle et prévoyant une autre procédure.

Cette acceptation déploie ses effets dès le moment de la signature de la présente déclaration [2].

Genève, le 12 septembre 1929. A. MICHALAKOPOULOS

Irish Free State.

On behalf of the Irish Free State I declare that I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice for a period of twenty years and on the sole condition of reciprocity. This declaration is subject to ratification.[3]

Geneva, 14 September, 1929. P. MCGILLIGAN

France.

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République française, je déclare, sous réserve de ratification, reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis des autres Membres ou Etats qui acceptent la même obligation la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut de ladite Cour, pour une durée de 5 années, sur tous les différends, qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet des situations ou des faits postérieurs à cette ratification, et qui n'auraient pu être réglés par une procédure de conciliation, ou par le Conseil aux termes de l'article 15, alinéa 6 du Pacte, sous réserve du cas où les parties seraient convenues ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement

---

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Latvia.)

[1] On behalf of the Latvian Government and subject to ratification by the Saeima, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement. This declaration replaces the declaration made on September 11, 1923.

Geneva, September 10, 1929.

(Greece.)

[2] Duly authorised by the Hellenic Government, acting in virtue of special approval by the legislative power, I declare that I accept on behalf of Greece the Optional Clause provided in Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, for a period of five years and on condition of reciprocity, for all the classes of disputes mentioned in the said Article 36, with the exception of :

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication;

(*b*) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Greece and providing for another procedure.

This acceptance is effective as from the date of signature of the present declaration.

Geneva, September 12, 1929.

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Etat libre d'Irlande.)

[3] Au nom de l'Etat libre d'Irlande je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, pour une période de vingt années et sous la seule condition de réciprocité. Cette déclaration est sujette à ratification.

Genève, le 14 septembre 1929.

arbitral. Cette déclaration remplace la déclaration du 2, octobre 1924 devenue caduque.[1]

Genève, le 19 sept. 1929. LOUCHEUR.

United Kingdom.

On behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention on condition of reciprocity the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom,

and subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.[2]

Geneva, 19 September 1929. Arthur HENDERSON.

Union of South Africa.

On behalf of His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention on condition of reciprocity the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

---

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(France.)

[1] On behalf of the Government of the French Republic and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, and which could not have been settled by a procedure of conciliation or by the Council according to the terms of Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant, with reservation as to the case where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration. This declaration replaces the declaration of October 2, 1924, which has now lapsed.

Geneva, September 19th, 1929.

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Royaume-Uni.)

[2] Au nom du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans le Royaume-Uni et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années et par la suite jusqu'à ce qu'il soit donné notification de l'abrogation de cette acceptation pour tous les différends qui s'élèveraient, après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

les différends au sujet desquels les parties en cause auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et

les différends avec les Gouvernements de tous autres Membres de la Société des Nations, Membres du Commonwealth Britannique de Nations, différends qui seront réglés selon une méthode convenue entre les parties ou dont elles conviendront, et

les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Royaume-Uni;

toutefois, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations et en cours d'examen par ce dernier, à condition que la requête de suspension soit déposée après que le différend aura été soumis au Conseil et dans les dix jours qui suivront la notification du début de la procédure devant la Cour, et à condition également que ladite suspension soit limitée à une période de douze mois ou à une période plus longue qui pourrait être fixée par les parties au différend ou déterminée par une décision de tous les membres du Conseil autres que les parties au différend.

Genève, le 19 septembre 1929.

other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa,

and subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.[1]

Geneva, September 19, 1929. Eric H. Louw.

New Zealand.

On behalf of His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention on condition of reciprocity the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of New Zealand,

and subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in New Zealand reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited

---

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Union Sud-Africaine.)

[1] Au nom du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans l'Union Sud-Africaine et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années et par la suite jusqu'à ce qu'il soit donné notification de l'abrogation de cette acceptation, pour tous les différends qui s'élèveraient, après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

les différends au sujet desquels les parties en cause auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et

les différends avec les Gouvernements de tous autres Membres de la Société des Nations, Membres du Commonwealth Britannique de Nations, différends qui seront réglés selon une méthode convenue entre les parties ou dont elles conviendront, et

les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction de l'Union Sud-Africaine;

toutefois, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans l'Union Sud-Africaine se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations et en cours d'examen par ce dernier, à condition que la requête de suspension soit déposée après que le différend aura été soumis au Conseil et dans les dix jours qui suivront la notification du début de la procédure devant la Cour, et à condition également que ladite suspension soit limitée à une période de douze mois ou à une période plus longue qui pourrait être fixée par les parties au différend ou déterminée par une décision de tous les membres du Conseil autres que les parties au différend.

Genève, le 19 septembre 1929.

to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.[1]

Geneva, 19 September, 1929. C. J. PARR.

Tchécoslovaquie.

Au nom de la République tchécoslovaque et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 de son Statut, pour une durée de dix années à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette ratification, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et sous réserve de la faculté, pour l'une ou l'autre des parties en litige, de soumettre le différend, préalablement à tout recours à la Cour, au Conseil de la Société des Nations [2].

Genève, le 19 septembre 1929. Dr Eduard BENEŠ.

India.

On behalf of the Government of India and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention on condition of reciprocity the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of India,

and subject to the condition that the Government of India reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten

---

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Nouvelle-Zélande.)

[1] Au nom du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans le Dominion de la Nouvelle-Zélande et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années et par la suite jusqu'à ce qu'il soit donné notification de l'abrogation de cette acceptation, pour tous les différends qui s'élèveraient, après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

les différends au sujet desquels les parties en cause auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et

les différends avec les Gouvernements de tous autres Membres de la Société des Nations, Membres du Commonwealth Britannique de Nations, différends qui seront réglés selon une méthode convenue entre les parties ou dont elles conviendront, et

les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Dominion de la Nouvelle-Zélande;

toutefois, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté en Nouvelle-Zélande se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations et en cours d'examen par ce dernier, à condition que la requête de suspension soit déposée après que le différend aura été soumis au Conseil et dans les dix jours qui suivront la notification du début de la procédure devant la Cour, et à condition également que ladite suspension soit limitée à une période de douze mois ou à une période plus longue qui pourrait être fixée par les parties au différend ou déterminée par une décision de tous les membres du Conseil autres que les parties au différend.

Genève, le 19 septembre 1929.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Czechoslovakia.)

[2] On behalf of the Czechoslovak Republic and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of its Statute, for a period of ten years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement, and subject to the right, for either of the parties to the dispute, to submit the dispute, before any recourse to the Court, to the Council of the League of Nations.

Geneva, September 19, 1929.

days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of 12 months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.[1]

Geneva, September 19, 1929. Md. HABIBULLAH.

Pérou.

Au nom de la République péruvienne, et sous réserve de ratification, je reconnais comme obligatoire de plein droit, sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou de tout Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 de son Statut, pour une durée de dix années à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient au sujet de situations et faits postérieurs à cette ratification, sauf le cas où les Parties seraient convenues, soit d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement arbitral, soit de soumettre préalablement le différend au Conseil de la Société des Nations [2].

Genève, 19 septembre 1929. M. H. CORNEJO

Siam.

On behalf of the Siamese Government, I recognize, subject to ratification, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto* and without any special convention, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court for a period of ten years in all disputes, as to which no other means of pacific settlement is agreed upon between the Parties.[3]

Geneva, September 20, 1929. VARNVAIDYA.

Commonwealth of Australia.

On behalf of His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention on condition of reciprocity the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

---

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Inde.)

[1] Au nom du Gouvernement de l'Inde et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années et, par la suite, jusqu'à ce qu'il soit donné notification de l'abrogation de cette acceptation pour tous les différends qui s'élèveraient, après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

les différends au sujet desquels les parties en cause auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et

les différends avec les Gouvernements de tous autres Membres de la Société des Nations, Membres du Commonwealth Britannique de Nations, différends qui seront réglés selon une méthode convenue entre les parties ou dont elles conviendront, et

les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction de l'Inde;

toutefois, le Gouvernement de l'Inde se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations et en cours d'examen par ce dernier, à condition que la requête de suspension soit déposée après que le différend aura été soumis au Conseil et dans les dix jours qui suivront la notification du début de la procédure devant la Cour, et à condition également que ladite suspension soit limitée à une période de douze mois ou à une période plus longue qui pourrait être fixée par les parties au différend ou déterminée par une décision de tous les membres du Conseil autres que les parties au différend.

Genève, le 19 septembre 1929.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Peru.)

[2] On behalf of the Republic of Peru and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or to any State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of its Statute, for a period of ten years from the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising with regard to situations and facts subsequent to that ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed either to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration, or to submit the dispute previously to the Council of the League of Nations.

Geneva, September 19, 1929.

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Siam.)

[3] Au nom du Gouvernement siamois, je déclare reconnaître, sous réserve de ratification, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années sur tous les différends au sujet desquels les parties ne seraient pas convenues d'un autre mode de règlement pacifique.

Genève, le 20 septembre 1929.

other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia,

and subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.[1]

Geneva, September 20, 1929. Granville RYRIE.

Canada.

On behalf of His Majesty's Government in Canada and subject to ratification, I accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, for a period of ten years and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to said ratification, other than:

disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; and

disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada.

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in Canada reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve

---

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Commonwealth d'Australie.)

[1] Au nom du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans le Commonwealth d'Australie et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années et par la suite jusqu'à ce qu'il soit donné notification de l'abrogation de cette acceptation, pour tous les différends qui s'élèveraient, après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

les différends au sujet desquels les parties en cause auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et

les différends avec les Gouvernements de tous autres Membres de la Société des Nations, Membres du Commonwealth Britannique de Nations, différends qui seront réglés selon une méthode convenue entre les parties ou dont elles conviendront, et

les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Commonwealth d'Australie;

Toutefois, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans le Commonwealth d'Australie se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations et en cours d'examen par ce dernier, à condition que la requête de suspension soit déposée après que le différend aura été soumis au Conseil et dans les dix jours qui suivront la notification du début de la procédure devant la Cour, et à condition également que ladite suspension soit limitée à une période de douze mois ou à une période plus longue qui pourrait être fixée par les parties au différend ou déterminée par une décision de tous les membres du Conseil autres que les parties au différend.

Genève, le 20 septembre 1929.

months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.[1]

20th September 1929. R. DANDURAND.

Nicaragua.

Au nom de la République de Nicaragua, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, et sans condition, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale [2].

Genève, le 24 septembre 1929. T. F. MEDINA

Lithuanie.

Pour la durée de cinq ans, avec effet à partir du quatorze janvier 1930 [3].

ZAUNIUS.

Yougoslavie.

Au nom du Royaume de Yougoslavie et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations, ou Etat dont le gouvernement est reconnu par le Royaume de Yougoslavie, et acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, conformément à l'article 36 de son Statut, pour une durée de cinq années à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration, sauf les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Royaume de Yougoslavie et sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [4].

16 mai 1930. Dr V. MARINKOVITCH

Salvador.

L'instrument de ratification déposé au Secrétariat de la Société des Nations par le Gouvernement du Salvador le 29 août 1930 indique que la ratification de la disposition facultative a été donnée sous certaines réserves

---

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Canada.)

[1] Au nom du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans le Canada et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut, pour une durée de dix années et par la suite jusqu'à ce qu'il soit donné notification de l'abrogation de cette acceptation, pour tous les différends qui s'élèveraient, après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

les différends au sujet desquels les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique, et

les différends avec les Gouvernements de tous autres Membres de la Société des Nations, Membres du Commonwealth Britannique de Nations, différends qui seront réglés selon une méthode convenue entre les parties ou dont elles conviendront, et

les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Dominion du Canada;

toutefois, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté dans le Canada se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations et en cours d'examen par ce dernier, à condition que la requête de suspension soit déposée après que le différend aura été soumis au Conseil et dans les dix jours qui suivront la notification du début de la procédure devant la Cour, et à condition également que ladite suspension soit limitée à une période de douze mois ou à une période plus longue qui pourrait être fixée par les parties au différend ou déterminée par une décision de tous les membres du Conseil autres que les parties au différend.

Le 20 septembre 1929.

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Nicaragua.)

[2] On behalf of the Republic of Nicaragua, I recognise as compulsory unconditionally the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Geneva, September 24, 1929.

(Lithuania.)

[3] For a period of five years, with effect as from January 14, 1930.

(Yugoslavia.)

[4] On behalf of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State the Government of which is recognised by the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in conformity with Article 36 of its Statute, for a period of five years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration, except disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement.

May 16, 1930.

visées dans la décision du Pouvoir Exécutif du 26 mai 1930 dont la teneur suit:

« Que no quedan sujetas a esta convención las controversias o diferencias sobre puntos o cuestiones que prohibe la Constitución Politica de esta República someter a arbitraje; ni las cuestiones anteriores a esta fecha; ni las reclamaciones contra la Nación por deudas pecuniarias; siendo entendido, también, que la clausula 36 del Estatuto, solo liga a El Salvador respecto a los Estados que acepten el arbitraje en esa forma. » [1]

Pour copie conforme.
Genève, le 29 août 1930.
Le Conseiller juridique du Secrétariat:
J. A. BUERO

Luxembourg.

Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la signature de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette signature, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à une autre procédure ou à un autre mode de règlement pacifique. La présente déclaration est faite pour une durée de cinq ans. Si elle n'est pas dénoncée six mois avant l'expiration de ce délai, elle sera considérée comme renouvelée pour une nouvelle période de cinq ans et ainsi de suite [2].

Genève, le 15 septembre 1930. BECH

Albanie.

Au nom du Royaume d'Albanie et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la Disposition facultative prévue à l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, pour une durée de cinq années, à dater du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification, sur tous les différends énumérés dans ledit article qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de cette déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification, autres que

a) les différends ayant trait au Statut territorial de l'Albanie;

b) les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Royaume d'Albanie;

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Salvador.)

[1] The instrument of ratification deposited with the Secretariat of the League of Nations by the Government of Salvador on August 29, 1930, states that the ratification of the Optional Clause was given subject to certain reservations expressed in the Decision of the Executive Power of May 26, 1930, and reading as follows:

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

Les dispositions de ce Statut ne s'appliquent pas aux contestations ou différends touchant des points ou questions qui ne sauraient être soumis à l'arbitrage conformément à la constitution politique de cette République.

Les dispositions de ce Statut ne s'appliquent pas non plus aux différends surgis avant cette date ni aux réclamations d'ordre pécuniaire formées contre la Nation, étant entendu également que l'article 36 du Statut lie seulement le Salvador à l'égard des Etats qui acceptent l'arbitrage dans cette forme.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The provisions of this Statute do not apply to any disputes or differences concerning points or questions which cannot be submitted to arbitration in accordance with the political Constitution of this Republic.

The provisions of this Statute also do not apply to disputes which arose before that date or to pecuniary claims made against the Nation, it being further understood that Article 36 binds Salvador only in regard to States which accept the arbitration in that form.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Luxemburg.)

[2] The Government of the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg recognises as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

Geneva, September 15, 1930.

c) les différends concernant, directement ou indirectement, l'application des traités ou conventions acceptés par le Royaume d'Albanie et prévoyant un autre mode de règlement pacifique [1].

17-9-1930.

Mehdi FRASHERI

Perse.

Le Gouvernement impérial de Perse déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut de la Cour, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration, au sujet de situations ou de faits ayant directement ou indirectement trait à l'application des traités ou conventions acceptés par la Perse et postérieurs à la ratification de cette déclaration, exception faite pour:

a) les différends ayant trait au statut territorial de la Perse, y compris ceux relatifs à ses droits de souveraineté sur ses îles et ports;

b) les différends au sujet desquels les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique;

c) les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèveraient exclusivement de la juridiction de la Perse.

Toutefois le Gouvernement impérial de Perse se réserve le droit de demander la suspension de la procédure devant la Cour pour tout différend soumis au Conseil de la Société des Nations.

La présente déclaration est faite pour une durée de six ans; à l'expiration de ce délai, elle continuera à avoir ses pleins effets jusqu'à ce que notification soit donnée de son abrogation [2].

Genève, le 2 octobre 1930.

HUSSEIN ALÂ.

Roumanie.

Le Gouvernement roumain déclare adhérer à la clause facultative de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, pour une période de cinq années, à l'égard des Gouvernements reconnus par la Roumanie et sous condition de réciprocité, pour les différends juridiques dérivant de situations ou faits postérieurs à la ratification par le Parlement roumain de la présente adhésion et sous réserve des matières soumises à une procédure spéciale établie ou à convenir et de la faculté pour la Roumanie de soumettre le différend, préalablement à tout recours à la Cour, au Conseil de la Société des Nations.

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Albania.)

[1] On behalf of the Kingdom of Albania and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the Optional Clause provided for by Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, for a period of five years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any of the disputes enumerated in the said article arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, other than:

(a) disputes relating to the territorial status of Albania;

(b) disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Albania;

(c) disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by the Kingdom of Albania and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

September 17, 1930.

(Persia.)

[2] The Imperial Government of Persia recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Persia and subsequent to the ratification of this declaration, with the exception of:

(a) disputes relating to the territorial status of Persia, including those concerning the rights of sovereignty of Persia over its islands and ports;

(b) disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(c) disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Persia.

However, the Imperial Government of Persia reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

The present declaration is made for a period of six years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effects until notification is given of its abrogation.

Geneva, October 2, 1930.

Sont exceptés néanmoins:

a) toute question de fond ou de procédure pouvant amener directement ou indirectement la discussion de l'intégrité territoriale actuelle et des droits souverains de la Roumanie, y compris ceux sur ses ports et ses voies de communication;

b) les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent de la juridiction intérieure de la Roumanie [1].

Genève, le 8 octobre 1930.

C. ANTONIADE

Pologne.

Au nom de la République de Pologne, sous réserve de ratification, le soussigné déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, conformément à l'article 36 paragraphe 2 du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de 5 années, sur tous les différends futurs qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette ratification, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique.

La présente déclaration ne s'applique pas aux différends:

1) qui concerneraient des questions que le droit international laisse à la compétence exclusive des Etats, ou

2) qui s'élèveraient entre la Pologne et des Etats qui refusent d'établir ou de maintenir des relations diplomatiques normales avec la Pologne, ou

3) qui se trouveraient directement ou indirectement en rapport avec la Guerre mondiale ou la guerre polono-soviétique, ou

4) qui résulteraient directement ou indirectement des stipulations du Traité de Paix signé à Riga le 18 mars 1921, ou

5) qui auraient trait aux dispositions de droit interne en rapport avec les points 3) et 4) [2].

Genève, le 24 janvier 1931.

Auguste ZALESKI

Colombie.

La República de Colombia reconoce como obligatoria, de pleno derecho y sin convención especial, bajo condición de reciprocidad, respecto de cualquier

---

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Roumania.)

[1] The Roumanian Government declares that it accedes to the Optional Clause of Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice for a period of five years in respect of the Governments recognised by Roumania and on condition of reciprocity in regard to legal disputes arising out of situations or facts subsequent to the ratification by the Roumanian Parliament of this accession and with the exception of matters for which a special procedure has been or may be established and subject to the right of Roumania to submit the dispute to the Council of the League of Nations before having recourse to the Court.

The following are, however, excepted:

(*a*) any question of substance or of procedure which might directly or indirectly cause the existing territorial integrity of Roumania and her sovereign rights, including her rights over her ports and communications, to be brought into question;

(*b*) disputes relating to questions which, according to international law, fall under the domestic jurisdiction of Roumania.

Geneva, October 8, 1930.

(Poland.)

[2] On behalf of the Republic of Poland, subject to ratification, the undersigned recognises as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of 5 years, in any future disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to such ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of peaceful settlement.

The present declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) with regard to matters which, by international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States, or

(2) arising between Poland and States which refuse to establish or maintain normal diplomatic relations with Poland, or

(3) connected directly or indirectly with the World War or with the Polono-Sovietic War, or

(4) resulting directly or indirectly from the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed at Riga, on March 18, 1921, or

(5) relating to provisions of internal law connected with points (3) and (4).

Geneva, January 24, 1931.

otro Estado que acepte la misma obligación, la jurisdicción de la Corte arriba mencionada, conforme al Articulo 36 del Estatuto [1].

Ginebra, el 6 de Enero de 1932. A. J. RESTREPO

Ethiopie.

Le soussigné déclare, au nom du Gouvernement impérial d'Ethiopie, reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut pour une durée de deux années avec effet à partir du 16 juillet 1931, en exceptant les différends futurs à propos desquels les parties auraient convenu d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique [2].

Genève, le 15 avril 1932.

Cte LAGARDE duc d'ENTOTTO

Allemagne.

Au nom du Gouvernement allemand, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de cinq années à compter du 1er mars 1933. Cette déclaration s'applique à tous les différends qui se seraient élevés après le 29 février 1928, date de la ratification de la déclaration faite en l'espèce à Genève le 23 septembre 1927, ou qui s'élèveraient à l'avenir, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite ratification. Sont exceptés les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique. La présente déclaration entrera en vigueur dès le jour de sa ratification [3].

Genève, le 9 février 1933. VON KELLER

Paraguay.

L'instrument de ratification par Son Excellence le Président de la République du Paraguay que M. le Délégué du Paraguay à la Société des Nations a fait parvenir au Secrétariat pour être déposé dans ses archives, contient le passage suivant:

« El Congreso de la Nación autorizó asimismo, por la citada Ley Nº 1.298, a reconocer como obligatoria de pleno derecho y sin convención especial, la jurisdicción de la Corte Permanente de Justicia Internacional,

---

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

(Colombie.)

[1] La République de Colombie reconnaît comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale sous condition de réciprocité, vis-à-vis de tout autre Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, conformément à l'article 36 du Statut.

Genève, le 6 janvier 1932.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Colombia.)

[1] The Republic of Colombia recognises as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in accordance with Article 36 of the Statute.

Geneva, January 6, 1932.

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Abyssinia.)

[2] On behalf of the Imperial Abyssinian Government, the undersigned recognises as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, for a period of two years taking effect as from July 16, 1931, excepting disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Geneva, April 15, 1932.

(Germany.)

[3] On behalf of the German Government, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years, from March 1, 1933. The present declaration applies to any disputes which might have arisen after the 29 February, 1928, date of the ratification of the declaration made on this subject at Geneva on the 23 September, 1927, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification. Cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement are excepted. The present declaration shall enter into force on the date of its ratification.

Geneva, February 9, 1933.

conforme al Artículo treinta y seis, Parágrafo 2º del Estatuto de la Corte, debiendo ser el reconocimiento puro y simple. » [1]

Pour copie conforme,

Genève, le 11 mai 1933.

Le Conseiller juridique du Secrétariat:

J. A. BUERO

Hongrie.

Au nom du Gouvernement royal hongrois je déclare reconnaître, sous réserve de ratification, comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut de la Cour, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité et pour une nouvelle période de cinq années à partir du 13 août 1934 [2].

Genève, le 30 mai 1934.

Ladislas DE TAHY.

Grèce.

Au nom du Gouvernement hellénique et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, et pour une nouvelle période de cinq années, à compter du 12 septembre 1934, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale sur les catégories de différends visées à l'alinéa 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, à l'exception:

a) des différends ayant trait au statut territorial de la Grèce, y compris ceux relatifs à ses droits de souveraineté sur ses ports et ses voies de communications;

b) des différends ayant directement ou indirectement trait à l'application des traités ou conventions acceptés par elle et prévoyant une autre procédure.

Cette acceptation déploie ses effets dès la signature de la présente déclaration [3].

Genève, le 12 septembre 1934.

D. MAXIMOS

Ethiopie.

En se référant à la déclaration en date du 15 avril 1932, le soussigné déclare, au nom du Gouvernement impérial d'Ethiopie, reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réci-

---

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Paraguay.)

[1] The instrument of ratification by His Excellency the President of the Republic of Paraguay, which the Delegate of Paraguay to the League of Nations transmitted to the Secretariat to be deposited in its archives, contains the following passage:

TRADUCTION DU SECRÉTARIAT DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.

Le Congrès de la Nation a autorisé également par ladite loi nº 1.298, la reconnaissance pure et simple commé obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale de la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, telle qu'elle est décrite à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The Congress of the Nation has also authorised by the said Law No. 1.298 the acceptance pure and simple, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, of the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, as set out in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute.

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Hungary.)

[2] On behalf of the Royal Hungarian Government and subject to ratification, I recognise, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a further period of five years as from August 13, 1934.

Geneva, May 30, 1934.

(Greece.)

[3] On behalf of the Hellenic Government and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, and for a further period of five years as from September 12, 1934, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, for the classes of disputes mentioned in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, with the exception of:

(*a*) disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication;

(*b*) disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Greece and providing for another procedure.

This acceptance is effective as from the date of signature of the present declaration.

Geneva, September 12, 1934.

procité, la juridiction de la Cour conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2 du Statut, en exceptant les différends futurs à propos desquels les parties auraient convenu d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique.

Cette acceptation est donnée pour une même période de deux ans à compter de ce jour, avec effet rétroactif pour couvrir la période comprise entre le 16 juillet 1933 et la date de signature de la présente déclaration[1].

Genève, le 18 septembre 1934. C^te LAGARDE duc d'ENTOTTO

Lettonie.

Au nom du Gouvernement letton et sous réserve de ratification, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, sur tous les différends qui se seraient élevés après le 26 février 1930, date du dépôt de la ratification de la déclaration faite à Genève le 10 septembre 1929 ou qui s'élèveraient à l'avenir, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite date, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique.

La présente déclaration est faite pour une durée de cinq ans; à l'expiration de ce délai, elle continuera à avoir ses pleins effets jusqu'à ce que notification soit donnée de son abrogation [2].

Genève, le 31 janvier 1935. Jules FELDMANS.

Lithuanie.

La déclaration suivante a été transmise par le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de la République de Lithuanie au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, par une lettre en date du 8 mars 1935:

« Faisant suite à la déclaration d'adhésion à la Disposition facultative du Protocole de signature concernant le Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, faite par le représentant de la Lithuanie le 14 janvier 1930 à Genève, je déclare par la présente, au nom du Gouvernement de la République de Lithuanie, reconnaître comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, conformément au paragraphe 2 de l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour, pour une nouvelle durée de cinq ans avec effet à partir du quatorze janvier 1935 [3].

(Signé) S. LOZORAITIS,
Ministre des Affaires étrangères. »

Pour copie conforme,
Genève, le 12 mars 1935,
Le Conseiller juridique p.i. du Secrétariat:
H. MCKINNON WOOD

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Abyssinia.)

[1] On behalf of the Imperial Abyssinian Government and referring to the declaration dated April 15, 1932, the undersigned recognises as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, excepting future disputes in respect of which the parties should have agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

This acceptance is given for a similar period of two years from to-day's date, with retroactive effect covering the period comprised between July 16, 1933, and the date of signature of the present declaration.

Geneva, September 18, 1934.

(Latvia.)

[2] On behalf of the Latvian Government and subject to ratification, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, over all disputes which might have arisen after the 26 February, 1930, date of deposit of the ratification of the declaration made at Geneva on the 10 September, 1929, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration is made for a period of five years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effect until notification is given of its abrogation.

Geneva, January 31, 1935.

(Lithuania.)

[3] The following declaration was transmitted by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, by a letter dated March 8, 1935:

" Following the declaration of acceptance of the Optional Clause of the Protocol of Signature concerning the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, made by the Representative of Lithuania at Geneva on the 14 January, 1930, I hereby recognise, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania, as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a further period of five years taking effect as from January 14, 1935."

Albanie.

Au nom du Gouvernement royal d'Albanie, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre de la Société des Nations ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la Disposition facultative prévue à l'article 36 du Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, pour une durée de cinq années à dater du 17 septembre 1935, sur tous les différends énumérés dans ledit article qui s'élèveraient postérieurement au 17 septembre 1930, date de l'engagement précédemment contracté par l'Albanie et que la présente déclaration vise à renouveler, au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à ladite date, autres que

a) les différends ayant trait au statut territorial de l'Albanie;

b) les différends relatifs à des questions qui, d'après le droit international, relèvent exclusivement de la juridiction du Royaume d'Albanie;

c) les différends concernant, directement ou indirectement, l'application des traités ou conventions acceptés par le Royaume d'Albanie et prévoyant un autre mode de règlement pacifique [1].

Genève, le 7 novembre 1935. Lec KURTI.

République Argentine.

Au nom de la République Argentine, sous réserve de ratification par le Congrès National, je déclare reconnaître comme obligatoire de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, c'est-à-dire sous condition de réciprocité, la juridiction de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, conformément à l'article 36, paragraphe 2, du Statut de la Cour, pour une durée de dix années à compter du jour du dépôt de l'instrument de ratification, sur tous les différends qui s'élèveraient après la ratification de la présente déclaration au sujet de situations ou de faits postérieurs à cette ratification, sauf les cas où les parties auraient convenu ou conviendraient d'avoir recours à un autre mode de règlement pacifique.

La présente déclaration ne s'applique pas:

1° aux questions déjà réglées,

2° aux questions qui, d'après le droit international, ressortissent à la juridiction locale ou au régime constitutionnel de chaque Etat [2].

Genève, le 28 décembre 1935. Enrique RUIZ GUIÑAZÚ

TRANSLATIONS BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(Albania.)

[1] On behalf of the Royal Albanian Government, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member of the League of Nations or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the Optional Clause provided for by Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, for a period of five years, as from September 17, 1935, in any of the disputes enumerated in the said article arising after September 17, 1930 (the date of the previous acceptance of Albania which is being renewed by the present declaration), with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, other than

(*a*) disputes relating to the territorial status of Albania;

(*b*) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Albania;

(*c*) disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by the Kingdom of Albania and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

Geneva, November 7, 1935.

(Argentine Republic.)

[2] On behalf of the Argentine Republic, subject to ratification by the National Congress, I recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of ten years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration does not apply:

(1) to questions already settled;

(2) to questions which, by international law, fall within the local jurisdiction or the constitutional regime of each State.

Geneva, December 28, 1935.

RÉSOLUTION
RELATIVE A LA REVISION DU STATUT DE LA COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

adoptée par l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations, Genève, le 14 septembre 1929.

1. L'Assemblée adopte les amendements au Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, ensemble le projet de protocole, élaborés par la Conférence convoquée par le Conseil de la Société des Nations, à la suite du rapport du Comité de juristes, qui a siégé à Genève en mars 1929, et qui comptait parmi ses membres un jurisconsulte, ressortissant des Etats-Unis d'Amérique. L'Assemblée exprime l'espoir que le projet de protocole élaboré par la Conférence réunisse le plus possible de signatures avant la clôture de la présente session de l'Assemblée et que tous les gouvernements intéressés fassent tout ce qui est en leur pouvoir pour assurer l'entrée en vigueur des amendements au Statut de la Cour avant l'ouverture de la prochaine session de l'Assemblée, au cours de laquelle l'Assemblée et le Conseil seront appelés à procéder à une nouvelle élection des membres de la Cour.

2. L'Assemblée fait sien le vœu ci-après qui a été adopté par la Conférence:

« La Conférence exprime le vœu que, conformément à l'esprit des articles 2 et 39 du Statut de la Cour, les candidats présentés par les groupes nationaux possèdent une expérience pratique notoire en matière de droit international et qu'ils soient en mesure de pouvoir au moins lire les deux langues officielles de la Cour et parler l'une ou l'autre; elle estime également souhaitable qu'à la présentation des candidats soit joint un état de leurs services justifiant leur candidature. »

RESOLUTION

CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva, September 14th, 1929.

1. The Assembly adopts the amendments to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the draft Protocol which the Conference convened by the Council of the League of Nations has drawn up after consideration of the report of the Committee of Jurists, which met in March 1929 at Geneva and which included among its members a jurist of the United States of America. The Assembly expresses the hope that the draft Protocol drawn up by the Conference may receive as many signatures as possible before the close of the present session of the Assembly and that all the Governments concerned will use their utmost efforts to secure the entry into force of the amendments to the Statute of the Court before the opening of the next session of the Assembly, in the course of which the Assembly and the Council will be called upon to proceed to a new election of the members of the Court.

2. The Assembly associates itself with the following recommendation adopted by the Conference:

> " The Conference recommends that, in accordance with the spirit of Articles 2 and 39 of the Statute of the Court, the candidates nominated by the national groups should possess recognised practical experience in international law and that they should be at least able to read both the official languages of the Court and to speak one of them; it also considers it desirable that to the nominations there should be attached a statement of the careers of the candidates justifying their candidature."

PROTOCOLE

CONCERNANT LA REVISION DU STATUT DE LA COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE [1].

1. Les soussignés, dûment autorisés, conviennent, au nom des gouvernements qu'ils représentent, d'apporter au Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale les amendements qui sont indiqués dans l'annexe [2] au présent Protocole et qui font l'objet de la résolution de l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations du 14 septembre 1929.

2. Le présent Protocole, dont les textes français et anglais feront également foi, sera soumis à la signature de tous les signataires du Protocole du 16 décembre 1920, auquel est annexé le Statut de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, ainsi qu'à celle des Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

3. Le présent Protocole sera ratifié. Les instruments de ratification seront déposés, si possible avant le 1er septembre 1930, entre les mains du Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, qui en informera les Membres de la Société et les Etats mentionnés dans l'annexe au Pacte.

4. Le présent Protocole entrera en vigueur le 1er septembre 1930, à condition que le Conseil de la Société des Nations se soit assuré que les Membres de la Société des Nations et les Etats mentionnés dans l'annexe au Pacte, qui auront ratifié le Protocole du 16 décembre 1920, mais dont la ratification sur le présent Protocole n'aurait pas encore été reçue à cette date, ne font pas d'objection à l'entrée en vigueur des amendements au Statut de la Cour qui sont indiqués dans l'annexe [2] au présent Protocole.

5. Dès l'entrée en vigueur du présent Protocole, les nouvelles dispositions feront partie du Statut adopté en 1920 et les dispositions des articles primitifs objet de la revision seront abrogées. Il est entendu que, jusqu'au 1er janvier 1931, la Cour continuera à exercer ses fonctions conformément au Statut de 1920.

6. Dès l'entrée en vigueur du présent Protocole, toute acceptation du Statut de la Cour signifiera acceptation du Statut revisé.

7. Aux fins du présent Protocole, les Etats-Unis d'Amérique seront dans la même position qu'un Etat ayant ratifié le Protocole du 16 décembre 1920.

---

[1] Ce Protocole est entré en vigueur le 1er février 1936, conformément à la résolution de l'Assemblée du 27 septembre 1935 et au rapport qui a été adopté par le Conseil le 23 janvier 1936.

En vue des prescriptions du paragraphe 6, le présent Protocole a cessé d'être ouvert à la signature à partir du 1er février 1936.

[2] Le Statut revisé dans lequel ces amendements sont incorporés est reproduit à la page 35 de ce document *(pour l'annexe au présent Protocole, voir document C.492.M.156.1929.V)*.

PROTOCOL

CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[1]

1. The undersigned, duly authorised, agree, on behalf of the Governments which they represent, to make in the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice the amendments which are set out in the Annex[2] to the present Protocol and which form the subject of the resolution of the Assembly of the League of Nations of September 14th, 1929.

2. The present Protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be presented for signature to all the signatories of the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, to which the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice is annexed, and to the United States of America.

3. The present Protocol shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited, if possible before September 1st, 1930, with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform the Members of the League of Nations and the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

4. The present Protocol shall enter into force on September 1st, 1930, provided that the Council of the League of Nations has satisfied itself that those Members of the League of Nations and States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant which have ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, and whose ratification of the present Protocol has not been received by that date, have no objection to the coming into force of the amendments to the Statute of the Court which are annexed[2] to the present Protocol.

5. After the entry into force of the present Protocol, the new provisions shall form part of the Statute adopted in 1920 and the provisions of the original articles which have been made the subject of amendment shall be abrogated. It is understood that, until January 1st, 1931, the Court shall continue to perform its functions in accordance with the Statute of 1920.

6. After the entry into force of the present Protocol, any acceptance of the Statute of the Court shall constitute an acceptance of the Statute as amended.

7. For the purposes of the present Protocol, the United States of America shall be in the same position as a State which has ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920.

---

[1] This Protocol came into force on February 1st, 1936, in accordance with the Assembly resolution of September 27th, 1935, and with the report which was adopted by the Council on January 23rd, 1936.

In view of the provisions of paragraph 6, the present Protocol has ceased to be open for signature as from February 1st, 1936.

[2] The amended Statute in which these amendments are incorporated is reproduced on page 35 of this document *(For the Annex to the present Protocol, see document C.492.M.156.1929.V)*.

FAIT à Genève, le quatorzième jour de septembre mil neuf cent vingt-neuf, en un seul exemplaire qui sera déposé dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations. Le Secrétaire général adressera des copies certifiées conformes aux Membres de la Société des Nations et aux Etats mentionnés dans l'annexe au Pacte.

DONE at Geneva, the fourteenth day of September nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The Secretary-General shall deliver authenticated copies to the Members of the League of Nations and to the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

UNION SUD-AFRICAINE

Eric H. LOUW.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

ALBANIE

Ilias VRIONI

ALBANIA

ALLEMAGNE

Fr. GAUS

GERMANY

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE

Jay PIERREPONT MOFFAT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE

Enrique RUIZ GUIÑAZÚ

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

AUSTRALIE

W. HARRISON MOORE.

AUSTRALIA

AUTRICHE

Dr Marcus LEITMAIER

AUSTRIA

BELGIQUE

Henri ROLIN

BELGIUM

BOLIVIE

A. CORTADELLAS.

BOLIVIA

BRÉSIL

M. DE PIMENTEL BRANDAO

BRAZIL

GRANDE-BRETAGNE ET IRLANDE DU NORD ainsi que toutes parties de l'Empire britannique non membres séparés de la Société des Nations.

Arthur HENDERSON

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all Parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.

BULGARIE

Wladimir MOLLOFF

BULGARIA

CANADA

R. DANDURAND

CANADA

CHILI

Luis V. DE PORTO-SEGURO

CHILE

CHINE

CHAO-CHU WU

CHINA

COLOMBIE

Francisco José URRUTIA

COLOMBIA

CUBA

G. DE BLANCK

CUBA

[1] Sous réserve de l'article 4 du Protocole et de la nouvelle rédaction de l'article 23 du Statut de la Cour [2].

DANEMARK

Georg COHN

DENMARK

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE

M. L. VASQUEZ G.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

ESPAGNE

C. BOTELLA

SPAIN

ESTONIE

A. SCHMIDT.

ESTONIA

ÉTHIOPIE

Badjirond ZELLEKA AGGUEDAOU

ABYSSINIA

FINLANDE

A. S YRJÖ-KOSKINEN.

FINLAND

FRANCE

Henri FROMAGEOT

FRANCE

[1] Le Gouvernement de Cuba, après avoir ratifié le Protocole avec cette réserve, l'a ensuite retirée par un instrument déposé au Secrétariat le 14 mars 1932.

[1] The Cuban Government, after ratifying the Protocol with this reservation, withdrew it later by an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on March 14th, 1932.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

[2] Subject to reservation as regards Article 4 of the Protocol and the new text of Article 23 of the Statute of the Court.

GRÈCE	N. POLITIS	GREECE
GUATÉMALA	Luis V. DE PORTO-SEGURO	GUATEMALA
HAÏTI	Luc DOMINIQUE	HAITI
HONGRIE	Ladislas GAJZAGO.	HUNGARY
INDE	Md. HABIBULLAH	INDIA
ÉTAT LIBRE D'IRLANDE	John A. COSTELLO	IRISH FREE STATE
ITALIE	Vittorio SCIALOJA	ITALY
JAPON	Isaburo YOSHIDA	JAPAN
LETTONIE	Charles DUZMANS.	LATVIA
LIBÉRIA	A. SOTTILE	LIBERIA
LITHUANIE	ZAUNIUS.	LITHUANIA
LUXEMBOURG	BECH	LUXEMBURG
NICARAGUA	Franco TORRES F.	NICARAGUA
NORVÈGE	Arnold RAESTAD	NORWAY
NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE	C. J. PARR	NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA	J. D. AROSEMENA	PANAMA
PARAGUAY	R. V. CABALLERO DE BEDOYA	PARAGUAY
PAYS-BAS	V. EYSINGA.	THE NETHERLANDS
PÉROU	Mar. H. CORNEJO	PERU
PERSE	P. P. KITABGI	PERSIA
POLOGNE	M. ROSTWOROWSKI S. RUNDSTEIN	POLAND
PORTUGAL	Prof. Doutor J. LOBO D'AVILA LIMA	PORTUGAL
ROUMANIE	ANTONIADE	ROUMANIA
SALVADOR	J. Gustavo GUERRERO	SALVADOR
ROYAUME DES SERBES, CROATES ET SLOVÈNES	I. CHOUMENKOVITCH	KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES
SIAM	VARNVAIDYA.	SIAM
SUÈDE	E. MARKS VON WÜRTEMBERG.	SWEDEN
SUISSE	MOTTA.	SWITZERLAND
TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE	Zd. FIERLINGER	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
URUGUAY	A. GUANI	URUGUAY
VENEZUELA	C. ZUMETA	VENEZUELA

FAIT à Genève, le quatorzième jour de septembre mil neuf cent vingt-neuf, en un seul exemplaire qui sera déposé dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations. Le Secrétaire général adressera des copies certifiées conformes aux Membres de la Société des Nations et aux Etats mentionnés dans l'annexe au Pacte.

DONE at Geneva, the fourteenth day of September nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The Secretary-General shall deliver authenticated copies to the Members of the League of Nations and to the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

UNION SUD-AFRICAINE — UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Eric H. LOUW.

ALBANIE — ALBANIA

Ilias VRIONI

ALLEMAGNE — GERMANY

Fr. GAUS

ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE — UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Jay PIERREPONT MOFFAT

RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE — ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

Enrique RUIZ GUIÑAZÚ

AUSTRALIE — AUSTRALIA

W. HARRISON MOORE.

AUTRICHE — AUSTRIA

Dr Marcus LEITMAIER

BELGIQUE — BELGIUM

Henri ROLIN

BOLIVIE — BOLIVIA

A. CORTADELLAS.

BRÉSIL — BRAZIL

M. DE PIMENTEL BRANDAO

GRANDE-BRETAGNE ET IRLANDE DU NORD ainsi que toutes parties de l'Empire britannique non membres séparés de la Société des Nations. — GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all Parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.

Arthur HENDERSON

BULGARIE — BULGARIA

Wladimir MOLLOFF

CANADA — CANADA

R. DANDURAND

CHILI — CHILE

Luis V. DE PORTO-SEGURO

CHINE — CHINA

CHAO-CHU WU

COLOMBIE — COLOMBIA

Francisco José URRUTIA

CUBA — CUBA

G. DE BLANCK

[1] Sous réserve de l'article 4 du Protocole et de la nouvelle rédaction de l'article 23 du Statut de la Cour [2].

DANEMARK — DENMARK

Georg COHN

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE — DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

M. L. VASQUEZ G.

ESPAGNE — SPAIN

C. BOTELLA

ESTONIE — ESTONIA

A. SCHMIDT.

ÉTHIOPIE — ABYSSINIA

Badjirond ZELLEKA AGGUEDAOU

FINLANDE — FINLAND

A. S YRJÖ-KOSKINEN.

FRANCE — FRANCE

Henri FROMAGEOT

[1] Le Gouvernement de Cuba, après avoir ratifié le Protocole avec cette réserve, l'a ensuite retirée par un instrument déposé au Secrétariat le 14 mars 1932.

[1] The Cuban Government, after ratifying the Protocol with this reservation, withdrew it later by an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on March 14th, 1932.

TRANSLATION BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

[2] Subject to reservation as regards Article 4 of the Protocol and the new text of Article 23 of the Statute of the Court.

GRÈCE	N. POLITIS	GREECE
GUATÉMALA	Luis V. DE PORTO-SEGURO	GUATEMALA
HAÏTI	Luc DOMINIQUE	HAITI
HONGRIE	Ladislas GAJZAGO.	HUNGARY
INDE	Md. HABIBULLAH	INDIA
ÉTAT LIBRE D'IRLANDE	John A. COSTELLO	IRISH FREE STATE
ITALIE	Vittorio SCIALOJA	ITALY
JAPON	Isaburo YOSHIDA	JAPAN
LETTONIE	Charles DUZMANS.	LATVIA
LIBÉRIA	A. SOTTILE	LIBERIA
LITHUANIE	ZAUNIUS.	LITHUANIA
LUXEMBOURG	BECH	LUXEMBURG
NICARAGUA	Fran^co^ TORRES F.	NICARAGUA
NORVÈGE	Arnold RAESTAD	NORWAY
NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE	C. J. PARR	NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA	J. D. AROSEMENA	PANAMA
PARAGUAY	R. V. CABALLERO DE BEDOYA	PARAGUAY
PAYS-BAS	V. EYSINGA.	THE NETHERLANDS
PÉROU	Mar. H. CORNEJO	PERU
PERSE	P. P. KITABGI	PERSIA
POLOGNE	M. ROSTWOROWSKI S. RUNDSTEIN	POLAND
PORTUGAL	Prof. Doutor J. LOBO D'AVILA LIMA	PORTUGAL
ROUMANIE	ANTONIADE	ROUMANIA
SALVADOR	J. Gustavo GUERRERO	SALVADOR
ROYAUME DES SERBES, CROATES ET SLOVÈNES	I. CHOUMENKOVITCH	KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES
SIAM	VARNVAIDYA.	SIAM
SUÈDE	E. MARKS VON WÜRTEMBERG.	SWEDEN
SUISSE	MOTTA.	SWITZERLAND
TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE	Zd. FIERLINGER	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
URUGUAY	A. GUANI	URUGUAY
VENEZUELA	C. ZUMETA	VENEZUELA

STATUT
DE LA COURT PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

visé par l'article 14 du Pacte de la Société des Nations,
tel qu'il a été amendé conformément au Protocole du 14 septembre 1929.

Article premier.

Indépendamment de la Cour d'Arbitrage, organisée par les Conventions de La Haye de 1899 et 1907, et des Tribunaux spéciaux d'Arbitres, auxquels les Etats demeurent toujours libres de confier la solution de leurs différends, il est institué, conformément à l'article 14 du Pacte de la Société des Nations, une Cour permanente de Justice internationale.

CHAPITRE PREMIER.

Organisation de la Cour.

Article 2.

La Cour permanente de Justice internationale est un corps de magistrats indépendants, élus, sans égard à leur nationalité, parmi les personnes jouissant de la plus haute considération morale, et qui réunissent les conditions requises pour l'exercice, dans leurs pays respectifs, des plus hautes fonctions judiciaires, ou qui sont des jurisconsultes possédant un compétence notoire en matière de droit international.

Article 3.

La Cour se compose de quinze membres.

Article 4.

Les membres de la Cour sont élus par l'Assemblée et par le Conseil sur une liste de personnes présentées par les groupes nationaux de la Cour d'Arbitrage, conformément aux dispositions suivantes.

En ce qui concerne les Membres de la Société qui ne sont pas représentés à la Cour permanente d'Arbitrage, les listes de candidats seront présentées par des groupes nationaux, désignés à cet effet par leurs Gouvernements, dans les mêmes conditions que celles stipulées pour les membres de la Cour d'Arbitrage par l'article 44 de la Convention de La Haye de 1907 sur le règlement pacifique des conflits internationaux.

En l'absence d'accord spécial, l'Assemblée, sur la proposition du Conseil, réglera les conditions auxquelles peut participer à l'élection des membres de la Cour un Etat qui, tout en ayant accepté le Statut de la Cour, n'est pas Membre de la Société des Nations.

Article 5.

Trois mois au moins avant la date de l'élection, le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations invite par écrit les Membres de la Cour d'Arbitrage appartenant aux Etats mentionnés à l'Annexe au Pacte ou entrés ultérieurement dans la Société des Nations, ainsi que les personnes désignées conformément à l'alinéa 2 de l'article 4, à procéder dans un délai déterminé par groupes nationaux à la présentation de personnes en situation de remplir les fonctions de Membre de la Cour.

Chaque groupe ne peut, en aucun cas, présenter plus de quatre personnes, dont deux au plus de sa nationalité. En aucun cas, il ne peut être présenté un nombre de candidats plus élevé que le double des places à remplir.

Article 6.

Avant de procéder à cette désignation, il est recommandé à chaque groupe national de consulter la plus haute Cour de Justice, les Facultés et Ecoles de Droit, les Académies nationales et les sections nationales d'Académies internationales, vouées à l'étude du droit.

Article 7.

Le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations dresse, par ordre alphabétique, une liste de toutes les personnes ainsi désignées: seules ces personnes sont éligibles, sauf le cas prévu à l'article 12, paragraphe 2.

Le Secrétaire général communique cette liste à l'Assemblée et au Conseil.

Article 8.

L'Assemblée et le Conseil procèdent indépendamment l'un de l'autre à l'élection des membres de la Cour.

STATUTE
FOR THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations as Amended in accordance with the Protocol of September 14th, 1929.

Article 1.

A Permanent Court of International Justice is hereby established, in accordance with Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. This Court shall be in addition to the Court of Arbitration organised by the Conventions of The Hague of 1899 and 1907, and to the special Tribunals of Arbitration to which States are always at liberty to submit their disputes for settlement.

CHAPTER I.

Organisation of the Court.

Article 2.

The Permanent Court of International Justice shall be composed of a body of independent judges, elected regardless of their nationality from amongst persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are jurisconsults of recognised competence in international law.

Article 3.

The Court shall consist of fifteen members.

Article 4.

The members of the Court shall be elected by the Assembly and by the Council from a list of persons nominated by the national groups in the Court of Arbitration, in accordance with the following provisions.

In the case of Members of the League of Nations not represented in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, the lists of candidates shall be drawn up by national groups appointed for this purpose by their Governments under the same conditions as those prescribed for members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration by Article 44 of the Convention of The Hague of 1907 for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

The conditions under which a State which has accepted the Statute of the Court but is not a member of the League of Nations, may participate in electing the members of the Court shall, in the absence of a special agreement, be laid down by the Assembly on the proposal of the Council.

Article 5.

At least three months before the date of the election, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall address a written request to the Members of the Court of Arbitration belonging to the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant or to the States which join the League subsequently, and to the persons appointed under paragraph 2 of Article 4, inviting them to undertake, within a given time, by national groups, the nomination of persons in a position to accept the duties of a member of the Court.

No group may nominate more than four persons, not more than two of whom shall be of their own nationality. In no case must the number of candidates nominated be more than double the number of seats to be filled.

Article 6.

Before making these nominations, each national group is recommended to consult its Highest Court of Justice, its Legal Faculties and Schools of Law, and its National Academies and national sections of International Academies devoted to the study of Law.

Article 7.

The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall prepare a list in alphabetical order of all the persons thus nominated. Save as provided in Article 12, paragraph 2, these shall be the only persons eligible for appointment.

The Secretary-General shall submit this list to the Assembly and to the Council.

Article 8.

The Assembly and the Council shall proceed independently of one another to elect the members of the Court.

Article 9.

Dans toute élection, les électeurs auront en vue que les personnes appelées à faire partie de la Cour, non seulement réunissent individuellement les conditions requises, mais assurent dans l'ensemble la représentation des grandes formes de civilisation et des principaux systèmes juridiques du monde.

Article 10.

Sont élus ceux qui ont réuni la majorité absolue des voix dans l'Assemblée et dans le Conseil.

Au cas où le double scrutin de l'Assemblée et du Conseil se porterait sur plus d'un ressortissant du même Membre de la Société des Nations, le plus âgé est seul élu.

Article 11.

Si, après la première séance d'élection, il reste encore des sièges à pourvoir, il est procédé, de la même manière, à une seconde et, s'il est nécessaire, à une troisième.

Article 12.

Si, après la troisième séance d'élection, il reste encore des sièges à pourvoir, il peut être à tout moment formé sur la demande, soit de l'Assemblée, soit du Conseil, une Commission médiatrice de six membres, nommés trois par l'Assemblée, trois par le Conseil, en vue de choisir pour chaque siège non pourvu un nom à présenter à l'adoption séparée de l'Assemblée et du Conseil.

Peuvent être portées sur cette liste, à l'unanimité, toutes personnes satisfaisant aux conditions requises, alors même qu'elles n'auraient pas figuré sur la liste de présentation visée aux articles 4 et 5.

Si la Commission médiatrice constate qu'elle ne peut réussir à assurer l'élection, les membres de la Cour déjà nommés pourvoient aux sièges vacants, dans un délai à fixer par le Conseil, en choisissant parmi les personnes qui ont obtenu des suffrages soit dans l'Assemblée, soit dans le Conseil.

Si parmi les juges il y a partage égal des voix, la voix du juge le plus âgé l'emporte.

Article 13.

Les membres de la Cour sont élus pour neuf ans.

Ils sont rééligibles.

Ils restent en fonction jusqu'à leur remplacement. Après ce remplacement, ils continuent de connaître des affaires dont ils sont déjà saisis.

En cas de démission d'un membre de la Cour, la démission sera adressée au Président de la Cour, pour être transmise au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

Cette dernière notification emporte vacance de siège.

Article 14.

Il est pourvu aux sièges devenus vacants selon la méthode suivie pour la première élection, sous réserve de la disposition ci-après: dans le mois qui suivra la vacance, le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations procédera à l'invitation prescrite par l'article 5, et la date d'élection sera fixée par le Conseil dans sa première session.

Article 15.

Le membre de la Cour élu en remplacement d'un membre dont le mandat n'est pas expiré achève le terme du mandat de son prédécesseur.

Article 16.

Les membres de la Cour ne peuvent exercer aucune fonction politique ou administrative, ni se livrer à aucune autre occupation de caractère professionnel.

En cas de doute, la Cour décide.

Article 17.

Les membres de la Cour ne peuvent exercer les fonctions d'agent, de conseil ou d'avocat dans aucune affaire.

Ils ne peuvent participer au règlement d'aucune affaire dans laquelle ils sont antérieurement intervenus comme agents, conseils ou avocats de l'une des parties, membres d'un tribunal national ou international, d'une commission d'enquête, ou à tout autre titre.

En cas de doute, la Cour décide.

Article 18.

Les membres de la Cour ne peuvent être relevés de leurs fonctions que si, au jugement unanime des autres membres, ils ont cessé de répondre aux conditions requises.

Le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations en est officiellement informé par le Greffier.

Cette communication emporte vacance de siège.

Article 19.

Les membres de la Cour jouissent dans l'exercice de leurs fonctions des privilèges et immunités diplomatiques.

Article 9.

At every election, the electors shall bear in mind that not only should all the persons appointed as members of the Court possess the qualifications required, but the whole body also should represent the main forms of civilisation and the principal legal systems of the world.

Article 10.

Those candidates who obtain an absolute majority of votes in the Assembly and in the Council shall be considered as elected.

In the event of more than one national of the same Member of the League being elected by the votes of both the Assembly and the Council, the eldest of these only shall be considered as elected.

Article 11.

If, after the first meeting held for the purpose of the election, one or more seats remain to be filled, a second and, if necessary, a third meeting shall take place.

Article 12.

If, after the third meeting, one or more seats still remain unfilled, a joint conference consisting of six members, three appointed by the Assembly and three by the Council, may be formed, at any time, at the request of either the Assembly or the Council, for the purpose of choosing one name for each seat still vacant, to submit to the Assembly and the Council for their respective acceptance.

If the Conference is unanimously agreed upon any person who fulfils the required conditions, he may be included in its list, even though he was not included in the list of nominations referred to in Articles 4 and 5.

If the joint conference is satisfied that it will not be successful in procuring an election, those members of the Court who have already been appointed shall, within a period to be fixed by the Council, proceed to fill the vacant seats by selection from amongst those candidates who have obtained votes either in the Assembly or in the Council.

In the event of an equality of votes amongst the judges, the eldest judge shall have a casting vote.

Article 13.

The members of the Court shall be elected for nine years.

They may be re-elected.

They shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled. Though replaced, they shall finish any cases which they may have begun.

In the case of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation will be addressed to the President of the Court for transmission to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

This last notification makes the place vacant.

Article 14.

Vacancies which may occur shall be filled by the same method as that laid down for the first election, subject to the following provision: the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall, within one month of the occurrence of the vacancy, proceed to issue the invitations provided for in Article 5, and the date of the election shall be fixed by the Council at its next session.

Article 15.

A member of the Court elected to replace a member whose period of appointment has not expired, will hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 16.

The members of the Court may not exercise any political or administrative function, nor engage in any other occupation of a professional nature.

Any doubt on this point is settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 17.

No member of the Court may act as agent, counsel or advocate in any case.

No member may participate in the decision of any case in which he has previously taken an active part as agent, counsel or advocate for one of the contesting parties, or as a member of a national or international Court, or of a commission of enquiry, or in any other capacity.

Any doubt on this point is settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 18.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless, in the unanimous opinion of the other members, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Formal notification thereof shall be made to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, by the Registrar.

This notification makes the place vacant.

Article 19.

The members of the Court, when engaged on the business of the Court, shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Article 20.

Tout membre de la Cour doit, avant d'entrer en fonction, en séance publique, prendre engagement solennel d'exercer ses attributions en pleine impartialité et en toute conscience.

Article 21.

La Cour élit, pour trois ans, son Président et son Vice-Président; ils sont rééligibles.

Elle nomme son Greffier.

La fonction de Greffier de la Cour n'est pas incompatible avec celle de Secrétaire général de la Cour permanente d'Arbitrage.

Article 22.

Le siège de la Cour est fixé à La Haye.

Le Président et le Greffier résident au siège de la Cour.

Article 23.

Le Cour reste toujours en fonction, excepté pendant les vacances judiciaires, dont les périodes et la durée sont fixées par la Cour.

Les membres de la Cour dont les foyers se trouvent à plus de cinq jours de voyage normal de La Haye auront droit, indépendamment des vacances judiciaires, à un congé de six mois, non compris la durée des voyages, tous les trois ans.

Les membres de la Cour sont tenus, à moins de congé régulier, d'empêchement pour cause de maladie ou autre motif grave dûment justifié auprès du Président, d'être à tout moment à la disposition de la Cour.

Article 24.

Si, pour une raison spéciale, l'un des membres de la Cour estime devoir ne pas participer au jugement d'une affaire déterminée, il en fait part au Président.

Si le Président estime qu'un des membres de la Cour ne doit pas, pour une raison spéciale, siéger dans une affaire déterminée, il en avertit celui-ci.

Si, en pareils cas, le membre de la Cour et le Président sont en désaccord, la Cour décide.

Article 25.

Sauf exception expressément prévue, la Cour exerce ses attributions en séance plénière.

Sous la condition que le nombre des juges disponibles pour constituer la Cour ne soit pas réduit à moins de onze, le Règlement de la Cour pourra prévoir que, selon les circonstances et à tour de rôle, un ou plusieurs juges pourront être dispensés de siéger.

Toutefois, le quorum de neuf est suffisant pour constituer la Cour.

Article 26.

Pour les affaires concernant le travail, et spécialement pour les affaires visées dans la partie XIII (Travail) du Traité de Versailles et les parties correspondantes des autres traités de paix, la Cour statuera dans les conditions ci-après:

La Cour constituera pour chaque période de trois années une chambre spéciale composée de cinq juges désignés en tenant compte, autant que possible, des prescriptions de l'article 9. Deux juges seront, en outre, désignés pour remplacer celui des juges qui se trouverait dans l'impossibilité de siéger. Sur la demande des parties, cette chambre statuera. A défaut de cette demande, la Cour siégera en séance plénière. Dans les deux cas, les juges sont assistés de quatre assesseurs techniques siégeant à leurs côtés avec voix consultative et assurant une juste représentation des intérêts en cause.

Les assesseurs techniques sont choisis dans chaque cas spécial d'après les règles de procédure visées à l'article 30, sur une liste d' « Assesseurs pour litiges de travail », composée de noms présentés à raison de deux par chaque Membre de la Société des Nations et d'un nombre égal présenté par le Conseil d'administration du Bureau international du Travail. Le Conseil désignera par moitié des représentants des travailleurs et par moitié des représentants des patrons pris sur la liste prévue à l'article 412 du Traité de Versailles et aux articles correspondants des autres traités de paix.

Le recours à la procédure sommaire visée à l'article 29 reste toujours ouvert dans les affaires visées à l'alinéa premier du présent article, si les parties le demandent.

Dans les affaires concernant le travail, le Bureau international aura la faculté de fournir à la Cour tous les renseignements nécessaires et, à cet effet, le Directeur de ce Bureau recevra communication de toutes les pièces de procédure présentées par écrit.

Article 27.

Pour les affaires concernant le transit et les communications, et spécialement pour les affaires visées dans la partie XII (Ports, Voies d'eau, Voies ferrées) du Traité de Versailles et les parties correspondantes des autres traités de paix, la Cour statuera dans les conditions ci-après:

La Cour constituera, pour chaque période de trois années, une chambre spéciale composée de cinq juges désignés en tenant compte autant que possible des prescriptions de l'article 9. Deux juges seront, en outre, désignés pour remplacer celui des juges qui se trouverait dans l'impossibilité de siéger. Sur la demande des parties, cette chambre statuera. A défaut de cette

Article 20.

Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, make a solemn declaration in open Court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

Article 21.

The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for three years; they may be re-elected.

It shall appoint its Registrar.

The duties of Registrar of the Court shall not be deemed incompatible with those of Secretary-General of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

Article 22.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague.

The President and Registrar shall reside at the seat of the Court.

Article 23.

The Court shall remain permanently in session except during the judicial vacations, the dates and duration of which shall be fixed by the Court.

Members of the Court whose homes are situated at more than five days' normal journey from The Hague shall be entitled, apart from the judicial vacations, to six months' leave every three years, not including the time spent in travelling.

Members of the Court shall be bound, unless they are on regular leave or prevented from attending by illness or other serious reason duly explained to the President, to hold themselves permanently at the disposal of the Court.

Article 24.

If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not take part in the decision of a particular case, he shall so inform the President.

If the President considers that for some special reason one of the members of the Court should not sit on a particular case, he shall give him notice accordingly.

If in any such case the member of the Court and the President disagree, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 25.

The full Court shall sit except when it is expressly provided otherwise.

Subject to the condition that the number of judges available to constitute the Court is not thereby reduced below eleven, the Rules of Court may provide for allowing one or more judges, according to circumstances and in rotation, to be dispensed from sitting.

Provided always that a quorum of nine judges shall suffice to constitute the Court.

Article 26.

Labour cases, particularly cases referred to in Part XIII (Labour) of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding portions of the other Treaties of Peace, shall be heard and determined by the Court under the following conditions:

The Court will appoint every three years a special chamber of five judges, selected so far as possible with due regard to the provisions of Article 9. In addition, two judges shall be selected for the purpose of replacing a judge who finds it impossible to sit. If the parties so demand, cases will be heard and determined by this Chamber. In the absence of any such demand, the full Court will sit. In both cases, the judges will be assisted by four technical assessors sitting with them, but without the right to vote, and chosen with a view to ensuring a just representation of the competing interests.

The technical assessors shall be chosen for each particular case in accordance with rules of procedure under Article 30 from a list of "Assessors for Labour Cases" composed of two persons nominated by each Member of the League of Nations and an equivalent number nominated by the Governing Body of the Labour Office. The Governing Body will nominate, as to one-half, representatives of the workers, and, as to one-half, representatives of employers from the list referred to in Article 412 of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace.

Recourse may always be had to the summary procedure provided for in Article 29, in the cases referred to in the first paragraph of the present Article, if the parties so request.

In Labour cases, the International Office shall be at liberty to furnish the Court with all relevant information, and for this purpose the Director of that Office shall receive copies of all the written proceedings.

Article 27.

Cases relating to transit and communications, particularly cases referred to in Part XII (Ports, Waterways and Railways) of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding portions of the other Treaties of Peace, shall be heard and determined by the Court under the following conditions:

The Court will appoint every three years a special Chamber of five judges, selected so far as possible with due regard to the provisions of Article 9. In addition, two judges shall be selected for the purpose of replacing a judge who finds it impossible to sit. If the parties so demand, cases will be heard and determined by this Chamber. In the absence of any such demand,

demande, la Cour siégera en séance plénière. Si les parties le désirent, ou si la Cour le décide, les juges seront assistés de quatre assesseurs techniques siégeant à leurs côtés avec voix consultative.

Les assesseurs techniques seront choisis dans chaque cas spécial d'après les règles de procédure visées à l'article 30, sur une liste d'« Assesseurs pour litiges de transit et de communications », composée de noms présentés à raison de deux par chaque Membre de la Société des Nations.

Le recours à la procédure sommaire visée à l'article 29 reste toujours ouvert dans les affaires visées à l'alinéa premier du présent article, si les parties le demandent.

Article 28.

Les chambres spéciales prévues aux articles 26 et 27 peuvent, avec le consentement des parties en cause, siéger ailleurs qu'à La Haye.

Article 29.

En vue de la prompte expédition des affaires, la Cour compose annuellement une chambre de cinq juges, appelés à statuer en procédure sommaire lorsque les parties le demandent. Deux juges seront, en outre, désignés, pour remplacer celui des juges qui se trouverait dans l'impossibilité de siéger.

Article 30.

La Cour détermine par un règlement le mode suivant lequel elle exerce ses attributions. Elle règle notamment la procédure sommaire.

Article 31.

Les juges de la nationalité de chacune des parties en cause conservent le droit de siéger dans l'affaire dont la Cour est saisie.

Si la Cour compte sur le siège un juge de la nationalité d'une des parties, l'autre partie peut désigner une personne de son choix pour siéger en qualité de juge. Celle-ci devra être prise de préférence parmi les personnes qui ont été l'objet d'une présentation en conformité des articles 4 et 5.

Si la Cour ne compte sur le siège aucun juge de la nationalité des parties, chacune de ces parties peut procéder à la désignation d'un juge de la même manière qu'au paragraphe précédent.

La présente disposition s'applique dans le cas des articles 26, 27 et 29. En pareils cas, le Président priera un, ou, s'il y a lieu, deux des membres de la Cour composant la Chambre, de céder leur place aux membres de la Cour de la nationalité des parties intéressées et, à défaut ou en cas d'empêchement, aux juges spécialement désignés par les parties.

Lorsque plusieurs parties font cause commune, elles ne comptent, pour l'application des dispositions qui précèdent, que pour une seule. En cas de doute, la Cour décide.

Les juges désignés, comme il est dit aux paragraphes 2, 3 et 4 du présent article, doivent satisfaire aux prescriptions des articles 2, 17, alinéa 2; 20 et 24 du présent Statut. Ils participent à la décision dans des conditions de complète égalité avec leurs collègues.

Article 32.

Les membres de la Cour reçoivent un traitement annuel.

Le président reçoit une allocation annuelle spéciale.

Le vice-président reçoit une allocation spéciale pour chaque jour où il remplit les fonctions de président.

Les juges désignés par application de l'article 31, autres que les membres de la Cour, reçoivent une indemnité pour chaque jour où ils exercent leurs fonctions.

Ces traitements, allocations et indemnités sont fixés par l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations sur la proposition du Conseil. Ils ne peuvent être diminués pendant la durée des fonctions.

Le traitement du Greffier est fixé par l'Assemblée sur la proposition de la Cour.

Un règlement adopté par l'Assemblée fixe les conditions dans lesquelles les pensions sont allouées aux membres de la Cour et au Greffier, ainsi que les conditions dans lesquelles les membres de la Cour et le Greffier reçoivent le remboursement de leurs frais de voyage.

Les traitements, indemnités et allocations sont exempts de tout impôt.

Article 33.

Les frais de la Cour sont supportés par la Société des Nations de la manière que l'Assemblée décide sur la proposition du Conseil.

CHAPITRE II.

Compétence de la Cour.

Article 34.

Seuls les Etats ou les Membres de la Société des Nations ont qualité pour se présenter devant la Cour.

Article 35.

La Cour est ouverte aux Membres de la Société des Nations, ainsi qu'aux Etats mentionnés à l'Annexe au Pacte.

the full Court will sit. When desired by the parties or decided by the Court, the judges will be assisted by four technical assessors sitting with them, but without the right to vote.

The technical assessors shall be chosen for each particular case in accordance with rules of procedure under Article 30 from a list of "Assessors for Transit and Communications Cases" composed of two persons nominated by each Member of the League of Nations.

Recourse may always be had to the summary procedure provided for in Article 29, in the cases referred to in the first paragraph of the present Article, if the parties so request.

Article 28.

The special chambers provided for in Articles 26 and 27 may, with the consent of the parties to the dispute, sit elsewhere than at The Hague.

Article 29.

With a view to the speedy despatch of business, the Court shall form annually a Chamber composed of five judges who, at the request of the contesting parties, may hear and determine cases by summary procedure. In addition, two judges shall be selected for the purpose of replacing a judge who finds it impossible to sit.

Article 30.

The Court shall frame rules for regulating its procedure. In particular, it shall lay down rules for summary procedure.

Article 31.

Judges of the nationality of each of the contesting parties shall retain their right to sit in the case before the Court.

If the Court includes upon the Bench a judge of the nationality of one of the parties, the other party may choose a person to sit as judge. Such person shall be chosen preferably from among those persons who have been nominated as candidates as provided in Articles 4 and 5.

If the Court includes upon the Bench no judge of the nationality of the contesting parties, each of these parties may proceed to select a judge as provided in the preceding paragraph.

The present provision shall apply to the case of Articles 26, 27 and 29. In such cases, the President shall request one or, if necessary, two of the members of the Court forming the Chamber to give place to the members of the Court of the nationality of the parties concerned, and, failing such or if they are unable to be present, to the judges specially appointed by the parties.

Should there be several parties in the same interest, they shall, for the purpose of the preceding provisions, be reckoned as one party only. Any doubt upon this point is settled by the decision of the Court.

Judges selected as laid down in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of this Article shall fulfil the conditions required by Articles 2, 17 (paragraph 2), 20 and 24 of this Statute. They shall take part in the decision on terms of complete equality with their colleagues.

Article 32.

The members of the Court shall receive an annual salary.

The President shall receive a special annual allowance.

The Vice-President shall receive a special allowance for every day on which he acts as President.

The judges appointed under Article 31, other than members of the Court, shall receive an indemnity for each day on which they sit.

These salaries, allowances and indemnities shall be fixed by the Assembly of the League of Nations on the proposal of the Council. They may not be decreased during the term of office.

The salary of the Registrar shall be fixed by the Assembly on the proposal of the Court.

Regulations made by the Assembly shall fix the conditions under which retiring pensions may be given to members of the Court and to the Registrar, and the conditions under which members of the Court and the Registrar shall have their travelling expenses refunded.

The above salaries, indemnities and allowances shall be free of all taxation.

Article 33.

The expenses of the Court shall be borne by the League of Nations, in such a manner as shall be decided by the Assembly upon the proposal of the Council.

CHAPTER II.

COMPETENCE OF THE COURT.

Article 34.

Only States or Members of the League of Nations can be parties in cases before the Court.

Article 35.

The Court shall be open to the Members of the League and also to States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant.

Les conditions auxquelles elle est ouverte aux autres Etats sont, sous réserve des dispositions particulières des traités en vigueur, réglées par le Conseil, et dans tous les cas, sans qu'il puisse en résulter pour les parties aucune inégalité devant la Cour.

Lorsqu'un Etat, qui n'est pas Membre de la Société des Nations, est partie en cause, la Cour fixera la contribution aux frais de la Cour que cette partie devra supporter. Toutefois cette disposition ne s'appliquera pas, si cet Etat participe aux dépenses de la Cour.

Article 36.

La compétence de la Cour s'étend à toutes affaires que les parties lui soumettront, ainsi qu'à tous les cas spécialement prévus dans les traités et conventions en vigueur.

Les Membres de la Société et Etats mentionnés à l'Annexe au Pacte pourront, soit lors de la signature ou de la ratification du Protocole, auquel le présent Acte est joint, soit ultérieurement, déclarer reconnaître dès à présent comme obligatoire, de plein droit et sans convention spéciale, vis-à-vis de tout autre Membre ou Etat acceptant la même obligation, la juridiction de la Cour sur toutes ou quelques-unes des catégories de différends d'ordre juridique ayant pour objet:

a) L'interprétation d'un traité;

b) Tout point de droit international;

c) La réalité de tout fait qui, s'il était établi, constituerait la violation d'un engagement international;

d) La nature ou l'étendue de la réparation due pour la rupture d'un engagement international.

La déclaration ci-dessus visée pourra être faite purement et simplement ou sous condition de réciprocité de la part de plusieurs ou de certains Membres ou Etats, ou pour un délai déterminé.

En cas de contestation sur le point de savoir si la Cour est compétente, la Cour décide.

Article 37.

Lorsqu'un traité ou convention en vigueur vise le renvoi à une juridiction à établir par la Société des Nations, la Cour constituera cette juridiction.

Article 38.

La Cour applique:

1. Les conventions internationales, soit générales, soit spéciales, établissant des règles expressément reconnues par les Etats en litige;

2. La coutume internationale comme preuve d'une pratique générale acceptée comme étant le droit;

3. Les principes généraux de droit reconnus par les nations civilisées;

4. Sous réserve de la disposition de l'article 59, les décisions judiciaires et la doctrine des publicistes les plus qualifiés des différentes nations, comme moyen auxiliaire de détermination des règles de droit.

La présente disposition ne porte pas atteinte à la faculté pour la Cour, si les parties sont d'accord, de statuer *ex æquo et bono*.

CHAPITRE III.

PROCÉDURE.

Article 39.

Les langues officielles de la Cour sont le français et l'anglais. Si les parties sont d'accord pour que toute la procédure ait lieu en français, le jugement sera prononcé en cette langue. Si les parties sont d'accord pour que toute la procédure ait lieu en anglais, le jugement sera prononcé en cette langue.

A défaut d'un accord fixant la langue dont il sera fait usage, les parties pourront employer pour les plaidoiries celle des deux langues qu'elles préféreront, et l'arrêt de la Cour sera rendu en français et en anglais. En ce cas, la Cour désignera en même temps celui des deux textes qui fera foi.

La Cour pourra, à la demande de toute partie, autoriser l'emploi d'une langue autre que le français ou l'anglais.

Article 40.

Les affaires sont portées devant la Cour, selon le cas, soit par notification du compromis, soit par une requête, adressées au Greffe; dans les deux cas, l'objet du différend et les parties en cause doivent être indiqués.

Le Greffe donne immédiatement communication de la requête à tous intéressés.

Il en informe également les Membres de la Société des Nations par l'entremise du Secrétaire général, ainsi que les Etats admis à ester en justice devant la Cour.

The conditions under which the Court shall be open to other States shall, subject to the special provisions contained in treaties in force, be laid down by the Council, but in no case shall such provisions place the parties in a position of inequality before the Court.

When a State which is not a Member of the League of Nations is a party to a dispute, the Court will fix the amount which that party is to contribute towards the expenses of the Court. This provision shall not apply if such State is bearing a share of the expenses of the Court.

Article 36.

The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in Treaties and Conventions in force.

The Members of the League of Nations and the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant may, either when signing or ratifying the protocol to which the present Statute is adjoined, or at a later moment, declare that they recognise as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all or any of the classes of legal disputes concerning:

(*a*) The interpretation of a Treaty;

(*b*) Any question of International Law;

(*c*) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(*d*) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The declaration referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain Members or States, or for a certain time.

In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 37.

When a treaty or convention in force provides for the reference of a matter to a tribunal to be instituted by the League of Nations, the Court will be such tribunal.

Article 38.

The Court shall apply:

1. International conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognised by the contesting States;

2. International custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;

3. The general principles of law recognised by civilised nations;

4. Subject to the provisions of Article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

This provision shall not prejudice the power of the Court to decide a case *ex æquo et bono*, if the parties agree thereto.

CHAPTER III.

PROCEDURE.

Article 39.

The official languages of the Court shall be French and English. If the parties agree that the case shall be conducted in French, the judgment will be delivered in French. If the parties agree that the case shall be conducted in English, the judgment will be delivered in English.

In the absence of an agreement as to which language shall be employed, each party may, in the pleadings, use the language which it prefers; the decision of the Court will be given in French and English. In this case the Court will at the same time determine which of the two texts shall be considered as authoritative.

The Court may, at the request of any party, authorise a language other than French or English to be used.

Article 40.

Cases are brought before the Court, as the case may be, either by the notification of the special agreement or by a written application addressed to the Registrar. In either case the subject of the dispute and the contesting parties must be indicated.

The Registrar shall forthwith communicate the application to all concerned.

He shall also notify the Members of the League of Nations through the Secretary-General, and also any States entitled to appear before the Court.

Article 41.

La Cour a le pouvoir d'indiquer, si elle estime que les circonstances l'exigent, quelles mesures conservatoires du droit de chacun doivent être prises à titre provisoire.

En attendant l'arrêt définitif, l'indication de ces mesures est immédiatement notifiée aux parties et au Conseil.

Article 42.

Les parties sont représentées par des agents.

Elles peuvent se faire assister devant la Cour par des conseils ou des avocats.

Article 43.

La procédure a deux phases: l'une écrite, l'autre orale.

La procédure écrite comprend la communication à juge et à partie des mémoires, des contre-mémoires, et, éventuellement, des répliques, ainsi que de toute pièce et document à l'appui.

La communication se fait par l'entremise du Greffe dans l'ordre et les délais déterminés par la Cour.

Toute pièce produite par l'une des parties doit être communiquée à l'autre en copie certifiée conforme.

La procédure orale consiste dans l'audition par la Cour des témoins, experts, agents, conseils et avocats.

Article 44.

Pour toute notification à faire à d'autres personnes que les agents, conseils et avocats, la Cour s'adresse directement au gouvernement de l'Etat sur le territoire duquel la notification doit produire effet.

Il en est de même s'il s'agit de faire procéder sur place à l'établissement de tous moyens de preuve.

Article 45.

Les débats sont dirigés par le Président et à défaut de celui-ci par le Vice-Président; en cas d'empêchement, par le plus ancien des juges présents.

Article 46.

L'audience est publique, à moins qu'il n'en soit autrement décidé par la Cour ou que les deux parties ne demandent que le public ne soit pas admis.

Article 47.

Il est tenu de chaque audience un procès-verbal signé par le Greffier et le Président.

Ce procès-verbal a seul caractère authentique.

Article 48.

La Cour rend des ordonnances pour la direction du procès, la détermination des formes et délais dans lesquels chaque partie doit finalement conclure; elle prend toutes les mesures que comporte l'administration des preuves.

Article 49.

La Cour peut, même avant tout débat, demander aux agents de produire tout document et de fournir toutes explications. En cas de refus, elle en prend acte.

Article 50.

A tout moment, la Cour peut confier une enquête ou une expertise à toute personne, corps, bureau, commission ou organe de son choix.

Article 51.

Au cours des débats, toutes questions utiles sont posées aux témoins et experts dans les conditions que fixera la Cour dans le règlement visé à l'article 30.

Article 52.

Après avoir reçu les preuves et témoignages dans les délais déterminés par elle, la Cour peut écarter toutes dépositions ou documents nouveaux qu'une des parties voudrait lui présenter sans l'assentiment de l'autre.

Article 53.

Lorsqu'une des parties ne se présente pas, ou s'abstient de faire valoir ses moyens, l'autre partie peut demander à la Cour de lui adjuger ses conclusions.

La Cour, avant d'y faire droit, doit s'assurer non seulement qu'elle a compétence aux termes des articles 36 et 37, mais que les conclusions sont fondées en fait et en droit.

Article 54.

Quand les agents, avocats et conseils ont fait valoir, sous le contrôle de la Cour, tous les moyens qu'ils jugent utiles, le Président prononce la clôture des débats.

La Cour se retire en chambre du Conseil pour délibérer.

Les délibérations de la Cour sont et restent secrètes.

Article 41.

The Court shall have the power to indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken to reserve the respective rights of either party.

Pending the final decision, notice of the measures suggested shall forthwith be given to the parties and the Council.

Article 42.

The parties shall be represented by Agents.

They may have the assistance of Counsel or Advocates before the Court.

Article 43.

The procedure shall consist of two parts: written and oral.

The written proceedings shall consist of the communication to the judges and to the parties of cases, counter-cases and, if necessary, replies; also all papers and documents in support.

These communications shall be made through the Registrar, in the order and within the time fixed by the Court.

A certified copy of every document produced by one party shall be communicated to the other party.

The oral proceedings shall consist of the hearing by the Court of witnesses, experts, agents, counsel and advocates.

Article 44.

For the service of all notices upon persons other than the agents, counsel and advocates, the Court shall apply direct to the Government of the State upon whose territory the notice has to be served.

The same provision shall apply whenever steps are to be taken to procure evidence on the spot.

Article 45.

The hearing shall be under the control of the President or, if he is unable to preside, of the Vice-President; if neither is able to preside, the senior judge present shall preside.

Article 46.

The hearing in Court shall be public, unless the Court shall decide otherwise, or unless the parties demand that the public be not admitted.

Article 47.

Minutes shall be made at each hearing, and signed by the Registrar and the President.

These minutes shall be the only authentic record.

Article 48.

The Court shall make orders for the conduct of the case, shall decide the form and time in which each party must conclude its arguments, and make all arrangements connected with the taking of evidence.

Article 49.

The Court may, even before the hearing begins, call upon the agents to produce any document, or to supply any explanations. Formal note shall be taken of any refusal.

Article 50.

The Court may, at any time, entrust any individual, body, bureau, commission or other organisation that it may select, with the task of carrying out an enquiry or giving an expert opinion.

Article 51.

During the hearing any relevant questions are to be put to the witnesses and experts under the conditions laid down by the Court in the rules of procedure referred to in Article 30.

Article 52.

After the Court has received the proofs and evidence within the time specified for the purpose, it may refuse to accept any further oral or written evidence that one party may desire to present unless the other side consents.

Article 53.

Whenever one of the parties shall not appear before the Court, or shall fail to defend his case, the other party may call upon the Court to decide in favour of his claim.

The Court must, before doing so, satisfy itself, not only that it has jurisdiction in accordance with Articles 36 and 37, but also that the claim is well founded in fact and law.

Article 54.

When, subject to the control of the Court, the agents, advocates and counsel have completed their presentation of the case, the President shall declare the hearing closed.

The Court shall withdraw to consider the judgment.

The deliberations of the Court shall take place in private and remain secret.

Article 55.

Les décisions de la Cour sont prises à la majorité des juges présents.
En cas de partage de voix, la voix du Président ou de celui qui le remplace est prépondérante.

Article 56.

L'arrêt est motivé.
Il mentionne les noms des juges qui y ont pris part.

Article 57.

Si l'arrêt n'exprime pas en tout ou en partie l'opinion unanime des juges, les dissidents ont le droit d'y joindre l'exposé de leur opinion individuelle.

Article 58.

L'arrêt est signé par le Président et par le Greffier. Il est lu en séance publique, les agents dûment prévenus.

Article 59.

La décision de la Cour n'est obligatoire que pour les parties en litige et dans le cas qui a été décidé.

Article 60.

L'arrêt est définitif et sans recours. En cas de contestation sur le sens et la portée de l'arrêt, il appartient à la Cour de l'interpréter, à la demande de toute partie.

Article 61.

La revision de l'arrêt ne peut être éventuellement demandée à la Cour qu'à raison de la découverte d'un fait de nature à exercer une influence décisive et qui, avant le prononcé de l'arrêt, était inconnu de la Cour et de la partie qui demande la revision, sans qu'il y ait, de sa part, faute à l'ignorer.

La procédure de revision s'ouvre par un arrêt de la Cour constatant expressément l'existence du fait nouveau, lui reconnaissant les caractères qui donnent ouverture à la revision, et déclarant de ce chef la demande recevable.

La Cour peut subordonner l'ouverture de la procédure en revision à l'exécution préalable de l'arrêt.

La demande en revision devra être formée au plus tard dans le délai de six mois après la découverte du fait nouveau.

Aucune demande de revision ne pourra être formée après l'expiration d'un délai de dix ans à dater de l'arrêt.

Article 62.

Lorsqu'un Etat estime que dans un différend un intérêt d'ordre juridique est pour lui en cause, il peut adresser à la Cour une requête, à fin d'intervention.

La Cour décide.

Article 63.

Lorsqu'il s'agit de l'interprétation d'une convention à laquelle ont participé d'autres Etats que les parties en litige, le Greffe les avertit sans délai.

Chacun d'eux a le droit d'intervenir au procès, et s'il exerce cette faculté, l'interprétation contenue dans la sentence est également obligatoire à son égard.

Article 64.

S'il n'en est autrement décidé par la Cour, chaque partie supporte ses frais de procédure.

CHAPITRE IV.

AVIS CONSULTATIFS.

Article 65.

Les questions sur lesquelles l'avis consultatif de la Cour est demandé sont exposées à la Cour par une requête écrite, signée soit par le Président de l'Assemblée ou par le Président du Conseil de la Société des Nations, soit par le Secrétaire général de la Société agissant en vertu d'instructions de l'Assemblée ou du Conseil.

La requête formule, en termes précis, la question sur laquelle l'avis de la Cour est demandé. Il y est joint tout document pouvant servir à élucider la question.

Article 66.

1. Le Greffier notifie immédiatement la requête demandant l'avis consultatif aux Membres de la Société des Nations par l'entremise du Secrétaire général de la Société, ainsi qu'aux Etats admis à ester en justice devant la Cour.

Article 55.

All questions shall be decided by a majority of the judges present at the hearing.
In the event of an equality of votes, the President or his deputy shall have a casting vote.

Article 56.

The judgment shall state the reasons on which it is based.
It shall contain the names of the judges who have taken part in the decision.

Article 57.

If the judgment does not represent in whole or in part the unanimous opinion of the judges, dissenting judges are entitled to deliver a separate opinion.

Article 58.

The judgment shall be signed by the President and by the Registrar. It shall be read in open Court, due notice having been given to the agents.

Article 59.

The decision of the Court has no binding force except between the parties and in respect of that particular case.

Article 60.

The judgment is final and without appeal. In the event of dispute as to the meaning or scope of the judgment, the Court shall construe it upon the request of any party.

Article 61.

An application for revision of a judgment can be made only when it is based upon the discovery of some fact of such a nature as to be a decisive factor, which fact was, when the judgment was given, unknown to the Court and also to the party claiming revision, always provided that such ignorance was not due to negligence.

The proceedings for revision will be opened by a judgment of the Court expressly recording the existence of the new fact, recognising that it has such a character as to lay the case open to revision, and declaring the application admissible on this ground.

The Court may require previous compliance with the terms of the judgment before it admits proceedings in revision.

The application for revision must be made at latest within six months of the discovery of the new fact.

No application for revision may be made after the lapse of ten years from the date of the sentence.

Article 62.

Should a State consider that it has an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision in the case, it may submit a request to the Court to be permitted to intervene as a third party.

It will be for the Court to decide upon this request.

Article 63.

Whenever the construction of a convention to which States other than those concerned in the case are parties is in question the Registrar shall notify all such States forthwith.

Every State so notified has the right to intervene in the proceedings: but if it uses this right, the construction given by the judgment will be equally binding upon it.

Article 64.

Unless otherwise decided by the Court, each party shall bear its own costs.

CHAPTER IV.

Advisory Opinions.

Article 65.

Questions upon which the advisory opinion of the Court is asked shall be laid before the Court by means of a written request, signed either by the President of the Assembly or the President of the Council of the League of Nations, or by the Secretary-General of the League under instructions from the Assembly or the Council.

The request shall contain an exact statement of the question upon which an opinion is required, and shall be accompanied by all documents likely to throw light upon the question.

Article 66.

1. The Registrar shall forthwith give notice of the request for an advisory opinion to the Members of the League of Nations, through the Secretary-General of the League, and to any States entitled to appear before the Court.

En outre, à tout Membre de la Société, à tout Etat admis à ester devant la Cour et à toute organisation internationale jugés, par la Cour ou par le Président si elle ne siège pas, susceptibles de fournir des renseignements sur la question, le Greffier fait connaître, par communication spéciale et directe, que la Cour est disposée à recevoir des exposés écrits dans un délai à fixer par le Président, ou à entendre des exposés oraux au cours d'une audience publique tenue à cet effet.

Si un des Membres de la Société ou des Etats mentionnés au premier alinéa du présent paragraphe, n'ayant pas été l'objet de la communication spéciale ci-dessus visée, exprime le désir de soumettre un exposé écrit ou d'être entendu, la Cour statue.

2. Les Membres, Etats ou organisations qui ont présenté des exposés écrits ou oraux sont admis à discuter les exposés faits par d'autres Membres, Etats et organisations dans les formes, mesures et délais fixés, dans chaque cas d'espèce, par la Cour, ou, si elle ne siège pas, par le Président. A cet effet, le Greffier communique en temps voulu les exposés écrits aux Membres, Etats ou organisations qui en ont eux-mêmes présentés.

Article 67.

La Cour prononcera ses avis consultatifs en audience publique, le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations et les représentants des Membres de la Société, des Etats et des organisations internationales directement intéressés étant prévenus.

Article 68.

Dans l'exercice de ses attributions consultatives, la Cour s'inspirera en outre des dispositions du Statut qui s'appliquent en matière contentieuse, dans la mesure où elle les reconnaîtra applicables.

Le soussigné certifie que le présent document contient copie conforme des Protocoles de 1920 et de 1929, ainsi que le texte amendé du Statut de la Cour.

Genève, le

Pour le Secrétaire général:

Conseiller juridique du Secrétariat.

The Registrar shall also, by means of a special and direct communication, notify any Member of the League or State admitted to appear before the Court or international organisation considered by the Court (or, should it not be sitting, by the President) as likely to be able to furnish information on the question, that the Court will be prepared to receive, within a time-limit to be fixed by the President, written statements, or to hear, at a public sitting to be held for the purpose, oral statements relating to the question.

Should any Member or State referred to in the first paragraph have failed to receive the communication specified above, such Member or State may express a desire to submit a written statement, or to be heard; and the Court will decide.

2. Members, States, and organisations having presented written or oral statements or both shall be admitted to comment on the statements made by other Members, States, or organisations in the form, to the extent and within the time-limits which the Court, or, should it not be sitting, the President, shall decide in each particular case. Accordingly, the Registrar shall in due time communicate any such written statements to Members, States, and organisations having submitted similar statements.

Article 67:

The Court shall deliver its advisory opinions in open Court, notice having been given to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and to the representatives of Members of the League, of States and of international organisations immediately concerned.

Article 68.

In the exercise of its advisory functions, the Court shall further be guided by the provisions of the Statute which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which it recognises them to be applicable.

The undersigned certifies that the present document contains a true copy of the Protocols of 1920 and 1929, as well as the amended text of the Statute of the Court.

Geneva,

For the Secretary-General:

Legal Adviser of the Secretariat.

[Communiqué au Conseil
et aux Membres de la Société.]

N° officiel : **C. 80. M. 28.** 1936. V. Addendum

Genève, le 1er mai 1936.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

ACTES RELATIFS A LA CONSTITUTION DE LA COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

Le renvoi explicatif suivant, concernant la déclaration d'acceptation par l'Estonie de la juridiction obligatoire de la Cour, doit être ajouté au bas de la page 13 de ce document :

* Le Gouvernement estonien, par une communication adressée au Secrétaire général le 25 juin 1928, a renouvelé cette déclaration pour une période de dix ans à partir du 2 mai 1928.

* By a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on June 25th, 1928, the Estonian Government renewed this Declaration for a period of ten years as from May 2nd, 1928.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ACTS RELATING TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

The following explanatory footnote regarding the Declaration of Acceptance by Estonia of the Compulsory Jurisdiction of the Court, should be inserted at the foot of page 13 of this document :

* Le Gouvernement estonien, par une communication adressée au Secrétaire général le 25 juin 1928, a renouvelé cette déclaration pour une période de dix ans à partir du 2 mai 1928.

* By a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on June 25th, 1928, the Estonian Government renewed this Declaration for a period of ten years as from May 2nd, 1928.

S.d.N. 2.630. 4/36. Imp. Kundig.

Série de Publications de la Société des Nations
V. QUESTIONS JURIDIQUES
1936. V. 1. Addendum

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 7.** 1936.V.
[C.36(I).1936.V.]

Geneva, February 10th, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 15TH, 1936

REPORT ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL ON JANUARY 23RD, 1936

CONTENTS.

	Page
1. Report to the Council, adopted by the Committee on January 15th, 1936	2
Appendix I. — Draft Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism .	3
Appendix II. — Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court	8
Appendix III. — Observations received from Governments after the First Session of the Committee:	
Argentine Republic	13
Egypt	13
Netherlands	14
2. Report adopted by the Council on January 23rd, 1936	16

S.d.N. 1.255 (F.) 1.035 (A.). 2/36. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL
1936. V.2.

I. REPORT TO THE COUNCIL ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON JANUARY 15TH, 1936.

The Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism, set up under the resolution adopted by the Council on December 10th, 1934, held a second session at Geneva from January 7th to 15th, 1936.

The following were present at this session: [1]

His Excellency Count CARTON DE WIART (Belgium), Minister of State, *President*; accompanied by: M. Simon SASSERATH, Advocate in the Brussels Court of Appeal, Professor in the Belgian Institute of Graduate Studies.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS, C.B.E., K.C. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); substitute: Mr. L. S. BRASS, Assistant Legal Adviser, Home Office.

M. E. J. GAJARDO (Chile), Head of the Permanent Office accredited to the League of Nations.

His Excellency M. Juan Manuel CANO Y TRUEBA (Spain), Minister Plenipotentiary, Head of the Legal Department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; substitute: M. José DE LAPUERTA Y DE LAS POZAS, Legal Adviser in the Legal Department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

M. Jules BASDEVANT (France), Professor at the Faculty of Law in Paris, Legal Adviser at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic.

M. Béla DE SZENT-ISTVÁNY (Hungary), Ministerial Councillor at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; expert: Colonel vitéz Aloyse BELDY.

His Excellency M. Ugo ALOISI (Italy), President of Chamber of the Court of Cassation of the Kingdom of Italy; substitute: Professor Tommaso PERASSI, Professor of International Law at the University of Rome.

M. Lucien BEKERMAN (Poland), Procureur in the Court of Cassation, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Justice.

His Excellency M. V. V. PELLA (Roumania), Minister Plenipotentiary, Professor at the Faculty of Law at the University of Bucharest; substitute: M. Slavko STOYKOVITCH, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Belgrade.

M. E. DELAQUIS (Switzerland), Professor at the University of Geneva.

M. Victor BROWN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Secretary of Embassy.

The Committee considered the replies of the Argentine and Egyptian Governments and the observations submitted by the Netherlands Government [2] on the text appended to the report made to the Council by the Committee at its first session (document C.184.M.102.1935.V).

It also received from the United Kingdom member proposals for amendments to the first part of the Convention and a note on the scheme for an International Criminal Court.

Lastly, the model texts for the repression of terrorism adopted in September 1935 by the sixth International Conference for the Unification of Penal Law at Copenhagen were communicated to the Committee.

Taking into account the considerations suggested by these communications and the observations submitted to it by certain of its members during its second session, the Committee proceeded to a revision of the texts concerning the prevention and punishment of terrorism, and to an examination of the provisions submitted to it at its first session by the Belgian, French, Roumanian and Spanish members for an International Criminal Court.

The Committee considered that it would be preferable to submit two draft Conventions to States for their appreciation.

The purpose of the first Convention would be the prevention and punishment of terrorism (Appendix I) and that of the second the creation of an International Criminal Court (Appendix II).

The Committee was led to adopt this solution by the fact that differences of opinion were manifested both as to the principle and the timeliness of the creation of an International Criminal Court.

Under this system, States which, for reasons of principle or any other reason, feel unable to hand over an accused person to the International Criminal Court in any circumstances, will have the option of becoming contracting parties to the first Convention only.

On the other hand, the acceptance by a State of the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court is conditional on the acceptance by that State of the Convention for the Prevention and Repression of Terrorism.

---

[1] The following members of the Committee were not able to be present:
His Excellency M. Titus Komarnicki (Poland);
M. Eugène Hirschfeld (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

[2] See Appendix III.

The Soviet member considered that the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism should contain a preamble emphasising the exceptional gravity of terrorist activities and the danger which they present to international relations. He also stressed the necessity of making it quite clear that the Convention refers to acts of political terrorism with a bearing on international relations.

The Committee considers that all forms of terrorism calling for international co-operation are covered by the texts which it has drawn up.

In the opinion of certain members of the Committee, States themselves should be put under an obligation to refrain from any acts likely to foster terrorist activities directed against public order and security in another State.

The Committee considered that such a provision would be superfluous, since international law imposes on every State the strict obligation, not only to refrain from resorting to such methods, but also to take measures on its own territory against any enterprise likely to endanger the public order and security of other States.

Lastly, the Chilian member, while recognising the connection which may exist between the prevention of terrorism and the subject of the falsification of passports, expressed the opinion that a Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism should not deal with this latter subject. In his opinion, this subject, which is of much wider range and regarding which certain recommendations now being put into force have already been made by an international conference, might be dealt with in an optional protocol annexed to the Convention.

The Committee thought, however, that provisions concerning the falsification of passports were necessary in a Convention for the prevention of acts of terrorism, since in most cases terrorists who carry on their activities in the territories of several States employ false passports for their journeys.

In submitting to the Council the results of its labours embodied in the present report and the texts annexed thereto, the Committee requests the Council, should it deem it desirable and opportune to do so, to forward the present report and its appendices to the Governments for their observations.

The observations of the Governments should reach the Secretary-General by July 15th, 1936, in order that they may be communicated to the Assembly at its ordinary session of 1936, at which a decision will have to be taken whether a diplomatic conference should be held in 1937 to draw up the Conventions contemplated by the Committee.

The Committee might, if necessary, hold a session shortly after the close of the next ordinary session of the Assembly in order to make a final revision of the texts to be submitted to the diplomatic conference, in the light of the observations of the Governments and the discussions of the Assembly.

January 15th, 1936.

(Signed) CARTON DE WIART,
Chairman.

Appendix I.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM.

Article 1.

The purpose of the present Convention is to ensure international co-operation for the prevention and punishment of terrorism.

Article 2

With this object, each High Contracting Party should make the following acts criminal offences, whether they affect his own interests or those of another High Contracting Party, in all cases where they are directed to the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services or a disturbance in international relations, by the use of violence or by the creation of a state of terror—viz.:

(1) Any act intended to cause death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to:
- (*a*) Heads of States; persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State; their hereditary or designated successors;
- (*b*) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;
- (*c*) Members, officers or servants of Governments;
- (*d*) Members of constitutional or legislative bodies;
- (*e*) Persons holding judicial office;
- (*f*) Diplomatic representatives or consuls;
- (*g*) Members of the armed forces of the State;

(2) Wilful destruction of, or damage to:
- (*a*) Public buildings or other public property;
- (*b*) Means of communication and transport or installations belonging thereto;
- (*c*) Property belonging to public utility undertakings;

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public, and in particular interference with the working of means of communication, the use of explosives or incendiary materials, the propagation of contagious diseases, or the poisoning of drinking-water or food;

(4) Manufacture, possession, export, import, transport, sale, transfer or distribution of any material or object with a view to the commission of an act falling within the present article;

(5) Wilfully giving assistance by any means whatever to a person or an accomplice of a person who does any of the acts set out above.

Article 3.

1. Each High Contracting Party should also make criminal offences:

(1) Any attempt to commit any of the acts set out in Article 2;

(2) Any conspiracy, and any direct incitement, whether successful or not, to commit any of the acts set out in Article 2, any wilful complicity and any help given towards the commission of such an act, whether the conspiracy, incitement, complicity or help takes place or is given in the country where the act is, or is to be, committed or in another country.

2. Acts of participation in the offences dealt with in the present Convention will be treated as separate offences when the persons committing them can only be brought to trial in different countries.

3. The as to obligation incitement shall be without prejudice to any rules of domestic law as to treating incitement which has not taken place in public and has not been successful as a criminal offence.

Article 4.

No distinction should be made as regards the protection afforded by the criminal law between acts falling under Articles 2 and 3 which are directed against the State itself, its nationals or its property, and the same acts when directed against another High Contracting Party, his nationals or his property, but this provision is without prejudice to the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law, in relation to certain persons mentioned at point (1) of Article 2.

Article 5.

1. In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is accepted, foreign convictions for the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 will, within the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, be taken into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

2. Such convictions will further, in the case of High Contracting Parties whose law recognises foreign convictions, be taken into account, with or without special proceedings, for the purpose of imposing, in the manner provided by that legislation, incapacities, disqualifications or interdictions whether in the sphere of public or of private law.

Article 6.

In so far as *parties civiles* are admitted under the domestic law, foreign *parties civiles*, including, in proper cases, a High Contracting Party, should be entitled to all rights allowed to nationals by the law of the country in which the case is tried.

Article 7.

1. In countries where the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country after the commission abroad of an offence mentioned in Articles 2 or 3 should be punishable in the same manner as if the offence had been committed in their own country, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. This provision does not apply if in similar circumstances the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 8.

Foreigners who are on the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 should be punished as though the act had been committed in the territory of that High Contracting Party, if the following conditions are realised —namely, that:

(*a*) Extradition has been demanded and could not be granted for a reason independent of the act itself;

(*b*) The law of the country of refuge, as a general rule, considers prosecution for offences committed abroad admissible;

(*c*) The foreigner is a national of a country which, as a general rule, considers the prosecution of foreigners for offences committed abroad admissible.

Article 9.

1. The acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been, or may hereafter be, concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall henceforward as between themselves recognise the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 as extradition crimes.

3. Extradition shall be granted in conformity with the law of the country to which application is made and be conditional on reciprocity.

Article 10.

Where in virtue of the present Convention a High Contracting Party has to bring to trial a person accused of one of the offences provided for by Articles 2 and 3, the law of that High Contracting Party shall determine what court shall have jurisdiction to try such person.

Article 11.

1. The carrying, possession and distribution of firearms (other than smooth-bore sporting-guns) and of munitions and explosives should be subjected to regulation, and it should be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute them to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by the domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such objects.

2. Manufacturers of firearms (other than smooth-bore sporting-guns) should be required to mark each arm with a serial number or other distinctive mark permitting it to be identified, and to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

Article 12.

1. The following acts should be punishable without regard to whether the passports or equivalent documents concerned are national or foreign, and without regard to the purpose with which the act was performed:

(1) Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration;

(2) The bringing into the country, the obtaining or the possession of forged or falsified passports or equivalent documents knowing them to be such;

(3) The obtaining of passports or equivalent documents by means of false declarations or documents;

(4) The utilisation of passports or equivalent documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. The wilful issue of passports or visas by competent officials to persons known not to have the right thereto under the applicable laws or regulations, with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention, should also be punishable.

Article 13.

Each High Contracting Party should take on his territory appropriate measures to prevent any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article 14.

1. The results of the investigation of offences provided for in Articles 2 and 3 shall in each country and within the framework of the law of that country be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. Such service should be in close contact:

(*a*) With the police authorities of the country;

(*b*) With the corresponding services in other countries.

3. It should furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and should, as far as possible, keep itself in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

Article 15.

Each service, so far as it considers it desirable to do so, should notify to the services of the other countries, giving all necessary particulars:

(*a*) Any offence provided for in Articles 2 and 3, even if it is only a contemplated offence, such notification to be accompanied by descriptions, copies and photographs;

(*b*) Any search after, prosecution, arrest, conviction or expulsion of persons guilty of acts dealt with in the present Convention, the movements of such persons and any pertinent information with regard to them, as well as their description, finger-prints and photographs;

(*c*) Discovery of documents, arms, appliances or other objects connected with acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 11 and 12.

Article 16.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request in accordance with their domestic law and practice.

2. The transmission of letters of request relating to offences contemplated by the present Convention should be effected:

(*a*) By direct communication between the judicial authorities; or

(*b*) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries, or by direct communication from the authority of the country making the request to the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made; or

(*c*) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request direct to the competent judicial authority, or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made, and shall receive direct from such authority the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request.

3. In cases (*a*) and (*c*), a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the superior authority of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letters of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority making the request, provided always that the country to which the request is made may require a translation in its own language, certified correct by the authority making the request.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method or methods of transmission mentioned above which he will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, his existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. Execution of letters of request shall not give rise to a claim for reimbursement of charges or expenses of any nature whatever other than expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws.

Article 17.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 18.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment, the characterisation of the various acts dealt with in the present Convention and the determination of the applicable penalties and of the methods of prosecution and trial depend in each country upon the general rules of the domestic law. It further does not impair the right of the High Contracting Parties to make such rules as they consider proper regarding the effect of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty.

Article 19.

The High Contracting Parties agree that any disputes which may arise between them relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall, if they cannot be settled by direct negotiations or by an arbitration arranged between the parties, be referred for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice. If any or all of the High Contracting Parties who are parties to such a dispute should not be parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the dispute shall be referred, at the choice of the parties and in accordance with the constitutional procedure of each party, either to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, or to some other court of arbitration.

Article 20.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and on behalf of any non-member State which was represented at the Conference which drew up the present Convention or to which a copy is communicated by the Council of the League of Nations.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who will notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Article 21.

1. After the . . . the present Convention shall be open to accession on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 20 on whose behalf it has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who will notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

Article 22.

Any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State which is ready to ratify the Convention under the second paragraph of Article 20, or to accede to the Convention under Article 21, but desires to be allowed to make reservations with regard to the application of the Convention, may so inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall forthwith communicate such reservations to the Members of the League and non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited and enquire whether they have any objection thereto. Should the reservation be formulated within two years from the entry into force of the Convention, the same enquiry shall be addressed to Members of the League and non-member States whose signature of the Convention has not been followed by ratification. If, within six months from the date of the Secretary-General's communication, no objection to the reservation has been made, it shall be treated as accepted by the High Contracting Parties.

Article 23.

Ratification of or accession to the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation are in conformity with the rules contained in the Convention.

Article 24.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, or the territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may at any time declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, or the territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 25.

The present Convention shall not come into force until . . . ratifications or accessions on behalf of Members of the League of Nations or non-member States have been deposited. The date of its coming into force shall be the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of the . . . th ratification or accession.

Article 26.

After the coming into force of the Convention in accordance with Article 25, each subsequent ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day from the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 27.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who will inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 20. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall operate only in respect of the Member of the League or non-member State on whose behalf it was notified.

Article 28.

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on the date of its coming into force.

Appendix II.

Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

Article 1.

An International Criminal Court for the trial, as hereinafter provided, of persons accused of an offence dealt with in the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism of to-day's date is hereby established.

Article 2.

The Court shall be a permanent body but shall only sit when it is seized of proceedings for an offence within its jurisdiction.

Article 3.

1. In the cases referred to in Article 10 of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, each High Contracting Party to the present Convention shall be entitled, instead of prosecuting before his own tribunal, to send the accused for trial before the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party shall further be entitled, instead of extraditing, to send the accused for trial before the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a party to the present Convention.

Article 4.

The Court shall be composed of a body of judges chosen regardless of their nationality from amongst jurists who are acknowledged authorities on criminal law and who are or have been members of courts of criminal jurisdiction or possess the qualifications required for appointment to judicial office in their own countries.

Article 5.

The Court shall consist of five regular judges and five deputy judges, each belonging to a different nationality.

Article 6.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations, and any non-member State, in regard to which the present Convention is in force may nominate not more than two candidates for appointment as judges of the Court.

2. The Council of the League of Nations will be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

Article 7.

1. Judges hold office for ten years. They may be re-appointed.
2. Judges shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled.
3. Though replaced, judges shall finish any cases which they may have begun.

Article 8.

A judge appointed in place of a judge whose period of appointment had not expired will hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 9.

1. Deputy judges shall be called upon to sit in the order laid down in a list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment, and, secondly, to age.

Article 10.

1. Every two years, one regular and one deputy judge shall retire.

2. The order of retirement shall, in the first instance, be determined under the authority of the Council of the League of Nations by drawing lots.

Article 11.

Any vacancy, whether occurring through the expiration of a judge's term of office or for any other cause, shall be filled as provided in Article 6.

Article 12.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of the other members he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Article 13.

The High Contracting Parties shall grant the members of the Court diplomatic privileges and immunities when engaged on the business of the Court.

Article 14.

1. The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for two years; they may be re-elected.

2. The work of Registry of the Court shall be performed by the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice, if that Court consents.

Article 15.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. For any particular case, the President may take the opinion of the Court and the Court may decide to meet elsewhere.

Article 16.

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to send a person for trial before the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 17.

The Court shall apply the substantive criminal law of the State on whose territory the offence was committed. Any dispute as to what is the applicable substantive law shall be decided by the Court.

Article 18.

If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers he should not sit to hear a particular case, he shall so notify the President so soon as he has been informed that the Court is seized of that case.

Article 19.

1. The presence of five members shall be necessary to enable the Court to sit.

2. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges.

Article 20.

Where the Court has to apply, in accordance with Article 17, the law of a State of which no sitting judge is a national, the Court may invite a jurist who is an acknowledged authority on such law to sit with it in a consultative capacity as a legal assessor.

Article 21.

So soon as the Court is seized of a case, the President shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, and the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. These

States, and any other States, may put before the Court the results of their investigations and any evidence and objects connected with the crime which they have in their possession; these shall be included in the file of the case.

Article 22.

The right to conduct the prosecution shall rest with the State against which the offence was committed. Failing that State, it shall belong to the State on the territory of which the offence was committed, and failing also that latter State, then to the State by which the Court was seized.

Article 23.

Any State or person injured by an offence may constitute itself or himself *partie civile* before the Court, inspect the file and submit a statement of its case to the Court.

Article 24.

The file of the case and the statement of the *partie civile* shall be communicated to the person who is before the Court for trial.

Article 25.

The parties may propose the hearing of witnesses and experts by the Court, which shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts.

Article 26.

1. The Court shall decide whether a person who has been sent before it for trial shall be placed or remain under arrest. Where necessary, it shall determine on what conditions he may be provisionally set at liberty.

2. The State on the territory of which the Court is sitting shall place at the Court's disposal a place of internment and the necessary staff of warders for the custody of the accused.

Article 27.

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall at its demand be addressed by the High Contracting Party on the territory of which the Court is sitting to the State competent to give effect thereto.

Article 28.

No examination of the person sent to the Court for trial, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for that person, the representatives of the States mentioned in Article 21 and the representatives of the *parties civiles*, or after due summons to such persons to be present.

Article 29.

1. Accused persons may be defended by regular members of a Bar who have been approved by the Court.

2. If provision is not made for the conduct of the defence by a barrister chosen by the accused and approved by the Court, the Court shall assign to each accused person not having an approved counsel for his defence a counsel selected from advocates duly admitted to a Bar.

Article 30.

1. The hearings before the Court shall be public.

2. Where, nevertheless, the Court decides, by a reasoned and unanimous judgment, that to hear particular witnesses or experts in public would be calculated to prejudice good international relations, it may decide that such hearing shall take place *in camera*.

Article 31.

The Court shall sit in private to consider its judgment.

Article 32.

The decisions of the Court shall be by majority of the judges.

Article 33.

Every judgment or order of the Court shall state the reasons therefor and be read at a public hearing by the President.

Article 34.

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person sent before it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been sent for trial.

Article 35.

1. The Court may sentence the persons sent before it to restore property or to pay damages.

2. High Contracting Parties in whose territory objects to be restored or property belonging to convicted persons is situated shall be bound to take all the measures provided by their own laws to ensure the execution of the sentences.

3. The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply where pecuniary penalties inflicted by the Court or costs of proceedings have to be recovered.

Article 36.

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed, unless the Court otherwise decides, by the State whose substantive criminal law has been applied.

2. The Court shall determine the way in which any fines shall be dealt with.

Article 37.

Where sentence of death has been pronounced, the State on whose territory such sentence is to be executed shall be entitled to substitute therefor the penalty which, under the law applied by the Court, comes next in order of severity.

Article 38.

The right of pardon shall be exercised by the State which has to enforce the penalty. It shall first consult the President of the Court.

Article 39.

1. Against convictions pronounced by the Court, no proceedings other than an application for revision shall be allowable.

2. The Court in its rules shall determine the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

Article 40.

1. The salaries of the judges shall be payable by the States of which they are nationals on a scale fixed by the High Contracting Parties.

2. There shall be created by contributions of the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

Article 41.

The Court's archives shall be in the charge of the Registrar.

Article 42.

The Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure.

Article 43.

1. The Court shall decide any questions as to its own jurisdiction arising during the hearing of a case; it shall for this purpose apply the provisions of the present Convention and of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the general principles of law.

2. Should a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, dispute the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts, this issue shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in the next following article.

Article 44.

The High Contracting Parties agree that any disputes which may arise between them relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall, if they cannot be settled by direct negotiations, be referred for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice. If any or all of the High Contracting Parties who are parties to such a dispute should not be parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the dispute shall be referred, at the choice of the parties and in accordance with the constitutional procedure of each party, either to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, or to some other court of arbitration.

Article 45.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State on whose behalf the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism of to-day's date has been signed.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who will notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Ratification shall only be allowable if the Member of the League or non-member State has ratified the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 46.

1. After . . . the present Convention shall be open to accession on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 45 on whose behalf the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism has been ratified but the present Convention has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who will notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 45.

Article 47.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, or the territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may, at any time, declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or the territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to all the non-member States the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 48.

The present Convention shall not come into force until . . . ratifications or accessions on behalf of Members of the League of Nations or non-member States have been deposited. The date of its coming into force shall be the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of the . . . ratification or accession.

Article 49.

After the coming into force of the Convention in accordance with Article 48, each subsequent ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day from the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 50.

1. The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who will inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 45. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall operate only in respect of the Member of the League or non-member State on whose behalf it was notified.

2. Denunciation of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism shall *ipso facto* involve denunciation of the present Convention.

Article 51.

A case brought before the Court before denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 47, paragraph 3, shall, notwithstanding, continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

Article 52.

1. The present Convention may be amended, either by the procedure by which it was concluded or by negotiations between the High Contracting Parties.

2. If the amended Convention does not secure acceptance by all the High Contracting Parties, it may notwithstanding be put into force by the majority of those Parties after three months' notice to the other High Contracting Parties.

3. At the end of the three months, the present Convention shall cease to be in force.

Article 53.

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on the date of its coming into force.

Appendix III.

REPLIES FROM GOVERNMENTS [1] RECEIVED AFTER THE FIRST SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE.

Argentine Republic.

[*Translation.*] August 8th, 1935.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Worship of the Argentine Republic has the honour to refer to the Circular Letter of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations (219.1934.V), and to transmit to him, for information, the following report by the police of the Federal capital:

With a view to the suppression of all criminal activities, the police keep a constant watch upon the movements of all suspected persons. Such being the case, they devoted special attention to preventing incitement to and the commission of terrorist offences. Joint international action by the Governments with a view to the suppression of such offences—as advocated in the attached report—would make for success in this sphere by ensuring full co-operation between the various countries, all of which are equally affected by the dissemination of extremist ideas; so dangerous indeed is the character of these ideas that their propagation has created a serious problem. The police, after consideration of the proposals for the suppression of such offences, are accordingly of opinion that the following suggestions might perhaps represent a useful contribution to the achievement of the end in view.

The pooling of information, which is a condition of the proposed co-operation, should take the form of an exchange of particulars regarding known or suspected terrorists, such as finger-prints, full details of parentage and previous history, together with photographs and the chief characteristics of the activities of such persons: constant supervision of all bodies, organisations, etc., which cannot establish their *bona fide* character and, more particularly, a close watch upon groups of suspected individuals; the immediate dissolution of any body proved to be contemplating terrorist action; the detention and careful identification of the members of such organisations without prejudice to the appropriate legal penalties, etc., together with confiscation of all periodicals, books, pamphlets or other publications designed to further terrorist propaganda, and the deportation to their own countries of all individuals regarded as dangerous.

Egypt.

[*Translation.*] September 29th, 1935.

I have the honour to inform you that the Egyptian Government is in full sympathy with the aims of the Council of the League of Nations in taking steps for the framing of a preliminary draft international Convention to ensure the repression of conspiracies or crimes committed with a political and terrorist purpose.

---

[1] The first series of replies is reproduced in document C.184.M.102.1935.V, Appendix IV.

While expressing its agreement with regard to the proposed bases for the conclusion of the above-mentioned international Convention, the Government feels bound to draw the Committee of Experts' attention to the fact that in view of the existence in its territory of the consular courts of the Capitulation Powers, it considers that recourse to the International Criminal Court should be compulsory whenever any offence, which in the Egyptian Government's opinion constitutes an act of political terrorism, is committed in Egyptian territory by a national of any of the Capitulation Powers. In such cases, it would be for the Egyptian Government, the public peace of whose territory and the harmony of whose international relations having been disturbed by the said offence, to send the guilty person for trial before the International Criminal Court.

Furthermore, as regards the rules applicable to passports and identity papers, provision should be made for a stipulation similar to that included in the Convention on the control of the international trade in arms (Article 30) to the effect that the Capitulation Powers would undertake to punish offences of this kind committed by their nationals in the territory of the foreign State, with the same penalties as those laid down by their national laws and applicable in their territory. The Egyptian Government, for its part, is prepared, failing the application of penalties by the consular courts, to undertake to expel any foreigner guilty of any of the offences enumerated in paragraph C[1] of the bases for the conclusion of the Convention.

In the last place, the Egyptian Government agrees to exclude, in its relations with all other States, whether parties to Capitulations or not, assassination from the category of political offences not giving rise to extradition both in the application of extradition treaties and in extradition on the basis of reciprocity.

Netherlands.

[*Translation.*] September 5th, 1935.

With reference to the Circular Letter of the Secretariat of the League of Nations dated December 27th, 1934 (219.1934.V), concerning the international repression of terrorism, and after reading the report submitted to the Council on the first session of the Committee set up for this purpose, the Netherlands Government desires to submit the following observations and to request the Secretary-General to transmit them to the members of the said Committee in order that it may be aware of them before it meets for its second session.

The French Government in its memorandum and in the French representative's speech in the Council of the League of Nations on December 8th, 1934, expressed the opinion that there was every ground for considering whether international solidarity imposed on every State the duty of co-operating as far as possible in the repression of terrorist crimes for a political purpose. The Netherlands Government shares this opinion in principle; but it considers that the great divergences which at present exist in several countries as regards the fundamental bases of national policy calls for some caution in this connection.

The preliminary draft suggests in Article 2 that each State should render punishable a series of political offences, Most of these are offences which in several countries, including the Netherlands, are already punishable when they concern the country itself. The Netherlands Penal Code also renders punishable certain political offences directed against a foreign State; for example any attempt on the life or liberty of a reigning prince or other head of State is punishable.

As regards Article 2, the Netherlands Government supposes that it does not refer to offences which are not of an international character—*i.e.*, an offence committed by a national against his own State in the territory of that State, without the criminal having gone to another country. On this understanding, the Netherlands Government is prepared to consider an extension of the category of punishable offences as proposed in Article 2; but it cannot accept the text of Article 2 as drafted by the Committee. It considers that the enumeration of the categories of offences which are to be covered by the Convention is much too wide. In the Government's opinion, it would be desirable to limit the offences covered by this article both as regards the persons against whom they are directed and as regards the nature of the offences. The same applies to the later paragraphs of Article 2. If it is desired to render punishable all kinds of incitements and all attempts to commit the offences provided for in the first three paragraphs, too wide a field is covered. In the same connection, attention is drawn to the eighth paragraph, in which reference is made, not only to assistance given to the criminal himself, but also to assistance given to an accomplice of that criminal. Particularly as regards preparatory acts, the Netherlands Government considers that, in the campaign against terrorism, freedom of speech should only be limited to the extent that is strictly necessary.

The Netherlands Government also wishes to lay stress on the necessity of clearly defining the relation between Article 1 and Article 2. It supposes that the Committee has rightly wished to indicate that the offences mentioned in Article 2 only come within the scope of the Convention if they are covered at the same time by the definition given in Article 1. In other words, the term " intentional " which occurs several times in Article 2 means that the offences in question must be committed for the purpose of causing a change in or impediment to the operation of the public authorities or services of the contracting parties or a disturbance of international relations. The Netherlands Government suggests that the relation between Article 1 and Article 2 would be made clearer by reproducing Article 1 in the form of a preamble and by inserting in Article 2—which would then become Article 1—a very precise reference to the preamble.

---

[1] See document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 23.

The last paragraph of Article 2 seems somewhat obscure; it would be preferable to replace it by the text contained in the Roumanian Government's memorandum (page 17, No. 6, paragraph 4):

> " Acts of participation in the offences covered by the Convention should be deemed to be separate offences when committed in different countries."

As regards Article 3, the Netherlands Government does not think it advisable to forbid States wishing to do so to make a distinction in their penal codes, in the scale of punishment for offences mentioned in Article 2, between acts directed against the State itself, its nationals or property, and acts directed against another contracting party or his nationals or property.

As the Netherlands does not recognise the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions, our Government is not concerned with the first paragraph of Article 4. As regards the second paragraph, the question of the recognition by other States of legal incapacity, etc., referred to here seems to be of too general a nature for a rule in this connection to be inserted in a draft Convention on terrorism.

In the Netherlands, in which the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised, and to which Article 6 therefore applies, Article 5 of the Penal Code stipulates that the Netherlands law covers any act committed by a Netherlands national abroad, on condition that this act constitutes a crime according to Netherlands penal law and is at the same time punishable under the law of the country in which it was committed. Nevertheless, Article 6 would not be wholly acceptable, unless the enumeration contained in Article 2 was considerably modified.

As regards Article 7, the Netherlands Government was doubtful as to the meaning of the expression " a country whose internal legislation recognises as a general rule the principle of the prosecution of offences committed abroad ". Would, for example, the Netherlands, which, in the above-mentioned Article 5 of its Penal Code, allows in certain cases for the prosecution of offences committed abroad, be considered as belonging to the category of countries covered by this article ? If, so, the Netherlands Government could not accept Article 7 in the general form given to it by the Committee. In particular, in the Netherlands Government's opinion, penal law should not be made applicable to offences directed against a foreign State and committed by a foreigner outside its territory.

Article 8 regarding extradition gives rise to the following observations:

The Netherlands, which makes extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty, is not prepared to consider all the offences referred to in the present Article 2 as being deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been or may hereafter be concluded between the Netherlands and all the other contracting States.

Moreover, the extradition treaties hitherto concluded by the Netherlands Government are based in general on the principle that extradition cannot be allowed for political offences. In view of the wide differences of political opinion which at present exist in different countries on fundamental questions, the time does not seem favourable for completely abrogating this rule. The present circumstances as regards the national policies of different States are not such as to induce the Netherlands to depart from their historic traditions as regards the hospitality offered to political refugees.

In Article 12, it would seem advisable to delete the words " of foreigners ", since States must also take appropriate measures to prevent any activity " of nationals " in the connection referred to.

In the Netherlands Government's opinion, it will be necessary to stipulate clearly the idea of reciprocity between the contracting parties as a basis for the new Convention. In this connection, it would be well to replace in some of the articles the expression " abroad " by the expression " in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties ".

Her Majesty's Government considers that the establishment of an international jurisdiction would no doubt offer advantages. Particularly in cases in which the State on whose territory the accused has taken refuge objects to extraditing the accused to the injured State, proceedings before an international court might be a useful device likely to relieve the strain between the nations involved. Thus, the objections put forward above to the extension of extradition might be attenuated by the institution of an international court and by the application of Article 9 of the draft Convention.

Nevertheless, an examination of the provisions drawn up by the Belgian, French, Roumanian and Spanish members of the Committee with regard to the organisation and working of such a Court leads us to believe that the actual establishment of such an international jurisdiction may still encounter many obstacles; for there are numerous questions for which no satisfactory solution has yet been found. The Netherlands Government ventures to mention a few of these questions below.

As regards the composition of the Court, the chief aim must be to guarantee the absolute impartiality of this new organ. The Netherlands Government wonders whether it would not be preferable to modify Article 21 on these lines by introducing the rule contained in the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which lays down that the Assembly and the Council shall proceed to the election of judges independently of one another.

The Netherlands Government wishes to thank the delegations which drew up the rules for the Court for suggesting that The Hague should be chosen as the seat of the new international jurisdiction. While associating itself in principle with the rules contained in the draft with regard to the seat of the Court, our Government wishes to suggest that the court itself should also be entitled to decide whether it should sit in the territory of the contracting party which desires to send a person for trial before the Court; on the basis of the present text of Article 33, paragraph 2, the Court would not possess this right.

Article 34, paragraph 2, also seems to give too much latitude to the contracting party who sends a person for trial before the Court; a general rule in this connection would be preferable.

Contrary to Article 35, paragraph 1, the Netherlands Government would prefer not to entrust the presidency of the Court to a judge who is a national of a State specially concerned in the case.

Articles 40 to 44 regarding preliminary investigations will not be sufficient in cases in which such investigations have not yet taken place in the territory of the State which has brought the case before the Court.

Articles 56 and 57, which deal with the execution of the sentence, raise several questions. Can a State on whose territory the Court has sat and to which the latter has applied with a view to the execution of the penalty be expected to give effect to this request if that State is not itself responsible for the choice of the seat ? As regards Article 57, it should be borne in mind that the penalty which is regarded as the next lighter penalty by the law which the Court has applied might be one which could not be applied in the State in whose territory it would have to be executed; an example is the Netherlands, in which not only the death penalty does not exist, but the Penal Code provides neither for forced labour nor deportation.

In the Netherlands Government's opinion, the Council of the League of Nations, which is an eminently political body, does not seem to be an appropriate body for exercising the right of pardon referred to in Article 58.

As regards Article 59, paragraph 2, allowance must be made for cases in which the law that has been applied makes no provision for revision of cases.

---

2. REPORT ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL ON JANUARY 23RD, 1936.

[C.60.1936.V.]

On December 10th, 1934, the Council adopted a resolution setting up a Committee of experts, to be designated by certain Governments selected by the Council, for the purpose of studying the question of international co-operation against terrorism, and drawing up a preliminary draft international Convention on the subject. The Counicl referred to the Committee for consideration certain suggestions formulated by the French Government and any suggestions which other Governments might desire to make. A number of Governments, accordingly, sent proposals and observations to the Committee. Included among the suggestions of the French Government was a proposal for the establishment of an international criminal court competent in certain contingencies to try persons accused of acts of terrorism.

A report on the first session of the Committee, held in April-May 1935, was drawn up by the Committee and circulated to the Council and the Members of the League (document C.184. M.102.1935.V).

As the result of a second session in the present month, the Committee has now presented to the Council a report putting forward a draft Convention for International Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and a draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. Differences of opinion existed in the Committee as to the principle and utility of the establishment of the international criminal court, and it was, therefore, thought wise to embody the provisions dealing with this subject in a separate instrument which the parties to the Convention dealing with terrorism would be free to accept or not.

The Council's resolution of 1934 provided that the procedure laid down for the conclusion of conventions in a resolution of the Assembly of September 25th, 1931, should be followed. In accordance with this procedure, the Committee asks that the Council will circulate its report and the annexed draft Conventions to the Governments for their observations, and that the report and draft Conventions, together with the Governments' observations, shall be submitted to the Assembly at its session of this year. The Committee further suggests that the Assembly, as it is entitled to do under its resolution of 1931, should consider this year whether the procedure laid down in the resolution might not be shortened and a diplomatic conference for consideration of the draft Conventions be convened in 1937. If necessary, the Committee could meet before the conference to make any alterations in the drafts which might seem desirable in the light of the Governments' observations and the discussion in the Assembly.

It is not necessary for the Council to discuss the work of the Committee now. I propose that it should accept the procedure recommended by the Committee and accordingly adopt the following resolution:

> " The Council,
>
> " Having received the report of the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism:
>
> " Directs the Secretary-General to transmit the report to the Governments of the Members of the League and of Germany, the United States of America, Brazil, Costa Rica, Danzig, Egypt and Japan, with the request that these Governments will be so good as to transmit to him, by July 15th next, any observations which they may wish to make;
>
> " And decides to place the report of the Committee, together with the draft Conventions and the Governments' observations, on the agenda of the next ordinary session of the Assembly."

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 9.** 1936. V.
[C.E.C.C. 7 (1).]

Geneva, May 2nd, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO STUDY THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL

(Adopted by the Committee on April 28th, 1936.)

CONTENTS.

Page

Report adopted by the Committee 1

Appendices:

1. Resolution adopted by the Council on September 26th, 1935. 3
2. Letter of May 21st, 1935, from the Chinese Minister in London addressed to the President of the Council 3
3. Texts governing the Composition of the Council 4

REPORT ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE.

1. The Committee was set up under a resolution of the Council of September 26th, 1935 (Appendix 1), for the purpose of reporting to the Council and the Assembly on two questions—namely :

(*a*) The question of the number of the Members of the Council, a question which was raised in 1933 in order to give satisfaction to the claims of those who have come to be known as the " non-grouped " States ; and

(*b*) The question of the representation of Asia on the Council, and, in particular, of the claim of China to re-enter the Council, as stated in the letter from the Chinese Government which is referred to below.

The Governments composing the Committee were represented as follows :

Argentine Republic: His Excellency M. RUIZ GUIÑAZÚ ; *Austria:* His Excellency M. Emerich PFLÜGL ; *Belgium:* M. Maurice BOURQUIN [1] ; *United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:* Viscount CRANBORNE (first and second sessions), Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (third session) ; *Canada:* Dr. RIDDELL (first and third sessions), Dr. RENAUD (second session) ; *China:* His Excellency M. QUO Tai-Chi (substitute : His Excellency Dr. Hoo Chi-Tsai) ; *France:* M. René MASSIGLI ; *Iran:* His Excellency M. SEPAHBODI (first session), His Excellency M. Mostafa ADLE (second session), His Excellency M. Mostafa ADLE and M. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (third session) ; *Italy:* M. Guido ROCCO ; *Latvia:* His Excellency M. Jules FELDMANS ; *Peru:* His Excellency Dr. Francisco TUDELA ; *Poland:* M. KULSKI (first session), His Excellency M. Tytus KOMARNICKI (second and third sessions) ; *Roumania:* M. N. HIOTT (first session), His Excellency M. Constantin ANTONIADE (second and third sessions) ; *Spain:* M. Juan TEIXIDOR Y SANCHEZ ; *Sweden:* His Excellency M. K. I. WESTMAN ; *Turkey:* His Excellency M. Cemal Hüsnü TARÁY (first and second sessions), His Excellency M. N. SADAK (third session) ; *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:* M. Boris STEIN (first and third sessions), M. HOERSCHELMANN (second session).

The Committee elected M. Guido Rocco (Italy) as Chairman and M. M. BOURQUIN (Belgium) as Vice-Chairman. Viscount CECIL (United Kingdom) was appointed Rapporteur.

[1] The representative of Belgium unfortunately met with an accident which prevented him from taking part in the work of the third session of the Committee.

S. d. N. 1.530 (F.) 915 (A.). 5/36. Imp. J. de G.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1936. V. 3.

2. The Committee has held three sessions : on September 28th, 1935 ; on January 24th, 1936 ; and on April 27th and 28th, 1936. In execution of its terms of reference, it twice (on October 1st, 1935, and again on February 13th, 1936) invited the Members of the League to send their observations and proposals to it. It received replies from the following Governments :

South Africa, Argentine, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Irish Free State, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Other countries which were represented on the Committee had the opportunity of expressing their views in the course of the discussion.

3. The number of non-permanent seats on the Council which resulted from the resolutions adopted by the Council and the Assembly in 1926 is nine. Since 1928, two have always been held by the so-called " semi-permanent " Members of the Council—Spain[1] and Poland[2]—and the remaining seven have been occupied by States belonging to five groups—viz., three seats by Latin-American States, one by a Little Entente State, one by a State of the group of the ex-neutrals, one by a British Dominion, and the remaining seat by an Asiatic State. The " non-grouped " States are those Members of the League which, as they do not belong to any of these groups, are not, in practice, able to secure election to the Council. A temporary remedy for this grievance was found in 1933 in the creation for three years only of a tenth non-permanent seat, to which one of the non-grouped States—Portugal—was elected. This measure left open the question whether a final solution should be sought in a modification of the system by which each group was entitled to one or more seats or in a permanent increase in the size of the Council. The seat in question ceases to exist at the date of this year's elections to the Council.

4. From 1926 to 1934, Asia was represented on the Council by a permanent Member—Japan—and by China (1926-1928, 1931-1934), or by Iran (1928-1931). In 1934, China failed to secure a declaration of re-eligibility and was thus disqualified for election, and Turkey was elected to the Council. In 1935, Japan ceased to be a Member of the League. In consequence of these events, the question of the representation of Asia was raised by China in the letter of May 21st, 1935, to the President of the Council, which is reproduced in Appendix 2.

5. After careful consideration, the Committee has been forced to recognise that the objections which, in 1933, stood in the way of a definitive solution of the questions connected with the non-permanent seats on the Council still exist, and, indeed, have become more acute. At a time when far-reaching issues have been raised as to the ultimate functions of the Council and the League itself, it seems undesirable to attempt permanent changes in the composition or mode of election of the Council. Accordingly, the Committee has sought to put forward for the two problems which have been referred to it a provisional solution which will involve the least possible immediate change in the *status quo* and will leave the maximum freedom of action in the future to the Council and the Assembly. This attitude has obliged it to pass over various suggestions, which might have been of great interest if measures of a permanent nature had seemed possible, and which contemplated fundamental changes in the group system or the method of election.

6. On the other hand, the Committee feels that it would be undesirable that a definitive solution of the problems connected with the composition of the Council should be postponed longer than is necessary. The provisional solution which it recommends is put forward, and should be adopted, on the understanding that, so soon as circumstances permit, the subject will be taken up again with a view to a final settlement.

7. Some members of the Committee maintained the view that even a provisional solution ought to be sought in a modification of the " group " system rather than in an increase of the size of the Council. In this connection, the representative of Sweden stated that, with the assent of Finland, the group of the ex-neutrals (composed of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands and Switzerland) agreed to take Finland into the group, and he asked if other groups would be willing to make adjustments in the same spirit. The other groups represented on the Committee did not find it possible, in present circumstances, to make a similar offer. The representative of Sweden did not concur in the Committee's proposals until this had been made clear.

8. The proposal made by the Committee, which, as already stated, is one aiming at a purely provisional solution and is subject to the observation made in paragraph 6, is that, for a limited period commencing with the elections of 1936, the number of non-permanent seats (which would otherwise once more fall to nine) shall be raised to eleven by appropriate resolutions of the Council and the Assembly acting under Article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant. Of the two seats which would thus be created, the Committee considers that one might provide representation for a group comprising the non-grouped European States, and that the Assembly might consider the other as attributed to Asia. The Committee were very favourably impressed

---

[1] Spain was elected on September 10th, 1928, and re-elected on September 14th, 1931, and September 17th, 1934.

[2] Poland was elected on September 16th, 1926, and re-elected on September 9th, 1929, October 3rd, 1932, and September 16th, 1935.

by the application of China for representation on the Council at an early date and were unanimous in thinking that means should be found for acceding to this application and for doing so in 1936. It is clear that, in order to do so, the Assembly must declare China re-eligible, since she only ceased to be a Member of the Council in 1934.

9. As regards the period for which the temporary seats were to be created, the Committee decided that, if created, they must be given a provisional character, but they were not agreed as to the best method of doing this. The majority (nine members) favoured the creation of the two seats for three years, which is the normal period for membership of the Council, it being understood that, if a scheme for the reorganisation of the Council should be desired before that period ended, the existence of these seats should in no way be regarded as an obstacle to the adoption of such a scheme. The minority (five members) were of opinion that, in present circumstances, the better plan would be to create the two seats for one year only. They felt that it was desirable to propose the least possible modification of the existing position and that the adoption of a one-year period would give the greatest possible freedom of action to the Council and the Assembly in dealing with the question of the composition of the Council at an early date. This method would, at the same time, make it clear that it was the hope of the Committee that, before the end of the one-year period, a scheme for a definitive settlement would be adopted by the Council.

10. The opinion was expressed that, if the view of the minority was adopted, it would be necessary, in order to guard against possible injustice, to provide, further, that the State occupying either of the seats would not be precluded by the rule regarding re-eligibility from being re-elected to the Council at the close of its tenure of the seat, even without securing a declaration of re-eligibility.

11. One member of the Committee, having raised objections as to the desirability of taking a vote in a *comité d'étude*, abstained from voting on the question of the period for which the two seats should be created, and one member abstained from voting both on this question and on the question whether there should be a provisional increase in the size of the Council.

Appendix 1.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 26TH, 1935.

The Council,

Having examined the communication of the Chinese Government, dated May 21st, 1935 ;

Noting that, under a resolution of the Assembly of October 2nd, 1933, it was understood that towards the end of the period 1933-1936 the " question of the number of the Members of the Council will be reconsidered and that all the Members of the League will remain entirely free to propose any final solution of this question which they consider desirable " :

(1) Decides to appoint a committee to undertake the study indicated in the above paragraph, and in connection therewith to examine the proposals contained in the communication from the Chinese Government. The Committee, which shall report to the Council and Assembly, shall be composed of representatives of the following Members of the League : Argentine, Austria, Belgium, United Kingdom, Canada, China, France, Iran, Italy, Latvia, Peru, Poland, Roumania, Turkey, Spain, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ;

(2) Requests the Committee to begin its work as soon as possible and authorises the Secretary-General to inform the Members of the League, at the request of the Committee, of the date at which any proposals which they may wish to make in accordance with the resolution of October 2nd, 1933, quoted above, should be received.

Appendix 2.

LETTER OF MAY 21ST, 1935, FROM THE CHINESE MINISTER IN LONDON ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL.

For the first time in the history of the League, the Council is now without any representation of the Far East. This situation, which has arisen as a result of China's non-election to the Council last September and the withdrawal of Japan from the League, cannot be overstressed. It is deplorable for the real interest of the League, whose strength and influence must lie in the universality of its organisation.

The representation of Asia on the League's Council has always been felt to be inadequate. M. Motta, as Rapporteur and Chairman of the First Committee of the seventh Assembly, already urged that " adequate representation should be given to Asia ". He declared that

" we cannot overlook even this year or—and more particularly—in future years the claims of the enormous populations and the inexhaustible wealth of Asia ". Those remarks have to-day gathered greater cogency by the events of the last few years.

Other considerations also call imperatively for a more active participation of the Far East in the counsels of the nations. The complexity of the present situation there is such as to require the united wisdom of the world's statesmanship. The continued absence of Far-Eastern representation on the Council, not only is a diminution of the League's prestige and influence, but also it constitutes a danger of undermining the solidarity of the whole collective system. Whether the situation be viewed from the constitutional standpoint or as a question of meeting present political exigencies, it is imperative that means be found to provide for China's participation in the Council at the present juncture.

Circumstances have placed China in a position in which she finds herself to be the outpost of the League in the Far East. In the midst of pressing difficulties, China has unswervingly upheld the principles of the Covenant and has strengthened her ties with the League by an extensive scheme of technical collaboration. She hopes and expects that the League, on its part, will recognise her key position in Asia as well as her special relations with the League, by reason of which she puts forward her claim to a place on the Council.

In view of the urgency and justice of the case, I have the honour to request, on behalf of the Chinese Government, that the Council take forthwith practical steps to secure China's representation on the Council.

(*Signed*) Quo Tai-Chi.

Appendix 3.

TEXTS GOVERNING THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL.

Covenant, Article 4, Paragraphs 1, 2 and 2*bis*.

1. The Council shall consist of representatives of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, together with representatives of four other Members of the League. These four Members of the League shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the representatives of the four Members of the League first selected by the Assembly, representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Spain and Greece shall be members of the Council.

2. With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional Members of the League whose representatives shall always be members of the Council ; the Council, with like approval, may increase the number of Members of the League to be selected by the Assembly for representation on the Council.

2*bis*. 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.

Rules of Procedure of the Assembly, Rule 22*a*.

1. The Members whose representatives are to sit on the Council as non-permanent Members of that body shall be selected by the Assembly by secret ballot.

2. Where several seats are to be filled, the election shall be made by voting a list of names. Any ballot-paper containing more names than there are seats to be filled shall be null and void.

3. No Member shall be elected at the first or at the second ballot unless it has obtained at least the absolute majority of the votes. If, after two ballots, there still remain seats to be filled, a third ballot shall be held upon a list consisting of the candidates which obtained most votes at the second ballot, up to a number double that of the seats still to be filled, and those Members shall be elected which obtain the greatest number of votes.

4. If two or more Members obtain the same number of votes and there is not a seat available for each, a special ballot shall be held between them ; if they again obtain an equal number of votes, the President shall decide between them by drawing lots.

Rules dealing with the Election of the Non-Permanent Members of the Council, adopted by the Assembly on September 15th, 1926.

Article I.

The Assembly shall each year, in the course of its ordinary session, elect three non permanent Members of the Council. They shall be elected for a term commencing immediately on their election and ending on the day of the elections held three years later by the Assembly.

Should a non-permanent Member cease to belong to the Council before its term of office expires, its seat shall be filled by a by-election held separately at the session following the occurrence of the vacancy. The term of office of the Member so elected shall end at the date at which the term of office of the Member whose place it takes would have expired.

Article II.

A retiring Member may not be re-elected during the period between the expiration of its term of office and the third election in ordinary session held thereafter, unless the Assembly, either on the expiration of the Member's term of office, or in the course of the said period of three years, shall, by a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast, previously have decided that such Member is re-eligible.

The Assembly shall pronounce separately, by secret ballot, upon each request for re-eligibility. The number of votes cast shall be determined by the total number of voting tickets deposited, deducting blank or spoilt votes.

The Assembly may not decide upon the re-eligibility of a Member except upon a request in writing made by the Member itself. The request must be handed to the President of the Assembly not later than the day before the date fixed for the election ; it shall be submitted to the Assembly, which shall pronounce upon it without referring it to a committee and without debate.

The number of Members re-elected in consequence of having been previously declared re-eligible shall be restricted, so as to prevent the Council from containing at the same time more than three Members thus elected. If the result of the ballot infringes this restriction to three Members, those of the Members affected which have received the smallest number of votes shall not be considered to have been elected.

Article III.

Notwithstanding the above provisions, the Assembly may, at any time, by a two-thirds majority, decide to proceed, in application of Article 4 of the Covenant, to a new election of all the non-permanent Members of the Council. In this case, the Assembly shall determine the rules applicable to the new election.

Article IV. — Temporary Provisions.

(Omitted, as no longer applicable.)

ADDITIONAL RULE ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY ON OCTOBER 2ND, 1933.

No Member of the League shall be eligible to be elected as a non-permanent Member of the Council unless it has proposed itself for election, or been nominated by another Member of the League, at least forty-eight hours before the election, which shall not be held before the seventh day of the Assembly's session.

The notice of the candidature shall be given in writing to the Secretary-General, who shall forthwith bring it to the attention of the Assembly. The Secretary-General shall at the time of the election place before the Assembly a list of the Members which have been duly put forward as candidates.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

[Also distributed as Special Supplement No. 152 to the *Official Journal*.]

Official No.: **A. 6(a).** 1936. Annex I. (V).

Geneva, September 10th, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Annex to the Report[1] on the Work of the League for the Year 1935/36

to the Seventeenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS AND CONVENTIONS

CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

SEVENTEENTH LIST

Note by the Secretary-General.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the report adopted by the Council of the League of Nations during its forty-third session on December 6th, 1926, the Secretary-General has the honour to submit herewith to the Members of the Council a list, in chronological order, of the international agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League. The list shows the States which have become parties to these agreements by ratification or accession or definitive signature; the States which have signed but have not yet ratified them, and, finally, the States which have neither signed nor acceded, although they took part in the conferences at which the agreements were drawn up or have been invited to become parties thereto.

According to the decision taken by the Council at its forty-ninth session on March 6th, 1928, the present list contains in addition the reservations affixed or declarations formulated either in signing or in ratifying or in acceding to the agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The International Labour Conventions and other instruments which concern the International Labour Organisation have been grouped at the end of this document.

---

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Austria, of September 10th, 1919.
2. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Bulgaria, of November 27th, 1919.
3. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Hungary, of June 4th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 187).
4. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey, of July 24th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 11).
5. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Poland, of June 28th, 1919.
6. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Czechoslovakia, of September 10th, 1919.
7. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, of September 10th, 1919.
8. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Roumania, of December 9th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 335).
9. Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, of May 15th, 1922.
10. Declaration by Albania, of October 2nd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 173).
11. Declaration by Finland as to the Aaland Islands, of June 27th, 1921.
12. Declaration by Latvia, of July 7th, 1923.
13. Convention between Bulgaria and Greece respecting Reciprocal Emigration, Neuilly-sur-Seine, November 27th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. I, p. 67).
14. Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, of January 30th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXII, p. 75).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN LIQUOR: Convention relating to the Liquor Traffic in Africa, St.-Germain-en-Laye, September 10th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 11).

(*c*) AERIAL NAVIGATION: Convention relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation, Paris, October 13th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XI, p. 173).

S.d.N. 1.710 (F.) 1.390 (A.) 9/36. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1936. V. 4.

N.B. — States which have signed, ratified or acceded to particular agreements or conventions since the date of the last list submitted to the Council and Assembly (document A.6(*a*).1935.V, Annex, of August 28th, 1935) are indicated in italics.

The letter "*a*" placed immediately after a date signifies an accession.

The letter "*s*" placed immediately after a date signifies a definitive signature.

(*d*) HEALTH:

1. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Roumania, Warsaw, December 20th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XVIII, p. 103).
2. Sanitary Convention between Poland and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Warsaw, February 17th, 1923.
3. Sanitary Convention between Germany and Poland, Dresden, December 18th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 301.)
4. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Czechoslovakia, Warsaw, 1922.
5. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Latvia, Warsaw, July 7th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 317).
6. Sanitary Convention between Estonia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 25th, 1922.
7. Sanitary Convention between Latvia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 24th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 9).
8. Sanitary Convention between Bulgaria and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, April 1923.

(*e*) AALAND ISLANDS: Convention relating to the Non-Fortification and Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands, Geneva, October 20th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 211).

(*f*) UPPER SILESIA: Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, Geneva, May 15th, 1922.

(*g*) FINANCIAL RESTORATION OF AUSTRIA:

1. Protocol No. I (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
2. Protocol No. II and Annexes and Explanatory Note, Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
3. Protocol No. III (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.

(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XII, pp. 385, 391 and 405.)

(*h*) SAAR: Protocol between the German Government and the Governing Commission of the Territory of the Saar Basin, Berlin, June 3rd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 189).

(*i*) DANZIG:

1. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).
2. Treaty between Germany and Poland concerning the Regulation of Option Questions, Danzig, November 8th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 323).
3. Treaty between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Warsaw, October 24th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXVI).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1924 (A.8(*a*).1924, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) MINORITIES:

1. Declaration concerning the Protection of Minorities in Lithuania, Geneva, May 12th, 1923.
2. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, signed at Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN ARMS: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva, September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*c*) REVISION OF BERLIN AND BRUSSELS ACTS RELATING TO AFRICAN TERRITORIES: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva on September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*d*) REFUGEES:

1. Arrangement with regard to the Issue of Certificates of Identity to Russian Refugees, Geneva, July 5th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XIII, p. 237).
2. Protocol relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 29).
3. Declaration relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 41).

(*e*) FINANCIAL RECONSTRUCTION OF HUNGARY: Protocols on the Financial Reconstruction of Hungary, March 14th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, pp. 423 and 427).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1925 (A.7(*a*).1925, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Proposal relating to the Protection of Greek Minorities in Bulgaria.
2. Proposal relating to the Protection of Bulgarian Minorities in Greece (Geneva, September 29th, 1924) (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 117 and 123).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) CURRENCY AND BANKING REFORM:

1. Protocol regarding Currency and Banking Reform in Estonia, signed at Geneva, December 10th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXII, p. 277).
2. Protocol regarding the Bulgarian Stabilisation Loan, signed at Geneva, March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 165).
3. Additional Act to the Protocol of March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 210).
4. Protocol for the stabilisation of the currency and liquidating the budget arrears of the Hellenic State and for further settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 15th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 9).
5. Declaration concerning the above Protocol on behalf of France, Great Britain and Italy, signed at Geneva, December 8th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 73).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

(*c*) REFUGEES:

1. Additional Act to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, relating to the Settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 19th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 413).
2. Declaration relating to the modifications made to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, with regard to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece, by the Additional Act of September 19th, 1924, Geneva, September 25th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 421).
3. Protocol concerning the Settlement of Refugees in Bulgaria, signed at Geneva, September 8th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 245).
4. Arrangement relating to the issue of identity certificates to Russian and Armenian Refugees, supplementing and amending the previous Arrangements dated July 5th, 1922, and May 31st, 1924, signed at Geneva, May 12th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 47).
5. Arrangement concerning the legal status of Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 53).
6. Arrangement concerning the extension to other categories of Refugees of certain measures taken to assist Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 63).
7. Agreement concerning the functions of the representatives of the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 377).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1931 (A.6(*a*).1931, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) REFUGEES:

Convention between the Hellenic Government and the Refugee Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, January 24th, 1930 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CVIII, p. 349).

(*b*) CONCERTED ECONOMIC ACTION:

1. Commercial Convention and Protocol, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.
2. Protocol regarding the Programme of Future Negotiations, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1933 (A.6(*a*).1933, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) ROUMANIA:

Agreement establishing technical advisory co-operation in Roumania, signed at Geneva, January 28th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 271).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Agreement between Colombia and Peru relating to the procedure for putting into effect the recommendations proposed by the Council of the League of Nations in the report which it adopted on March 18th, 1933, in order to avoid any incident that might aggravate the relations between the two countries, with Annexes, signed at Geneva, May 25th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 251).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1934 (A.6(*a*).1934, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) AUSTRIA:

Austrian Protocol, signed at Geneva, July 15th, 1932 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 285, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 469; and Vol. CXLII, p. 392).

(*b*) ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS.

International Convention for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927.

Protocol of the above Convention, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927.

Supplementary Agreement to the Convention of November 8th, 1927, for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.

Protocol of the Supplementary Agreement, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.

(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCVII, p. 391; Vol. C, p. 264; Vol. CVII, p. 538; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 411; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 447; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 336.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT.
Chapter XXXI.

Creation of an International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Company (Convention for the), with Charter and Statutes. Geneva, May 21st, 1931 92

ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.
Chapters VI and XVI.

Awards (Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral). Geneva, September 26th, 1927 52
Clauses (Protocol on Arbitration). Geneva, September 24th, 1923 28

ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR (SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN).
Chapter XI.

Gases (asphyxiating, poisonous and other), and Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 45
Ifni (Declaration regarding the Territory of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925. 45
Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War (Convention for the). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 44

ASSISTANCE (FINANCIAL).
Chapter XXV.

Assistance (Convention on Financial). Geneva, October 2nd, 1930 80

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES (UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON).
Chapters XXIV and XXIX.

Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930. 77
Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931. 87
Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 78
Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 88
Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 76
Uniform Law for Cheques (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 85

COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY (SUPPRESSION OF).
Chapter XX.

Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency (International Convention for the). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 . 67
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, April 20th, 1929 68
Protocol (Optional). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 68

COURT (PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE).
Chapters I and XXII.

Accession of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Protocol relating to the). Geneva, September 14th, 1929 70
Court (Protocol of Signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice). Geneva, December 16th, 1920. 9
Clause (Optional). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 10
Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Protocol concerning the). Geneva, September 14th, 1929 69

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (AMENDMENTS TO THE).
Chapters IV, IX and XII.

Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Third paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 23
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). First paragraph amended. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. . 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). Third and fourth paragraphs of Article 26 amended, replacing the original second paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. 25
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, September 27th, 1924 38
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph of the original text. Geneva, September 21st, 1925 48

CUSTOMS.
Chapter VII.

Simplification of Customs Formalities (International Convention relating to the), and Protocol. Geneva, November 3rd, 1923. 30

DANUBE (DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE).
Chapter XXVII.

Declaration by the Governments of the Powers which are Parties to the Convention instituting the Definitive Statute of the Danube. Geneva, December 5th, 1930 83

Page

DISPUTES (PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XVIII.
General Act. Geneva, September 26th, 1928 57

ELECTRIC (QUESTIONS).
Chapter VIII.
Electric Power (Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 35
Hydraulic Power affecting more than one State (Convention relating to the Development of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 37

EMIGRANTS (TRANSIT CARD FOR).
Chapter XXI.
Preparation of a Transit Card for Emigrants (Agreement concerning the). Geneva, June 14th, 1929 . . 69

EXPORTATION.
Chapter XVII.
Bones (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 55
Protocol to the International Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928. 56
Hides and Skins (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 . 53
Protocol to the International Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928. 54

FILMS (OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER).
Chapter XXXVII.
International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character (Convention for facilitating the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 101

LAW (PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XXIII.
Conflict of Nationality Laws (Convention on Certain Questions relating to the). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 71
Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality (Protocol relating to). The Hague, April 12th, 1930. 73
Statelessness (Protocol relating to a Certain Case of). The Hague, April 12th, 1930. 74
Statelessness (Special Protocol concerning). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 75

NAVIGATION (INLAND).
Chapters II, XIII and XXVIII.
Collisions in Inland Navigation (Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules concerning), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 83
Flag (Convention on Administrative Measures for attesting the Right of Inland Navigation Vessels to a), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930. 84
Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation (Convention regarding the), and Protocol of Signature. Paris, November 27th, 1925 48
Registration of Inland Navigation Vessels, Rights *in rem* over Such Vessels and Other Cognate Questions (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 84
Waterways of International Concern (Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 16
Waterways of International Concern (Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 17

NAVIGATION (MARITIME).
Chapters II, VIII, XXVI and XLI.
Buoyage (Agreement for a Uniform System of Maritime), and Rules annexed thereto. Geneva, May 13th, 1936. 108
Flag (Declaration recognising the right to a) of States having no Sea-coast. Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 19
Lightships (Manned) not on their Stations (Agreement concerning). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 82
Maritime Ports (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 33
Signals (Agreement concerning Maritime). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 81

OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS (TRAFFIC IN).
Chapters X, XXXII, XXXV, XLII and XLIII.
Drugs (Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous). Geneva, June 26th, 1936. 109
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, June 26th, 1936 110
Narcotic Drugs (Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, July 13th, 1931 93
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, July 13th, 1931 96
Narcotic Drugs (Procès-verbal to alter the latest date of issue of the annual statement of the estimated world requirements of dangerous drugs, drawn up by the Supervisory Body, as provided for by the International Convention of July 13th, 1931, for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, June 26th, 1936 111
Opium Convention (International). The Hague, January 23rd, 1912. 39
Opium (Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of Prepared), Protocol and Final Act. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 11th, 1925 40
Opium Convention (International). Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 41
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 43
Smoking (Agreement for the Suppression of Opium). Bangkok, November 27th, 1931 100

PUBLICATIONS (OBSCENE).
Chapter V.
Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications (International Convention for the). Geneva, September 12th, 1923 26

Page

RAILWAYS.
Chapter VIII.
Railways (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 31

RELIEF UNION (INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XV.
Relief Union (Convention and Statute establishing an International). Geneva, July 12th, 1927 51

REFUGEES.
Chapter XXXIX and XLIV.
International Status of Refugees (Convention relating to the). Geneva, October 28th, 1933 103
Status of Refugees coming from Germany (Provisional Arrangement concerning the). Geneva, July 4th, 1936. 112

ROAD TRAFFIC.
Chapter XXX.
Signals (Convention concerning the Unification of Road). Geneva, March 30th, 1931 89
Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, March 30th, 1931 90
Triptychs (Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost). Geneva, March 28th, 1931. 91

SLAVERY.
Chapter XIV.
Slavery Convention. Geneva, September 25th, 1926 49

STATISTICS (ECONOMIC).
Chapter XIX.
Statistics (International Convention relating to Economic). Geneva, December 14th, 1928 64
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, December 14th, 1928 66

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.
Chapters III and XXXVIII.
Traffic in Women and Children (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, September 30th, 1921 19
Traffic in Women of Full Age (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 102

TRANSIT.
Chapter II.
Freedom of Transit (Convention and Statute on). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 15

VETERINARY (QUESTIONS).
Chapter XL.
Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals (International Convention for the), with Declaration attached. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 105
Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products) (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 107
Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 106

WAR (MEANS OF PREVENTING).
Chapter XXXIV.
Means of preventing War (General Convention to improve the). Geneva, September 26th, 1931 99

WHALING.
Chapter XXXIII.
Regulation of Whaling (Convention for the). Geneva, September 24th, 1931 98

WHEAT.
Chapter XXXVI.
Final Act of the Conference of Wheat Exporting and Importing Countries, with Appendices and Minutes of Final Meeting. London, August 25th, 1933 100

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) adopted as Draft Conventions by the International Labour Conference at its various Sessions.
Chapter XLV.

(*a*) First Session (Washington, October 29th-November 29th, 1919):
Age for admission of children to industrial employment (Convention fixing the minimum) 115
Employment of Women before and after childbirth (Convention concerning the) 114
Hours of work in industrial undertakings (Convention limiting the) to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week 113
Night (Convention concerning the employment of women during the) 114
Night Work of young persons employed in Industry (Convention concerning the) 115
Unemployment (Convention concerning) 113

(*b*) Second Session (Genoa, June 15th-July 10th, 1920):
Age for admission of children to employment at sea (Convention fixing the minimum) 116
Employment for seamen (Convention for establishing facilities for finding) 117
Unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship (Convention concerning) 116

(*c*) Third Session (Geneva, October 25th-November 19th, 1921):
Age for admission of children to employment in agriculture (Convention concerning the) 117
Age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers and stokers (Convention fixing the minimum) 120

Page

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) *(continued)*.

Association and combination of agricultural workers (Convention concerning the rights of) 118
Compensation in agriculture (Convention concerning workmen's) 118
Medical Examination of children and young persons employed at sea (Convention concerning the compulsory) 120
Weekly rest in Industrial Undertakings (Convention concerning the application of the) 119
White Lead in painting (Convention concerning the use of) 119

(*d*) Seventh Session (Geneva, May 19th-June 10th, 1925):

Accidents (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for) 121
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational) 121
Equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents (Convention concerning) 122
Night work in Bakeries (Convention concerning) 122

(*e*) Eighth Session (Geneva, May 26th-June 5th, 1926):

Simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship (Convention concerning the) 122

(*f*) Ninth Session (Geneva, June 7th-24th, 1926):

Articles of Agreement (Convention concerning Seamen's) 123
Repatriation of seamen (Convention concerning the) 123

(*g*) Tenth Session (Geneva, May 25th-June 16th, 1927):

Sickness insurance for agricultural workers (Convention concerning) 124
Sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants (Convention concerning) 124

(*h*) Eleventh Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 16th, 1928):

Minimum-wage-fixing machinery (Convention concerning the creation of) 124

(*i*) Twelfth Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 21st, 1929):

Heavy Packages transported by vessels (Convention concerning the marking of the weight on) . . 125
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the) 125

(*j*) Fourteenth Session (Geneva, June 10th-28th, 1930):

Forced or compulsory labour (Convention concerning) 126
Hours of work in commerce and offices (Convention concerning the regulation of) 127

(*k*) Fifteenth Session (Geneva, May 28th-June 18th, 1931):

Hours of work in coal-mines (Convention limiting) 127

(*l*) Sixteenth Session (Geneva, April 12th-30th, 1932):

Age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (Convention concerning the) 127
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the). Revised 1932 127

(*m*) Seventeenth Session (Geneva, June 8th-30th, 1933):

Agencies (Convention concerning fee-charging employment) 127
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity). 128
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity) 128
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 128
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 128
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans'). 128
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans') 128

(*n*) Eighteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-23rd, 1934):

Automatic sheet-glass works (Convention for the regulation of hours of work in) 129
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational). Revised 1934 . . . 129
Night (Convention concerning employment of women during the). Revised 1934 128
Unemployed (Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily) 129

(*o*) Nineteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-25th, 1935):

Hours of work (Convention concerning the reduction of) to forty a week 129
Hours of work in coal mines (Convention limiting). Revised 1935 129
Hours of work in glass-bottle works (Convention concerning the reduction of) 130
Employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (Convention concerning the) . . 129
Scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance (Convention concerning the establishment of an international) 130

(*p*) Twentieth Session (Geneva, June 4th-24th, 1936):

Holidays with pay (Convention concerning annual) 130
Reduction of hours of work on public works (Convention concerning the) 130
Regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers (Convention concerning the) 130

LABOUR PART OF THE TREATIES OF PEACE (AMENDMENTS TO THE).
Chapter XLVI.

Amendment to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles and to the Corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace, adopted at the fourth session of the International Labour Conference. Geneva, November 2nd, 1922 131
Protocol relative to the above Amendment, opened for signature at Geneva on June 14th, 1923 131

I. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

1. PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[1]

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 4th, 1921)
ALBANIA (July 13th, 1921)
AUSTRALIA (August 4th, 1921)
AUSTRIA (July 23rd, 1921)
BELGIUM (August 29th, 1921)
Bolivia (July 7th, 1936)
BRAZIL (November 1st, 1921)
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 4th, 1921)
BULGARIA (August 12th, 1921)
CANADA (August 4th, 1921)
CHILE (July 20th, 1928)
CHINA (May 13th, 1922)
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA (January 12th, 1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 2nd, 1921)
DENMARK (June 13th, 1921)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (May 2nd, 1923)
ETHIOPIA (July 16th, 1926)
FINLAND (April 6th, 1922)
FRANCE (August 7th, 1921)
GERMANY (March 11th, 1927)
GREECE (October 3rd, 1921)
HAITI (September 7th, 1921)
HUNGARY (November 20th, 1925)
INDIA (August 4th, 1921)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY (June 20th, 1921)
JAPAN (November 16th, 1921)
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)
LITHUANIA (May 16th, 1922)
LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS (August 6th, 1921)
NEW ZEALAND (August 4th, 1921)
NORWAY (August 20th, 1921)
PANAMA (June 14th, 1929)
PARAGUAY (May 11th, 1933)
PERU (March 29th, 1932)
POLAND (August 26th, 1921)
PORTUGAL (October 8th, 1921)
ROUMANIA (August 8th, 1921)
SALVADOR (August 29th, 1930)
SIAM (February 27th, 1922)
SPAIN (August 30th, 1921)
SWEDEN (February 21st, 1921)
SWITZERLAND (July 25th, 1921)
URUGUAY (September 27th, 1921)
VENEZUELA (December 2nd, 1921)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 12th, 1921)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Argentine Republic
COSTA RICA
GUATEMALA
LIBERIA
NICARAGUA
Turkey

Other Members or States which may sign the Protocol

AFGHANISTAN
SA'UDI ARABIA
ECUADOR
HONDURAS
IRAQ
MEXICO
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VI, p. 379; Vol. XI, p. 404; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XXIV, p. 152; Vol. XXVII, p. 416; Vol. XXXIX, p. 165; Vol. XLV, p. 96; Vol. L, p. 159; Vol. LIV, p. 387; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 435; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 272; Vol. XCII, p. 362; Vol. XCVI, p. 180; Vol. C, p. 153; Vol. CIV, p. 492; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXI, p. 402; Vol. CXVII, p. 46; Vol. CXXVI, p. 430; Vol. CXXX, p. 440; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 392; Vol. CXLVII, p. 318; Vol. CLII, p. 282; Vol. CLVI, p. 176; and Vol. CLX, p. 325.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Final Act of the Conference of States signatories of the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Geneva, September 23rd, 1926.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (April 7th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

**Albania* (November 7th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years as from September 17th, 1935, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 of the Statute arising after September 17th, 1930 (the date of the previous acceptance of Albania which is being renewed by the present declaration), with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, other than:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Albania;

(*b*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Albania;

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Argentine Republic

Reciprocity, 10 years, from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration does not apply:

(1) To questions already settled;

(2) To questions which, by international law, fall within the local jurisdiction or the constitutional regime of each State.

Costa Rica

Reciprocity.

Czechoslovakia

Reciprocity, 10 years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement, and subject to the right, for either of the parties to the dispute, to submit the dispute, before any recourse to the Court, to the Council of the League of Nations.

Denmark

Reciprocity, 10 years as from June 13th, 1936.

Guatemala

Reciprocity.

Liberia

Reciprocity.

Nicaragua

Unconditional.

Poland

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any future disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to such ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of peaceful settlement.

The present declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) With regard to matters which, by international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; or,

(2) Arising between Poland and States which refuse to establish or maintain normal diplomatic relations with Poland; or,

(3) Connected directly or indirectly with the world war or with the Polono-Sovietic war; or,

Other Members or States which may sign the Clause.

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Brazil
Chile
China
Cuba
Ecuador
Honduras
Iraq
Italy
Japan
Mexico
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

(c) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by the Kingdom of Albania and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

AUSTRALIA (August 18th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

AUSTRIA (March 13th, 1927)

Reciprocity, 10 years.

BELGIUM (March 10th, 1926)

Reciprocity, 15 years, in any disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

(4) Resulting directly or indirectly from the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed at Riga, on March 18th, 1921; or,

(5) Relating to provisions of internal law connected with points (3) and (4).

Turkey

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 arising after the signature of the present declaration, with the exception of disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions concluded by Turkey and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Bolivia (July 7th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 10 years.

United Kingdom (February 5th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Bulgaria (August 12th, 1921)
Reciprocity.

Canada (July 28th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to said ratification, other than:

Disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in Canada reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Colombia (January 6th, 1932)
Reciprocity.

Dominican Republic (February 4th, 1933)
Reciprocity.

*Estonia (May 2nd, 1928)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in any future dispute in respect of which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*Ethiopia (September 18th, 1934)
Reciprocity, 2 years, as from September 18th, 1934, with retroactive effect covering the period comprised between July 16th, 1933, and this date, excepting future disputes in respect of which the parties should have agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*Finland (April 6th, 1927)
Reciprocity, 10 years.

**France* (April 11th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 5 years, as from April 25th, 1936, in any disputes arising with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the engagement assumed by France, and which could not have been settled by a procedure of conciliation or by the Council according to the terms of Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant, with reservation as to the case where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

GERMANY (July 5th, 1933)

Reciprocity, 5 years, from March 1st, 1933, as regards disputes which might have arisen after February 29th, 1928, date of the ratification of the declaration made on this subject at Geneva on September 23rd, 1927, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification. Cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement are excepted.

*GREECE (July 19th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years, as from September 12th, 1934.

For the classes of disputes mentioned in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication;

(*b*) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Greece and providing for another procedure.

This acceptance is effective as from the date of signature of the present declaration.

*HAITI (September 7th, 1921)

Unconditional.

HUNGARY (August 9th, 1934)

Reciprocity, 5 years, with effect as from August 13th, 1934.

INDIA (February 5th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of India,

And subject to the condition that the Government of India reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

IRAN (September 19th, 1932)

Reciprocity in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations of facts relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Iran and subsequent to the ratification of this declaration, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Iran, including those concerning the rights of sovereignty of Iran over its islands and ports;

(*b*) Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*c*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Persia.

However, the Imperial Government of Iran reserves the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

The present declaration is made for a period of six years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effects until notification is given of its abrogation.

IRISH FREE STATE (July 11th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 20 years.

LATVIA (February 26th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years, over all disputes which might have arisen after February 26th, 1930, date of deposit of the ratification of the declaration made at Geneva on September 10th, 1929, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration is made for a period of five years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effect until notification is given of its abrogation.

*LITHUANIA (January 14th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)

Reciprocity, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

**The Netherlands* (August 5th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from August 6th, 1936, in any future disputes, excepting those in regard to which the parties would have agreed after the coming into force of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

New Zealand (March 29th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of New Zealand,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in New Zealand reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

**Norway* (May 29th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from October 3rd, 1936.

*Panama (June 14th, 1929)

Reciprocity.

*Paraguay (May 11th, 1933)

Unconditional.

Peru (March 29th, 1932)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any dispute arising with regard to situations and facts subsequent to ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed either to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration, or to submit the dispute previously to the Council of the League of Nations.

*Portugal (October 8th, 1921)

Reciprocity.

**Roumania* (June 4th, 1936)

Renewal for 5 years, as from June 9th, 1936, of the declaration of October 4th, 1930, within the limits and subject to the conditions and reservations laid down in the said declaration.

The declaration of October 4th, 1930, read as follows:

" Reciprocity, 5 years, in respect of the Governments recognised by Roumania and on condition of reciprocity in regard to legal disputes arising out of situations or facts subsequent to the ratification by the Roumanian Parliament of this accession and with the exception of matters for which a special procedure has been or may be established and subject to the right of Roumania to submit the dispute to the Council of the League of Nations before having recourse to the Court.

" The following are, however, excepted:

"(*a*) Any question of substance or of procedure which might directly or indirectly cause the existing territorial integrity of Roumania and her sovereign rights, including her rights over her ports and communications, to be brought into question;

"(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which, according to international law, fall under the domestic jurisdiction of Roumania."

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Salvador (August 29th, 1930)
The provisions of this Statute do not apply to any disputes or differences concerning points or questions which cannot be submitted to arbitration in accordance with the political Constitution of this Republic.
The provisions of this Statute also do not apply to disputes which arose before that date or to pecuniary claims made against the Nation, it being further understood that Article 36 binds Salvador only in regard to States which accept the arbitration in that form.

Siam (May 7th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in all disputes as to which no other means of pacific settlement is agreed upon between the parties.

*Spain (September 21st, 1928)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

**Sweden* (April 18th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 10 years, as from August 16th, 1936.

*Uruguay (September 27th, 1921)
Reciprocity.

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

1. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (November 15th, 1923)	China	Union of South Africa
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	Ethiopia (*a*)	Argentine Republic
British Empire, including	Guatemala	Australia
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)	Lithuania	Brazil
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.	Panama	Canada
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	Peru (*a*)	Colombia
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	Portugal	Costa Rica
Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)	Uruguay	Cuba
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)		Dominican Republic
India (August 2nd, 1922)		Ecuador
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Irish Free State
		Liberia
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Paraguay
		Salvador
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

1 This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 11; Vol. XI, p. 407; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XIX, p. 279; Vol. XXIV, p. 155; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 166; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 181; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393; and Vol. CXLII, p. 340.

1. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON FREEDOM OF TRANSIT *(continued)*.
(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BULGARIA (July 11th, 1922)
CHILE (March 19th, 1928)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 29th, 1923)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 3rd, 1925 *a*)
DENMARK (November 13th, 1922)
ESTONIA (June 6th, 1925)
FINLAND (January 29th, 1923)
FRANCE (September 19th, 1924)
SYRIA AND LEBANON (French Mandate) (February 7th, 1929 *a*)
GERMANY (April 9th, 1924 *a*)
GREECE (February 18th, 1924)
HUNGARY (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
IRAN (January 29th, 1931)
IRAQ (March 1st, 1930 *a*)
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)
JAPAN (February 20th, 1924)
LATVIA (September 29th, 1923)
LUXEMBURG (March 19th, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (April 17th, 1924)
NORWAY (September 4th, 1923)
POLAND (October 8th, 1924)
ROUMANIA (September 5th, 1923)
SIAM (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
SPAIN (December 17th, 1929)
SWEDEN (January 19th, 1925)
SWITZERLAND (July 14th, 1924)
TURKEY (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)

2. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.[1]
(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

ALBANIA (October 8th, 1921)
AUSTRIA (November 15th, 1923)
BRITISH EMPIRE, including NEWFOUNDLAND (August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (August 2nd, 1922)
INDIA (August 2nd, 1922)
BULGARIA (July 11th, 1922)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
BOLIVIA
CHINA
COLOMBIA *(a)*
ESTONIA
GUATEMALA
LITHUANIA
PANAMA
PERU *(a)*
POLAND
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GERMANY
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR

[1] This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 35; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 306; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. XCVI, p. 182; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393.

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Chile (March 19th, 1928)	Switzerland
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)	Venezuela
Finland (January 29th, 1923)	Yugoslavia
France (December 31st, 1926)	
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)	
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)	
Italy (August 5th, 1922)	
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)	
Norway (September 4th, 1923)	
Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*) In so far as its provisions are not in conflict with the principles of the new Danube Statute drawn up by the International Commission which was appointed in accordance with Articles 349 of the Treaty of Versailles, 304 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, 232 of the Treaty of Neuilly and 288 of the Treaty of Trianon.	
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)	
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)	
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)	

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Belgium Accepting paragraph (*a*).	Afghanistan
Austria (November 15th, 1923 *a*) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.	Peru *(a)*	Union of South Africa
British Empire (August 2nd, 1922) In respect of the United Kingdom only accepting paragraph (*a*).	Portugal	Argentine Republic
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).	Spain Accepting paragraph (*a*).	Australia
Nyasaland Protectorate and Tanganyika Territory (August 2nd, 1922) To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*b*).		Bolivia
Bahamas Barbados British Guiana Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands) Leeward Islands Trinidad and Tobago Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent) Gibraltar Malta (August 2nd, 1922 *a*.) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).		Brazil
		Bulgaria
		Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		France
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Mexico
		The Netherlands

[1] The Convention being in force, this Protocol became operative after it had been ratified by two Powers See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 65; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 437; Vol. XCVI, p. 182; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394.

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Cyprus
Gambia Colony and Protectorate
Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate
Nigeria Colony and Protectorate
Gold Coast: Ashanti and northern territories of the Gold Coast
Kenya Colony and Protectorate
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar
St. Helena
Ceylon
Mauritius
Seychelles
Hong-Kong
Straits Settlements
Fiji
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
British Solomon Islands
Tonga Islands

(August 2nd, 1922 *a*.) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Federated Malay States:
Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Non-Federated Malay States:
Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.

Bermuda (December 27th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

India (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of India only accepting paragraph (*a*).

Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Finland (January 29th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Greece (January 3rd, 1928)

Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
Is unable to accept any restriction of her liberty in administrative matters on the waterways which are not of international concern, that is to say, on purely national rivers, while at the same time accepting the principles of liberty in accordance with the laws of the country.

Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Sweden (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Poland
Salvador
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

4. Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Declaration is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (July 10th, 1924)	China	Argentine Republic
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	Guatemala	Brazil
British Empire, including Newfoundland (October 9th, 1922)	Iran	Colombia
Canada (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Lithuania	Costa Rica
Australia (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Panama	Cuba
Union of South Africa (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Peru	Dominican Republic
New Zealand (October 9th, 1922)	Portugal	Ecuador
India (October 9th, 1922)	Uruguay	Ethiopia
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)		Haiti
Chile (March 19th, 1928)		Honduras
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)		Irish Free State
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (January 10th, 1933 *a*)		Liberia
Denmark (Nov. 13th, 1922)		Luxemburg
*Estonia		Nicaragua
Finland (September 22nd, 1922 *a*)		Paraguay
*France		Salvador
Germany (Nov. 10th, 1931 *a*)		Venezuela
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)		
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)		
Iraq (April 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*Italy		
Japan (February 20th, 1924)		
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)		
Mexico (October 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (November 28th, 1921)		
Norway (September 4th, 1923)		
Poland (December 20th, 1924)		
Roumania (Feb. 22nd, 1923 *a*)		
Siam (November 29th, 1922)		
Spain (July 1st, 1929)		
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)		
*Switzerland		
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)		
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (May 16th, 1935 *a*)		
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)		

III. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.[2]

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children.[3]

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935 *a*)	Costa Rica	United States of America
Albania (October 13th, 1924)	Panama *(a)*	Sa'udi Arabia
	Peru *(a)*	Argentine Republic

* Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 73; Vol. XI, p. 411; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 281; Vol. XXIV, p. 159; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 72; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 283; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 183; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; Vol. CXXX, p. 441; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394; and Vol. CLVI, p. 177.

[2] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, details concerning:

1. The Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 18th, 1904.
2. The Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 4th, 1910.

[3] "The present Convention shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date of the deposit of its ratification or act of accession" (Article 11). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXVII, p. 419; Vol. XXXV, p. 301; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol. XLV, p. 99; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIV, p. 388; Vol. LXIII, p. 378; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p 367; Vol. C, p. 156; Vol. CVII, p. 462; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 49; Vol. CXXII, p. 322; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 399; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 417; Vol. CXLVII, p. 319; Vol. CLVI, p. 182; and Vol. CLX, p. 330.

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued).*

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions:

Austria (August 9th, 1922)
Belgium (June 15th, 1922)
Brazil (August 18th, 1933)
British Empire (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the Island of Newfoundland, the British Colonies and Protectorates, the Island of Nauru, or any territories administered under mandates by Great Britain.

(September 18th, 1922 *a*):
Bahamas,
Trinidad and Tobago
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate),
Nyasaland,
Ceylon,
Hong-Kong,
Straits Settlements,
Gibraltar,
Malta,
Cyprus,
Southern Rhodesia,
Barbados,
Grenada,
St. Lucia,
St. Vincent,
Seychelles,
Northern Rhodesia,
British Honduras

British Guiana and Fiji (October 24th, 1922 *a*)
Leeward Islands (March 7th, 1924 *a*)
Jamaica and Mauritius (March 7th, 1924 *a*)
Falkland Islands and Dependencies (May 8th, 1924 *a*)
Gold Coast Colony (July 3rd, 1924 *a*)
Iraq (May 15th, 1925 *a*)
The Government of Iraq desire to reserve to themselves the right to fix an age-limit lower than that specified in Article 5 of the Convention.
Colony of Sierra Leone (November 16th, 1927 *a*)

(April 10th, 1931 *a*):
Colony and Protectorate of Gambia
Protectorate of Uganda
Territory of Tanganyika

(November 2nd, 1931 *a*):
Palestine (including Trans-Jordan)
Protected State of Sarawak
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Zanzibar Protectorate (January 14th, 1932 *a*)

Canada (June 28th, 1922)
Australia (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territory of New Guinea.

September 2nd, 1936:
Papua
Norfolk Island
New Guinea
Nauru

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Bolivia
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Paraguay
San Marino
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (June 28th, 1922)

NEW ZEALAND (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

IRISH FREE STATE (May 18th, 1934 *a*)

INDIA (June 28th, 1922)
Reserves the right at its discretion to substitute the age of sixteen years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limits prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and in Article 5 of the present Convention.

BULGARIA (April 29th, 1925 *a*)

CHILE (January 15th, 1929)

CHINA (February 24th, 1926)

COLOMBIA (November 8th, 1934)

CUBA (May 7th, 1923)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 29th, 1923)

DENMARK (April 23rd, 1931 *a*)[1]
This ratification does not include Greenland, the Convention, in view of the special circumstances, being of no interest for that possession.

EGYPT (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

ESTONIA (February 28th, 1930)

FINLAND (August 16th, 1926 *a*)

FRANCE (March 1st, 1926 *a*)
Does not include the French Colonies, the countries in the French Protectorate or the territories under French mandate.

SYRIA AND LEBANON (June 2nd, 1930 *a*)

GERMANY (July 8th, 1924)

GREECE (April 9th, 1923)

HUNGARY (April 25th, 1925)

IRAN (March 28th, 1933)

ITALY (June 30th, 1924)

ITALIAN COLONIES (July 27th, 1922 *a*)
Subject to the age-limit for native women and children, referred to in Article 5, being reduced from twenty-one to sixteen years.

JAPAN (December 15th, 1925)
Does not include Chosen, Taiwan, the leased Territory of Kwantung, the Japanese portion of Saghalien Island and Japan's mandated territory in the South Seas.

LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)

LITHUANIA (September 14th, 1931)

LUXEMBURG (December 31st, 1929 *a*)

MEXICO (May 10th, 1932 *a*)

MONACO (July 18th, 1931 *a*)

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 19th, 1923)

Nicaragua (December 12th, 1935 *a*)

NORWAY (August 16th, 1922)

POLAND and FREE CITY OF DANZIG (October 8th, 1924)

PORTUGAL (December 1st, 1923)

ROUMANIA (September 5th, 1923)

SIAM (July 13th, 1922)
With reservation as to the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of 1910 and Article 5 of this Convention, in so far as concerns the nationals of Siam.

SPAIN (May 12th, 1924 *a*)
Does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

SUDAN (June 1st, 1932 *a*)

SWEDEN (June 9th, 1925)

SWITZERLAND (January 20th, 1926)

URUGUAY (October 21st, 1924 *a*)

YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929 *a*)

---

[1] According to a reservation made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE.[1]

(Geneva, October 5th, 1921.)

9. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.[2]

(First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th,1924)	COSTA RICA	ALBANIA
AUSTRIA (August 29th, 1927)	CUBA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	HAITI	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (August 13th, 1924)	LIBERIA	ECUADOR
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	PANAMA	ETHIOPIA
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	PARAGUAY	FRANCE
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PERU	GERMANY
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	VENEZUELA	GUATEMALA
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)		HONDURAS
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		IRAN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)		IRAQ
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)		IRISH FREE STATE
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)		LUXEMBURG
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)		MEXICO
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)		NICARAGUA
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)		POLAND
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)		SALVADOR
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)		SPAIN
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923)		TURKEY
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)		YUGOSLAVIA
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th,1923)		
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)		
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)		
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)		
ROUMANIA (September 5th, 1923)		
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)		
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)		
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)		
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)		

10. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th, 1924)	COSTA RICA	ALBANIA
AUSTRIA (August 29th, 1927)	CUBA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	HAITI	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (August 13th, 1924)	LIBERIA	ECUADOR
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	PANAMA	ETHIOPIA
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	PARAGUAY	FRANCE
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PERU	GERMANY
	VENEZUELA	GUATEMALA
		HONDURAS

---

[1] Article 26 of the Covenant provides: " Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Assembly ".

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (document A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the amendments to Articles 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 of the Covenant. These amendments being now in force, no reference is made to them in the present document.

[2] The Assembly adopted at its fifth ordinary session (1924) a resolution according to which it is no longer opportune to ratify the first amendment to Article 16 of the Covenant adopted in 1921. As a consequence of this resolution, the first amendment to Article 16 adopted by the Assembly at its second ordinary session does not appear in the present report. See under No. IX the new amendment adopted in 1924.

10. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16 *(continued)*.
(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	IRAN
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)	IRAQ
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)	IRISH FREE STATE
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)	LUXEMBURG
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)	MEXICO
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)	NICARAGUA
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)	POLAND
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)	SALVADOR
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)	SPAIN
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)	TURKEY
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923).	YUGOSLAVIA
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)	
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)	
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th, 1923)	
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)	
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)	
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)	
ROUMANIA (Sept. 5th, 1923)	
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)	
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)	
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)	
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)	

11. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.
(Third paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRIA (August 29th, 1927)	COSTA RICA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	CUBA	ECUADOR
BRAZIL (July 7th, 1923)	HAITI	ETHIOPIA
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	LATVIA	FRANCE
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	LIBERIA	GERMANY
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PANAMA	GUATEMALA
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	PARAGUAY	HONDURAS
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)	PERU	IRAN
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)	VENEZUELA	IRAQ
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)		IRISH FREE STATE
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)		LUXEMBURG
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)		MEXICO
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)		NICARAGUA
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)		POLAND
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)		SALVADOR
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)		SPAIN
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)		TURKEY
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923)		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)		YUGOSLAVIA
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th, 1923)		
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)		
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)		
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)		
ROUMANIA (Sept. 5th, 1923)		
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)		
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)		
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)		
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)		

12. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(First paragraph amended.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (Febr. 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26 *(continued)*.

(New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

14. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(Third and fourth paragraphs of Article 26 amended, replacing the original second paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (September 28th, 1923)
Brazil (July 7th, 1923)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

V. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications. [1]

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 13th, 1924)	Costa Rica	Afghanistan
Austria (January 12th, 1925)	France	United States of America
Belgium (July 31st, 1926)	Haiti	Sa'udi Arabia
Includes also the Belgian Congo and the mandated territory of Ruanda-Urundi.	Honduras	Argentine Republic
Brazil (September 19th, 1931)	Lithuania	Bolivia
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (December 11th, 1925)	Panama	Chile
Does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions, Protectorates or Territories under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority.	Peru *(a)*	Dominican Republic
Newfoundland (December 31st, 1925 *a*)	Salvador	Ecuador
Southern Rhodesia (December 31st, 1935 *a*)	Uruguay	Ethiopia
Nigeria: (November 3rd, 1926 *a*)		Iceland
(a) Colony		Liberia
(b) Protectorate		Liechtenstein
(c) Cameroons under British Mandate.		Mexico
Seychelles		Nicaragua
British Honduras		Sweden
Ceylon		Venezuela
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		
Mauritius		
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		
Gilbert and Ellice Islands		
Fiji		
Uganda		
Trinidad and Tobago		
Zanzibar		
Tanganyika Territory		
Leeward Islands		
Windward Islands		
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		
Nyasaland		
Straits Settlements		
Federated Malay States		
Non-Federated Malay States:		
Brunei		
Johore		
Kedah		
Kelantan		
Trengganu		

[1] The present Convention came into force on August 7th, 1924, viz., on the thirtieth day following that on which the deposit of the second ratification took place (Article 11). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVII, p. 213; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 122; Vol. LIV, p. 391; Vol. LIX, p. 357; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 313; Vol. XCII, p. 368; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXXVI, p. 433; Vol. CXLII, p. 341; Vol. CLII, p. 294; Vol. CLVI, p. 186; and Vol. CLX, p. 335.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Northern Rhodesia
Barbados
Gold Coast
Cyprus
Gibraltar
Malta
Somaliland
Basutoland
Bechuanaland
Swaziland
Hong-Kong
(November 3rd, 1926 *a*)

Bermuda
Bahamas
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
St. Helena
Palestine
Trans-Jordan
(May 23rd, 1927 *a*)

Jamaica (August 22nd, 1927 *a*)

British Guiana (September 23rd, 1929 *a*)

CANADA (May 23rd, 1924 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (June 29th, 1935 *a*)

Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, including the Mandated Territory of South West Africa (December 11th, 1925)

NEW ZEALAND, including the Mandated Territory of Western Samoa (December 11th, 1925)

IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)

INDIA (December 11th, 1925)

BULGARIA (July 1st, 1924)

CHINA (February 24th, 1926)

COLOMBIA (November 8th, 1934)

CUBA (September 20th, 1934)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 11th, 1927)

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 31st, 1926)

DENMARK (May 6th, 1930)

With regard to Article IV, see also Article I. The acts mentioned in Article I are punishable under the rules of Danish law only if they fall within the provisions of Article 184 of the Danish Penal Code, which inflicts penalties upon any person publishing obscene writings, or placing on sale, distributing, or otherwise circulating or publicly exposing obscene images. Further, it is to be observed that the Danish legislation relating to the Press contains special provisions on the subject of the persons who may be prosecuted for Press offences. The latter provisions apply to the acts covered by Article 184 in so far as these acts can be considered as Press offences. The modification of Danish legislation on these points must await the revision of the Danish Penal Code, which is likely to be effected in the near future.

EGYPT (October 29th, 1924 *a*)

Estonia (March 10th, 1936 *a*)

FINLAND (June 29th, 1925)

GERMANY (May 11th, 1925)

GREECE (October 9th, 1929)

GUATEMALA (October 25th, 1933 *a*)

HUNGARY (February 12th, 1929)

IRAN (September 28th, 1932)

IRAQ (April 26th, 1929 *a*)

ITALY (July 8th, 1924)

Japan (May 13th, 1936)

The provisions of Article 15 of the Convention are in no way derogatory to the acts of the Japanese judicial authorities in the application of Japanese laws and decrees.[1]

LATVIA (October 7th, 1925)

---

[1] By a communication dated February 14th, 1936, the Japanese Government withdrew the declaration regarding Taiwan, Chosen, the leased territory of Kwantung, Karafuto and the territories under Japanese mandate, expressed at the time of signing the Convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*LUXEMBURG (August 10th, 1927)
Subject to reservation " that, in the application of the penal clauses of the Convention, the Luxemburg authorities will observe the closing paragraph of Article 24 of the Constitution of the Grand-Duchy, which provides that proceedings may not be taken against the publisher, printer or distributor if the author is known and if he is a Luxemburg subject residing in the Grand-Duchy ".
SAN MARINO (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
MONACO (May 11th, 1925)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 13th, 1927)
NORWAY (May 8th, 1929 *a*)
PARAGUAY (October 21st, 1933 *a*)
POLAND (March 8th, 1927)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 7th, 1926)
SIAM (July 28th, 1924)
The Siamese Government reserve full right to enforce the provisions of the present Convention against foreigners in Siam in accordance with the principles prevailing for applying Siamese legislation to such foreigners.
SPAIN (December 19th, 1924)
SWITZERLAND (January 20th, 1926)
TURKEY (September 12th, 1929)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929)

VI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

1. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES.[1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

ALBANIA (August 29th, 1924)
AUSTRIA (January 25th, 1928)
BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1924)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
BRAZIL (February 5th, 1932)
Subject to the condition that the arbitral agreement or the arbitration clause mentioned in Article 1 of this Protocol should be limited to contracts which are considered as commercial by the Brazilian legislation.
BRITISH EMPIRE (September 27th, 1924)
Applies only to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and consequently does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority or any territory in respect of which His Majesty's Government exercises a mandate.
Southern Rhodesia (December 18th, 1924 *a*)
NEWFOUNDLAND (June 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA
CHILE
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
INDIA
This signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Protocol upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
India reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
LATVIA
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
LITHUANIA
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
LIBERIA
MEXICO
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

* This ratification, given subject to reservation, has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

[1] The present Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1924, date of the second deposit of ratification (Article 6). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVII, p. 157; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 116; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 355; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 393; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 312; Vol. XCVI, p. 190; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CIV, p. 499; Vol. CVII, p. 470; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 55; and Vol. CLVI, p. 185.

I. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES *(continued)*.
(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

British Guiana
British Honduras
Jamaica:
Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands
Leeward Islands
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gold Coast (including Ashanti and the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast and Togoland)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Zanzibar
Northern Rhodesia
Ceylon
Mauritius
Gibraltar
Malta
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
(March 12th, 1926 *a*)

IRAQ
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Trans-Jordan
Tanganyika (June 17th, 1926 *a*)
St. Helena (July 29th, 1926 *a*)
Uganda (June 28th, 1929 *a*)
Bahamas (January 23rd, 1931 *a*)

NEW ZEALAND (June 9th, 1926)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic will regard itself as being bound only in relation to States which will have ratified the Convention of September 26th, 1927, on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, and the Czechoslovak Republic does not intend by this signature to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it which regulate the questions referred to in the present Protocol by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Protocol.

DENMARK (April 6th, 1925)

Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary courts of law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such Courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.

ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)

Limits, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of this Protocol, the obligation mentioned in paragraph 1 of the said article to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

FINLAND (July 10th, 1924)

FRANCE (June 7th, 1928)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its own national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates or Territories in respect of which France exercises a mandate.

GERMANY (November 5th, 1924)

GREECE (May 26th, 1926)

ITALY (July 28th, 1924)

JAPAN (June 4th, 1928)

Excluding Colonies.

Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the leased territory of Kwantung, and the territories in respect of which Japan exercises a mandate (February 26th, 1929 *a*).

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MONACO (February 8th, 1927)

Reserves the right to limit its obligation to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 6th, 1925)

The Government of the Netherlands reserves its right to restrict the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under Netherlands law.

Further, it declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.

I. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

NORWAY (September 2nd, 1927)

POLAND (June 26th, 1931)

Under reservation that in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 1, the undertaking contemplated in the said Article will apply only to contracts which are declared as commercial in accordance with national Polish law.

PORTUGAL (December 10th, 1930)

(1) In accordance with the second paragraph of Article 1, the Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

(2) According to the terms of the first paragraph of Article 8, the Portuguese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include its colonies.

ROUMANIA (March 12th, 1925)

Subject to the reservation that the Royal Government may in all circumstances limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

SIAM (September 3rd, 1930)

SPAIN (July 29th, 1926)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa, or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

SWEDEN (August 8th, 1929)

SWITZERLAND (May 14th, 1928)

VII. CUSTOMS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL. [1]

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (September 11th, 1924)	CHILE	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (October 4th, 1924)	JAPAN	ALBANIA
BRAZIL (July 10th, 1929)	LITHUANIA	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)	PARAGUAY	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
It is stated in the instrument of ratification that this ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia (or any territory under its authority) or the Irish Free State or in the case of India, and that in pursuance of the power reserved in Article XXIX of the Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Island of Newfoundland or of the territories of Iraq and Nauru, in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate. It does not apply to the Sudan.	PORTUGAL	BOLIVIA
	SPAIN	CANADA
	URUGUAY	COLOMBIA
AUSTRALIA (March 13th, 1925)		COSTA RICA
Excluding Papua, Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea.		CUBA
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 29th, 1924)		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
NEW ZEALAND (August 29th, 1924)		ECUADOR
Includes the mandated territory of Western Samoa.		ETHIOPIA
		GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		IRISH FREE STATE
		LIBERIA
		MEXICO
		NICARAGUA
		PANAMA
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		VENEZUELA

[1] The present Convention came into force on November 27th, 1924, ninety days after the deposit of the fifth ratification (Article 26). The Protocol came into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 371; Vol. XXXV, p. 324; Vol. XXXIX, p. 208; Vol. XLV, p. 140; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 398; Vol. LIX, p. 365; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 319; Vol. XCII, p. 370; Vol. CXI, p. 404; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 401; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 322.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

INDIA (March 13th, 1925)
BULGARIA (December 10th, 1926)
CHINA (February 23rd, 1926)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 10th, 1927)
DENMARK (May 17th, 1924)
EGYPT (March 23rd, 1925)
ESTONIA (February 28th, 1930 *a*)
FINLAND (May 23rd, 1928)
FRANCE (September 13th, 1926)
Does not apply to the Colonies under its sovereignty.
SYRIA AND LEBANON (March 9th, 1933 *a*)
GERMANY (August 1st, 1925)
GREECE (July 6th, 1927)
HUNGARY (February 23rd, 1926)
IRAN (May 8th, 1925 *a*)
IRAQ (May 3rd, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (June 13th, 1924)
LATVIA (September 28th, 1931 *a*)
LUXEMBURG (June 10th, 1927)
FRENCH PROTECTORATE OF MOROCCO (November 8th, 1926)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1925)
NORWAY (September 7th, 1926)
POLAND (September 4th, 1931)
ROUMANIA (December 23rd, 1925)
Under the same reservations as those formulated by the other Governments and inserted in Article 6 of the Protocol, the Royal Government understands that Article 22 of the Convention confers the right to have recourse to the procedure provided for in this Article for questions of a general nature solely on the High Contracting Parties, private persons being only entitled to appeal to their own judicial authorities in case any dispute arises with the authorities of the Kingdom.
SIAM (May 19th, 1925)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1926)
SWITZERLAND (January 3rd, 1927)
REGENCY OF TUNIS (French Protectorate)(November 8th, 1926)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929)

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

5. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927)
BELGIUM (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CHILE
CHINA *(a)*
The Chinese Government, subject to the declarations made in its name by the delegates whom it instructed to take part in the discussions on this Convention, confirms the said declarations regarding:
(1) The whole of Part III: " Relations between the railway and its users ", Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17;
(2) In Part VI: " General Regulations ", Article 37, relating to the conclusion of special agreements for the

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force (Article 6) on March 23rd, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XLVII, page 55; Vol. L, p. 180; Vol. LIX, p. 383; Vol. LXIII, p. 417; Vol. LXIX, p. 92; Vol. LXXVIII. p. 472; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 403; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 336; Vol. XCII. p. 381; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. CLVI, p. 192; and Vol. CLX, p. 338.

5. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Railways, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate ; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or territories.

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

British Guiana
British Honduras
Brunei
Federated Malay States:
Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British mandate
Hong-Kong
Non-Federated Malay States:
Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu
Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory

(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)

Estonia (September 21st, 1929)

Ethiopia (September 20th, 1928 *a*)

France (August 28th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation contained in Article 9 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

purpose of putting the provisions of the Statute into force in cases where existing agreements are not adequate for this purpose.

Colombia *(a)*
Czechoslovakia
Finland
Lithuania
Panama *(a)*
Portugal
Salvador
Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Irish Free State
Liberia
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Peru
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

5. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GERMANY (December 5th, 1927)
GREECE (March 6th, 1929)
HUNGARY (March 21st, 1929)
ITALY (December 10th, 1934)
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
JAPAN (September 30th, 1926)
LATVIA (October 8th, 1934)
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (February 22nd, 1928)
NORWAY (February 24th, 1926)
POLAND and FREE CITY OF DANZIG (January 7th, 1928)
ROUMANIA (December 23rd, 1925)
SIAM (January 9th, 1925)
SPAIN (January 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (September 15th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (October 23rd, 1926)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)

6. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF MARITIME PORTS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927*a*)
BELGIUM (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
With regard to Article 12 of the Statute, the Belgian Government declares that legislation exists in Belgium on the transport of emigrants, and that this legislation, whilst it does not distinguish between flags and consequently does not affect the principle of equality of treatment of flags, imposes special obligations on all vessels engaged in the transport of emigrants.
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and that, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CHILE
LITHUANIA
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
PANAMA *(a)*
SALVADOR
SPAIN
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LUXEMBURG
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 285; Vol. LXIX, p. 102; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXVII, p. 184; Vol. CXXII, p. 349; Vol. CXLII, p. 342; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 332.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Brunei
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Federated Malay States:
Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Grenada
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (excluding Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher-Nevis
Virgin Islands
Non-Federated Malay States:
Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu
Mauritius
Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
St. Helena
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Somaliland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Zanzibar

} (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Malta (November 7th, 1925 *a*)

Australia (June 29th, 1925 *a*)
Does not apply in the case of Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Czechoslovakia (July 10th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Excluding Greenland, the maritime ports of which are subject to a separate regime.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions

ESTONIA (November 4th, 1931)
The Estonian Government reserves the right regarding emigration provided for in Article 12 of the Statute.

FRANCE (August 2nd, 1932)
Shall have the power, in conformity with Article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.
Does not include any of the Protectorates, Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

GERMANY (May 1st, 1928)
In conformity with Article 12 of the Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, the German Government declares that it reserves the right of limiting the transport of emigrants, in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, to vessels which have been granted special authorisation as fulfilling the requirements of the said legislation.
In exercising this right, the German Government will continue to be guided as far as possible by the principles of this Statute.

GREECE (January 24th, 1927)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

HUNGARY (March 21st, 1929)
With reservation as to the right regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

IRAQ (May 1st, 1929 *a*)
With reservation as to all the rights regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

ITALY (October 16th, 1933)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
This ratification cannot be interpreted as implying the admission or the recognition of any reservation or declaration made with a view to limiting in any way the rights granted by Article 12 of the Statute to the High Contracting Parties.

JAPAN (September 30th, 1926)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

MEXICO (March 5th, 1934 *a*)

THE NETHERLANDS (February 22nd, 1928)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (February 22nd, 1928 *a*)
The Netherlands Government reserves the right mentioned in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Statute annexed to the Convention, it being understood that no discrimination shall be made against the flag of any contracting State which in regard to the transport of emigrants does not discriminate against the Netherlands flag.

NORWAY (June 21st, 1928)

SIAM (January 9th, 1925)

SWEDEN (September 15th, 1927)

SWITZERLAND (October 23rd, 1926)

YUGOSLAVIA (November 20th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

7. Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of Electric Power, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927)	BELGIUM	AFGHANISTAN
BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1st, 1925) This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. It shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories	BULGARIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	CHILE	ALBANIA
	FRANCE Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
		AUSTRALIA
		BOLIVIA
		BRAZIL
		CANADA

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 315; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. XCII, p. 399; Vol. CXLVII, p. 333; and Vol. CLX, p. 342.

7. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE TRANSMISSION IN TRANSIT OF ELECTRIC POWER, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions, or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates, or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.	HUNGARY ITALY LITHUANIA POLAND URUGUAY YUGOSLAVIA	CHINA COLOMBIA COSTA RICA CUBA DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ECUADOR ESTONIA ETHIOPIA FINLAND GERMANY GUATEMALA HAITI HONDURAS INDIA IRAN IRISH FREE STATE JAPAN LATVIA LIBERIA LUXEMBURG MEXICO THE NETHERLANDS NICARAGUA NORWAY PARAGUAY PERU PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SALVADOR SIAM SWEDEN SWITZERLAND TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS VENEZUELA
NEWFOUNDLAND (April 23rd, 1925 *a*) Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*) British Guiana British Honduras Brunei Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate Hong-Kong Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis Kelantan, Trengganu Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Palestine Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*) NEW ZEALAND (April 1st, 1925) Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. CZECHOSLOVAKIA (November 30th, 1926) DENMARK (April 27th, 1926) FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934) GREECE (February 15th, 1929) IRAQ (August 2nd, 1935 *a*) PANAMA (July 7th, 1934 *a*) SPAIN (January 15th, 1930)		

(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

8. Convention relating to the Development of Hydraulic Power affecting more than One State, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (January 20th, 1927)	Belgium	Afghanistan
British Empire (April 1st, 1925) This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.	Bulgaria	Union of South Africa
	Chile	Albania
	France Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	United States of America
		Argentine Republic
		Australia
		Bolivia
		Brazil
		Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Czechoslovakia
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		India
		Iran
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		The Netherlands
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Roumania
		Salvador
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Italy	
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Lithuania	
British Guiana British Honduras Brunei Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate Hong-Kong Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British mandate Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Palestine Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)	Poland	
	Uruguay	
	Yugoslavia	

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on June 30th, 1925. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 75; Vol. XLV, p. 170; Vol. L, p. 166; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 395; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 405; Vol. CXLVII, p. 322; and Vol. CLII, p. 295.

8. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE STATE, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934)
DENMARK (April 27th, 1926)
HUNGARY (March 20th, 1933)
GREECE (March 14th, 1929)
Iraq (January 28th, 1936 *a*)
PANAMA (July 7th, 1934 *a*)
SIAM (January 9th. 1925)

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

15. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16.)

(Geneva, September 27th, 1924.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

ESTONIA (September 18th, 1926)
THE NETHERLANDS (February 8th, 1926)
ROUMANIA (March 12th, 1925)
SALVADOR (June 4th, 1925)
SIAM (September 30th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CUBA
GREECE
NEW ZEALAND
PERU
POLAND
URUGUAY

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

AFGHANISTAN
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
BRITISH EMPIRE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

X. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

I. International Opium Convention. The Hague, January 23rd, 1912.[1]

Schedule[2] *containing the signatures of the Convention, the signatures of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the First Opium Conference, provided for in the penultimate paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention, the ratifications of the Convention, and the signatures of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention provided under "B" of the Final Protocol of the Third International Opium Conference.*

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
Albania	—	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925
United States of America	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	Feb. 11, 1915
Argentine Republic	—	Oct. 17, 1912	—	—
Austria	—	—	July 16, 1920*	July 16, 1920*
Belgium[3]	—	June 18, 1912	June 16, 1914	May 14, 1919
Bolivia	—	June 4, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Brazil	—	Oct. 16, 1912	Dec. 23, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Great Britain[4]	Jan. 23, 1912	April 24, 1922	July 15, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Bulgaria	—	March 2, 1914	Aug. 9, 1920*	Aug. 9, 1920*
Chile	—	July 2, 1913	Jan. 16, 1923	May 18, 1923
China	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Feb. 9, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
Colombia[5]	—	Jan. 15, 1913	June 26, 1924	June 30, 1924
Costa Rica	—	April 25, 1912	August 1, 1924	July 29, 1925
Cuba	—	May 8, 1913	March 8, 1920*	March 8, 1920*
Czechoslovakia	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	—	Nov. 8, 1921	April 18, 1922	March 5, 1931
Denmark[6]	—	Dec. 17, 1912	July 10, 1913	Oct. 21, 1921
Dominican Republic	—	Nov. 12, 1912	June 7, 1923	April 14, 1931
Ecuador	—	July 2, 1912	Feb. 25, 1915	August 23, 1923
Estonia	—	Jan. 9, 1923	April 20, 1923	January 21, 1931
Finland	—	April 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec. 1, 1922
France[7]	Jan. 23,1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Germany	Jan. 23,1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Greece	—	—	March 30, 1920*	March 30, 1920*

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 187; Vol. XI, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol.. LIX, p. 346; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; and Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 416.

[2] This Schedule which appeared in the Annexes to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the is reproduced here for purposes of information.

[3] Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards the Belgian Congo.

[4] In accordance with the following reservation:

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Wei-hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said Convention in the name of any Dominion, Colony, Dependency, or Protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

In virtue of the above-mentioned reservation, Great Britain signed the Convention for the following Dominions, Colonies, Dependencies, and Protectorates:

On December 17th, 1912, for Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Brunei, Cyprus, the East Africa Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Malay Protectorates, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, Malta, Northern Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Somaliland, Southern Nigeria, Trinidad, Uganda; on February 27th, 1913, for the Colony of Fiji; on April 22nd, 1913, for the Colony of Sierra Leone, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate and the Solomon Islands Protectorate; on June 25th, 1913, for the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Bahamas Islands and for the three Colonies of the Windward Islands, that is to say, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent; on January 30th, 1914, for the Leeward Islands; on February 11th, 1914, for British Guiana as well as for British Honduras; on March 11th, 1914, for the Government of the Union of South Africa; on March 28th, 1914, for Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland; on April 4th, 1914, for the Colony of Barbados; on April 8th, 1914, for Mauritius and its dependencies; on July 11th, 1914, for the Bermuda Islands; on August 21st, 1924, for Palestine and together with France for the New Hebrides; on October 20th, 1924, for Iraq.

[5] Subject to the approval of the Colombian Parliament.

[6] The signature of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the Conference as well as its ratification were given by Denmark for Iceland and the Danish Antilles; the signature of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention was given separately by Denmark and Iceland.

[7] With the reservation that a separate and special ratification or denunciation may subsequently be obtained for the French Protectorates. France and Great Britain signed the Convention for the New Hebrides, August 21st, 1924.

1. International Opium Convention. The Hague, January 23rd, 1912 *(continued)*.

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
Guatemala	—	June 17, 1912	Aug. 27, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
Haiti	—	Aug. 21, 1912	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
Honduras	—	July 5, 1912	Aug. 29, 1913	April 3, 1915
Hungary	—	—	July 26, 1921*	July 26, 1921*
Iran [1]	Jan. 23,1912	—	—	—
Italy	Jan. 23,1912	—	June 28, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Japan	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Latvia	—	Feb. 6, 1922	March 25, 1924	Jan. 18, 1932.
Liberia	—	—	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
Lithuania	—	April 7, 1922	—	—
Luxemburg	—	June 18, 1912	Aug. 21, 1922	Aug. 21, 1922
Mexico	—	May 15, 1912	April 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
Monaco	—	May 1, 1923	Feb. 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
The Netherlands	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 28, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
Nicaragua	—	July 18, 1913	Nov. 10, 1914	Nov. 3, 1920
Norway	—	Sept. 2, 1913	Nov. 12, 1914	Sept. 20, 1915
Panama	—	June 19, 1912	Nov. 25, 1920*	Nov. 25, 1920*
Paraguay	—	Dec. 14, 1912	—	—
Peru	—	July 24, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Poland	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Portugal	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	April 8, 1920*
Roumania	—	Dec. 27, 1913	Sept. 14, 1920*	Sept. 14, 1920*
Russia	Jan. 23,1912	—	—	—
Salvador	—	July 30, 1912	Sept. 19, 1922	May 29, 1931
Siam [2]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 10, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
Spain	—	Oct. 23, 1912	Jan. 25, 1919	Feb. 11, 1921
Sweden [3]	—	Aug. 27, 1913	April 17, 1914	Jan. 13, 1921
Switzerland [4]	—	Dec. 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1925	Jan. 15, 1925
Turkey	Sept. 15, 1933	—	Sept. 15, 1933	Sept. 15, 1933
Uruguay	—	March 9, 1914	April 3, 1916	Jan. 10, 1920*
Venezuela	—	Sept. 10, 1912	Oct. 28, 1913	July 12, 1927
Yugoslavia	—	—	Feb. 10, 1920*	Feb. 10, 1920*

2. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, Protocol and Final Act. [5]

(Signed at Geneva, February 11th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
The signature of this Protocol is subject, in respect of British Protectorates, to the conditions contained in Article XIII of the Agreement.
India (February 17th, 1926)
France (April 29th, 1926)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (March 1st, 1927)

Other State to whose Signature the Agreement is open:

China

---

[1] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Persia having no treaty with China) and paragraph (*a*) of Article 3.

[2] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Siam having no treaty with China).

[3] Subject to the following declaration: " Opium not being manufactured in Sweden, the Swedish Government will for the moment confine themselves to prohibiting the importation of prepared opium, but they declare at the same time that they are ready to take the measures indicated in Article 8 of the Convention if experience proves their expediency."

[4] Subject to ratification and with the declaration that the Swiss Government will be unable to issue the necessary legal enactments within the terms fixed by the Convention.

[5] The Agreement and the Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the Leogue of Nations*, Vol. LI, p. 337; Vol. LIX, p. 401; and Vol. LXXVIII, p. 489.

2. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, Protocol and Final Act *(continued)*.

(Signed at Geneva, February 11th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Portugal (September 13th, 1926)

While accepting the principle of a monopoly as formulated in Article I, does so, as regards the moment at which the measures provided for in the first paragraph thereof shall come into force, subject to the limitation contained in the second paragraph of the article.

The Portuguese Government, being bound by a contract consistent with the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912, will not be able to put into operation the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article VI of the present Agreement so long as its obligations under this contract are in force.

Siam (May 6th, 1927)

Under reservation of Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), with regard to the time when this provision shall come into force, and of Article V. The reason for these reservations had been stated by the First Delegate of Siam on November 14th, 1924. The Siamese Government is hoping to put into force the system of registration and rationing within the period of three years. After that date, the reservation in regard to Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), will fall to the ground.

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

International Opium Convention.[1]

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (November 25th, 1927)	**Albania**	**Afghanistan**
Belgium (August 24th, 1927) Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.	**Argentine Republic** (*a*)	**United States of America**
Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*) 1. Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population. 2. The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the Bolivian Government, by means of export certificates. 3. The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported: Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.	**Iran** *Ad referendum* and subject to the League of Nations complying with the request made by Iran in the Memorandum O.D.C.24.	**Sa'udi Arabia** **China** **Ethiopia** **Guatemala** **Haiti** **Iceland** **Liberia** **Mexico** **Panama** **Paraguay** **Peru**
Brazil (June 10th, 1932)	**Nicaragua**	
British Empire (February 17th, 1926) His Britannic Majesty's ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada or the Irish Free State and, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 39 of the Convention, the instrument shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Colony of the Bahamas or the State of Sarawak under His Britannic Majesty's protection.		
State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)		
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)		
Canada (June 27th, 1928)		
Australia (February 17th, 1926)		

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force September 25th, 1928 (Article 36). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXI, p. 317; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 390; Vol. XCII, p. 409; Vol. XCVI, p. 204; Vol. C, p. 249; Vol. CIV, p. 516; Vol. CVII, p. 525; Vol. CXI, p. 411; Vol. CXVII, p. 290; Vol. CXXII, p. 355; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 407; Vol. CLVI, p. 205; and Vol. CLX, p. 348.

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1926)
NEW ZEALAND, (February 17th, 1926)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
IRISH FREE STATE (September 1st, 1931)
INDIA (February 17th, 1926)
IRAQ (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
BULGARIA (March 9th, 1927)
CHILE (April 11th, 1933)
COLOMBIA (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
COSTA RICA (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
CUBA (July 6th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 11th, 1927)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 16th, 1927 *a*).
DENMARK (April 23rd, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (July 19th, 1928 *a*)
ECUADOR (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
EGYPT (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
FINLAND (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
FRANCE (July 2nd, 1927)
The French Government is compelled to make all reservation, as regards the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing, within the strictly prescribed time-limit, the quarterly statistics provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 22.
GERMANY (August 15th, 1929)
Subject to the reservation annexed to the Procès-verbal of the plenary meeting of February 16th, 1925. (The validity of the signature and ratification of this Convention are subject to the condition that a German expert will be appointed as a member of the Central Board.)
GREECE (December 10th, 1929)
HUNGARY (August 27th, 1930)
HONDURAS (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (for the Kingdom and Colonies) (December 11th, 1929 *a*)
JAPAN (October 10th, 1928)
LATVIA (October 31st, 1928)
Liechtenstein[1]
LITHUANIA (February 13th, 1931 *a*)
LUXEMBURG (March 27th, 1928)
MONACO (February 9th, 1927 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
New Hebrides (December 27th, 1927 *a*)
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931 *a*)
POLAND (June 16th, 1927)
PORTUGAL (September 13th, 1926)
ROUMANIA (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
SALVADOR (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
SAN MARINO (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
SIAM (October 11th, 1929)
SPAIN (June 22nd, 1928)
Includes also the Spanish Colonies and the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.
SUDAN (February 20th, 1926)
SWEDEN (December 6th, 1930 *a*)

---

[1] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Switzerland (April 3rd, 1929)
With reference to the declaration made by the Swiss delegation at the 36th plenary meeting of the Conference concerning the forwarding of the quarterly statistics provided for in Article 22, paragraph 2.
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (Sept. 11th, 1930)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (September 4th, 1929)

Protocol.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
(Same reservation as for the Convention.)
Canada (June 27th, 1928)
Australia (Febr. 17th, 1926)
Union of South Africa (February 17th, 1926)
New Zealand (February 17th, 1926)
India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934*a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
Portugal (Sept. 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (April 19th, 1930 *a*)
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Venezuela (June 19 th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (Sept. 4th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Argentine Republic (*a*)
Iran
Nicaragua

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Austria
Belgium
Brazil
China
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ethiopia
France
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
Iceland
Irish Free State
Italy
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Mexico
Monaco
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
San Marino
Sweden
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay

XI. SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

1. Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War.[1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

United States of America
This ratification is subject to the reservation that the Convention shall only enter into force, as far as the United States of America are concerned, when it has entered into force as regards Belgium, the British Empire, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

British Empire
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Convention.
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the said Convention by all the following Powers — *i.e.*, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and United States of America — have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

Australia (*a*)
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

Bulgaria

Canada

China

Denmark
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Convention, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

Egypt

France
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the Convention by Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the United States of America have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

Iraq (*a*)
In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 28 of the Convention, Iraq assume with regard to its territory the undertakings set forth in paragraph I of Article 28 and the obligations of Articles 19 to 26 inclusive of that Convention, in so far as they are applicable.

Latvia
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Latvia in Article 29.

Liberia (*a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Austria

Belgium
To the same extent as does the effect of the Convention apply in the States named hereafter: the United States of America, Austria, France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

Brazil
Reserves, during the whole period of application of the present Convention, the right of fulfilling it, as regards the part that concerns Brazil, according to the spirit of the provisions having for their object the generalisation of control both as concerns the commerce as well as concerns the manufacture of armaments.

Chile

Czechoslovakia

Estonia
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Estonia in Article 29.

Ethiopia

Finland
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Finland in Article 29.

Germany

Hungary

India

Italy

Japan

Luxemburg

Norway

Roumania
Ad referendum with the reservation provided in Article 29 of the Convention, in virtue of which the application of Articles 6 and 9, as far as they concern exports consigned to Roumania by the High Contracting Parties and as far as they concern imports manufactured in Roumania, will be suspended until the date of the accession of Russia to the present Convention, as also to the Annex.

Salvador

Siam

Switzerland

Uruguay

Yugoslavia

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Argentine Republic

Colombia

Greece

Iran

Irish Free State

Lithuania

Mexico

Nicaragua

Panama

Paraguay

Portugal

Turkey

And all other States invited to adhere in accordance with Article 37 of the a Convention.

---

[1] " A first *procès-verbal* of the deposit of ratifications will be drawn up by the Government of the French Republic as soon as the present Convention shall have been ratified by fourteen Powers.
" The Convention shall come into force four months after the date of the notification of this *procès-verbal* by the Government of the French Republic to all signatory Powers " (Article 41).

1. CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Poland in Article 29.

SPAIN

SWEDEN
Subject to the condition that this ratification will only take effect when the other producing States shall have ratified the convention.

VENEZUELA

2. DECLARATION REGARDING THE TERRITORY OF IFNI.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRALIA *(a)*
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

CHINA *(a)*

DENMARK
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Declaration, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

EGYPT

FRANCE

LIBERIA *(a)*

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND

SPAIN

VENEZUELA

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA

BELGIUM

BRAZIL

BRITISH EMPIRE:
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Declaration.

CANADA

INDIA

BULGARIA

CHILE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ESTONIA

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND

ITALY

JAPAN

LATVIA

LUXEMBURG

ROUMANIA

SALVADOR

SWITZERLAND

YUGOSLAVIA

The Declaration is open to Accession by:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

GERMANY

GREECE

HUNGARY

IRAN

IRISH FREE STATE

LITHUANIA

MEXICO

NICARAGUA

NORWAY

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

PORTUGAL

SIAM

SWEDEN

TURKEY

URUGUAY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

3. PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS AND OTHER GASES AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE. [1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (May 9th, 1928)

BELGIUM (December 4th, 1928)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Belgian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Belgian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BRAZIL

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

JAPAN

LUXEMBURG

NICARAGUA

SALVADOR

URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

HUNGARY

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

---

[1] This Protocol came into force February 8th, 1928. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIV, p. 65; Vol. C, p. 262; Vol. CIV, p. 528; Vol. CVII, p. 537; Vol. CXI, p. 416; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXVI, p. 451; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 446; Vol. CXLVII, p. 336; and Vol. CLX, p. 355.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (April 9th, 1930)

Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Protocol.

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Canada (May 6th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any State at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or whose allies *de jure* or in fact fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Australia (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

New Zealand (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Union of South Africa (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Irish Free State (August 18th, 1930 *a*)

The Government of the Irish Free State does not intend to assume, by this accession, any obligation except towards the States having signed and ratified this Protocol or which shall have finally acceded thereto, and

Should the armed forces of an enemy State or of the allies of such State fail to respect the said Protocol, the Government of the Irish Free State would cease to be bound by the said Protocol in regard to such State.

India (April 9th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Iraq (September 8th, 1931 *a*)

On condition that the Iraq Government shall be bound by the provisions of the Protocol only towards those States which have both signed and ratified it or have acceded thereto; and that they shall not be bound by the Protocol towards any State at enmity with them whose armed forces, or the forces of whose allies, do not respect the dispositions of the Protocol.

Bulgaria (March 7th, 1934)

The said Protocol is only binding on the Bulgarian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.

The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Bulgarian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Chile (July 2nd, 1935)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Chilian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may definitely accede to it.

(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Chilian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

China (August 7th, 1929 *a*)

Denmark (May 5th, 1930)

Egypt (December 6th, 1928)

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Estonia (August 28th, 1931)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Estonian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Estonian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Ethiopia (September 18th, 1935 *a*)
Finland (June 26th, 1929)
France (May 9th, 1926)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the French Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the French Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Germany (April 25th, 1929)
Greece (May 30th, 1931)
Iran (July 4th, 1929 *a*)
Italy (April 3rd, 1928)
Latvia (June 3rd, 1931)
Liberia (April 2nd, 1927 *a*)
Lithuania (June 15th, 1933)
Mexico (March 15th, 1932 *a*)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (October 31st, 1930)
Subject to the reservation that, as regards the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, this Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Royal Netherlands Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Norway (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (February 4th, 1929)
Portugal (July 1st, 1930)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Roumania (August 23rd, 1929)
Subject to the reservation:
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Roumanian Government in relation to States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol;
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Roumanian Government in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect the restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.

Siam (June 6th, 1931)
Spain (August 22nd, 1929)
Declares this Protocol as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting and executing the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity.

Sweden (April 25th, 1930)
Switzerland (July 12th, 1932)
Turkey (October 5th, 1929)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (April 5th, 1928 *a*)
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Government of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to the States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol.
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.

Venezuela (February 8th, 1928)
Yugoslavia (April 12th, 1929)

XII. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

16. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Second paragraph of the original text.)

(Geneva, September 21st, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
Denmark (March 28th, 1926)	Albania	Argentine Republic
Estonia (September 18th, 1926)	Bolivia	Australia
The Netherlands (August 20th, 1926)	Brazil	Austria
	Bulgaria	Belgium
	Canada	British Empire
	Dominican Republic	China
	Japan	Colombia
	New Zealand	Cuba
	Norway	Czechoslovakia
	Peru	Ecuador
	Portugal	Ethiopia
	Salvador	Finland
	Siam	France
	Uruguay	Germany
		Greece
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Italy
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Poland
		Roumania
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

XIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

9. Convention regarding the Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (July 4th, 1927)	Finland	Albania
Belgium (July 2nd, 1927)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Denmark
British Empire (for Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (June 14th, 1927)		Estonia
		Iran
		Irish Free State

[1] The Convention came into force on October 1st, 1927, in conformity with Article 12. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXVII, p. 63; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 443; Vol. XCVI, p. 201; Vol. C. p. 228; Vol. CIV. p. 511; and Vol. CXXVI, p. 448.

9. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
BULGARIA (July 2nd, 1927)	LATVIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (January 17th, 1929)	LITHUANIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (July 23rd, 1930 *a*)	LUXEMBURG
FRANCE (July 2nd, 1927)	NORWAY
It being understood on behalf of the French Government, and as provided for in Article 6 of the Protocol of Signature, that in the event of a re-measurement of a vessel originally measured by its own officials the original indelible marks, when they are not intended solely to indicate that the vessel has been measured, shall have added to them an indelible cross having arms of equal length, and that this addition shall be regarded as equivalent to the removal described in Article 10 of the Annex to the Convention; that the old measurement plates shall be marked with a cross instead of being withdrawn; and that, if new plates are affixed, the old plates shall be placed at the same level and near to the new ones. In the case provided for above, the notification provided for in the third paragraph of Article 5 and in Article 6 of the Convention shall also be addressed to the original office of inscription.	PORTUGAL
GERMANY (July 2nd, 1927)	SWEDEN
GREECE (February 6th, 1931)	TURKEY
HUNGARY (January 3rd, 1928)	
ITALY (September 27th, 1932)	
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 2nd, 1927)	
POLAND (June 16th, 1930)	
ROUMANIA (May 18th, 1928)	
SPAIN (July 11th, 1927)	
SWITZERLAND (July 2nd, 1927)	
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)	

Under Clause IV of the Protocol of Signature.

XIV. SLAVERY.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.[1]

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (November 9th, 1935 *a*)	ALBANIA	SA'UDI ARABIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (March 21st, 1929 *a*)	CHINA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
Subject to the reservation that the Government of the United States, adhering to its policy of opposition to forced or compulsory labour except as punishment for crime of which the person concerned has been duly convicted, adheres to the Convention except as to the first sub-division of the second paragraph of Article five, which reads as follows: "(1) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes."[2]	COLOMBIA	BOLIVIA
	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (*a*)	BRAZIL
	ETHIOPIA	CHILE
	IRAN	COSTA RICA
	Ad referendum and interpreting Article 3 as without power to compel Iran to bind herself by any arrangement or convention which would place her ships of whatever tonnage in the category of native vessels provided for by the Convention on the Trade in Arms.	FREE CITY OF DANZIG
		GUATEMALA
		HONDURAS
		ICELAND
		JAPAN
		LIECHTENSTEIN
		LUXEMBURG
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		VENEZUELA
AUSTRIA (August 19th, 1927)	LITHUANIA	
BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1927)	PANAMA	
	URUGUAY	

[1] This Convention came into force March 9th, 1927, according to its Article 12. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LX, p. 253; Vol. LXIX, p. 114; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 356; Vol. XCVI, p. 192; Vol. C, p. 221; Vol. CIV, p. 511; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXXX, p. 444; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 440; Vol. CLII, p. 296; and Vol. CLX, p. 342.

[2] This accession, given subject to reservation, has been communicated to the signatory States for acceptance.

SLAVERY CONVENTION *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 18th, 1927)
CANADA (August 6th, 1928)
AUSTRALIA (June 18th, 1927)
NEW ZEALAND (June 18th, 1927)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including South West Africa) (June 18th, 1927)
IRISH FREE STATE (July 18th, 1930 *a*)
INDIA (June 18th, 1927)

Under the terms of Article 9 of this Convention, the signature of the Convention is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of Article 2, sub-section (*b*), Articles 5, 6 and 7 of this Convention upon the following territories, namely: in Burma, the Naga tracts lying west and south of the Hukawng Valley bounded on the north and west by the Assam boundary, on the east by the Nanphuk River and on the south by the Singaling Hikamti and the Somra tracts; in Assam, the Sadiya and Balipara frontier tracts, the tribal area to the east of the Naga Hills district, up to the Burma boundary, and a small tract in the south of the Lushai Hills district; or on the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

Further, the signature of the Convention is not binding in respect of Article 3 in so far as that article may require India to enter into any convention whereby vessels, by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Indians, or of the fact that one-half of the crew is Indian, are classified as native vessels, or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of such other States are not subject.

BULGARIA (March 9th, 1927)
CUBA (July 6th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 10th, 1930)
DENMARK (May 17th, 1927)
ECUADOR (March 26th, 1928 *a*)
EGYPT (January 25th, 1928 *a*)
ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)
FINLAND (September 29th, 1927)
FRANCE (March 28th, 1931)
SYRIA and LEBANON (June 25th, 1931 *a*)
GERMANY (March 12th, 1929)
GREECE (July 4th, 1930)
HAITI (September 3rd, 1927 *a*)
HUNGARY[1] (February 17th, 1933 *a*)
IRAQ (January 18th, 1929 *a*)
ITALY (August 25th, 1928)
LATVIA (July 9th, 1927)
LIBERIA (May 17th, 1930)
MEXICO (September 8th, 1934 *a*)
MONACO (January 17th, 1928 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 7th, 1928)
NICARAGUA (October 3rd, 1927 *a*)
NORWAY (September 10th, 1927)
POLAND (September 17th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)
SPAIN (September 12th, 1927)

For Spain and the Spanish Colonies, with the exception of the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.

SUDAN (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
SWEDEN (December 17th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (November 1st, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (July 24th, 1933 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (September 28th, 1929)

---

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXX, p. 444.

XV. INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.[1]

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

ALBANIA (August 31st, 1929)
BELGIUM (May 9th, 1929)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (January 9th, 1929 *a*)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
NEW ZEALAND (December 22nd, 1928 *a*)
On the understanding that no contribution to the initial fund of the Union will fall due by New Zealand before the commencement of the next financial year in that country, viz., April 1st, 1929.
INDIA (April 2nd, 1929)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1931)
CHINA (May 29th, 1935 *a*)
CUBA (June 18th, 1934)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (August 20th, 1931)
ECUADOR (July 30th, 1928)
EGYPT (August 7th, 1928)
Subject to later acceptance by the Egyptian Government of the decisions of the Executive Committee fixing its contribution.
FINLAND (April 10th, 1929)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1932)
GERMANY (July 22nd, 1929)
GREECE (January 16th, 1931)
HUNGARY (April 17th, 1929)
It being understood that "the most extensive immunities, facilities and exemptions" mentioned in Article 10 of the present Convention shall not include exterritoriality or the other rights and immunities enjoyed in Hungary by duly accredited diplomatic agents.
IRAN (September 28th, 1932 *a*)
IRAQ (June 12th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (August 2nd, 1928)
Applies also to the Italian Colonies.
LUXEMBURG (June 27th, 1929 *a*)
MONACO (May 21st, 1929)
POLAND AND FREE CITY OF DANZIG (July 11th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (September 11th, 1928)
SAN MARINO (August 12th, 1929)
SUDAN (May 11th, 1928 *a*)
SWITZERLAND (January 2nd, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (March 10th, 1932)
VENEZUELA (June 19th, 1929)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 28th, 1931 *a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
GUATEMALA
LATVIA
NICARAGUA
PERU
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] The present Convention entered into force on December 27th, 1932, in accordance with its Article 18. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 247; Vol. CXLVII, p. 353; and Vol. CLVI, p. 256.

XVI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

2. CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

AUSTRIA (July 18th, 1930)

BELGIUM (April 27th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Belgian Congo, Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (June 5th, 1930 *a*)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (July 2nd, 1930)

(May 26th, 1931 *a*)
- Bahamas
- British Guiana
- British Honduras
- Falkland Islands
- Gibraltar
- Gold Coast:
  - (*a*) Colony
  - (*b*) Ashanti
  - (*c*) Northern Territories
  - (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
- Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
- Kenya
- Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
- Tanganyika Territory
- Uganda Protectorate
- Windward Islands:
  - Grenada
  - St. Lucia
  - St. Vincent
- Zanzibar

(July 13th, 1931 *a*)
- Mauritius
- Northern Rhodesia

(March 9th, 1932 *a*)
- Leeward Islands:
  - Antigua
  - Dominica
  - Montserrat
  - St. Christopher-Nevis
  - Virgin Islands
- Malta (October 11th, 1934 *a*)

NEW ZEALAND (Western Samoa included) (April 9th, 1929)

NEWFOUNDLAND (January 7th, 1931 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic does not intend to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it with various States, which regulate the questions referred to in the present Convention by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Convention.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

INDIA

This signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

NICARAGUA

PERU

The Convention is open to Signature by:

ALBANIA
BRAZIL
CHILE
IRAQ
JAPAN
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
MONACO
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
POLAND
SALVADOR
URUGUAY,

And all the other States which may sign the Protocol of September 24th, 1923.

---

[1] The Convention came into force July 25th, 1929 (Article 8). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCII, p. 301; Vol. XCVI, p. 205; Vol. C, p. 259; Vol. CIV, p. 526; Vol. CVII, p. 528; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 303; Vol. CXXX, p. 457; and Vol. CLVI, p. 210.

2. Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Denmark (April 25th, 1929)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary Courts of Law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such Courts without further examination as a basis for the final judgment in the affair.

Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Finland (July 30th, 1931)

France (May 13th, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Germany (September 1st, 1930)

Greece (January 15th, 1932)
The Hellenic Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Italy (November 12th, 1930)

Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Netherlands (August 12th, 1931) (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (January 28th, 1933 *a*)

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)
(1) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.
(2) The Portuguese Government declares, according to the terms of Article 10, that the present Convention does not apply to its colonies.

Roumania (June 22nd, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Siam (July 7th, 1931)

Spain (January 15th, 1930)

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (September 25th, 1930)

XVII. EXPORTATION.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.

Turkey [2]
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 357; Vol. C, p. 264; and Vol. CVII, p. 537.

[2] The reservation to which this signature is subject has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins *(cont.)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement as regards Hungary is subject to its ratification by Austria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

2. Protocol to the International Agreement.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.
Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures, as from October 1st, 1929.

2. Protocol to the International Agreement *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
Same reservations as for the Agreement.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.
Turkey
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

Denunciation.

Finland (March 4th, 1936)

The Agreement in open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series* of the *League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 373; Vol. C, p. 264; and Vol. CVII, p. 537.

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones *(continued)*. *(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)*

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)
The obligations resulting from this Agreement shall be binding for Yugoslavia only as regards signatory States which do not render exportation impossible, either by formal prohibitions or by prohibitive duties (duties considered as prohibitive are duties imposing a tax of 5 Swiss francs or more per hundred kilogrammes).

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

4. Protocol to the International Agreement. *(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)*

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.
Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

Denunciation:

Finland (March 4th, 1936).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures as from October 1st, 1929.

4. PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
NORWAY (September 26th, 1930)	JAPAN
POLAND (August 8th, 1931)	LATVIA
ROUMANIA (June 30th, 1929) Same reservation as for the Agreement.	LIBERIA
SWEDEN (June 27th, 1929)	LITHUANIA
SWITZERLAND (June 27th, 1929)	MEXICO
YUGOSLAVIA (September 30th, 1929)	NEW ZEALAND
	NICARAGUA
	PANAMA
	PARAGUAY
	PERU
	PORTUGAL
	SALVADOR
	SIAM
	SPAIN
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	URUGUAY
	VENEZUELA

XVIII. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.[1]

GENERAL ACT.[2]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions			*This Act is open to Accession by:*
A	B	C	All the Members of the League of Nations, with the exception of those mentioned in the preceding columns, and:
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BELGIUM (May 18th, 1929) Subject to the reservation provided in Article 39 (2) (*a*), with the effect of excluding from the procedures described in this Act disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession of Belgium or prior to the accession of any other Party with whom Belgium may have a dispute.	THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 8th, 1930)		BRAZIL
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (May 21st, 1931) Subject to the following conditions: 1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation: (*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of	NORWAY[3] (June 11th, 1929)		COSTA RICA
	SWEDEN (May 13th, 1929)		EGYPT

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Protocol for the pacific settlement of international disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

[2] The General Act came into force August 16th, 1929 (Article 44). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 343; Vol. C, p. 260; Vol. CVII, p. 529; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CLII, p. 297; Vol. CLVI, p. 211; and Vol. CLX, p. 354.

[3] Norway having acceded on June 11th, 1929, to Chapters I, II and IV, and thereafter having extended its accession to Chapter III, on June 11th, 1930, has therefore accepted all the provisions of the Act. However, it has been deemed necessary to make it appear also under " B " in the present list, so as to make it clear that Norway had already accepted the provisions provided under that heading as from June 11th, 1929.

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

CANADA (July 1st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession in respect of Canada to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in Canada and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty in respect of Canada reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

AUSTRALIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

NEW ZEALAND (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in New Zealand and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

IRISH FREE STATE (September 26th, 1931)

INDIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between the Government of India and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	C Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).
All the provisions of the Act.		

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

DENMARK (April 14th, 1930)

ESTONIA (September 3rd, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Estonia or to the accession of another Party with whom Estonia might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

ETHIOPIA (March 15th, 1935)

FINLAND (September 6th, 1930)

FRANCE (May 21st, 1931)

The said accession concerning all disputes that may arise after the said accession with regard to situations or facts subsequent thereto, other than those which the Permanent Court of International Justice may recognise as bearing on a question left by international law to the exclusive competence of the State, it being understood that in application of Article 39 of the said Act the disputes which the parties or one of them may have referred to the Council of the League of

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

Nations will not be submitted to the procedures described in this Act unless the Council has been unable to pronounce a decision under the conditions laid down in Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant.

Furthermore, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations " on the submission and recommendation of the General Act ", Article 28 of this Act is interpreted by the French Government as meaning in particular that " respect for rights established by treaty or resulting from international law " is obligatory upon arbitral tribunals constituted in application of Chapter III of the said General Act.

GREECE (September 14th, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation referred to in Chapter I:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Greece or to the accession of another Party with whom Greece might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States and in particular disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication.

ITALY (September 7th, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. The following disputes shall be excluded from the procedure described in the said Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which international law leaves to the sole jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Italy and any third Power.

II. It is understood that, in conformity with Article 29 of the said Act, disputes for the solution of which a special procedure is provided by other conventions shall be settled in accordance with the provisions of those conventions; and that, in particular, disputes which may be submitted to the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations in virtue of one of the provisions of the Covenant shall be settled in accordance with those provisions.

III. It is further understood that the present accession in no way affects Italy's accession to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and to the clause in that Statute concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Latvia (September 17th, 1935)

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)

NORWAY (June 11th, 1930)

PERU (November 21st, 1931)

Subject to reservation (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SPAIN (September 16th, 1930)

Subject to reservations (*a*) and (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SWITZERLAND (December 7th, 1934)

TURKEY (June 26th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession:

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Turkey and any third Power.

XIX. ECONOMIC STATISTICS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS.[1]

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (March 27th, 1931)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)

Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)

[2] Returns provided for in Article 2, III (B), will not contain information with regard to areas under crops on native farms, and in native reserves, locations and mission stations.

CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Does not apply to the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island, New Guinea and Nauru.

(1) [2] The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I (*b*), for separate returns for direct transit trade shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

(2) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I, Paragraph IV, that when the quantity of goods of any kind is expressed in any unit or units of measure other than weight, an estimate of the average weight of each unit, or multiple of units, shall be shown in the annual returns, shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)

IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

In pursuance of Article 11 of the Convention, the Belgian Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that it cannot accept, in regard to the Colony of the Belgian Congo, the obligations arising out of the clauses of the present Convention.

BRAZIL

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

ESTONIA

FINLAND

GERMANY

HUNGARY

JAPAN

In virtue of Article 11 of the present Convention, the Japanese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Convention does not extend to its Territories mentioned below: Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung, the Territories under Japanese mandate.

LATVIA

LUXEMBURG

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force December 14th, 1930, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CX, p. 171; Vol. CXVII, p. 330; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXVI, p. 454; Vol. CXXX, p. 463; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; and Vol. CLVI, p. 222.

[2] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)

A. Under the terms of Article 11, the obligations of the Convention shall not extend to the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty the King Emperor.

B[1](1) Article 2 I (*a*). — The provisions for returns of "transit trade" made in Annex I, Part I, 1 (*b*) shall not apply to India nor shall returns of the "land frontier trade" of India be acquired.

(2) Article 2. II (*a*). — The question whether a general census of agriculture can be held in India and, if so, on what lines and at what intervals still remains to be settled. For the present, India can assume no obligations under this article.

(3) Article 2. III (*b*). (1). — For farms in the "permanently settled" tracts in India, estimates of the cultivated areas may be used in compiling the returns.

(4) Article 2. III (*b*). (2). — The returns of quantities of crops harvested may be based on estimates of yield each year per unit area in each locality.

(5) Article 2. III (*d*). — Complete returns cannot be guaranteed from Burma, and in respect of the rest of India the returns shall refer to Government forests only.

The Government of India further declared that, with regard to the second paragraph of Article 3 of the Convention, they cannot, with the means of investigation at their disposal, usefully undertake to prepare experimentally the specified tables, and that for similar reasons they are not in a position to accept the proposal contained in Recommendation II of the Convention.

BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)

CHILE (November 20th, 1934 *a*)

CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)

DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)

In pursuance of Article 11, Greenland is excepted from the provisions of this Convention. Furthermore, the Danish Government, in accepting the Convention, does not assume any obligation in respect of statistics concerning the Faroe Islands.

EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)

FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)

By its acceptance, France does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

GREECE (September 18th, 1930)

ITALY (June 11th, 1931)

In accepting the present Convention, Italy does not assume any obligation in respect of her Colonies, Protectorates and other Territories referred to in the first paragraph of Article 11.

THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932)

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)

1. The following shall not be applicable:
   (*a*) The provisions of Article 2, III, E) and V;
   (*b*) The provisions concerning the system of valuations known as "declared values" mentioned in Annex I, Part I, § II (See Article 3);
   (*c*) Article 3, paragraph 2.
2. The returns mentioned in Article 2, IV, shall only apply to coal, petroleum, natural gas, tin, manganese, gold and silver.
3. The statistics of foreign trade mentioned in Article 3 shall not comprise tables concerning transit.[1]

NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)

In accordance with Article 11, the Bouvet Island is excepted from the provisions of the present Convention. Furthermore, in ratifying the Convention, Norway does not assume any obligation as regards statistics relating to the Svalbard.

POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)

PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)

In accordance with Article 11, the Portuguese Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that the present Convention does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)

SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)

SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)

---

[1] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (March 27th, 1931)	BELGIUM	AFGHANISTAN
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ALBANIA
Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)	ESTONIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)	FINLAND	BOLIVIA
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)	GERMANY	CHINA
IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)	HUNGARY	COLOMBIA
INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)	JAPAN	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)	LATVIA	ECUADOR
CHILE (November 20th, 1934 *a*)	LUXEMBURG	ETHIOPIA
CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)	YUGOSLAVIA	GUATEMALA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)		HAITI
DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)		HONDURAS
EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)		IRAN
FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)		IRAQ
GREECE (Sept. 18th, 1930)		LIBERIA
ITALY (June 11th, 1931)		LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932)		MEXICO
This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.		NICARAGUA
Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)		NEW ZEALAND
NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)		PANAMA
POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)		PARAGUAY
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)		PERU
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)		SALVADOR
SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)		SIAM
SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)		SPAIN
		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

XX. SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.[1]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935)
The procedure provided by Article 19 of the Convention, for the settlement of any disputes which might arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or the application of the said Convention, shall not be applied in the case of a dispute between Poland and the Free City of Danzig.
DENMARK (February 19th, 1931) [2]
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)
IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)
Italy (December 27th, 1935)
Mexico (March 30th, 1936 *a*)
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)
In view of the provisions of Article 176, paragraph 2, of the Norwegian Ordinary Criminal Code and Article 2 of the Norwegian Law on the Extradition of Criminals, the extradition provided for in Article 10 of the present Convention may not be granted for the offence referred to in Article 3, No. 2, where the person uttering the counterfeit currency himself accepted it *bona fide* as genuine.[3]
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[4] (July 13th, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.
INDIA
As provided in Article 24 of the Convention, this signature does not include the territories of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
CHINA
FRANCE
JAPAN
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA
ROUMANIA
SWITZERLAND

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SAN MARINO
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
TURKEY
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on February 22nd, 1931, in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 371; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 450; Vol. CXLVII, p. 351; Vol. CLII, p. 301; Vol. CLVI, p. 227; and Vol. CLX, p. 380.

[2] According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[3] As this reservation has not given rise to any objection on the part of the States to which it was communicated in accordance with Article 22, it may be considered as accepted.

[4] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

PROTOCOL.

Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)	GREAT BRITAIN and NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)	INDIA	AUSTRALIA
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)	CHINA	BOLIVIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)	FRANCE	BRAZIL
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935).	JAPAN	CANADA
DENMARK[1] (February 19th, 1931)	LUXEMBURG	CHILE
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)	PANAMA	COSTA RICA
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)	ROUMANIA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)	SWITZERLAND	ECUADOR
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)		EGYPT
IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)		ETHIOPIA
Italy (December 27th, 1935)		FINLAND
Mexico (March 30th, 1936 *a*)		GUATEMALA
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)		HAITI
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)		HONDURAS
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)		ICELAND
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		IRAN
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		IRAQ
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		LATVIA
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[2] (July 13th, 1931)		LIBERIA
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		LIECHTENSTEIN
		LITHUANIA
		NICARAGUA
		NEW ZEALAND
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SAN MARINO
		SALVADOR
		SIAM
		SWEDEN
		TURKEY
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

OPTIONAL PROTOCOL.[3]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)	PANAMA	The Members of the League of Nations who did not sign it and the non-member States having signed or who have been invited to accede to the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency.
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)		
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)		
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)		
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)		
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		
ROUMANIA (November 10th, 1930)		
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		

[1] Same note as for the Convention.
[2] Instrument deposited in Berlin.
[3] This Protocol came into force on August 30th, 1930. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 395; Vol. CXXII, p. 367; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 428; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 351.

XXI. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.[1]

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

In Force.

Definitive signatures.	*Signatures* ad referendum.	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
AUSTRIA (February 3rd, 1930)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	ALBANIA
BELGIUM (June 14th, 1929)	HUNGARY	BULGARIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 14th, 1929)	SWITZERLAND	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FINLAND (October 9th, 1929)		DENMARK
FRANCE (June 14th, 1929)		ESTONIA
GERMANY (May 12th, 1930)		IRISH FREE STATE
GREECE (June 22nd, 1931)		LATVIA
ITALY (June 14th, 1929)		LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS, (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 3rd, 1930)		LUXEMBURG
POLAND (December 23rd, 1929).		NORWAY
ROUMANIA (November 26th, 1929)		PORTUGAL
SAAR TERRITORY GOVERNING COMMISSION (June 14th, 1929)		SWEDEN
SPAIN (December 17th, 1929)		YUGOSLAVIA

XXII. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

3. PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[2]

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1930)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ALBANIA (September 12th, 1930)	*Argentine Republic*
AUSTRALIA (August 28th, 1930)	BOLIVIA
AUSTRIA (February 26th, 1930)	BRAZIL
BELGIUM (November 18th, 1929)	GUATEMALA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (February 12th, 1930)	NICARAGUA
BULGARIA (April 27th, 1931)	PANAMA
CANADA (August 28th, 1930)	PERU
CHILE (November 20th, 1933)	
CHINA (October 14th, 1930)	

---

[1] This Agreement is not subject to ratification. It came into force, September 12th, 1929, in accordance with its Article 11. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIV, p. 277; Vol. C, p. 263; and Vol. CXI, p. 416.

[2] This Protocol came into force on February 1st, 1936.
In view of the provisions of its paragraph 6, this Protocol has ceased to be open for signature.

3. PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE REVISION OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA [1] (January 5th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 30th, 1930)
DENMARK (March 11th, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (September 8th, 1930)
ETHIOPIA (March 30th, 1935)
FINLAND (August 28th, 1930)
FRANCE (May 8th, 1931)
GERMANY (August 13th, 1930)
GREECE (August 29th, 1930)
HAITI (September 30th, 1930)
HUNGARY (August 13th, 1930)
INDIA (February 26th, 1930)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE (August 2nd, 1930)
ITALY (April 2nd, 1931)
JAPAN (November 14th, 1930)
LATVIA (August 29th, 1930)
LIBERIA (August 29th, 1930)
LITHUANIA (January 23rd, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 8th, 1930)
NEW ZEALAND (June 4th, 1930)
NORWAY (April 10th, 1930)
PARAGUAY (May 11th, 1933)
POLAND (May 13th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (June 12th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (August 4th, 1930)
SALVADOR (August 29th, 1930)
SIAM (June 2nd, 1930)
SPAIN (July 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (March 20th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 5th, 1930)
URUGUAY (September 19th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (August 4th, 1933)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 27th, 1930)

4. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE. [2]

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1930)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA (Sept. 12th, 1930)	BOLIVIA	COSTA RICA
AUSTRALIA (August 28th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ECUADOR
AUSTRIA (February 26th, 1930)	CHILE	IRAQ
BELGIUM (October 5th, 1931)	GUATEMALA	MEXICO
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (February 12th, 1930)	HAITI	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	LIBERIA	
	NICARAGUA	
	PARAGUAY	
	PERU	
	SALVADOR	
	Turkey	

[1] The reservation made by the Cuban Government when ratifying the Protocol was withdrawn by this Government by an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on March 14th, 1932.

[2] The present Protocol shall come into force as soon as all States which have ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, and also the United States, have deposited their ratifications (Article 7).

4. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

BULGARIA (April 27th, 1931)
CANADA (August 28th, 1930)
CHINA (October 14th, 1930)
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA (November 26th, 1930)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 30th, 1930)
DENMARK (March 11th, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (September 8th, 1930)
ETHIOPIA (March 30th, 1935)
FINLAND (August 28th, 1930)
FRANCE (May 8th, 1931)
GERMANY (August 13th, 1930)
GREECE (August 29th, 1930)
HUNGARY (August 13th, 1930)
INDIA (February 26th, 1930)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
IRISH FREE STATE (August 2nd, 1930)
ITALY (April 2nd, 1931)
JAPAN (November 14th, 1930)
LATVIA (August 29th, 1930)
LITHUANIA (January 23rd, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (November 3rd, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 8th, 1930)
NEW ZEALAND (June 4th, 1930)
NORWAY (April 10th, 1930)
PANAMA (May 2nd, 1935)
POLAND (May 13th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (June 12th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (August 4th, 1930)
SIAM (June 2nd, 1930)
SPAIN (July 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (March 20th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 5th, 1930)
URUGUAY (September 19th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 14th, 1932)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 27th, 1930)

XXIII. PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

1. CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
With reservations as regards Articles 5, 6, 7, 16 and 17, which Brazil will not adopt owing to difficulties with which it has to contend in connection with principles forming the basis of its internal legislation.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
CHILE

The Convention is open to Accession by :

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
COSTA RICA

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 25, § 1).
The present Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 25 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 26, § 1).

1. Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws *(continued).*

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations (April 6th, 1934)	Colombia Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.	Dominican Republic
Canada (April 6th, 1934)	Cuba Subject to reservation as regards Articles 9, 10 and 11.	Ecuador
China (February 14th, 1935) Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.	Czechoslovakia	Ethiopia
India (October 7th, 1935) In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	Finland
Monaco (April 27th, 1931 *a*)	Denmark Subject to reservation as regards Articles 5 and 11.	Guatemala
Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)	Egypt	Haiti
Poland (June 15th, 1934)	Estonia	Honduras
Sweden (July 6th, 1933) The Swedish Government declares that it does not accept to be bound by the provisions of the second sentence of Article 11, in the case where the wife referred to in the article, after recovering the nationality of her country of origin, fails to establish her ordinary residence in that country.	France	Iran
	Germany	Iraq
	Greece	Liberia
	Hungary	Lithuania
	Iceland	New Zealand
	Irish Free State	Nicaragua
	Italy	Panama
	Japan Subject to reservation as regards Articles 4 and 10 and as regards the words "according to its law" of Article 13.	Paraguay
	Latvia	Roumania
	Luxemburg	San Marino
	Mexico Subject to reservation as regards paragraph 2 of Article 1.	Siam
	The Netherlands (1) Exclude from acceptance Articles 8, 9 and 10; (2) Do not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	Turkey
	Peru Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Portugal	Venezuela
	Salvador	
	Spain	
	Switzerland Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.	
	Uruguay	
	Yugoslavia	

2. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Union of South Africa (October 9th, 1935 *a*) Subject to reservation as regards Article 2.	Austria	Afghanistan
United States of America (August 3rd, 1932)	Belgium Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.	Albania
Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	Canada	Argentine Republic
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)	Chile	Bolivia
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)	Colombia	Bulgaria
India (September 28th, 1932) In accordance with the provisions of Article 15, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Cuba	China
Salvador (October 14th, 1935)	Denmark	Costa Rica
Sweden (July 6th, 1933)	Egypt	Czechoslovakia
	France	Free City of Danzig
	Germany	Dominican Republic
	Greece	Ecuador
	Irish Free State	Estonia
	Luxemburg	Ethiopia
	Mexico	Finland
	The Netherlands (1) Exclude from acceptance Article 3; (2) Do not intend to assume any obligation as regards Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	Guatemala
	Peru	Haiti
	Portugal	Honduras
	Spain	Hungary
	Uruguay	Iceland
		Iran
		Iraq
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Monaco
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Poland
		Roumania
		San Marino
		Siam
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 11, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 11 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 12, § 1).

3. Protocol relating to a Certain Case of Statelessness.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)	Belgium Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.	Afghanistan
Australia (July 8th, 1935) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	Canada	Albania
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)	Colombia	United States of America
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)	Cuba	Argentine Republic
	Czechoslovakia	Austria
	Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	Bolivia
Chile (March 20th, 1935)	Denmark	Bulgaria
China (February 14th, 1935)	Egypt	Costa Rica
India (September 28th, 1932) In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Estonia	Dominican Republic
	France	Ecuador
	Greece	Ethiopia
	Irish Free State	Finland
	Japan	Germany
	Latvia	Guatemala
	Luxemburg	Haiti
	Mexico	Honduras
	The Netherlands Do not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	Hungary
Poland (June 15th, 1934)	Peru	Iceland
Salvador (October 14th, 1935 *a*)	Portugal	Iran
	Spain	Iraq
	Uruguay	Italy
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Monaco
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Roumania
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 9, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 9 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 10, § 1).

4. Special Protocol concerning Statelessness.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)	Austria	Afghanistan
Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*) Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	Belgium With the reservation that the application of this Protocol will not be extended to the Colony of the Belgian Congo or to the Territories under mandate.	Albania
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)	Canada	United States of America
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)	Colombia	Argentine Republic
	Cuba	Bolivia
	Egypt	Bulgaria
China (February 14th, 1935)	Greece	Chile
India (September 28th, 1932) In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.	Irish Free State	Costa Rica
	Luxemburg	Czechoslovakia
	Mexico	Free City of Danzig
	Peru	Denmark
	Portugal	Dominican Republic
	Spain	Ecuador
	Uruguay	Estonia
Salvador (October 14th, 1935) The Republic of Salvador does not assume the obligation laid down by the Protocol where the Salvadorian nationality possessed by the person and ultimately lost by him was acquired by naturalisation.		Ethiopia
		Finland
		France
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		Iran
		Iraq
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Monaco
		The Netherlands
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Poland
		Roumania
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 9, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 9 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 10, § 1).

XXIV. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

I. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles, 6, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the utilisation of the rights provided in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention. As regards the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government intends to reserve all the rights provided in the Annex in question, with the exception of the right mentioned in Article 21 of that Annex.

* FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The undertaking by the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 of Annex II of the said Convention.
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Declares that Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II of the Convention.

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
Subject to the following reservations with regard to Annex II:
Article 8: Paragraphs 1 and 3.
Article 9: As regards bills payable at a fixed date, or at a fixed period after date or after sight.
Article 13.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ECUADOR
HUNGARY
LUXEMBURG
PERU
POLAND
SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article VI of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 257; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; and Vol. CLX, p. 428.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, with Annexes and Protocol *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Article 15: (*a*) Proceedings against a drawer or endorser who has made an inequitable gain;

(*b*) Same proceedings against an acceptor who has made an inequitable gain.

"These proceedings shall be taken within a period of five years counting from the date of the bill of exchange."

Article 17: The provisions of Greek law relating to short-term limitations shall apply.

Article 20: The above-mentioned reservations apply equally to promissory notes.

ITALY (August 31st, 1932)

The Italian Government reserves the right to avail itself of the right granted in Articles 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the right referred to in the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention, in virtue of Article 1, paragraph 2.

MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)

NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15 and 17 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Annex II.

It will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (August 31st, 1932)	BRAZIL	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)	COLOMBIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland (June 24th, 1935)	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ALBANIA
	ECUADOR	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
	HUNGARY	SA'UDI ARABIA
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)	LUXEMBURG	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	PERU	AUSTRALIA
	POLAND	BOLIVIA
	SPAIN	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
	TURKEY	
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)	YUGOSLAVIA	BULGARIA
France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)		CANADA
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)		CHILE
GREECE (August 31st, 1931)		CHINA
ITALY (August 31st, 1932)		COSTA RICA
JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)		CUBA
MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)		*DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 15 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 317; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; and Vol. CLX, p. 428.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

2. CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.
(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932) Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*) *Surinam* (August 7th, 1936 *a*) NORWAY (July 27th, 1932) *PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal. SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932) SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.	EGYPT ESTONIA ETHIOPIA GUATEMALA HAITI HONDURAS ICELAND INDIA IRAN IRAQ IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LIBERIA LIECHTENSTEIN LITHUANIA MEXICO NEW ZEALAND NICARAGUA PANAMA PARAGUAY ROUMANIA SALVADOR SAN MARINO SIAM SUDAN UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS URUGUAY VENEZUELA

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.[1]
(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (August 31st, 1932) BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932) GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 18th, 1934 *a*) His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His Colonies or Protectorates or any territories under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom. NEWFOUNDLAND (May 7th, 1934 *a*) Subject to the provision D. I in the Protocol of the Convention *Barbados (** with limitation)* *Basutoland* *Bechuanaland Protectorate* *Bermuda (with limitation)* *British Guiana (with limitation)* *British Honduras* *Ceylon (with limitation)* *Cyprus (with limitation)* *Fiji (with limitation)* *Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)* *Gibraltar (with limitation)* (July 18th, 1936 *a*)	BRAZIL COLOMBIA CZECHOSLOVAKIA ECUADOR HUNGARY LUXEMBURG PERU POLAND SPAIN TURKEY YUGOSLAVIA	AFGHANISTAN UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA ALBANIA UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SA'UDI ARABIA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA BOLIVIA BULGARIA CANADA CHILE CHINA COSTA RICA CUBA DOMINICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT ESTONIA ETHIOPIA GREECE GUATEMALA HAITI HONDURAS ICELAND INDIA IRAN IRAQ

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 337; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; and Vol. CLX, p. 429.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

** The words "with limitation" placed after the names of certain territories indicate that the limitation contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention applies to these territories.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Gold Coast: (a) *Colony* (b) *Ashanti* (c) *Northern Territories* (d) *Togoland under British Mandate* *Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation)* *Malay States:* (a) *Federated Malay States* *Negri Sembilan*, *Pahang*, *Perak*, *Selangor* (with limitation) (b) *Unfederated Malay States:* *Johore*, *Kedah*, *Kelantan*, *Perlis*, *Trengganu* (with limitation) *Brunei* *Malta* *Northern Rhodesia* *Nyasaland Protectorate* *Palestine* (excluding Trans-Jordan) *Seychelles* *Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation)* *Straits Settlements (with limitation)* *Swaziland* *Trinidad and Tobago (with limitation)* *Uganda Protectorate (with limitation)* *Windward Islands:* *Grenada*, *St. Lucia*, *St. Vincent* (with limitation) ****Irish Free State* (July 10th, 1936 *a*) *FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935) DENMARK (July 27th, 1932) The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland. FINLAND (August 31st, 1932) *France* (April 27th, 1936 *a*) *GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933) ITALY (August 31st, 1932) JAPAN (August 31st, 1932) MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*) THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932) Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*) *Surinam* (August 7th, 1936 *a*) NORWAY (July 27th, 1932) *PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal. SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932) SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.	(July 18th, 1936 *a*) LATVIA LIBERIA LIECHTENSTEIN LITHUANIA MEXICO NEW ZEALAND NICARAGUA PANAMA PARAGUAY ROUMANIA SALVADOR SAN MARINO SIAM SUDAN UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS URUGUAY VENEZUELA

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

** The Government of the Irish Free State having informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its desire to be allowed the limitation specified in paragraph I of Section D of the Protocol to this Convention, the Secretary-General has transmitted this desire to the interested States in application of paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned Section.

XXV. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.[1]

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
DENMARK (May 15th, 1931)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
FINLAND (July 30th, 1931)	AUSTRIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)	Subject to the reservation that this signature shall only take effect when an agreement with the States concerned has removed the obstacles which still stand in the way of the application of the Convention as regards Austria —*i.e.*, the supervision of credit exercised by the Committee of Control and the general lien belonging to the States which have granted reconstruction credits.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	BELGIUM	CANADA
	BOLIVIA	CHILE
	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations	CHINA
	AUSTRALIA	COLOMBIA
	IRISH FREE STATE	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	BULGARIA	ECUADOR
	CUBA	GUATEMALA
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	HAITI
	ESTONIA	HONDURAS
	ETHIOPIA	HUNGARY
	FRANCE	INDIA
	GERMANY	IRAQ
	GREECE	JAPAN
	ITALY	LIBERIA
	LATVIA	LUXEMBURG
	LITHUANIA	MEXICO
	THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.	NEW ZEALAND
	NORWAY	NICARAGUA
	PERU	PANAMA
	POLAND	PARAGUAY
	PORTUGAL	SALVADOR
	ROUMANIA	SIAM
	SPAIN	SWITZERLAND
	SWEDEN	TURKEY
	In virtue of the constitutional laws of Sweden, loan operations are entrusted to a special authority (Riksgäldskontoret) appointed direct by Parliament.	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	YUGOSLAVIA	URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

[1] The present Convention shall not come into force until it has received ratifications or accessions resulting in causing a sum of not less than 50 million gold francs, for the annual service of loans, to be covered by ordinary guarantees and also by the special guarantees of not less than three Governments. It shall enter into force ninety days after the date on which the conditions provided above are satisfied and subject to the provisions of Article 35.

XXVI. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.	*Signatures or Accessions subject to Ratification.*	*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932) Belgium cannot undertake, for the present, to apply the provisions relating to "Warning of gale expected to affect the locality" which form the first chapter of the Regulations of this Agreement. Further, the ratification by Belgium of the provisions which are the object of Chapter II (Tide and depth signals), and Chapter III (Signals concerning the movement of vessels at the entrances of harbours or important channels), will only take effect when Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Norway shall have themselves notified their effective ratifications of the provisions contained in these two chapters. This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA CUBA ESTONIA GERMANY SWEDEN YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA CANADA CHILE COLOMBIA COSTA RICA DENMARK DOMINICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT ECUADOR GUATEMALA HAITI HONDURAS INDIA IRISH FREE STATE ICELAND IRAN IRAQ ITALY JAPAN LIBERIA LITHUANIA MEXICO NEW ZEALAND NICARAGUA NORWAY PANAMA PERU SALVADOR SIAM TANGIER URUGUAY VENEZUELA
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*) CHINA (May 29th, 1935) FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933) *Finland* (June 12th, 1936) FRANCE (July 13th, 1931) French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows: French West Africa French Equatorial Africa Togoland Cameroons Madagascar French Settlements in India Indo-China Reunion French Coast of Somaliland New Caledonia Oceania Martinique Guadeloupe Guiana St. Pierre and Miquelon (October 28th, 1933 *a*) GREECE (September 14th, 1932) *Latvia* (September 17th, 1935 *a*) MONACO (November 3rd, 1933) MOROCCO (September 3rd, 1931) THE NETHERLANDS (August 24th, 1931 *s*) Including the Netherlands Indies. POLAND (October 2nd, 1933) PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*) SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933) TUNIS (October 27th, 1931) *Turkey* (June 27th, 1936 *a*) UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)		

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on November 22nd, 1931, the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by five Governments. (Article 5.) See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXV, p. 95; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 453; Vol. CXLII, p. 379; Vol. CLVI, p. 241; and Vol. CLX, p. 393.

2. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.

BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932)
This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Does not include any Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate of His Britannic Majesty.
INDIA (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Does not include any of the Indian States under British suzerainty.
CHINA (May 29th, 1935)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
DENMARK (April 29th, 1931 *s*)
FINLAND (May 23rd, 1934)
FRANCE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:
French West Africa
French Equatorial Africa
Togoland
Cameroons
Madagascar
French Settlements in India
Indo-China
Reunion
French Coast of Somaliland
New Caledonia
Oceania
Martinique
Guadeloupe
Guiana
St. Pierre and Miquelon
(October 28th, 1933 *a*)
MOROCCO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
TUNIS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
GREECE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Iraq (October 15th, 1935 *a*)
Latvia (September 17th, 1935 *a*)
MONACO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
THE NETHERLANDS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Including the Netherlands Indies.
POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)
SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)
SWEDEN (February 3rd, 1933)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)
Turkey (June 27th, 1936 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures or Accessions subject to Ratification.

CUBA
ESTONIA
GERMANY

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
TANGIER
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on January 21st, 1931, the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by five Governments. (Article 4.) See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 21: Vol. CXVII, p. 331; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 449; Vol. CXLII, p. 371; Vol. CXLVII, p. 350; Vol. CLVI, p. 226; and Vol. CLX, p. 380.

XXVII. DECLARATION BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE POWERS WHICH ARE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION INSTITUTING THE DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE DANUBE.

(Geneva, December 5th, 1930.)

Signatures.	*Signatures ad referendum.*
AUSTRIA BELGIUM GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA FRANCE ITALY ROUMANIA YUGOSLAVIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA GERMANY GREECE HUNGARY

XXVIII. UNIFICATION OF RIVER LAW.

1. CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
PORTUGAL (March 1st, 1932 *a*) Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.	AUSTRIA Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14, of the Protocol-Annex. BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland). Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. FRANCE GERMANY Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG THE NETHERLANDS Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. POLAND ROUMANIA SWITZERLAND Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK ESTONIA FINLAND GREECE IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LITHUANIA NORWAY SPAIN SWEDEN TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 17).

2. CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *in rem* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	AUSTRIA Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland). Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. FRANCE GERMANY Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG THE NETHERLANDS Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. POLAND SWITZERLAND Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK ESTONIA FINLAND GREECE IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LITHUANIA NORWAY PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SPAIN SWEDEN TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

3. CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [2]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FRANCE HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under IV, *ad* Article 8, of the Protocol-Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG POLAND YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA AUSTRIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK FREE CITY OF DANZIG ESTONIA FINLAND GERMANY GREECE IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LITHUANIA THE NETHERLANDS NORWAY PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SPAIN SWEDEN SWITZERLAND TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Convention shall enter into force six months after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 53).
[2] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 11).

XXIX. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

1. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935) This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, para. 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to this Convention. DENMARK (July 27th, 1932) The undertaking of the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14 par. 1, 16 (*a*), 18, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of Annex II to the said Convention. The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland. FINLAND (August 31st, 1932) This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*), 18 and 27 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein. *France* (April 27th, 1936 *a*) Declares that Articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied. *GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933) This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to the Convention. *GREECE (June 1st, 1934) Subject to the following conditions: A. The Hellenic Government does not avail itself of the reservations provided in Articles 1, 2, 5-8, 10-14, 16, paragraph 1 (*a*) and (*b*), 18, paragraph 1, 19-22, 24 and 26, paragraph 2, of Annex II. B. The Hellenic Government avails itself of the following reservations provided in Annex II: (1) The reservation in Article 3, paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the Uniform Law being replaced by the words: " A cheque which does not specify the place of payment shall be regarded as payable at the place where it was drawn ". (2) The reservation in Article 4, the following paragraph being added to Article 3: " A cheque issued and payable in Greece shall not be valid as a cheque unless it is drawn on a banking Company or Greek legal person having the status of an institution of public law, engaging in banking business ".	AUSTRIA BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA ECUADOR HUNGARY LUXEMBURG MEXICO POLAND ROUMANIA SPAIN TURKEY YUGOSLAVIA	AFGHANISTAN UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA ALBANIA UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SA'UDI ARABIA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA BOLIVIA BRAZIL GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA CANADA CHILE CHINA COLOMBIA COSTA RICA CUBA DOMINICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT ESTONIA ETHIOPIA GUATEMALA HAITI HONDURAS ICELAND INDIA IRAN IRAQ IRISH FREE STATE LATVIA LIBERIA LIECHTENSTEIN LITHUANIA NEW ZEALAND PANAMA PARAGUAY PERU SALVADOR SAN MARINO SIAM SUDAN UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS URUGUAY VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article VI of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 355; and Vol. CLVI, p. 293.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, with Annexes and Protocol *(cont)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

(3) The reservation in Article 9, the following provision being added to paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Uniform Law: "But in such exceptional case the issue of the cheque to bearer is prohibited."

(4) The reservation in Article 15, the following paragraph being added to Article 31 of the Uniform Law: "By presidential decree, promulgated at the instance of the Ministers of Justice and National Economy, it may be decided what institutions in Greece are to be regarded as clearing-houses."

(5) The reservation in the second paragraph of Article 16, it being laid down that "provisions with regard to the loss or theft of cheques shall be embodied in Greek law."

(6) The reservation in Article 17, the following paragraph being added at the end of Article 35: "In exceptional circumstances connected with the rate of exchange of Greek currency, the effects of the stipulation contained in paragraph 3 of the present Article may be abrogated in each case by special legislation as regards cheques payable in Greece. The above provision may also be applied as regards cheques issued in Greece."

(7) The reservation in Article 23, the following being added to No. 2 in Article 45 of the Uniform Law: "which, however, in the case of cheques issued and payable in Greece, shall be calculated in each case at the legal rate of interest in force in Greece." Similarly, the following is added to No. 2 of Article 46 of the Uniform Law: "except in the special case dealt with in No. 2 of the preceding Article."

(8) The reservation in Article 25, the following Article being added to the National Law: "In the event of forfeiture of the bearer's rights or limitation of the right of action, proceedings may be taken against the drawer or endorser on the ground of his having made an inequitable gain. The right to take such proceedings lapses after three years from the date of the issue of the cheque."

(9) The reservation in the first paragraph of Article 26, a provision being enacted to the following effect: "The causes of interruption or suspension of limitation of actions enacted in the present law shall be governed by the rules regarding limitation and short-term limitation of actions."

(10) The reservation in Article 27, a separate Article being appended in the following terms: "Legal holidays within the meaning of the present law shall be all Sundays and all full days of rest observed by public offices."

(11) The reservation in Article 28 and the reservation in Article 29.

(12) The reservation in Article 30.

ITALY (August 31st, 1933)

In accordance with Article 1 of this Convention, the Royal Italian Government intends to avail itself of the rights provided in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, para. 2, 19, 20, 21, para. 2, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

In connection with Article 15 of Annex II to this Convention, the institutions referred to in the said article are, in Italy, solely the "Stanze di compensazione".

JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)

By application of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, this ratification is subject to the benefit of the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention.

MONACO (February 9th, 1933)

*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph, 1, 16(*a*) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 4, 8, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

It will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
*Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)	Austria	Afghanistan
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)	Belgium	Union of South Africa
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	Czechoslovakia	Albania
Finland (August 31st, 1932)	Ecuador	United States of America
France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)	Hungary	Sa'udi Arabia
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)	Luxemburg	Argentine Republic
*Greece (June 1st, 1934)	Mexico	Australia
Italy (August 31st, 1933)	Poland	Bolivia
Japan (August 25th, 1933)	Roumania	Brazil
Monaco (February 9th, 1933)	Spain	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
*The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)	Turkey	Bulgaria
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)	Yugoslavia	Canada
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)		Chile
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)		China
Norway (July 27th, 1932)		Colombia
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934)		Costa Rica
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.		Cuba
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)		Dominican Republic
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932)		Egypt
This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		New Zealand
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Uruguay
		Venezuela

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 407; and Vol. CLVI, p. 293.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (January 13th, 1932) This ratification does not include any British Colony or Protectorate or any mandated territory in respect of which the mandate is exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.	Austria	Afghanistan
Barbados	Belgium	Union of South Africa
Basutoland	Czechoslovakia	Albania
Bechuanaland Protectorate	Ecuador	United States of America
Bermuda	Hungary	Sa'udi Arabia
British Guiana	Luxemburg	Argentine Republic
British Honduras	Mexico	Australia
Ceylon	Poland	Bolivia
Cyprus	Roumania	Brazil
Fiji	Spain	Bulgaria
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)	Turkey	Canada
Gibraltar	Yugoslavia	Chile
Gold Coast:		China
(a) *Colony*		Colombia
(b) *Ashanti*		Costa Rica
(c) *Northern Territories*		Cuba
(d) *Togoland under British Mandate*		Dominican Republic
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		Egypt
Malay States:		Estonia
(a) *Federated Malay States:*		Ethiopia
Negri Sembilan		Guatemala
Pahang		Haiti
Perak		Honduras
Selangor		Iceland
(b) *Unfederated Malay States:*		India
Johore		Iran
Kedah		Iraq
Kelantan		Latvia
Perlis		Liberia
Trengganu		Liechtenstein
Brunei		Lithuania
Malta		New Zealand
Northern Rhodesia		Panama
Nyasaland Protectorate		Paraguay
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)		Peru
Seychelles		Salvador
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)		San Marino
Straits Settlements		Siam
Swaziland		Sudan
Trinidad and Tobago		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uganda Protectorate		Uruguay
Windward Islands:		Venezuela
Grenada		
St. Lucia		
St. Vincent		
July 18th, 1936 *a)*		
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)		

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on November 29th, 1933, in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 7; and Vol. CLVI, p. 292.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
*GREECE (June 1st, 1934)
Irish Free State (July 10th, 1936 *a*)
ITALY (August 31st, 1933)
JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)
MONACO (February 9th, 1933)
*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
NICARAGUA (March 16, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (August 26, 1932)
This ratification will take effect only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques.

XXX. ROAD TRAFFIC.

I. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS.[1]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (August 21st, 1936 *a*)
FRANCE (October 11th, 1934)
Does not assume any obligation in regard to Algeria, colonies, protectorates and territories under its mandate.
Algeria (July 22nd, 1935 *a*)
ITALY (September 25th, 1933)
Luxemburg (April 9th, 1936)
MONACO (January 19th, 1932*a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
DENMARK
GERMANY
HUNGARY
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA

---

[1] This Convention came into force on July 16th, 1934, in accordance with its Article 11. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CL, p. 247; and Vol. CLX, p. 439.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. Convention concerning the Unification of Road Signals (*continued*).

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Poland (April 5th, 1934)	Cuba
Portugal (April 18th, 1932 *a*) Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.	Dominican Republic
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)	Ecuador
Spain (July 18th, 1933)	Estonia
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)	Ethiopia
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)	Finland
	Greece
	Guatemala
	Haiti
	Honduras
	India
	Iran
	Iraq
	Irish Free State
	Japan
	Latvia
	Liberia
	Lithuania
	Mexico
	New Zealand
	Nicaragua
	Norway
	Panama
	Paraguay
	Peru
	Salvador
	Siam
	Sweden
	Uruguay
	Venezuela

2. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles, with Protocol-Annex.[1]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (November 9th, 1932) Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.	Czechoslovakia	Afghanistan
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 20th, 1932) Does not include any colonies, protectorates or overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or mandate.	Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	Union of South Africa
Southern Rhodesia (August 6th, 1932 *a*)	Turkey	Albania
Newfoundland (January 9th, 1933 *a*)		Argentine Republic
Ceylon, Cyprus, Gold Coast: Colony, Ashanti, Northern Territories, Togoland under British mandate (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)		Australia
		Austria
		Bolivia
		Canada
		Chile
		China
		Colombia
		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		France
		Germany
		Greece
		Guatemala

[1] This Convention entered into force on May 9th, 1933, in accordance with its Article 14. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 149; Vol. CXLII, p. 393; Vol. CXLVII, p. 356; Vol. CLVI, p. 260; and Vol. CLX, p. 418.

2. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles, with Protocol-Annex *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Hong-Kong, Jamaica, Malta, Windward Islands: Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)

Nigeria: *Colony*, *Protectorate*, *Cameroons under British Mandate*; *Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)* (March 11th, 1936 *a*)

Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (April 29th, 1936 *a*)

Bulgaria (March 5th, 1932 *a*)
Denmark (December 4th, 1931)
Finland (May 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Irish Free State (November 27th, 1933 *a*)
Italy (September 25th, 1933)
Luxemburg (March 31st, 1933)
The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)
Poland (June 15th, 1934)
Portugal (January 23rd, 1932)
Does not assume any obligation as regards its Colonies.
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
Spain (June 3rd, 1933)
Sweden (November 9th, 1933)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 9th, 1933 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
India
Iran
Iraq
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
Monaco
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
Siam
Uruguay
Venezuela

3. Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost Triptychs.[1]

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

Austria (August 4th, 1931)
Belgium (March 28th, 1931)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (March 28th, 1931)
Bulgaria (February 27th, 1932)
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1933)
Denmark (March 28th, 1931)
France (April 15th, 1931)
Germany (March 28th, 1931)
Greece (August 18th, 1931)
Hungary (August 14th, 1931)

Signatures ad referendum.

Yugoslavia

The Agreement is open to Signature by:

Albania
Free City of Danzig
Estonia
Finland
Iceland
Latvia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Monaco
San Marino

[1] This Agreement entered into force on June 26th, 1931, on the ninetieth day after its signature on behalf of three Customs administrations (Article III). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXIX, p. 47; Vol. CXXVI, p. 460; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 432; Vol. CLVI, p. 230; and Vol. CLX, p. 384.

3. AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

IRISH FREE STATE (May 6th, 1931)
ITALY (May 27th, 1931)
LUXEMBURG (March 28th, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (June 11th, 1931)
NORWAY (September 27th, 1932)
POLAND (September 9th, 1932)
PORTUGAL (August 26th, 1931)
ROUMANIA (June 19th, 1935)
SPAIN (July 8th, 1931)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (March 28th, 1931)
TURKEY (May 15th, 1932)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (September 6th, 1935)

XXXI. INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY.

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY,[1] WITH CHARTER AND STATUTES.

(Geneva, May 21st, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
LATVIA (September 28th, 1931)
POLAND (April 22nd, 1932)
ROUMANIA (February 4th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (December 31st, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DENMARK

The Danish Government reserves the right to make the entry into force of this Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being ratified and also put into force by Norway and Sweden.

ESTONIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
HUNGARY
ITALY
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe only)
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
SWEDEN [2]

The Convention is open to Accession by:

1. The European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *a*.
2. The non-European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *b*.

---

[1] The present Convention shall come into force as soon as the amount of the contributions, whether obligatory or voluntary, to the Special Reserve due from the Governments which have ratified the Convention attains the sum of twenty-five million francs. If this condition is not realised before December 31st, 1931, a Conference of the Governments which have ratified the Convention shall be called by the Council of the League of Nations. This Conference will determine new conditions for the coming into force of the Convention (Article 16).

[2] On signing this Convention, the Swedish Plenipotentiary made the following declaration:

"The Swedish Government reserves the right to make its ratification of this Convention depend on the attitude which the Governments of Denmark and Norway shall adopt towards it."

XXXII. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS. [1]

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (June 21st, 1935 *a*)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (April 28th, 1932)

1. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purpose of internal control and control of import into, and export from, territory under its jurisdiction, of opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures stricter than the provisions of the Convention.
2. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purposes of controlling transit through its territories of raw opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures by which the production of an import permit issued by the country of destination may be made a condition precedent to the granting of permission for transit through its territory.
3. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to send statistics of import and export to the Permanent Central Opium Board short of 60 days after the close of the three months' period to which such statistics refer.
4. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to state separately amounts of drugs purchased or imported for Government purposes.
5. Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs by them on the part of the United States of America on this date is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognises a regime or entity which signs or accedes to the Convention as the Government of a country when that regime or entity is not recognised by the Government of the United States of America as the Government of that country.
6. The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed on this date, does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country represented by a regime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognise as the Government of that country until such country has a Government recognised by the Government of the United States of America.

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
ETHIOPIA
LIBERIA
PARAGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
FINLAND
ICELAND
LATVIA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Convention entered into force on July 9th, 1933, in accordance with its Article 30. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXIX, p. 301; Vol. CXLVII, p. 361; Vol. CLII, p. 344; Vol. CLVI, p. 268; and Vol. CLX, p. 419.

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Sa'udi Arabia (August 15th, 1936)

Austria (July 3rd, 1934)

Belgium (April 10th, 1933)

This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo, nor the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

Brazil (April 5th, 1933)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 1st, 1933)

His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates and overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.

British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(a) *Colony*
(b) *Ashanti*
(c) *Northern Territories*
(d) *Togoland under British Mandate*
Hong-Kong
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher and Nevis
Virgin Islands
Mauritius
Nigeria:
(a) *Colony*
(b) *Protectorate*
(c) *Cameroons under British Mandate*
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar Protectorate

(May 18th, 1936 *a*)

Canada (October 17th, 1932)

Australia (January 24th, 1934)

This accession applies to Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

New Zealand (June 17th, 1935 *a*)

Irish Free State (April 11th, 1933 *a*)

India (November 14th, 1932)

Bulgaria (March 20th, 1933 *a*)

Chile (March 31st, 1933)

China (January 10th, 1934 *a*)

Colombia (January 29th, 1934 *a*)

Costa Rica (April 5th, 1933)

Cuba (April 4th, 1933)

Czechoslovakia (April 12th, 1933)

Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)

Denmark (June 5th, 1936)

Dominican Republic (April 8th, 1933)

Egypt (April 10th, 1933)

Ecuador (April 13th, 1935 *a*)

Estonia (July 5th, 1935 *a*)

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

France (April 10th, 1933)

The French Government makes every reservation, with regard to the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated Territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Germany (April 10th, 1933)
Greece (December 27th, 1934)
Guatemala (May 1st, 1933)
Haiti (May 4th, 1933 *a*)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Hungary (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
Iran (September 28th, 1932)
Iraq (May 30th, 1934 *a*)
Italy (March 21st, 1933)
Japan (June 3rd, 1935)

The Japanese Government declare that, in view of the necessity of close co-operation between the High Contracting Parties in order to carry out most effectively the provisions of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931, they understand that the present position of Japan, regardless of whether she be a Member of the League of Nations or not, is to be maintained in the matter of the composition of the organs and the appointment of the members thereof mentioned in the said Convention.[1]

Liechtenstein [2]
Lithuania (April 10th, 1933)
Luxemburg (May 30th, 1936)
Mexico (March 13th, 1933)

The Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory—as it has already done—measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the preparation, use, possession, importation, exportation and consumption of the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Monaco (February 16th, 1933)
The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
Panama (April 15th, 1935)
Peru (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
Poland (April 11th, 1933)
Portugal (June 17th, 1932)

The Portuguese Government makes every reservation with regard to its colonies as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Roumania (April 11th, 1933)
Salvador (April 7th, 1933 *a*)

(*a*) The Republic of Salvador does not agree to the provisions of Article 26, on the ground that there is no reason why the High Contracting Parties should be given the option of not applying the Convention to their colonies, protectorates, and overseas mandated territories.

(*b*) The Republic of Salvador states that it disagrees with the reservations embodied in Nos. 5 and 6 of the declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America regarding Governments not recognised by the Government of that country; in its opinion, those reservations constitute an infringement of the national sovereignty of Salvador, whose present Government, though not as yet recognised by the United States Government, has been recognised by the majority of the civilised countries of the world. Their recognition is due to their conviction that that Government is a perfectly constitutional one and affords a full and

---

[1] Before ratifying the Convention with the declaration here set out, the Japanese Government consulted the Contracting Parties, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General. A summary of the correspondence which took place was published in the League of Nations *Official Journal* for September 1935 (16th Year, No. 9).

[2] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

" Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

complete guarantee of the performance of its international duties, inasmuch as it enjoys the unanimous, decided and effective support of all the inhabitants of the Republic, whether citizens of the country or foreigners resident therein.

As it respects the internal regimes of other nations, the Republic of Salvador considers that the Convention in question, being of a strictly hygienic and humanitarian character, does not offer a suitable occasion to formulate such political reservations as have called forth this comment.

San Marino (June 12th, 1933)
Siam (February 22nd, 1934)

As its harmful-habit-forming drugs law goes beyond the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the present Convention on certain points, the Siamese Government reserves the right to apply its existing law.

Spain (April 7th, 1933)
Sudan (August 25th, 1932 *a*)
Sweden (August 12th, 1932)
Switzerland (April 10th, 1933)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (April 7th, 1933)
Venezuela (November 15th, 1933)

Protocol of Signature.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
United States of America (April 28th, 1932)	Argentine Republic	Afghanistan
Sa'udi Arabia (August 15th, 1936 *a*)	Bolivia	Union of South Africa
Austria (July 3rd, 1934)	Ethiopia	Albania
Belgium (April 10th, 1933)	Guatemala	Bulgaria
Brazil (April 5th, 1933)	Panama	China
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 1st, 1933) Same reservation as for the Convention.	Paraguay	Finland
British Honduras		Haiti
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		Iceland
Ceylon		Iraq
Cyprus		Latvia
Falkland Islands and Dependencies		Liberia
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		Salvador
Gibraltar		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Gold Coast: (a) *Colony* (b) *Ashanti* (c) *Northern Territories* (d) *Togoland under British Mandate*		Yugoslavia
Hong-Kong		
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		
Leeward Islands: *Antigua* *Dominica* *Montserrat* *St. Christopher and Nevis* *Virgin Islands*		
Mauritius		

May 18th, 1936 *a*)

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Nigeria:
(a) *Colony*
(b) *Protectorate*
(c) *Cameroons under British Mandate*
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar Protectorate
(May 18th, 1936 *a*)

CANADA (October 17th, 1932)
AUSTRALIA (January 24th, 1934 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
IRISH FREE STATE (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
INDIA (November 14th, 1932)
CHILE (November 20th, 1933)
COLOMBIA (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
COSTA RICA (April 5th, 1933)
CUBA (April 4th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 12th, 1933 *a*)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)
Denmark (June 5th, 1936)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (April 8th, 1933)
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
EGYPT (April 10th, 1933)
ESTONIA (July 5th, 1935 *a*)
FRANCE (April 10th, 1933)
GERMANY (April 10th, 1933)
GREECE (December 27th, 1934)
HONDURAS (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
HUNGARY (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)
ITALY (March 21st, 1933)
JAPAN (June 3rd, 1935)
Liechtenstein [1]
LITHUANIA (April 10th, 1933)
Luxemburg (May 30th, 1936)
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
MONACO (March 20th, 1933)
THE NETHERLANDS [2] (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)
NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
PERU (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
POLAND (April 11th, 1933)
PORTUGAL (June 17th, 1932)
ROUMANIA (April 11th, 1933)
SAN MARINO (June 12th, 1933)
SIAM (February 22nd, 1934)
SPAIN (April 7th, 1933)
SUDAN (January 18th, 1933 *a*)
SWEDEN (August 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (April 10th, 1933)
TURKEY (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
URUGUAY (April 7th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 11th, 1934)

---

[1] Same note as for the Convention.

[2] The instrument of ratification specifies that the reservation relating to paragra ph 2 of Article 22, as formulated by the Netherlands representative at the time of signature of the Protocol, should be co nsidered as withdrawn.

XXXIII. WHALING.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING. [1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (July 7th, 1932)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
Austria (January 2nd, 1936 *a*)	BELGIUM	SA'UDI ARABIA
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)	AUSTRALIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 18th, 1934)	INDIA	BOLIVIA
His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.	COLOMBIA	BULGARIA
Canada (December 12th, 1935)	GERMANY	CHILE
New Zealand (October 16th, 1935)	GREECE	CHINA
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (January 11th, 1933)	ROUMANIA	COSTA RICA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 20th, 1933)		CUBA
DENMARK (including Greenland (June 26th, 1934)		FREE CITY OF DANZIG
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT (January 25th, 1933 *a*)		ESTONIA
Finland (March 21st, 1936)		ETHIOPIA
FRANCE (May 16th, 1935)		GUATEMALA
ITALY (June 12th, 1933)		HAITI
The accession of the Italian Government to this Convention can in no way constitute a precedent for future agreements providing for the limitation of fishing in extra-territorial sea.		HONDURAS
Latvia (September 17th, 1935 *a*)		HUNGARY
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)		ICELAND
MONACO (June 7th, 1932 *a*)		IRAN
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)		IRAQ
NICARAGUA (April 30th, 1932*a*)		IRISH FREE STATE
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)		JAPAN
POLAND (September 27th, 1933)		LIBERIA
SUDAN (April 13th, 1932 *a*)		LIECHTENSTEIN
SPAIN (August 2nd, 1933)		LITHUANIA
SWITZERLAND (February 16th, 1933)		LUXEMBURG
TURKEY (May 28th, 1934)		PANAMA
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		PORTUGAL
		SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
		SWEDEN
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

[1] This Convention came into force on January 16th, 1935, in accordance with its Article 17. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLV, p. 349.

XXXIV. MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

GENERAL CONVENTION TO IMPROVE THE MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
NICARAGUA (April 1st, 1935 *a*)	AUSTRIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)	BELGIUM	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PERU (March 29th, 1932)	BULGARIA	SA'UDI ARABIA
	COLOMBIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	AUSTRALIA
	DENMARK	BOLIVIA
	FRANCE	BRAZIL
	Ratification cannot take place until it has been possible for the Government of the Republic to ascertain that the regulations provided for in Article 4, and which must be elaborated in order to enter into force at the same time as the Convention, ensure the guarantees of control which are deemed necessary by the French Government.	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
		CANADA
		CHILE
		CHINA
		COSTA RICA
		CUBA
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		ECUADOR
		EGYPT
		ESTONIA
		ETHIOPIA
		FINLAND
	GERMANY	GUATEMALA
	GREECE	HAITI
	LITHUANIA	HONDURAS
	LUXEMBURG	HUNGARY
	PANAMA	INDIA
	This signature does not affect in any way the provisions of the treaties of conciliation and arbitration concluded up to this date by the Republic of Panama with other Powers.	IRAN
		IRAQ
	PORTUGAL	IRISH FREE STATE
	SIAM	ITALY
	SPAIN	JAPAN
	SWEDEN	LATVIA
	SWITZERLAND	LIBERIA
	URUGUAY	MEXICO
		NEW ZEALAND
		PARAGUAY
		POLAND
		ROUMANIA
		SALVADOR
		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		VENEZUELA
		YUGOSLAVIA

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States have been deposited (Article 13, § 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will then enter into force as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 14, § 1).

XXXV. — SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM-SMOKING.

AGREEMENT.[1]

(Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 3rd, 1933)
India (December 4th, 1935)
Subject to the understanding that this Agreement does not apply at present to the territory known as the Shan States and that it applies, so far as India is concerned, only to the Province of Burma, excluding the Shan States.
FRANCE (May 10th, 1933)
THE NETHERLANDS (May 22nd, 1933)
PORTUGAL (January 27th, 1934)
SIAM (November 19th, 1934)
With a reservation to Article I.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

JAPAN

XXXVI. WHEAT.

FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE OF WHEAT EXPORTING AND IMPORTING COUNTRIES, WITH APPENDICES AND MINUTES OF FINAL MEETING. [2]

(London, August 25th, 1933.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.	*Signatures* ad referendum.	*This Act is open to signature by :*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA AUSTRIA BELGIUM UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA CANADA CZECHOSLOVAKIA [4] FRANCE GERMANY GREECE HUNGARY ITALY POLAND ROUMANIA SPAIN SWEDEN SWITZERLAND UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS YUGOSLAVIA	IRISH FREE STATE [3]	All States with the exception of those mentioned in the preceding columns.

---

[1] The Agreement shall not come into force until it has been ratified by all the High Contracting Parties. The date of its coming into force shall be the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of the last ratification. (Article VI.)

[2] Came into force August 25th, 1933.

The signatures are to be regarded as affixed in the light of the statements made during the discussions by the representatives of the various countries; these statements are contained in the Minutes of the Conference, and are to be interpreted in the sense of paragraph IV of Article 6 of the Final Act.

[3] The Government of the Irish Free State has informed the Secretariat that it regrets not to be in a position to accept this Act which it had signed *ad referendum*.

[4] The Czechoslovak Government informed the Secretariat that it is unable to take a decision as regards its signature given *ad referendum* before September 22nd, 1933. The Czechoslovak Government further informed the Secretariat, on September 21st, 1933, of its acceptance of the Act, calling attention at the same time to the declaration made by the Czechoslovak delegate at the Wheat Conference, by which the Czechoslovak Government reserved the right to make further reservations on approval of its signature, and added that it agrees to the reduction of Customs duties, provided that such reduction shall not affect the maintenance of remunerative prices for home-grown cereals. A decision regarding the remunerative level of prices can only be taken with due consideration of the conditions prevailing in Czechoslovakia.

XXXVII. FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (August 26th, 1935)
With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

Belgium (June 8th, 1936)
The Belgian Government reserve the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending their market against invasion by films of foreign origin.
The Belgian Government declare that they do not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (February 26th, 1936)
His Majesty is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or the territories under his suzerainty, or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him and is being exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

Newfoundland (June 29th, 1936 *a*)

IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)

INDIA (October 17th, 1934)
Under the terms of Article XX of the Convention, this signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of the Convention in the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

BULGARIA (July 10th, 1934 *a*)

CHILE (March 20th, 1935)
With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

Cuba (June 25th, 1936 *a*)

DENMARK (July 10th, 1935)
In conformity with paragraph 1 of Article XX of the Convention, Denmark does not assume any obligation as regards Greenland.

Egypt (February 8th, 1936)

Hungary (May 9th, 1936)
With reservation, for the Hungarian Government, of the right provided in Article IX to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

IRAN (April 12th, 1935 *a*)

Iraq (February 18th, 1936 *a*)

ITALY (November 21st, 1934)

Latvia (October 21st, 1935)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Under the terms of Article XX of this Convention, the Government of the United States of America assume no obligation in respect of the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Island of Guam.

FINLAND

FRANCE
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX, and declaring that the signature of the Convention shall be effective only as regards the home territory of France.

GREECE

PANAMA

POLAND
Subject to the reservation, provided for in Article IX, of the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

SWEDEN

URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] This Convention came into force on January 15th, 1935, in accordance with its Article XVIII. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLV, p. 331.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

MONACO (September 11th, 1934)
Nicaragua (September 7th, 1935)
NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)
ROUMANIA (June 19th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX.
SWITZERLAND (April 20th, 1934)

XXXVIII. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN.

2. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (April 10th, 1935 *a*)
Union of South Africa (November 20th, 1935)
Australia (September 2nd, 1936)
(Including Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.)
Austria (August 7th, 1936)
Belgium (June 11th, 1936)
With reservation as regards Article 10.
BULGARIA (December 19th, 1934)
CHILE (March 20th, 1935)
Cuba (June 25th, 1936 *a*)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (July 27th, 1935)
HUNGARY (August 12th, 1935)
IRAN (April 12th, 1935 *a*)
Latvia (September 17th, 1935)
The Netherlands (September 20th, 1935)
(Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.)
Nicaragua (December 12th, 1935 *a*)
NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)
ROUMANIA (June 6th, 1935)
SUDAN (June 13th, 1934 *a*)
SWEDEN (June 25th, 1934)
SWITZERLAND (July 17th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.
CHINA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
FRANCE
GERMANY
GREECE
LITHUANIA
MONACO
PANAMA
POLAND
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ICELAND
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

[1] The Convention came into force on August 24th, 1934, in accordance with its Article 8. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CL, p. 431; and Vol. CLX, p. 439.

XXXIX. REFUGEES.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES. [1]

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BULGARIA (December 19th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. Article 1. — The Bulgarian Government maintains the reservations made by the Bulgarian delegate on signing the Arrangement of June 30th, 1928,[2] concerning the extension to other categories of refugees of certain measures taken in favour of Russian and Armenian refugees.

II. Article 2. — The departure from the country of refugees in possession of Nansen certificates (passports) shall be governed by the general regulations in force in this respect. Bulgarian consuls will be empowered in cases of *force majeure* to extend Nansen certificates issued in Bulgaria for a period of three months. The cost of visas for Nansen certificates shall be fixed in accordance with the tariff applicable to the nationals of the country by which the certificate was issued.

III. Article 6. — Exemption from *cautio judicatum solvi* shall be at the discretion of the courts in each individual case.

IV. Article 7. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept points *(a)* and *(d)*.

V. Articles 8 and 10 (formerly 7 and 9). — Disability and old-age pensions shall be paid (regard being had to the possibilities of the fund concerned) to the persons entitled, their heirs and assigns, provided always that such persons are resident in the country.

VI. Article 13. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept the first paragraph, as refugees resident in Bulgaria are subject to the same treatment in fiscal matters as other foreign nationals resident in the country.

VII. Article 15. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept paragraphs 2 and 3.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 2, paragraph 3, relating to the right conferred on consuls to extend Nansen certificates, cannot be accepted by the Belgian Government;

(2) Article 9, in so far as it concerns the application of the provisions of the domestic legislation relating to "unemployment insurance", cannot be accepted;

(3) Article 10, concerning social insurance laws, cannot be favourably received;

(4) Article 14, which concerns the enjoyment of the rights and favours accorded to foreigners, subject to reciprocity, cannot be admitted;

(5) The Belgian Government in accepting the present Convention is not assuming any obligation as regards the colony of the Congo or the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

EGYPT

Article 1:

Apart from such modifications or amplifications as each Contracting Party may introduce in this definition, my Government reserves the right to extend or limit the said definition in any way.

Article 2:

Bearers of Nansen certificates may not be admitted into Egypt unless the said certificates contain a visa for return to the countries by which they were issued. If these refugees are authorised to sojourn in Egypt, the competent local authorities reserve the right to issue to them Egyptian travel papers.

Article 3:

These authorities reserve the right to expel such refugees at any moment for reasons of public security.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
MONACO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY

---

[1] This Convention came into force on June 13th, 1935, in accordance with its Article 20. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLIX, p. 199.

[2] This reservation was worded as follows:

"On the understanding that the present Arrangement applies only to such refugees as are at the present date on Bulgarian territory."

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (May 14th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the following reservations:

"A. The Czechoslovak Government will regard as refugees within the meaning of Article 1 only such persons as formerly actually possessed Russian or Turkish nationality, lost it before January 1st, 1923, and have not acquired any other nationality.

"B. The accession of the Czechoslovak Republic does not apply to:

"(*a*) Paragraph 3 of Article 2, whereby consuls are qualified to extend Nansen certificates;

"(*b*) Paragraph 3 of Article 3, so far as it limits the power of the national authorities to expel persons who constitute a danger to the safety of the State and public order; nor, of course, do the provisions of Article 3 in any way affect expulsions by order of the courts, or obligations deriving from extradition treaties or from the Czechoslovak laws regarding the extradition of aliens;

"(*c*) The whole of Article 7, which exempts refugees from the application of the provisions of laws and decrees for the protection of the national labour market;

"(*d*) The whole of Article 14, which waives the condition of reciprocity;

"(*e*) The whole of Article 15, which deals with the creation of local committees.

"C. Articles 4 and 5, dealing with the juridical condition of refugees, and Articles 8, 9, 10 and 11, dealing with industrial accidents and welfare and relief, will be applied in Czechoslovakia only so far as the laws of the country permit."

Denmark (December 21st, 1935 *a*)

With reservation as regards Articles 7 and 14 of the Convention.

This accession does not include Greenland.

Italy (January 16th, 1936 *a*)

1. Article 3 of the Convention cannot limit the right of the Italian authorities to apply measures of expulsion to refugees for reasons of national security and public order.
2. In acceding to the Convention, the Italian Government assumes no obligations in regard to its colonies and possessions.

NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)

With reservation as regards the provisions of Article 2, para. 3, and Article 14.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Article 4:

Moreover, as regards the acquired rights referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the draft Convention, it should be stipulated that in order to ensure respect for such rights due account must be taken of international public order and of internal public order as the latter is conceived and applied in Egyptian law. Further, in order to dispel any misunderstanding, it should be stipulated that the rights in question are only those relating to personal status.

Article 13:

This article must not in any case invalidate or impair our reservation relating to Egyptian travel papers together with the consequences involved in the application of that reservation.

Article 14:

Our signature does not apply to this Article.

Article 15:

The Egyptian Government wishes it to be understood that the committees referred to in Article 15 will not be invested with the powers laid down in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said Article in the event of its desiring to reserve the said powers for the representatives of the local authority.

* * *

The Egyptian Government reserves the right to substitute, should the case arise, and whenever it may think fit, assimilation to nationals, for the most favourable treatment granted to nationals of a foreign country, in all the provisions of the Convention in which such treatment is stipulated.

FRANCE

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 7 shall not preclude the application of the laws and regulations fixing the proportion of wage-earning foreigners that employers are authorised to employ in France;

(2) The organisation, in France, of committees such as are provided for in Article 15 shall not, if it takes place, confer on them powers incompatible with the existing laws in the matter of finding employment;

(3) The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Convention, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

XL. VETERINARY QUESTIONS.

I. International Convention for the Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals, with Declaration attached.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Bulgaria (August 28th, 1936)	Austria	Afghanistan
	Belgium	Union of South Africa
	The Belgian Government does not regard the mere fact that in Belgium the inspection of meat, while carried out by Government veterinary surgeons or by veterinary surgeons approved by the Government, is placed under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior (Inspection of Foodstuffs), as being contrary to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 5, of the present Convention; particularly since all the requirements of the said Article are observed in Belgium.	Albania
	Czechoslovakia	United States of America
	France	Argentine Republic
	Greece	Australia
	Italy	Bolivia
	Latvia	Brazil
	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Poland	Canada
	Roumania	Chile
	Spain	China
	Switzerland	Colombia
	Turkey	Cuba
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions have been received (Article 13, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will come into force on that date (Article 14, paragraph 1).

2. International Convention concerning the Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin, with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
Belgium
BULGARIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Czechoslovak Government does not consider that it can waive the right to make the transit of animals across its territory subject to a previous authorisation. It intends, in practice, to exercise the right so reserved in as liberal a spirit as possible, in conformity with the principles which are at the basis of the present Convention, the object of which is to facilitate the transit of animals and of animal products.

FRANCE
Greece
ITALY
LATVIA
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe)
POLAND
ROUMANIA
Spain
SWITZERLAND
Turkey
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the conditions laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 18 and in paragraph 3 of Article 19 have been received (Article 20, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 20. It will come into force on that date (Article 21, paragraph 1).

3. International Convention concerning the Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products), with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	Austria	Afghanistan
	Belgium	Union of South Africa
	Bulgaria	Albania
	Czechoslovakia	United States of America
	France	Argentine Republic
	Greece	Australia
	Italy	Bolivia
	Latvia	Brazil
	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Poland	Canada
	Roumania	Chile
	Spain	China
	Switzerland	Colombia
	Turkey	Cuba
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the condition laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 12 and in paragraph 3 of Article 13 have been received (Article 14, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 14. It will come into force on that date (Article 15, paragraph 1).

XLI. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

3. AGREEMENT FOR A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF MARITIME BUOYAGE, AND RULES ANNEXED THERETO.[1]

(Geneva, May 13th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures and Ratifications.	*Signatures subject to Ratification.*	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
		UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
		ALBANIA
		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
		AUSTRALIA
		BELGIUM
		BRAZIL
		GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
		BULGARIA
		CANADA
		CHILE
		CHINA
		COLOMBIA
		COSTA RICA
		CUBA
		DENMARK
		FREE CITY OF DANZIG
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		EGYPT
		ECUADOR
		ESTONIA
		FINLAND
		FRANCE
		GERMANY
		GREECE
		GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		ICELAND
		INDIA
		IRAN
		IRISH FREE STATE
		ITALY
		JAPAN
		LATVIA
		LIBERIA
		LITHUANIA
		MEXICO
		MONACO
		MOROCCO
		THE NETHERLANDS
		NEW ZEALAND
		NICARAGUA
		NORWAY
		PANAMA
		PERU
		POLAND
		PORTUGAL
		ROUMANIA
		SALVADOR
		SIAM
		SPAIN
		SWEDEN
		TANGIER
		TUNIS
		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA
		YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The Agreement shall enter into force the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by ten Governments (Article 5).

XLII. SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.

5. CONVENTION OF 1936 FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.[1]

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Signature by:*
	Austria	AFGHANISTAN
	Brazil	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	Great Britain and Northern Ireland	ALBANIA
	Canada	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
	India	SA'UDI ARABIA
	Bulgaria	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	China	AUSTRALIA
	Cuba	BELGIUM
	Czechoslovakia	BOLIVIA
	Denmark	CHILE
	Ecuador	COLOMBIA
	Egypt	COSTA RICA
	France	FREE CITY OF DANZIG
	Greece	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	Honduras	ESTONIA
	Japan	ETHIOPIA
	Mexico	FINLAND
	The Netherlands	GERMANY
	Panama	GUATEMALA
	Poland	HAITI
	Portugal	HUNGARY
	Roumania	ICELAND
	Spain	IRAN
	Switzerland	IRAQ
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	IRISH FREE STATE
	Uruguay	ITALY
	Venezuela	LATVIA
		LIBERIA
		LIECHTENSTEIN
		LITHUANIA
		LUXEMBURG
		MONACO
		NEW ZEALAND
		NICARAGUA
		NORWAY
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
		SUDAN
		SWEDEN
		TURKEY
		YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Convention shall come into force ninety days after the Secretary-General of the League of Nations has received the ratifications or accessions of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States. It shall be registered on that date by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations (Article 22).

Protocol of Signature.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by.:*
	Austria	Afghanistan
	Brazil	Union of South Africa
	Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Albania
	Canada	United States of America
	India	Sa'udi Arabia
	Bulgaria	Argentine Republic
	China	Australia
	Cuba	Belgium
	Czechoslovakia	Bolivia
	Denmark	Chile
	Ecuador	Colombia
	Egypt	Costa Rica
	France	Free City of Danzig
	Greece	Dominican Republic
	Honduras	Estonia
	Japan	Ethiopia
	Mexico	Finland
	The Netherlands	Germany
	Panama	Guatemala
	Poland	Haiti
	Portugal	Hungary
	Roumania	Iceland
	Spain	Iran
	Switzerland	Iraq
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Irish Free State
	Uruguay	Italy
	Venezuela	Latvia
		Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Monaco
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Sweden
		Turkey
		Yugoslavia

XLIII. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

6. Procès-Verbal [1]

TO ALTER THE LATEST DATE OF ISSUE OF THE ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED WORLD REQUIREMENTS OF DANGEROUS DRUGS, DRAWN UP BY THE SUPERVISORY BODY, AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF JULY 13TH, 1931, FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures.

United States of America
Austria
Brazil
Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
Canada
Irish Free State
India
China
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Ecuador
Egypt
France
Greece
Japan
Liechtenstein [2]
The Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Roumania
Siam
Spain
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

The Procès-verbal *is open to Signature by :*

AFGHANISTAN
SA'UDI ARABIA
AUSTRALIA
BELGIUM
BULGARIA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
IRAN
IRAQ
ITALY
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
MONACO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SUDAN
SWEDEN
TURKEY
URUGUAY

---

[1] The present *Procès-verbal* will come into force as soon as it shall have been signed in the name of all Governments parties to the Convention of July 13th, 1931 (§ 2).

[2] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

> " Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

XLIV. REFUGEES.

PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENT CONCERNING THE STATUS OF REFUGEES COMING FROM GERMANY.[1]

(Geneva, July 4th, 1936.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

Denmark

France

The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

Signatures ad referendum.

Belgium

In application of paragraph 1 of Article 12, the Belgian Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation as regards the Colony of the Congo, the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi, or any other territory provided in paragraph 1 of Article 12.

The Netherlands

Norway

Switzerland

The Arrangement is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
SWEDEN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The Arrangement came into force on August 4th, 1936, in accordance with its Article 10.

XLV. — INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS.[1]

(*a*)

1. Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA [2]	June 12th, 1924
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM	September 6th, 1926
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CANADA	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	September 20th, 1934
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
FRANCE [3]	June 2nd, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
ITALY [4]	October 6th, 1924
LATVIA [5]	August 15th, 1925
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN [6]	February 22nd, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

2. Convention concerning unemployment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	February 20th, 1924
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BELGIUM [7]	August 25th, 1930
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
DENMARK	October 13th, 1921
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FINLAND	October 19th, 1921
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning: The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of White Phosphorus in the Manufacture of Matches, Berne, September 26th, 1906.

[2] "As regards Austria, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified by those European Members of the International Labour Organisation which are of the chief industrial importance (Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy) and by all the States, bordering upon Austria, with whom the latter has economic relations (Yugoslavia, Poland, Switzerland, the Czechoslovak Republic and Hungary) . . .".

[3] This ratification is subject to the condition that the obligations it entails for France shall not take effect until the Convention has been ratified by Germany and Great Britain.

[4] Subject to the condition that it shall only come into force when the ratifications, without reservations or other conditions, of the following Members of the International Labour Organisation have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations: Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Switzerland.

[5] "The Convention shall come into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Draft Convention, after the ratifications of three of the Powers which are of the chief industrial importance, as laid down in Article 393, paragraphs 5 and 6, of the Treaty of Peace of Versailles, shall have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations."

[6] The reservation by which Spain made its ratification subject to the ratification of Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy was withdrawn on October 1st, 1931.

[7] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	February 6th, 1932
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

3. Convention concerning the employment of women before and after childbirth, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 29th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
GERMANY	October 31st, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	June 3th, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

4. Convention concerning the employment of women during the night, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciation*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	November 1st, 1921	*Union of South Africa* (October 25th, 1935) This denunciation is not to take effect until the revised Convention of 1934 on the same subject shall have come into force.
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932	
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933	
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924	
BELGIUM [1]*	July 12th, 1924	
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934	
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921	*Estonia* (January 28th, 1936)
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922	
CHILE	October 8th, 1931	*Greece* (June 30th, 1936)
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	*Switzerland* (June 4th, 1936)
CUBA	August 6th, 1928	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921	
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922	
FRANCE	May 14th, 1925	
GREECE	November 19th, 1920	
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928	
INDIA	July 14th, 1921	
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925	
ITALY	April 10th, 1923	
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931	
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928	
THE NETHERLANDS	September 4th, 1922	
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934	
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932	
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921	
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932	
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922	
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933	
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933	
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927	

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

5. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
Austria	February 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
JAPAN	August 7th, 1926
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	July 21st, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

6. Convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 17th, 1924
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

(*b*)

7. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to employment at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
Brazil	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
Chile	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	July 14th, 1932
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 26th, 1925
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	May 8th, 1922
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

8. Convention concerning unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
GREAT BRITAIN	March 12th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
Chile	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FRANCE	March 21st, 1929
GERMANY	March 4th, 1930
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA [3]	August 29th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
Norway	July 21st, 1936
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	January 1st, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] Latvia had ratified this Convention on August 5th, 1926, subject to the following reservation: " The Convention shall enter into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of this Convention, when the States which are of chief importance in maritime commerce shall have sent their ratifications for registration by the Secretariat of the League of Nations." By an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on August 29th, 1930, this reservation was withdrawn.

9. Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 10th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA	August 3rd, 1925
BELGIUM [1]	February 4th, 1925
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
Chile	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 7th, 1922
FRANCE	January 25th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

(c)

10. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to employment in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 16th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	June 13th, 1928
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
Chile	October 18th, 1935
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
HUNGARY	February 2nd, 1927
IRISH FREE STATE	May 26th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	December 19th, 1923
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

11. Convention concerning the rights of association and combination of agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6th, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA	April 27th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DENMARK [2]	June 20th, 1930
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	March 23rd, 1929
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRISH FREE STATE	June 17th, 1924
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
THE NETHERLANDS	August 20th, 1926
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

12. Convention concerning workmen's compensation in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1*]	October 26th, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6th, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
DENMARK	February 26th, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
ITALY [3]	September 1st, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	June 17th, 1924
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	August 20th, 1926
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
SPAIN	October 1st, 1931
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[*] As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Italian colonies and possessions.

13. Convention concerning the use of white lead in painting, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 19th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND [2]	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE	February 19th, 1929
GREECE	December 22nd, 1926
HUNGARY [3]	January 4th, 1928
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	December 4th, 1925
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	April 28th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

14. Convention concerning the application of the weekly rest in industrial undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 17th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA [4]	May 17th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
Denmark [5]	August 30th, 1935
ESTONIA	November 29th, 1923
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	September 3rd, 1926
GREECE	May 11th, 1929
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRISH FREE STATE	July 22nd, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
SWITZERLAND [6]	January 16th, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] Effective as from October 1st, 1929.

[3] The Convention shall not come into force as regards Hungary until it has been ratified by France, Great Britain and Germany.

[4] Article I of the Chinese " Amended Factory Laws " promulgated on December 30th, 1932, provides that " this Act shall apply to all factories using machines driven by motor-power and regularly employing thirty workers or more."

[5] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[6] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from September 1st, 1934.

15. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers or stokers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	July 19th, 1926
GREAT BRITAIN	March 8th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
Chile	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
FRANCE	January 16th, 1928
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	June 14th, 1930
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	November 20th, 1922
IRISH FREE STATE	June 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN [3]	December 4th, 1930
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	June 17th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14th, 1925
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

16. Convention concerning the compulsory medical examination of children and young persons employed at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Argentine Republic	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	July 19th, 1926
Brazil	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN	March 8th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
Chile	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
FRANCE	March 22nd, 1928
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	June 28th, 1930
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	November 20th, 1922
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 9th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14th, 1925
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung or the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

(*d*)

17. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Austria	August 21st, 1936
BELGIUM [1]*	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	May 29th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929
SPAIN	February 22nd, 1929
SWEDEN	September 8th, 1926
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

18. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciation*
AUSTRIA	September 29th, 1928	
BELGIUM [1]*	October 3rd, 1927	*Great Britain and Northern Ireland* (April 29th, 1936)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	October 6th, 1926	
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929	
CHILE	May 31st, 1933	
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	
CUBA	August 6th, 1928	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	September 19th, 1932	
DENMARK	June 18th, 1934	
FINLAND	September 17th, 1927	
FRANCE	August 13th, 1931	
GERMANY	September 18th, 1928	
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928	
INDIA [3]	September 30th, 1927	
IRISH FREE STATE	November 25th, 1927	
ITALY [4]	January 22nd, 1934	
JAPAN [5]	October 8th, 1928	
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929	
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928	
THE NETHERLANDS	November 1st, 1928	
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934	
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929	
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929	
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932	
SWEDEN	October 15th, 1929	
SWITZERLAND	November 16th, 1927	
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933	
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927	

---

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] Subject to subsequent decisions as regards the application of the Convention to the Italian Colonies and Possessions.

[5] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

19. Convention concerning equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 5th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Union of South Africa	March 30th, 1926
Austria	September 29th, 1928
Belgium [1]	October 3rd, 1927
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	October 6th, 1926
Bulgaria	September 5th, 1929
Chile	October 8th, 1931
China	April 27th, 1934
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 6th, 1928
Czechoslovakia	February 8th, 1927
Denmark [2]	March 31st, 1928
Finland	September 17th, 1927
France	April 4th, 1928
Estonia	April 14th, 1930
Germany	September 18th, 1928
Greece	May 30th, 1936
Hungary	April 19th, 1928
India [3]	September 30th, 1927
Irish Free State	July 5th, 1930
Italy	March 15th, 1928
Japan [4]	October 8th, 1928
Latvia	May 29th, 1928
Lithuania	September 28th, 1934
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	May 12th, 1934
The Netherlands	September 13th, 1927
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Norway	June 11th, 1929
Poland	February 28th, 1928
Portugal [5]	March 27th, 1929
Spain	February 22nd, 1929
Sweden	September 8th, 1926
Switzerland	February 1st, 1929
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Yugoslavia	April 1st, 1927

20. Convention concerning night work in bakeries, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 8th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Bulgaria	September 5th, 1929
Chile	May 31st, 1933
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 6th, 1928
Estonia	December 23rd, 1929
Finland	May 26th, 1928
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Spain	August 29th, 1932
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933

(e)

21. Convention concerning the simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighth Session on June 5th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Albania	March 17th, 1932
Australia	April 18th, 1931
Austria	December 29th, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[5] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	February 15th, 1928
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	September 16th, 1927
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	May 25th, 1928
FINLAND	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE [3]	January 13th, 1932
HUNGARY	February 3rd, 1931
INDIA	January 14th, 1928
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
JAPAN [4]	October 8th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SWEDEN [5]	October 15th, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(f)

22. Convention concerning seamen's articles of agreement, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 24th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [6]	April 1st, 1935
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
Chile	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	May 10th, 1929
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	September 20th, 1930
INDIA	October 31st, 1932
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

23. Convention concerning the repatriation of seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 23rd, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	July 9th, 1928
FRANCE	March 4th, 1929
GERMANY	March 14th, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] As regards Great Britain and Northern Ireland, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by France, Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Norway and Spain.

[3] The ratification of this Convention will only take effect as regards France from the date on which the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall have registered the ratifications without reservation of Poland, Spain and Italy.

[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[5] As regards Sweden, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by Denmark, Finland and Norway.

[6] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[7] This ratification applies also to the Italian colonies.

(*g*)

24. Convention concerning sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 18th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 28th, 1929
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

25. Convention concerning sickness insurance for agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 18th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*h*)

26. Convention concerning the creation of minimum-wage-fixing machinery, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eleventh Session on June 16th, 1928.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	December 28th, 1932
AUSTRALIA	March 9th, 1931
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	June 4th, 1935
CANADA	April 25th, 1935
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	May 5th, 1930
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	February 24th, 1936
FRANCE	September 18th, 1930
GERMANY	May 30th, 1929
HUNGARY	July 30th, 1932
ITALY	September 9th, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	June 3rd, 1930
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 7th, 1933
SPAIN	April 8th, 1930
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*i*)

27. Convention concerning the marking of the weight on heavy packages transported by vessels, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session, on June 21st, 1929.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Union of South Africa[1]	February 21st, 1933
Australia[2]	March 9th, 1931
Austria	August 16th, 1935
Belgium[3]	June 6th, 1934
Bulgaria	June 4th, 1935
Chile	May 31st, 1933
China	June 24th, 1931
Czechoslovakia	March 26th, 1934
Denmark[4]	January 18th, 1933
Estonia	January 18th, 1932
Finland[5]	August 8th, 1932
France	July 29th, 1935
Germany	July 5th, 1933
Greece	May 30th, 1936
Irish Free State	July 5th, 1930
India	September 7th, 1931
Italy	July 18th, 1933
Japan[6]	March 16th, 1931
Lithuania	September 28th, 1934
Luxemburg	April 1st, 1931
Mexico	May 12th, 1934
The Netherlands	January 4th, 1933
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Norway	July 1st, 1932
Poland	June 18th, 1932
Portugal[7]	March 1st, 1932
Roumania	December 7th, 1932
Spain	August 29th, 1932
Sweden	April 11th, 1932
Switzerland[8]	November 8th, 1934
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Venezuela	December 17th, 1932
Yugoslavia	April 22nd, 1933

28. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session, on June 21st, 1929.[9]

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Irish Free State	July 5th, 1930
Luxemburg	April 1st, 1931
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Spain[10]	August 29th, 1932

---

[1] The ratification by the Union of South Africa shall not take effect unless and until the ratifications of Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy have been registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in terms of Article 406 of the Treaty of Versailles.

[2] The Convention applies to the Territory Nauru.

[3] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[4] This ratification does not include Greenland.

The Danish Government makes the entry into force of the Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being also ratified by Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy and The Netherlands.

[5] This Convention shall be put into force in Finland as from January 1st, 1933.

[6] This ratification includes Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[7] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

[8] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from October 1st, 1934.

[9] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1932 involves, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirement of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 21 of the present Convention. The present Convention has ceased to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1932 (October 30th, 1934). It remains, nevertheless, in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

[10] This Convention is denounced as regards Spain as from October 30th, 1934, date of the coming into force of the revising Convention of 1932, Spain having ratified the latter Convention on July 28th, 1934.

(1)

29. Convention concerning forced or compulsory labour, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [1]	January 2nd, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	June 3rd, 1931
BULGARIA	September 22nd, 1932
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
DENMARK	February 11th, 1932
Finland	January 13th, 1936
IRISH FREE STATE	March 2nd, 1931
ITALY	June 18th, 1934
JAPAN [3]	November 21st, 1932
LIBERIA	May 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS [4]	March 31st, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
YUGOSLAVIA	March 4th, 1933

[1] This ratification applies also to the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and to the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland is accompanied with a Declaration, as provided for in Article 26 of the Convention, that the provisions of the Convention shall be applied without modification to the following Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under mandate:

Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Ashanti
  (*c*) Northern Territories
  (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (including Turks and Caïcos Islands and the Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
  Antigua
  Dominica
  Montserrat
  St. Christopher and Nevis
  Virgin Islands
Malay States:
  (*a*) Federated Malay States:
    Negri Sembilan
    Pahang
    Perak
    Selangor
  (*b*) Unfederated Malay States:
    Johore
    Kedah
    Kelantan
    Perlis
    Trengganu
    Brunei
Malta
Mauritius
Nigeria:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Protectorate
  (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine
St. Helena and Ascension
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
South Africa High Commission, Territories of the:
  Basutoland
  Bechuanaland Protectorate
  Swaziland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Trans-Jordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Western Pacific, Islands of:
  British Solomon Islands Protectorate
  Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
  Tonga
Windward Islands:
  Grenada
  St. Lucia
  St. Vincent
Zanzibar Protectorate

The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland applies also to: Newfoundland, November 13th, 1931, and to Southern Rhodesia, March 20th, 1933.

[3] This ratification applies also to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[4] I. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention integrally in the Kingdom in Europe, in Surinam and in Curaçao;

II. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention to the Netherlands Indies with the following modifications:

(*a*) Article 3 will not be applied; nevertheless, the competent central authorities will be responsible for the employment of forced or compulsory labour;

(*b*) Article 4 will not be applied to services rendered to owners by persons living in the so-called " particuliere landerijen " in the Island of Java.

30. Convention concerning the regulation of hours of work in commerce and offices, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA [1]	February 16th, 1933
BULGARIA	June 22nd, 1932
Chile	October 18th, 1935
Cuba	February 24th, 1936
Finland	January 13th, 1936
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(k)

31. Convention limiting hours of work in coal-mines, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fifteenth Session, on June 18th, 1931. [2]

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932

(l)

32. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (revised 1932), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 27th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	January 10th, 1935
Chile	October 18th, 1935
China	November 30th, 1935
ITALY	October 30th, 1933
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
SPAIN	July 28th, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

33. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to non-industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 30th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Austria	February 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [3]	June 6th, 1934
Cuba	February 24th, 1936
THE NETHERLANDS	July 12th, 1935
SPAIN	June 22nd, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(m)

34. Convention concerning fee-charging employment agencies, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Chile	October 18th, 1935
Finland	January 13th, 1936
SPAIN	April 27th, 1935
Sweden	January 1st, 1936

[1] The ratification by Austria shall only become effective from the date on which the Secretary-General shall have registered the ratification of Germany.

[2] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1935 shall involve, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirements of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 20 of the present Convention. The present Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1935. It shall remain nevertheless in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

[3] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

35. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936
Chile	October 18th, 1935

36. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936
Chile	October 18th, 1935

37. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936
Chile	October 18th, 1935

38. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936
Chile	October 18th, 1935

39. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936

40. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session, on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936

(n)

41. Convention concerning employment of women during the night (revised 1934), adopted as Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 19th, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	May 28th, 1935
Brazil	June 8th, 1936
Estonia	December 21st, 1935
Greece	May 30th, 1936
India	November 22nd, 1935
The Netherlands	December 9th, 1935
Switzerland	June 4th, 1936

42. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases (revised 1934), adopted as Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Austria	February 26th, 1936
Brazil	June 8th, 1936
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	April 29th, 1936
HUNGARY	June 17th, 1935
Japan[1]	June 6th, 1936
NORWAY	May 21st, 1935

43. Convention for the regulation of hours of work in automatic sheet-glass works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
NORWAY	May 21st, 1935

44. Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily unemployed, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session, on June 23rd, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	April 29th, 1936

45. Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Union of South Africa	June 25th, 1936
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	July 18th, 1936
Cuba	April 14th, 1936
Greece	May 30th, 1936
Irish Free State	August 20th, 1936
Sweden	July 11th, 1936

46. Convention limiting hours of work in coal mines (revised 1935), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Cuba	April 14th, 1936

47. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work to forty a week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

[1] The Japanese Government intend to apply the above-mentioned Convention, in so far as mining industries are concerned, also to Taiwan and Karafuto.

48. Convention concerning the establishment of an international scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

49. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in glass-bottle works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session, on June 25th, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Norway	July 21st, 1936

(*f*)

50. Convention concerning the regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session, on June 20th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

51. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session, on June 23rd, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

52. Convention concerning annual holidays with pay, adopted by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session, on June 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

XLVI. AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOUR PART OF THE TREATIES OF PEACE.

(*a*) Amendment to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles and to the Corresponding Articles of the Other Treaties of Peace.

(Adopted at the Fourth Session of the International Labour Conference, Geneva, November 2nd, 1922.[1])

In Force.

Has been ratified by	*Has been ratified by*
Albania (November 26th, 1924)	Italy (July 19th, 1932)
Argentine Republic (June 4th, 1934)	Latvia (March 16th, 1925)
Austria (October 9th, 1924)	Lithuania (May 25th, 1928)
Belgium (October 29th, 1924)	Luxemburg (April 5th, 1928)
Bulgaria (March 6th, 1925)	The Netherlands (August 14th, 1924)
Chile (August 23rd, 1928)	Panama (April 18th, 1934)
Czechoslovakia (September 30th, 1924)	Peru (July 6th, 1931)
Denmark (June 20th, 1924)	Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
Estonia (April 12th, 1926)	Roumania (July 19th, 1923)
Finland (March 25th, 1924)	Salvador (May 4th, 1928)
Germany (June 6th, 1925)	Spain (July 5th, 1924)
Guatemala (July 6th, 1932)	Sweden (May 15th, 1924)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)	Switzerland (November 1st, 1924)
Hungary (May 14th, 1925)	Uruguay (April 28th, 1928)
Iran (August 14th, 1928)	Venezuela (August 11th, 1931)
Irish Free State (June 26th, 1925)	

(*b*) Protocol relative to this Amendment opened for Signature at Geneva on June 14th, 1923.

Signatures	*Ratifications*	*Signatures*	*Ratifications*
Union of South Africa	Union of South Africa (October 20th, 1923)	India	India (October 20th, 1923)
Australia	Australia (October 20th, 1923)	Japan	Japan (May 11th, 1925)
British Empire	British Empire (October 20th, 1923)	Mexico	Mexico (May 12th, 1934)
Canada	Canada (October 20th, 1923)	New Zealand	New Zealand (October 20th, 1923)
China	China (June 3rd, 1926)	Norway	Norway (April 8th, 1924)
Cuba	Cuba (September 7th, 1925)	Paraguay	—
France	France (June 2nd, 1925)	Poland	Poland (February 10th, 1925)
Greece	Greece (June 8th, 1927)	Siam	Siam (March 18th, 1924)
		Yugoslavia	Yugoslavia (March 11th, 1927)

---

[1] The amendment entered into force on June 4th, 1934, in accordance with the provisions of Article 422 of the Treaty of Versailles and of the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIX, p. 35.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: A. 22. 1936. V. 221

Geneva, September 25th, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Results of the Sixth Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL.

1936. V. 5.

DECLARATION RECOGNISING THE RIGHT TO A FLAG OF STATES HAVING NO SEA-COAST.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, Guatemala, Iran, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Costa Rica, Panama, Peru.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF, AND TRAFFIC IN, OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Costa Rica, France, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Haiti, Honduras.

PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES.[1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

India.

A Bill enacting the legislation necessary for the ratification of this Protocol has been introduced into the Indian Legislative Assembly. The question of the ratification of this Protocol therefore depends upon the fate of this Bill. (Letter of July 16th, 1936.)

---

[1] As this Protocol is still open for signature, the communication prescribed in the Assembly's resolution was sent to all the States which had signed before January 1st, 1935.

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, Chile, Free City of Danzig, Latvia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Paraguay.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL RELATING THERETO.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Chile, Japan, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Paraguay.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Brazil, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Lithuania, Panama, Portugal, Salvador, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, Colombia.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF MARITIME PORTS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Brazil, Chile, Lithuania, Panama, Salvador, Spain, Uruguay.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE TRANSMISSION IN TRANSIT OF ELECTRIC POWER, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium, Chile, France, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE STATE, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium, Chile, France, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION ADOPTED BY THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Argentine Republic.

By Decree of August 10th, 1936, the Government of the Argentine Republic approved the accession of the Republic to this Convention and decided to communicate the text to the National Congress in order to obtain the necessary legislative ratification. (Letter of August 28th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Albania, Iran, Nicaragua.

CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Estonia.

Fourteen Powers must ratify this Convention before a *procès-verbal* of deposit of ratifications can be drawn up, and the entry into force of the Convention is subject to the conclusion of this *procès-verbal*. Up to the present date, the Convention has been ratified by fourteen Powers, but the British Empire, Australia, France, Denmark and Sweden have made the coming into force of the Convention conditional upon previous ratification by the other States producing arms and ammunition and implements of war. It is therefore not possible to foresee when this Convention will enter into force. For this reason, Estonia prefers not to ratify this Convention. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria,	**Finland,**	**Japan,**	**Salvador,**
Belgium,	**Germany,**	**Luxemburg,**	**Switzerland,**
Brazil,	**Hungary,**	**Norway,**	**Uruguay,**
Chile,	**India,**	**Roumania,**	**Yugoslavia.**
Czechoslovakia,	**Italy,**		

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia, Siam.

DECLARATION REGARDING THE TERRITORY OF IFNI.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Declaration with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

Estonia.

The importance of this Declaration, for Estonia, has considerably decreased since it was signed. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria,
Belgium,
Brazil,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
Canada,
Chile,
Czechoslovakia,
Finland,
India,
Italy,
Japan,
Latvia,
Luxemburg,
Roumania,
Salvador,
Switzerland,
Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia.

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS AND OTHER GASES AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

United States of America,
Brazil,
Czechoslovakia,
Japan,
Luxemburg,
Nicaragua,
Salvador,
Uruguay.

CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The question of this ratification is pending. (Letter of June 2nd, 1936.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Finland.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Albania,
Colombia,
Iran,
Panama,
Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, **Dominican Republic,** **Ethiopia,** **Lithuania.**

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Brazil.

During the year which has just ended, the Legislature of the Republic of the United States of Brazil decided not to approve this Convention. (Letter of January 27th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Guatemala, **Nicaragua,** **Portugal,** **Uruguay.**
Latvia, **Peru,** **Spain,**

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia.

CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, **Free City of Danzig,** **Nicaragua,** **Peru.**

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF HIDES AND SKINS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Agreement with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.30.1931.V :

Turkey.

---

[1] As this Convention is still open for signature, the communication prescribed in the Assembly's resolution was sent to all States which had signed before January 1st, 1935.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF BONES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Agreement with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.30.1931.V :

Turkey.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Estonia.

In all work of this kind, Estonia has followed the recommendations and provisions of this Convention, but, for budgetary reasons, does not see its way to ratify it. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium,
Brazil,
Free City of Danzig,
Finland,
Germany,
Hungary,
Japan,
Latvia,
Luxemburg,
Yugoslavia.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Albania,
United States of America,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
France,
India,
Japan,
Luxemburg,
Panama,
Roumania,
Switzerland.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.[1]

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Free City of Danzig, Hungary, Switzerland.

CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Estonia.

The provisions of this Convention were put into force, in practice, by the Estonian Nationality Act, but a formal ratification would only be called for if a large number of countries had ratified the Convention. Up to the present date, the Convention in question has only been ratified by nine countries, five of which are European States. Estonia prefers to wait until the neighbouring States and the most important States of Europe have ratified this Act. Only then can it reconsider the ratification of the Convention. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

The Netherlands.

The Second Chamber of the States-General adopted on July 2nd, 1936, a Bill approving this Convention. (Letter of July 6th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V and A.17.1935.V :

Union of South Africa,	**Czechoslovakia,**	**Hungary,**	**Luxemburg,**
Australia,	**Free City of Danzig,**	**Iceland,**	**Mexico,**
Austria,	**Denmark,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Peru,**
Belgium,	**France,**	**Italy,**	**Portugal,**
Chile,	**Germany,**	**Japan,**	**Switzerland,**
Cuba,	**Greece,**	**Latvia,**	**Uruguay.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia,	**Salvador,**	**Yugoslavia.**
Egypt,	**Spain,**	

PROTOCOL RELATING TO MILITARY OBLIGATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES OF DOUBLE NATIONALITY.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The Second Chamber of the States-General adopted on July 2nd, 1936, a Bill approving this Protocol. (Letter of July 6th, 1936.)

---

[1] As this Agreement is still open for signature, the communication prescribed in the Assembly's resolution was sent to all the States which had signed before January 1st, 1935.

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria.	**Cuba,**	**Greece,**	**Peru,**
Belgium,	**Denmark,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Portugal,**
Canada,	**France,**	**Luxemburg,**	**Uruguay.**
Chile,	**Germany,**	**Mexico,**	

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, **Egypt,** **Spain.**

PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Estonia.

The provisions of this Protocol were put into force, in practice, by the Estonian Nationality Act, but a formal ratification would only be called for if a large number of countries had ratified the Protocol. Up to the present date, the Protocol in question has only been ratified by nine countries, five of which are European States. Estonia prefers to wait until the neighbouring States and the most important States of Europe have ratified this Act. Only then can it reconsider the ratification of the Protocol. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

The Netherlands.

The Second Chamber of the States-General adopted on July 2nd, 1936, a Bill approving this Protocol. (Letter of July 6th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium,	**Free City of Danzig,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Mexico,**
Canada,	**Denmark,**	**Japan,**	**Peru,**
Cuba,	**France,**	**Latvia,**	**Portugal,**
Czechoslovakia,	**Greece,**	**Luxemburg,**	**Uruguay.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, **Egypt,** **Spain.**

SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria,	**Cuba,**	**Luxemburg,**	**Portugal,**
Belgium,	**Greece,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay.**
Canada,	**Irish Free State,**	**Peru,**	

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, **Egypt,** **Spain.**

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

The legislation of Brazil as regards Bills of Exchange is very complete, and it does not seem to the Brazilian Government that this Convention need concern it, especially in view of the fact that, the time-limit for ratification having expired, it could only become party to the Convention by accession, and this procedure is not contemplated by the Brazilian Government, for the reasons already given. (Letter of June 3rd, 1936.)

Ecuador.

This Convention is at present being examined with a view to its ratification, which will take place as soon as possible. (Letter of April 15th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Poland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

The legislation of Brazil as regards Bills of Exchange is very complete, and it does not seem to the Brazilian Government that this Convention need concern it, especially in view of the fact that, the time-limit for ratification having expired, it could only become party to the Convention by accession, and this procedure is not contemplated by the Brazilian Government, for the reasons already given. (Letter of June 3rd, 1936.)

Ecuador.

This Convention is at present being examined with a view to its ratification, which will take place as soon as possible. (Letter of April 15th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Poland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

The legislation of Brazil as regards Bills of Exchange is very complete, and it does not seem to the Brazilian Government that this Convention need concern it, especially in view of the fact that, the time-limit for ratification having expired, it could only become party to the Convention by accession, and this procedure is not contemplated by the Brazilian Government, for the reasons already given. (Letter of June 3rd, 1936.)

Ecuador.

This Convention is at present being examined with a view to its ratification, which will take place as soon as possible. (Letter of April 15th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Poland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

Estonia.

Estonia is unable to ratify this Convention, because it would involve considerable financial commitments. Its entry into force depends on the constitution of a guarantee fund of at least fifty million gold francs for the annual loan service. The amount promised falls far short of this sum, towards which Estonia can make only a very small contribution. While recognising the great importance of this Convention from the point of view of social relations and international collaboration, Estonia is, for purely budgetary reasons, unable to ratify it. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention was placed before the States-General on February 22nd, 1932 ; the Second Chamber presented a report on April 29th, 1932 ; the Government, in view of the failure of the Disarmament Conference, did not send a note in reply. (Letter of June 29th, 1936.)

Sweden.

The Royal Government does not at present contemplate ratifying this Convention, for the same reasons as previously stated. (Letter of June 26th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Albania,
Australia,
Belgium,
Bolivia,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
Czechoslovakia,
France,
Germany,
Greece,
Lithuania,
Norway,
Poland,
Portugal,
Roumania,
Spain,
Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, **Ethiopia,** **Italy,** **Peru.**
Cuba, **Irish Free State,** **Latvia,**

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Estonia.

Estonia is prepared to ratify this Agreement. In principle, there is no reason why she should not do so. The matter is at present regulated in agreement with Latvia, Finland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In order to maintain uniformity of regulations, Estonia prefers to wait until the neighbouring countries have also accepted the system of maritime signals provided for in this Agreement. Of those countries, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has alone affixed its definitive signature to the Agreement. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

Sweden.

The Royal Government does not at present contemplate ratifying this Agreement, for the same reasons as previously stated. (Letter of June 26th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Union of South Africa, **Germany,** **Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Cuba.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.17.1933.V :

Germany.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Cuba.

CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Committee composed of representatives of the competent Ministries, and entrusted with the preparation of a Bill regulating the conditions of inland navigation from the point of view of private law, has not yet finished its work. The Czechoslovak Government is therefore unable to indicate the date of the Parliamentary debates on this Bill and the ratification of this Convention, which will come into force by the law now being drafted. (Letter of August 13th, 1936.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention was placed before the States-General on November 16th, 1934. The Second Chamber presented a report on July 16th, 1935. The Government's reply is being prepared. (Letter of June 29th, 1936).

Switzerland.

The competent authorities intended to submit this Convention to the Federal Chambers in 1935, but certain difficulties delayed the preparatory work. The Swiss Government hopes, nevertheless, that this Convention may be ratified in the near future. (Letter of March 21st, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933,V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria,	**France,**	**Poland,**
Belgium,	**Germany,**	**Roumania,**
Free City of Danzig,	**Hungary,**	**Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, **Luxemburg.**

CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *IN REM* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Committee composed of representatives of the competent Ministries, and entrusted with the preparation of a Bill regulating the conditions of inland navigation from the point of view of private law, has not yet finished its work. The Czechoslovak Government is therefore

unable to indicate the date of the Parliamentary debates on this Bill and the ratification of this Convention, which will come into force by the law now being drafted. (Letter of August 13th, 1936.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention was placed before the States-General on November 16th, 1934. The Second Chamber presented a report on July 16th, 1935. The Government's reply is being prepared. (Letter of June 29th, 1936.)

Switzerland.

The competent authorities intended to submit this Convention to the Federal Chambers in 1935, but certain difficulties delayed the preparatory work. The Swiss Government hopes, nevertheless, that this Convention may be ratified in the near future. (Letter of March 21st, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria, Belgium, Free City of Danzig, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Committee composed of representatives of the competent Ministries, and entrusted with the preparation of a Bill regulating the conditions of inland navigation from the point of view of private law, has not yet finished its work. The Czechoslovak Government is therefore unable to indicate the date of the Parliamentary debates on this Bill and the ratification of this Convention, which will come into force by the law now being drafted. (Letter of August 13th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium, France, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ecuador.

This Convention is at present under examination with a view to its ratification, which will take place as soon as possible. (Letter of April 15th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ecuador.

This Convention is at present under examination with a view to its ratification, which will take place as soon as possible. (Letter of April 15th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ecuador.

This Convention is at present under examination with a view to its ratification, which will take place as soon as possible. (Letter of April 15th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Turkey.

This Convention was ratified by the Grand National Assembly by Law No. 2409, dated April 14th, 1934. The instrument of ratification will be transmitted to the Secretariat as soon as the necessary formalities have been completed. (Letter of August 19th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Free City of Danzig, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION ON THE TAXATION OF FOREIGN MOTOR VEHICLES, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Czechoslovakia, Free City of Danzig.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY, WITH CHARTER AND STATUTES.

(Geneva, May 21st, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

Estonia.

Estonia is unable to ratify this Convention, because it would involve considerable financial obligations. Its entry into force depends on the constitution of a reserve fund of twenty-five million gold francs. While recognising the great importance of this Convention from the point of view of social relations and international collaboration, Estonia is, for purely budgetary reasons, unable to ratify it. (Letter of June 30th, 1936.)

The Netherlands.

The Netherlands Government does not intend to ratify this Convention. (Letter of June 29th, 1936.)

Sweden.

The Royal Government does not at present contemplate ratifying this Convention, for the same reasons as previously stated. (Letter of June 26th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, Italy, Luxemburg.

CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Argentine Republic.

By Decree of August 10th, 1936, the Government of the Argentine Republic approved the accession of the Republic to this Convention and decided to communicate the text to the National Congress in order to obtain the necessary legislative ratification. (Letter of August 28th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, Liberia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia, Paraguay.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V:

Albania, Australia, Belgium, Greece, India, Roumania.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Germany.

GENERAL CONVENTION TO IMPROVE THE MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Bulgaria.

The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs has drawn the attention of the competent authorities to this Convention with a view to its ratification as early as possible. (Letter of July 8th, 1936.)

Sweden.

The Royal Government does not at present contemplate ratifying this Convention, for the same reasons as previously stated. (Letter of June 26th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Albania, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Panama, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, Colombia, Luxemburg, Siam.

SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM-SMOKING. AGREEMENT.

(Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Japan.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

The proposal of the Finnish Government to ask the approval of the Chamber of Representatives for the ratification of this Convention will be submitted in the near future. It is therefore highly probable that the Convention will be ratified in the course of the summer. (Letter of March 13th, 1936.)

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention has been adopted by the Chamber of Deputies and will soon be discussed by the Senate, as the latter's rapporteur presented his report on July 2nd, 1936. (Letter of July 4th, 1936.)

Poland.

This Convention is being considered by the competent Polish authorities. (Letter of June 22nd, 1936.)

Sweden.

The Royal Government expects to take a decision in the near future regarding the ratification of this Convention. (Letter of June 26th, 1936.)

Uruguay.

The Message by which this Convention is to be submitted to Parliament in view of its ratification is at present being prepared. (Letter of June 8th, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
United States of America,
Greece,
Panama.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Certain modifications of the law will be required to enable His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to ratify this Convention. (Letter of July 13th, 1936.)

Free City of Danzig.

The procedure for the ratification of this Convention has not yet begun. The competent authorities have, however, already declared in favour of ratification. (Letter of July 23rd, 1935.)

France.

This Convention has been submitted to the Chamber of Deputies for approval. (Letter of July 4th, 1936.)

Monaco.

As the adaptation of Monegasque legislation to the provisions of this Convention appears to be necessary, the question is now under consideration by the Committee on Litigation and Legislative Studies. The Government of the Principality will not be able to ratify until the legislative text bringing the Monegasque law into harmony with the Convention has been adopted. (Letter of April 21st, 1936.)

Poland.

The procedure for the ratification of this Convention has just been begun. (Letter of June 22nd, 1936.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
China,
Germany,
Greece,
Lithuania,
Panama,
Portugal,
Spain,
Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill approving this Convention will soon be submitted to the Chambers. (Letter of April 1st, 1936.)

Egypt.

The Egyptian Government has taken due note of the Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General in application of the Assembly's Resolution. (Letter of March 23rd, 1936.)

France.

This Convention was voted by the Chamber of Deputies on March 20th, 1936. The Bill for its ratification was deposited with the Senate on June 19th, 1936. (Letter of July 4th, 1936.)

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 24.** 1936. V.

Geneva, September 7th, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM[1]

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

OBSERVATIONS BY GOVERNMENTS

Series I

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

In execution of the Council's decision of January 23rd, 1936,[1] the Secretary-General invited the Governments to be so good as to forward to him, by July 15th, 1936, any observations they might desire to submit to the Assembly on the above-mentioned draft Conventions.

Down to the date of publication of the present document, the following Governments have submitted observations:

	Page		Page
Australia	1	India	8
Austria	1	Latvia	9
Belgium	2	Netherlands	10
Bolivia	3	Norway	9
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4	Siam	12
Estonia	5	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	12
Finland	5	Venezuela	12
Hungary	5		

Australia.

August 24th, 1936.

His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia agrees in principle to the former Convention, but does not favour the creation of an International Criminal Court.

Austria.

[*Translation.*] July 2nd, 1936.

The Federal Government of Austria has the honour to submit the following observations with regard to the conclusion of a Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and of a Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

[1] See document A.7.1936.V.

S.d.N. 1200 (F.) 970 (A.). 9/36. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL V
1936. V. 6

The Federal Government greatly values the work done by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism and considers that the two draft Conventions which it framed could be suitably taken as the basis for the proceedings of a diplomatic conference to be summoned in 1937 with a view to the conclusion of the proposed Conventions.

The Federal Government ventures to add that, in its opinion, the provisions of the second Convention form an integral part of any measures to deal with the question of terrorism, so that it would appear to be necessary to bring both Conventions into force simultaneously.

As regards questions of detail, the Federal Government must make it clear that Austrian law does not permit of the extradition of an offender unless he is charged with an offence regarded as a crime *(Verbrechen)* in Austria itself, whereas the provisions of the first draft Convention also comprise other punishable offences. Were it to ratify this Convention, the Federal Government would therefore be obliged to enter a reservation to the effect that the extradition of an offender could not be granted by Austria for an offence not described as a *Verbrechen* by the Austrian Criminal Code. This reservation would, however, not be necessary if an appropriate clause were inserted in Article 9 of the first Convention. Such a clause might be modelled on the terms of Article 5, paragraph 4, of the draft Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs of 1934.[1] For its own part, the Austrian Government would nevertheless prefer a text authorising each of the contracting parties to define by a general rule which offences are to be regarded as sufficiently serious instead of the text above referred to, which provides that each individual case is to be judged on its merits.

As regards Article 2, paragraph 4, of the first Convention, it would be advisable to introduce a slight qualification by providing that the acts therein enumerated only fall within the scope of the Convention when the said materials and objects are *by their very nature* capable of being used for the doing of the acts specified by the Convention.

The provisions of Article 12 would appear to go beyond the purpose of the first Convention, as they deal with a matter unconnected with terrorism. In view of the difficulties involved in the insertion of this article in the Convention, the Austrian Government suggests its omission.

Belgium.

[Translation.] July 27th, 1936.

I have the honour to communicate herewith the Belgian Government's observations on the two draft Conventions framed by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism.

These observations relate more particularly to the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, but they also govern the Belgian Government's attitude to the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, since, as is pointed out in document A.7.1936.V, page 2, the acceptance by a State of the latter Convention is conditional on its acceptance of the former.

* * *

Under Belgian law (Article 6 of the Law of October 1st, 1833), extradition may not be granted in respect of political offences or of acts related to such offences.

This principle is applied as follows:

1. In the case of *political offences proper*—that is to say, of offences which are directed solely against the political interests of a State and which do not cause prejudice to private interests—extradition is absolutely precluded.

2. As regards *related offences*—that is to say, ordinary criminal offences related to a politica offence, the principle of non-extradition is established by the Law of October 1st, 1833.

In the preparatory proceedings *(travaux préparatoires)* in respect of that law, the following were given as examples of such related offences: If on the occasion of a seditious rising or of an outrage designed to bring about the overthrow of the Government " the people were to seize the arms to be found in shops or arsenals, such acts would constitute theft. If, as often happens, there were also loss of life, it would be a case of murder." [2]

Such cases of theft and murder would be offences related to a political offence.

3. The second category of *quasi-political offences* consists of *complex offences*—that is to say, ordinary criminal offences which, without being related to a political offence, nevertheless have a political motive.

This is the subjective conception of political offences.

Under the Law of March 22nd, 1856, referred to by writers on international law as the " Belgian Clause ", the Belgian Legislature decided that this class of political offence was not to be immune from extradition. According to the preparatory proceedings, the law in question, which

---

[1] This text was retained in the Convention signed on June 26th, 1936, as Article 9, paragraph 4, which reads as follows:

" The High Contracting Party to whom application for extradition is made shall, in all cases, have the right to refuse to effect the arrest or to grant the extradition of a fugitive offender if his competent authorities consider that the offence of which the fugitive offender is accused or convicted is not sufficiently serious."

[2] *Translator's note.* — Throughout the present document " murder " is used to translate *meurtre* and " premeditated murder " to translate *assassinat*.

lays it down that " an outrage against the head of a foreign Government constituting either murder, premeditated murder or poisoning shall not be deemed to be a political offence or offence related thereto ", was designed solely to dispel uncertainty as to whether extradition could be granted in respect of an attempt on the life of a foreign sovereign as it would be if the victim of such a crime were merely a private person *(Pasinomie,* 1856, page 105, note in first column).

According to the preparatory proceedings *(Pasinomie,* 1856, pages 107 and 112) and to the " Records of the House of Representatives " of May 25th, 1871, page 1254, *attempts on the lives of human beings shall be judged under the ordinary criminal law, whatever their purpose or motive.*

Nevertheless, it should be observed that, according to these same documents, *acts of civil war* (that is to say, related offences as defined under 2 above) were to *continue to be non-extraditable;* so that, even if such acts were to lead to the death of the head of a foreign State, they would still be non-extraditable under Article 6 of the Law of October 1st, 1833.

* * *

These facts having been made clear, there would appear to be no doubt that the draft Convention does not apply to political offences *proper.*

It is, however, difficult to perceive to what extent the draft would alter the present position as regards *quasi*-political offences as defined under 2 and 3 above.

The draft had its origin in the assassination of the King of Yugoslavia at Marseilles in 1935 and relates mainly to political crimes.

From the *terms* of the draft (Article 2), however, the latter would appear to apply to offences under the ordinary criminal law " directed to the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services or a disturbance in international relations ".

Are these terms to be interpreted as applying even to *related* offences as defined above under No. 2 ?

The present draft does not *expressly* exclude such cases, more particularly those arising out of civil war. (In any case, who is to determine when the state of civil war begins ?)

Does the draft exclude such cases by *implication,* by specifically referring to offences directed to bring about a change " dans le *fonctionnement* des pouvoirs ",[1] and not mentioning offences the purpose of which is to bring about a change " dans la *forme* des pouvoirs ".

If the draft is meant to embrace even the related offences defined in point (2) of Article 2, it would seem that the Belgian Government would be unable to accept it.

But, even assuming that the draft is to be interpreted as applying solely to cases in which the offence, though not related to a political offence, was nevertheless directed to bringing about one of the results enumerated in Article 2, paragraph 1, the Belgian Government is reluctant to bind itself to abandon the subjective conception of political offences in connection with extradition for the acts referred to in Article 2 of the draft, in the manner in which it was expressly ruled out by the Law of March 22nd, 1856 (see 3 above), in regard to attempts upon the life of the head of a State.

It is to be feared that, were it to give such an undertaking, the Belgian Government would risk being obliged to grant extradition in cases in which such action would be incompatible with a proper understanding of the principles of non-extradition in political matters.

This will at once be evident from consideration of the following case: Let it be supposed that the State whose interests " are affected " within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 1, by offences falling within the scope of that article, subsequently undergoes a change of Government.

In the very nature of things the new Government—if it does not actually make heroes of those of its supporters by whom the offences were committed—will at least refrain from prosecuting them; more particularly, it will not request their extradition.

But, if the interests of the new Government happened in their turn to be " affected " by offences similar to those formerly committed by its own adherents, it would seek to punish the offenders and would request their extradition.

To hand over persons guilty of such acts either to the State requesting extradition or to the International Criminal Court which the second draft Convention proposes to set up might be contrary to a proper understanding of the principle of non-extradition in political matters.

The Belgian Government therefore desires, as far as possible, to retain the right to decide for itself in each particular case whether an offence under the ordinary criminal law is or is not of a political character such as would justify the refusal of extradition.

It is nevertheless willing to give the matter further consideration and its delegation to the League Assembly next September will be happy to proceed, with other delegations, to an exchange of views regarding the two draft Conventions, the examination of which has been placed upon the Assembly's agenda.

Bolivia.

April 2nd, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs . . . has pleasure in informing you that it is in entire agreement with the draft Conventions submitted to it.

---

1 *Translator's note.* — The corresponding phrase in the English text is: " directed to the overthrow of a Government . . . "

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

August 13th, 1936.

1. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom fully recognise both the importance and exceptional complexity of the proposals contained in the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and, having regard to the difficulties inherent in the subject, have given the proposals the closest examination.

2. In general, the English criminal law is already sufficient to render criminal the acts mentioned in Article 2, though it deals with such acts in general terms without reference to the particular circumstances in which they are committed. English law is, however, based upon the broad principle that the English courts are only concerned with criminal offences committed and taking effect within the territory, and, although there are a few exceptions to this principle (for example, the English courts would take cognisance of a conspiracy in England to commit murder abroad), very grave consideration would be required before any proposal to extend these exceptions could be accepted.

3. As regards the proposed provisions relating to extradition, though His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are unable to surrender persons in respect of offences of a political character and their extradition treaties accordingly contain an exception in respect of such offences, the English courts place in this connection a very narrow construction upon offences of a political character. Subject to this narrow exception, the ordinary policy of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is to surrender by way of extradition British subjects in respect of offences committed by them abroad. There is, however, a serious lack of reciprocity in this matter. Many States decline to surrender their own nationals to the United Kingdom. His Majesty's Government would welcome a greater measure of reciprocity in this matter.

4. His Majesty's Government consider that the draft Convention merits careful consideration, and they will give the closest attention to the views expressed by other Governments.

5. As regards the proposed Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have carefully and sympathetically considered the text prepared by the Committee of Experts; but they are of opinion that the time has not yet arrived for the creation of the proposed Court.

6. There would appear to His Majesty's Government to be no general analogy between the existing Permanent Court of International Justice and the proposed International Criminal Court. The existing Court applies recognised rules of international law to the settlement of international disputes and fulfils a function which no other judicial institution can perform. The proposed Court, on the other hand, would apply no single system of substantive law; its judgments would be dependent upon the national law to be applied in the particular case; and its decisions in similar cases would necessarily vary according to the particular national law. The method of trial, the procedure and the rules of evidence play a most important part in the administration of criminal justice, and it is felt that it would not be possible for the International Criminal Court to draw up rules in such matters which would be such as to command general acceptance by public opinion in the different countries. The administration of criminal justice reflects the national traditions and ideas of the different peoples, and it would not appear possible to bring them into unison at the present time. Further, it is thought that the work which the proposed Court would perform can generally be done with more efficiency by national courts. In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government do not see their way to participate in a scheme for an International Criminal Court.

7. His Majesty's Government would not, however, wish to oppose the creation of an International Criminal Court under the auspices of the League of Nations on the ground that they did not themselves propose to participate in the scheme if they were of opinion that the Court would be likely to serve a useful international purpose. So far, however, as His Majesty's Government can foresee, the Court would seldom be used, and, in view of the inherent difficulties of the proposal, they doubt whether the creation of an International Criminal Court would at the present time be conducive to improved international co-operation. Harm, in their opinion, is done to international institutions generally by the establishment of an institution which is not supported by the general assent of public opinion. His Majesty's Government accordingly consider that the time is not yet ripe for the creation of such a Court and suggest that the proposal should, for the time being at any rate, be abandoned.

8. In the event of the proposal being abandoned, Article 10 of the Terrorism Convention would consequentially be deleted. Should it, however, be decided to proceed with a Convention for the creation of an International Criminal Court, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are of opinion that Article 10 of the Terrorism Convention should be amended so as to preclude a State from sending to the Court for trial a person who is the subject of a State which has not adhered to the Court Convention.

Estonia.

[*Translation.*] July 13th, 1936.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs has the honour to express the complete agreement of the Government of Estonia with the principles laid down in these Conventions. In view, however, of the complexity of the problems involved, the competent authorities have not, down to the present moment, been able to reach their final conclusion as to the Conventions. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs proposes, therefore, to reserve for a later date the final expression of its opinion.

Finland.

[*Translation.*] May 28th, 1936.

The Finnish Government is of opinion that the adoption and application of conventions similar to the two draft Conventions for the international repression of terrorism would be likely to help the competent authorities to combat extremist movements dangerous to the State itself and to public order. The Finnish Government considers it necessary, however, that the said drafts should be supplemented by stipulations, including among acts punishable under the said Conventions the printing, conveyance and distribution of publications containing exhortations to overthrow by force the Government of any contracting country, or otherwise tending to promote activities with such a purpose. The effectiveness of the Conventions in question would also be considerably enhanced if the contracting parties could agree to prohibit in their respective territories the activities of any organisation aiming at the overthrow by force of the Government of any other country or otherwise promoting the achievement of such a purpose.

Lastly, the practical results of the proposed Conventions depend essentially on continuous co-operation between the competent authorities of the different countries. Such co-operation should be arranged direct between the said special authorities.

Hungary.

[*Translation.*] July 6th, 1936.

I. As regards the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, the Hungarian Government has no observations to make except with reference to certain formal provisions of this draft, which are dealt with later under No. IV.

II. With reference to the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, the Hungarian Government wishes to recall the general attitude which it adopted at the outset, when it stated that it was not in favour of the creation of an International Criminal Court. It also ventures to refer to the objections put forward by the Hungarian member of the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism in this connection during the general discussion which took place on this subject at the April 1935 session and at the second session from January 7th to 15th, 1936.

III. The Hungarian Government, while emphasising once again that it cannot see its way to accept the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court and maintaining its general standpoint unaltered, is nevertheless anxious to reply to the request made to it on behalf of the Council and to submit some observations on certain provisions of the draft in question, on the understanding that these observations do not in any way imply that it considers the creation of an International Criminal Court and the conclusion of a Convention on this matter necessary or even desirable.

This being understood, the Hungarian Government submits the following observations:

Ad *Article 4.*

This text is in accordance with the provisions of Article 2 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice; in particular, it specifies the class of persons eligible as members of the International Criminal Court.

This article does not, however, contain any provisions ensuring the impartiality of the judges (see Article 16 of the Statute), nor does it provide for the solemn declaration which, in accordance with Article 20 of the Statute, the members of the Hague Court are required to make before taking up their duties.

There is no reason why similar rules should not be laid down for the members of the International Criminal Court, since impartiality is essential when they are trying persons accused of acts of terrorism.

Ad *Article 22.*

This article deals with the right to conduct the prosecution before the International Court and defines the States competent to conduct it.

It does not, however, make it clear that the International Criminal Court is not entitled to institute proceedings in the absence of a charge and that it must drop the proceedings if the charge is withdrawn. A formal provision to this effect should be inserted, as it is doubtful whether, according to Article 22, a charge is held to be an essential element of the procedure or whether the intention is simply to enable the charge to be upheld without making it a condition of judicial action.

To this lacuna in the draft must be attributed the fact that, contrary to the provisions relating to judges and counsel for the defence (Articles 4 and 29), the text does not define the class of persons from among whom the plaintiff State may appoint its representative.

Ad *Article 24.*

The counsel of the accused should be expressly mentioned as the person to whom the file of the case, including the statement of the *partie civile,* should be communicated. This appears to be necessary because the person sent to the Court for trial may not be living or staying at the seat of the Court; in such a case, if the documents are sent to him there may not be time for his counsel to study them properly.

Ad *Article 28.*

It is doubtless due to an oversight that the text omits to mention that the State which has brought the case before the International Criminal Court should be represented at the examination and hearing of witnesses and experts. The text refers to Article 21, which does not mention the State in question.

Ad *Article 30.*

There are two objections to point 2.

In the first place, only witnesses and experts are to be heard *in camera;* the Court should, however, be authorised to adopt this procedure in other circumstances, with the sole general restriction that the Court's judgment or order should in every case be read at a public hearing (Article 33).

Secondly, it appears to be necessary to stipulate that, even when the hearing takes place *in camera,* the provisions of Article 21 will continue to be applicable—that is to say, the States enumerated in that article and also the State which has brought the matter before the Court should in every case be invited to be present at the hearing, even if it takes place *in camera.*

Ad *Article 35.*

The jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court should not be extended to private law matters and the Court should not pronounce upon the restoration of property or decide questions relating to the payment of damages.

In the first place, as regards articles serving as proof of the crime and articles in general which are of some importance from the point of view of criminal procedure, the general principle recognised by extradition treaties is that each State, even if it agrees to extradition, cedes such articles only temporarily, and subject to their return, to the State making the application, because they may be claimed in the extraditing State by persons whose right of ownership or other rights are not affected by the proceedings.

Secondly, as regards damages at private law, it is not advisable to extend the jurisdiction of the Criminal Court beyond its natural limits or to authorise the Court to decide claims which are simply and solely a matter of private law and in respect of which States would have to be compelled to execute the judgment in their territory. Persons having claims of this kind should be requested to follow the normal procedure laid down by law—that is to say, to apply to the courts of the State competent to hear and determine such cases.

Ad *Article 36.*

No observation is called for in regard to Rule No. 1 to the effect that, in principle, the judgments of the Court shall be executed by the State whose substantive criminal law has been applied; this will usually be the State in whose territory the offence has been committed.

As regards the provision relating to the execution of sentences, the basic principle should be, on the one hand, that the case should be tried with the utmost impartiality and, on the other, that, if the State does not wish to take part in the judicial proceedings and desires to free itself from all responsibility, it can do so by handing over the offender to the International Criminal Court.

The whole Convention should bear the impress of this principle, and none of the provisions should conflict with it.

Impartiality is undoubtedly of the greatest importance, not only as regards the trial of the case, but also—and this point closely affects the accused person—as regards the execution of the sentence. This fundamental principle of the Convention should therefore be applied in full in respect of its execution also.

Consequently, the State which has brought the case before the International Criminal Court so as not to assume responsibility for the proceedings and to hold aloof from the consequences of the offence should not be called upon to execute the sentence unless it agrees to do so.

According to the report of the proceedings of the Committee of Experts, this appears to be the idea underlying Article 36; moreover, it was specifically mentioned in the text of Article 56 of the 1935 draft drawn up by the Belgian, French, Roumanian and Spanish members of the Committee (document C.184.M.102.1935.V), but is not clearly brought out in the new text.

Another defect is that the draft omits to mention the important rule that the State against which the offence has been committed can in no case be responsible for the execution of the sentence.

We need not stress the fact that, if it is the object of the Convention to set up an International Criminal Court to ensure that certain criminal acts will be tried impartially, the possibility that the judgment of this impartial Court may be executed by the injured State which is primarily concerned and incapable of impartiality should be precluded.

Ad *Article 39.*

Point 2 of this article leaves it to the Court (Article 42) to determine by its rules the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

The class of persons entitled to make an application for revision should be defined in the actual Convention, and in any case it should be expressly stated that the persons mentioned in Articles 22 and 29 will have this right.

Ad *Article 40.*

According to paragraph 1, the salaries of the judges are payable by the States of which they are nationals. As Article 6 does not require States to nominate candidates who are their nationals, the judges will not necessarily possess the nationality of the State by which they are nominated; they might even be nationals of States that have not acceded to the Convention. Consequently, the rule laid down in paragraph 1 of Article 40 is obviously incorrect; it should stipulate that the salaries of the judges are payable by the State which put forward their candidature.

In this connection, the Hungarian Government wishes once again to draw attention to a gap in the draft, which omits one of the most delicate questions of the International Criminal Court—namely, the question of language. In the Hungarian Government's opinion, this point is of such importance that it would be better not to leave it to be settled by the Court's regulations.

Ad *Article 42.*

It would be well to add (as part of the Convention) to the provision that the Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure the stipulation that the Court's procedure will naturally be governed by the principles of modern law relating to criminal procedure.

IV. As regards the provisions of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court relating to interpretation, ratification, accessions, colonies and protectorates, and also to the entry into force and denunciation of the Convention, the Hungarian Government ventures to point out that the text of document A.7.1936.V differs considerably from the Minutes of the meeting held by the Committee of Experts at Geneva on January 14th, 1936.

For instance, there are the following discrepancies:

In the third line of Article 44, after the words " direct negotiations ", the words " or by means of arbitration agreed upon between them " are missing.

According to the Minutes referred to above, this phrase should be inserted in the corresponding articles of the two Conventions, and it is, in fact, embodied in Article 19 of the draft Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism; but it has been omitted from the second draft, although it was adopted by the Committee for both these draft Conventions.

The same observation applies to the whole of the text of Article 52 of the second draft, which has also been omitted from the first draft.

Moreover, the second paragraph of this article has been drawn up in such a way to make it doubtful whether the amendment of the Convention, if adopted by the majority of the contracting parties, will or will not be binding on States which have not accepted it.

Should an article reproducing the text of Article 52 of the second draft Convention also be inserted, in accordance with the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee of Experts on January 14th, 1936, in the draft Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, the Hungarian Government wishes to state forthwith that it regards as unacceptable any interpretation of paragraph 2 of Article 52 to the effect that amendments adopted by the majority of the contracting parties are binding upon all signatory States. In that case, the Hungarian Government would be obliged to request that the text of paragraph 2 should be made more explicit.

Lastly, the Hungarian Government feels obliged to revert once again to certain formal provisions of the two draft Conventions.

In its opinion, Articles 21 and 25 of the first draft and Articles 46 and 48 of the second draft, in their present wording, offer certain drawbacks. For instance, the Convention may be acceded to even before, for lack of ratifications, it has come into force (Article 21 of the first draft and Article 46 of the second draft). This conflicts with the principle that an international convention may only be acceded to after it has come into force. The drawback to Article 25 of the first draft and Article 48 of the second draft is that, as they are worded at present, the entry into force of the Convention may take place independently of the signatory States and even without any of those States having ratified the Convention.

In the Hungarian Government's opinion, Article 21 of the first and Article 46 of the second draft should be amended so as to make accession possible only after the date on which the Convention comes into force. Moreover, the text of Article 25 of the first and Article 48 of the second draft should be revised so as to ensure that the entry into force of the Convention is subject only to ratification by a certain number of Members of the League of Nations or non-member States.[1]

The Hungarian Government wishes to point out that, on July 10th, 1935, it submitted similar observations regarding the second preliminary draft International Convention on the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace (Circular Letter 44.1936.XII, Annex, pages 19 and 20), and that the Drafting Committee appointed to draw up the text of the draft for submission to the Diplomatic Conference to be held at Geneva on September 3rd, 1936, recognised the soundness of the objections formulated by the Hungarian Government (cf. the above-mentioned document, page 8).

In accordance with this Government's proposals, Articles 10 and 11 of the draft Convention in question were worded as follows:

"*Article 10.*

"After the entry into force of the present Convention, any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State referred to in Article 8 may accede to it.

"The instruments of accession shall be sent to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall notify the deposit thereof to all the Members of the League and to all the non-member States referred to in the aforesaid article.

"*Article 11.*

"The present Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of the sixth ratification.

"Every ratification effected after the deposit of the ratification mentioned in paragraph 1 of the present article shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date of receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

"In conformity with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Secretary-General shall register the present Convention on the date of its coming into force."

India.

August 14th, 1936.

As regards the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, the Government of India do not propose to offer any detailed remarks, since they are unable to accept the draft Convention. As the jurisdiction of the Court is limited to the offences set out in the Terrorist Convention (or, possibly, to some of them), and as the Convention, even for these offences, places no obligation upon any party to the Convention to remit any person to the Court, they feel doubtful whether this organisation would serve any practical purpose. Terrorism in India has very little connection at present with that in European countries. The Governments in India have adequate legal powers to deal with it and it appears most unlikely that they would ever wish to resort to the proposed Court. Further, if India accepted the Convention, the institution of the Court would necessitate new legislation in the Indian Legislature, and, even if the Court would serve a useful purpose as regards crimes committed in Europe, the Government of India would not feel justified in introducing legislation to make resort possible to a court situated at such a distance from India. The inconvenience and expense involved in resort to the Court would outweigh any advantages to be obtained from participation in an international administration of criminal law.

As regards the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, the Government of India observe that, under the operation of Article 23, the enactment of any

---

[1] *Note by the Secretariat.* — The provisions here criticised are not an innovation. They represent a method of facilitating the entry into force of general international conventions, and their extension to the greatest possible number of countries, which originated with the conventions adopted at the Barcelona Conference of 1921. Every convention which has been actually concluded under the League's auspices and which is open to accession allows accession to take place before the convention is in force. Since 1928, it has been the regular practice to give to an accession the same force as to a ratification so far as regards the entry into force of the convention.

legislation necessary to bring the law of India and the administrative organisation into conformity with the rules contained in the Convention would be a condition precedent to ratification. It is impossible for them within the time at their disposal to reach definite conclusions regarding the extent, if any, to which the Convention would necessitate amendment of the existing law. In view of certain sections of the Indian Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure which provide that offences (or abetments of offences) committed by British-Indian subjects outside British India may be dealt with as if they had been committed within British India, they anticipate that the existing law is likely to be found adequate to implement the more essential provisions of the Convention, though it is probable that detailed examination will disclose certain respects in which legislation would be necessary. They therefore desire it to be understood that their attitude towards this Convention is subject to the possibility that the Indian Legislature would decline to pass legislation the enactment of which might be found to be a condition precedent to ratification, and that the question whether, in that event, resort could properly be had to the extraordinary powers vested in the Governor-General by the Government of India Act, which empower him to pass legislation that is considered essential to the safety and tranquillity of British India, has not been considered. In the second place, it has not been found possible to consult the local Governments in the time allowed, and a similar reservation is necessary as regards consultation with them. In the third place, it is necessary to state that this document refers to the position in British India alone.

Subject to the reservations mentioned above, the Government of India are fully in accord with the principle of international co-operation for the prevention and punishment of terrorism, as stated in Article 1 of the draft Convention.

Latvia.

[*Translation.*] July 14th, 1936.

I have the honour to inform you that the competent authorities have considered the draft Conventions and have declared that, in principle, they have no objection to make to them. They reserve, however, their right to express a further opinion at a later date.

Norway.

[*Translation.*] July 20th, 1936.

1. *Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.*

The most important provisions of the draft are those of Articles 2, 3, 7, 8 and 9.

The Norwegian Government has no objections of principle to Articles 2, 3, 7 and 8.

Under the Norwegian Criminal Code, all the acts enumerated under Nos. 1 to 3 of Article 2 are punishable both as ordinary or as aggravated crimes intended to cause death, grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty (Criminal Code, Chapter 9, cpr. Article 96, Chapters 21 and 22), crimes against property (Chapter 28) or crimes against public security (Chapter 14). The same applies to attempts to commit the above mentioned crimes. Generally speaking, the penalties provided for in the Criminal Code are also applicable to persons guilty of participation in such crimes.

Article 2, No. 4, and Article 3, No. 1 (2), refer to certain preparatory acts less directly connected with the actual crimes. As a general rule, such preparatory acts are not punishable under Norwegian law. For this reason and as both the determination of guilt and also the definitions of " attempt " and " participation " vary greatly from country to country, the Norwegian Government considers that the draft Convention should do no more than refer, in so far as these questions are concerned, to the municipal law of the individual States.

Persons guilty of the acts mentioned in Articles 7 and 8 could no doubt be prosecuted in Norway in all cases (Criminal Code, Article 12, Nos. 3*c* and 4*b*). As regards offences committed abroad by foreigners, Article 13, paragraph 2, of the Criminal Code nevertheless provides that criminal proceedings can only be instituted if the act in question is also punishable in the country in which it was committed; furthermore, the sentence cannot be heavier than that which might be passed in the foreign country in question. The Norwegian Government does not, however, consider it necessary to enter a reservation as the result of these provisions of its Criminal Code.

The chief importance of the draft Convention resides, no doubt, in the proposals regarding the treatment of political crimes and, above all, extradition. It would appear that the obligation as to extradition embodied in Article 9 overrides the obligation to institute criminal proceedings under Article 8.

The objections of principle that might be raised against restrictions upon the right of asylum, however, would also apply in Norway to the obligation to institute criminal proceedings. In cases in which the request for the extradition of an offender guilty of a political crime has been refused, there has never been any question of instituting criminal proceedings in Norway, even when the express conditions under which such proceedings are permissible, in virtue of Article 12, No. 4, of the Criminal Code, have been fulfilled.

Article 3 of the Norwegian Extradition Law of June 13th, 1908, contains the following provisions:

> " Extradition may not be granted in respect of any political crime or of any ordinary crime committed in connection with a political crime and with the purpose of assisting the attainment of the end aimed at by that crime.
>
> " The crime of causing death or grievous bodily harm to the head of a State or to a person belonging to the family of the head of a State may nevertheless give rise to extradition, provided always that the crime was not committed in connection with another political crime."

The draft Convention could not therefore be accepted unless the above law were amended.

The Norwegian Government is not convinced of the wisdom of adopting, at the present juncture, general restrictions on the right of asylum, which would be the result of the acceptance of the provisions of the draft. It nevertheless considers that certain acts must be punishable and also give rise to extradition, even when they constitute political crimes or are connected with such crimes. Murder and attempted murder fall within this category; nevertheless, an exception should perhaps be made in respect of acts committed in open fight. Nor has the Government any special objection to extending international repression so as to include crimes intended to cause grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty. The crimes mentioned under No. 3 of Article 2 of the draft should be regarded from the same point of view as they are also of a nature to endanger human lives.

On the other hand, the Norwegian Government considers that the acts mentioned in Article 2, No. 2, should not be included in the above-mentioned category. In serious cases, these acts would come under the provisions of No. 1 or No. 3 of the article; otherwise, the right of asylum must be granted; provided always that the acts in question are to be regarded as political crimes within the meaning of the law. The same applies to the preparatory acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3.

The Norwegian Government desires, lastly, to point out that, in its opinion, the provisions of Articles 14, 15 and 16 are of particular importance and to them it gives its fullest support. These articles are designed to centralise criminal investigations and to institute mutual assistance during criminal proceedings, together with a service for the mutual exchange of information.

2. *Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.*

The Norwegian Government regrets that, for reasons of principle, it is unable to support this draft.

Netherlands.

[*Translation.*] July 15th, 1936.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands has the honour to forward to the Secretary-General, in respect of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe, the following observations concerning the two draft Conventions drawn up by the Committee—viz., the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, and the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.[1]

The Netherlands Government is perfectly ready to co-operate, in so far as may be possible, in an international attempt to put down terrorist crimes having a political object. Nevertheless, the two drafts prepared by the Committee call for the following comments:

As regards Article 2, the Netherlands Government is of opinion that it should be clearly understood that the acts enumerated in that article will only fall within the scope of the Convention when committed for the purpose of bringing about " the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services, or a disturbance in international relations, by the use of violence or by the creation of a state of terror ". It will not, therefore, be enough that such an act should be *of a nature* to bring about the overthrow of a Government or a disturbance in international relations, as mentioned above. The efforts of the person committing the act must have been deliberately directed towards such an end. The Netherlands Government is doubtful as to whether the words " lorsque lesdits faits tendent à " make this sufficiently clear.[2]

The Netherlands Government is further of opinion that the enumeration of the categories of offences which are to be covered by the Convention is too wide. This observation applies to Article 2, No. 5, under which it is a punishable offence to give assistance to an accomplice of a person who commits any of the acts mentioned in that article; the Government considers that this clause should only apply to assistance given to the criminal himself.

The Netherlands Government considers that the Convention being naturally limited to international acts, this fact implies that Article 2 should not deal with offences which are in no way international in character—*i.e.*, offences committed against a State by one of its own nationals in its own territory and without the criminal's having proceeded to any other country.

---

[1] The present note reproduces certain observations regarding this problem already set forth in the note of September 5th, 1935, and published in document A.7.1936.V, in so far as their relevance has remained unaffected by the Committee's subsequent proceedings.

[2] *Translator's note.* — The English text has " in all cases where they are directed to . . . "

The words " any wilful complicity [1] and any help given towards the commission of such an act " in Article 3, paragraph I (2), would appear to be too wide in scope; it should be understood that help given towards the commission of such an act would only be punishable if the person by whom the help was given had the *deliberate intention (volonté)* to assist the commission of the criminal act.

The drafting of Article 3, paragraph 3, with regard to incitement is not quite clear. The Netherlands Government assumes that it is to be interpreted to mean that, as a rule, incitement which has not taken place in public must always be punished like that which has taken place in public, and that the exception made in paragraph 3 merely relates to incitement which has not taken place in public when such incitement has not been successful.

Article 7 calls for the comments made in the previous note in respect of Article 6. As the Netherlands does not admit the principle of the extradition of nationals, a provision (Article 5) has been included in the Criminal Code to the effect that Netherlands law shall apply to any act committed by a Netherlands subject in foreign territory, provided always that such act constitutes a crime under the Netherlands criminal law, and is at the same time punishable under the laws of the country in which it has been committed.

As regards Article 9, which deals with extradition, the Netherlands Government desires to reiterate what was said in the note of September 5th, 1935. The Netherlands is not prepared to consider all the offences referred to in the present Articles 2 and 3 as being deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been or may hereafter be concluded between the Netherlands and all the other contracting States. Moreover, the extradition treaties hitherto concluded by the Netherlands Government are based, in general, on the principle that extradition cannot be granted for political offences. In view of the wide differences of political opinion which at present exist in different countries on fundamental questions, the time does not seem favourable for completely abrogating this rule. The present circumstances as regards the national policies of different States are not such as to induce the Netherlands to depart from their historic tradition as regards the hospitality offered to political refugees.

The service referred to in Article 14, as at present drafted, would merely deal with the offences referred to in Articles 2 and 3. Would it not be desirable to make the same service responsible for the investigations in regard to offences under Article 12.

The Netherlands Government has been glad to note that rules have been inserted in Article 19 with regard to the settlement of disputes which might arise in respect of the interpretation or application of the Convention. At the same time, the Netherlands Government regrets that the present text does nothing to remove the possibility that, in the event of two contracting parties failing to agree upon the jurisdiction, the dispute will remain unsettled. In this connection, the Netherlands Government ventures to suggest that a rule be inserted making good this omission; it would, for example, be possible to reproduce the provisions of Article 21 of the 1930 Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws, which are more satisfactory in this respect.

As Her Majesty's Government has already stated in its previous note, it considers that the establishment of an international jurisdiction would no doubt offer advantages, particularly in cases in which the State on whose territory an accused person has taken refuge prefers sending him for trial before the international jurisdiction to extraditing him to the injured State.

In this connection, the Netherlands Government ventures to suggest that, in Article 22 of the first draft Convention, States prepared to ratify the Convention should be given the possibility of entering a special reservation to the effect that the reciprocal obligations ensuing from that instrument are only accepted in regard to the States which are also parties to the Convention on the Court. It might, indeed, happen that a State unwilling to accept the very general rule as to extradition embodied in Article 9 would nevertheless be prepared to accept the Convention on terrorism in regard to other contracting parties if it were entitled, under certain circumstances, to send the person charged before the International Court for trial instead of granting his extradition.

As regards the second draft Convention, the Netherlands Government has been gratified to note that The Hague has been suggested as the seat of the new Court. The Government has observed with satisfaction that the Committee has taken into account several observations regarding the details of the Court's composition and the procedure to be followed which were put forward by the Netherlands Government in its previous note. The Government persists in its belief that it would be wiser to modify Article 6 by the introduction of the rule contained in the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which lays down that the Assembly and the Council shall proceed to the election of judges independently of one another.

The Netherlands Government ventures to suggest that the draft Convention be modified in the following way:

From the present text of Articles 17 and 36, it ensues that, unless otherwise decided by the Court, sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by the State in whose territory the offence was committed. It might nevertheless happen that a State sending an offender for trial before the Court had adopted this procedure in preference to extradition to the State in whose territory the offence was committed, for the very reason that it was anxious to avoid leaving jurisdiction and execution of the sentence to the State in question. It would therefore appear to be desirable that a clause be inserted in Article 36 to the effect that the Court will be required to " decide otherwise " within the meaning of Article 36 if the State by which the offender has been sent for trial before the Court has itself requested to be entrusted with the execution of any sentence of imprisonment which is imposed.

The observation regarding the settlement of disputes made in regard to Article 19 of the first Convention naturally applies also to Article 44 of the second draft.

---

[1] *Translator's note.* — The French text has " participation intentionnelle ".

Siam.

July 1st, 1936.

The Siamese Government has the honour to state that, whereas many of the acts enumerated in the draft are already punishable under the Siamese Penal Code, the draft Convention in its present form would entail certain difficulties in respect of the existing judicial system, and in some other matters is not particularly appropriate to conditions in Siam. Under the circumstances, His Majesty's Government is inclined to refrain from offering detailed comment at the present time.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[*Translation.*] April 16th, 1936.

The People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs has the honour to acknowledge receipt of the copies of document A.7.1936.V,transmitted by the Secretary-General's letter dated February 25th, 1936 (Circular Letter 26.1936.V), and containing the draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, together with the report adopted by the Council on January 23rd, 1936.

Examination of these drafts suggests a general observation concerning the actual object of the international agreement in question as contemplated by the Council resolution of December 10th, 1934. Considered in the light of the circumstances which prompted this resolution and of the exchange of views following which the resolution was drawn up, the agreement provided for was to have as its sole object the organising of joint action by the contracting parties for combating terrorist conspiracies which endanger international peace and security. This aspect of the question does not seem to have been sufficiently taken into account in the drafts drawn up by the Committee, although it is the aspect which should be the one and only object of the agreement to be concluded under the terms of the resolution of December 10th, 1934.

Bearing this in mind, the drafts in question should be examined with a view to a more exact definition of their scope, while providing at the same time for a more complete and efficacious solution of the problem in its international aspect.

Venezuela

[*Translation.*] August 7th, 1936.

I have the honour to inform you that the Department concerned, after studying the draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, finds that the acts in respect of which proceedings are to be instituted, as indicated in Section A and enumerated in Bases (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*) for the conclusion of the former agreement, are included in the provisions of our Criminal Code (Articles 158, 160, 174, 175, 273, 284, 286, 287, 344 and 385), so that, so far as our country is concerned, it is unnecessary to add other acts to the list in question.

As regards paragraph (*a*), it should be noted that criminal acts committed in the territory of the Republic against the head or President of a foreign nation, or against the diplomatic representatives accredited to the Venezuelan Government, on account of their functions, and also attempts to commit such acts and complicity in the commission of such acts, are severely punished under the above-mentioned Articles 158 and 160 of the present Criminal Code.

With reference to paragraph (*d*), which relates to the possession of arms, ammunition, explosives, etc., by private persons, this question is dealt with in Venezuela by a special Law dated July 19th, 1928, prohibiting the " importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, possession, and carrying of arms " whether these are *side-arms* or *fire-arms;* this Law provides for the imposition of effective penalties in the case of the said acts, which are also offences under our Criminal Code.

In accordance with the spirit of our penal legislation, the punishment of the acts enumerated in the Bases mentioned above would come wholly within the jurisdiction of the Venezuelan criminal courts, since the administration of justice in the States which form the Union is automatic, in virtue of the federal regime in force. Consequently, the proposal to create an International Criminal Court for the trial of persons accused of the criminal acts mentioned above, under the conditions set forth in Section B of the draft Convention, would necessitate a previous reform of our positive criminal law, which is a delicate matter, owing to the autonomy of the federal organisations in question.

In conclusion, the opinion of the Department for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, after examining the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, is favourable in the former and unfavourable in the latter case.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 24 (a).** 1936. V.

Geneva, September 21st, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

OBSERVATIONS BY GOVERNMENTS

Series II

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

Since the publication of document A.24.1936.V, on September 7th, 1936, the following Governments have submitted observations:

	Page		Page
Poland.	1	Roumania.	3

Poland.

September 3th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

The Polish Government considers that the purpose of the Convention for the International Repression of Terrorism, as drafted by a special Committee, should be to ensure the prevention and punishment of offences recognised as of a terrorist nature when aimed at the interests of any signatory and even when committed on foreign territory. For this purpose, the offences defined by the Convention should be regarded as *delicta juris gentium.*

To this end, there is no need to ask the signatory States to accept identical definitions and penalties of the offences covered by the Convention. This would be virtually impracticable, since such a Convention would require States to introduce into their respective bodies of law very profound changes, which would sometimes be incompatible with their penal law system as a whole, and in its scope and consequences would go beyond the purpose aimed at—viz., to make so-called terrorist offences punishable and not to unify certain questions of penal law.

This general observation gives a sufficiently clear idea of the attitude of the Polish Government on the question of principle. The following observations on the various draft articles are submitted by the Government:

Sub-paragraph (3) of Article 2 might be reworded as follows: " Any wilful act calculated to endanger the community by imperilling human life or by causing the destruction of property on a large scale, and in particular, interference with the working of means of communication . . . " (continue with the existing text).

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1936. V. 7.

S.d.N. 1200 (F.) 970 (A.). 9/36. Imp. Kundig.

This form of words would cover the large-scale destruction of private property not imperilling human life but designed to create a state of terror as defined in Article 2, paragraph 1. Experience shows that the action of terrorists is sometimes directed against private property of great economic, cultural or other value without human lives being endangered. Such action, however, is intended to create a state of terror and by its violent character to disturb the working of the public services.

The expression " *en particulier* " in the French text is substituted for " *notamment* " because the restrictive enumeration does not cover other forms of action which may occur in practice and constitute a danger to the community—*e.g.*, the destruction of a dyke may cause floods.

The wording of sub-paragraph (4) of Article 2 should be made more restrictive. The substitution for " any material or object " of the words " arms, ammunition or explosives " would be more in keeping with the provisions of various criminal codes.

The Polish Government considers that sub-paragraph (5) of Article 2 is superfluous, since the question of assistance is adequately dealt with in Article 3. If the reference is to forms of assistance not covered by Article 3, these would not exist in the criminal codes, and the codes could probably not be amended in this respect. It is, moreover, difficult to conceive of complicity in an offence taking any other form than help or incitement. As Article 3 covers the entire ground, sub-paragraph (5) of Article 2 should be deleted.

Ad *Article 3.* — The Polish Government considers that it would be better to substitute the word " association " for " conspiracy ". Such a wide conception as " conspiracy " could only apply to the most serious crimes, such as attempts against the safety of the State. Conspiracy in the sense of the unorganised maintenance of connections would go beyond the scope of the Convention, which should cover association only—*i.e.*, the organised preparation of crimes or offences.

As regards incitement, it would probably be advisable to avoid the unequal commitments which the present wording of paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (2), and paragraph 3 of Article 3 would impose on the contracting parties. Instead of leaving it to domestic law to define the exact scope of these undertakings in the case of incitement which has not taken place in public and has not been successful, it would be better to make no reference in the Convention to such incitement. In this vay, paragraph 3 would be deleted and paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (2), would read as follows: " . . . direct public incitement, whether successful or not, and also direct incitement which has not taken place in public and has been successful . . . ".

Ad *Article 4.* — The Polish Government thinks that the reservation regarding characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law should also be extended to the property covered by sub-paragraph (2) of Article 2. The signatories to the Convention could not, of course, undertake to apply the same definitions and penalties to the crimes and offences referred to in Article 2, sub-paragraph (2), when directed against their own interests as when directed against the interests of another contracting party. Such complete assimilation would go beyond the purpose of the Convention, which is to recognise acts of terrorism as international offences and thus ensure their punishment, and it would entail far-reaching reform of those penal codes which admit the principle of qualified protection for the public property of their respective States.

In these circumstances, the Polish Government proposes that Article 4 be deleted and the question dealt with in Article 18, which should apply not only to the general rules but also to the special provisions of domestic law.

Ad *Article 5.* — To ensure equality of obligations among signatories to the Convention, the Polish Government would like to see one of two solutions adopted: either, and preferably, all signatories should be deemed bound to recognise foreign convictions for the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 as establishing habitual criminality in the international sense, or Article 5 should be deleted and the problem left to be dealt with by domestic law.

Ad *Article 6.* — This article seems superfluous, as it leaves the question of *parties civiles* to national law, but, at the same time, imposes on States where *parties civiles* are admitted under the domestic law certain obligations which would have no equivalent in the case of other signatories.

Ad *Articles 7, 8 and 9.* — The structure of these three articles seems to be extremely complicated and leaves several loop-holes which would make it possible for acts of terrorism to go unpunished, contrary to the intention of the Convention. For instance, if a national of country X, a signatory to the Convention, commits an outrage against a Minister of country Y, which is also a signatory to the Convention, in that country's territory, and then escapes to his own country, country X would not under Article 7, paragraph 2, be obliged to punish its offending national, because, the offence being political, the extradition of a foreigner in similar circumstances could not be granted.

As the text at present stands, the number of cases in which extradition would not be granted or punishment imposed would be still further increased by the provisions of sub-paragraphs (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) of Article 8, which make the punishment subject to various conditions. If any one of these conditions were not fulfilled, the criminal would escape justice. In the case of sub-paragraph (*b*) it may, *inter alia*, be pointed out that domestic law does not, as a general rule, consider prosecution for offences committed abroad admissible, and stipulates for prosecution only in special provisions. The consequence would be that international punishment of acts of terrorism would, contrary to the essential purpose of the Convention, become the exception.

In the Polish Government's view, Articles 7 to 9 should lay down the clear and simple rule: *aut dedere aut judicare.* Signatories should undertake in the first place to extradite the offender, even where there is no extradition treaty between the countries concerned. Where extradition

cannot be granted (*e.g.*, where the offender is a national of the country on whose territory he has taken refuge), the offender should necessarily and in every case be brought before the national courts.

Ad *Article 10.* — This clause seems entirely superfluous since, clearly, the law of the country concerned determines which court shall have jurisdiction.

Ad *Article 12.* — The Polish Government thinks the following a more suitable wording: " . . . and intended for use as genuine, and without regard to the purpose with which the act was performed ".

Ad *Article 18.* — The Polish Government thinks that a second paragraph should be added, reading as follows:

> " The High Contracting Parties may, in each particular case, make criminal prosecution or extradition subject to reciprocity on the part of the High Contracting Party concerned."

Ad *Article 19.* — The Polish Government considers that disputes relating to the application and interpretation of the Convention might usefully be referred to the international political authority—*i.e.*, the Council of the League of Nations—since the disputes would usually be on rather delicate political questions demanding special tact on the part of the body which has to give a decision. The matter could be referred to the Council under Article 15 of the Covenant and the Council could, if necessary, ask the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion on difficulties of a purely juridical character.

Ad *Appendix II.* — The Polish Government sees no need for the creation of an International Criminal Court. Though it does not wish to prevent in any way other countries from setting up such a Court, it thinks that the existence of the Criminal Court would have no effect, *de facto* or *de jure*, on those signatories to the Convention for the Repression of Terrorism who did not recognise the Criminal Court. The signatories to the said Convention who recognise the Court could never cite the existence of the latter in reply to requests from the other signatories which were warranted by the actual terms of the Convention.

Roumania.

[*Translation.*] September 12th, 1936.

The Royal Roumanian Government accepts the principles set forth in the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and in the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

The Roumanian Government reserves the right, however, to submit any observations it may have to make regarding certain points of detail during the discussion of the above-mentioned drafts at the seventeenth Assembly of the League of Nations.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 33.** 1936. V. 241

Geneva, September 29th, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

CONTENTS.

Page

Note by the Secretary-General 2

Resolution adopted by the Assembly on September 27th, 1935 2

Part I. — Communications from Governments:

Union of South Africa 2
Belgium 3
Brazil 4
United Kingdom 14
China 16
Colombia 16
Czechoslovakia 30
Estonia 18
India 19
Latvia 22
Monaco 26
Netherlands 28
New Zealand 27
Norway 27
Poland 28
Danzig 30
Turkey 31

Part II. — Communications from Women's International Organisations:

Pan-Pacific Women's Association 32

S. d. N. 1310 (F.) 1220 (A.) 9/36. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL
1936. V. 8.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

The text of the resolution adopted by the Assembly on September 27th, 1935, on the subject of the status of women is reproduced below.

A small number of Governments have already found it possible to send their observations and statements to the Secretary-General (see paragraphs 1 and 3 of the above-mentioned resolution). Although the subject has not been placed on the agenda of this year's ordinary session of the Assembly, the Secretary-General has felt that the publication of this information in the present document would be of value to Governments and the international organisations concerned.

The Secretary-General understands that the women's international organisations will not be in a position to present, during the present year, the statements which they are preparing.[1]

A communication regarding the scope which should be given to an enquiry into the status of women has been received from the Pan-Pacific Women's Association and is reproduced in Part II of the present document.

If the information received justifies this course, the Secretary-General proposes to publish, shortly before the Assembly's ordinary session of next year, a second series of the statements received in response to the Assembly's resolution.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY ON SEPTEMBER 27TH, 1935.

The Assembly,

Noting that the question of the status of women was placed on the agenda of the present session for examination, at the instance of a number of delegations, with particular reference to the Equal Rights Treaty signed at Montevideo on December 26th, 1933, by representatives of the Governments of Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay;

Considering that the terms of the Equal Rights Treaty should be examined in relation to the existing political, civil and economic status of women under the laws of the countries of the world;

Recognising that the question of conditions of employment, whether of men or women, is a matter which properly falls within the sphere of the International Labour Organisation:

(1) Decides that the question of the political and civil status of women shall be referred by the Secretary-General to the Governments for their observations, including observations as to the action which, in their view, the League might take in this matter, and that the Governments shall be requested to supply to the Secretary-General, together with their observations, information as to the existing political and civil status of women under their respective national laws;

(2) Recommends that the women's international organisations should continue their study of the whole question of the political and civil status of women;

(3) Requests that the observations and information communicated by the Governments and the statements of the said international organisations shall be sent to the Secretary-General for consideration by the Assembly of the League of Nations at a subsequent session;

(4) Expresses the hope that the International Labour Organisation will, in accordance with its normal procedure, undertake an examination of those aspects of the problem within its competence — namely, the question of equality under labour legislation — and that it will, in the first place, examine the question of legislation which effects discriminations, some of which may be detrimental to women's right to work.

PART I. — COMMUNICATIONS FROM GOVERNMENTS.

Observations and statements as to the political and civil status of women have been received from the following Governments :

Union of South Africa.

February 24th, 1936.

1. NATIONALITY OF WOMEN.

Reference is invited to my letter No. L.N. 14/3/1 of June 1st, 1932.[2] The Union Government are not prepared to go beyond the acceptance of Articles 8 to 10 of the Hague

[1] A letter has been received from the International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship asking that it may be mentioned in the present document that that organisation, while unable to submit a memorandum at present, is giving the subject the most careful consideration with a view to presenting its considered opinion at a later date.

[2] See document A.15.1932.V.

Convention of 1930. In this connection, I may add that it has been decided that it is not necessary to introduce legislation at the present parliamentary session to give effect to those articles.

As regards the ratification of the Convention, as such, reference is invited to my letter No. L.N. 10/4 of June 12th, 1935, paragraph (*a*).[1]

A further point on the question as it affects naturalisation is that no person under disability may become naturalised in the Union. The category of persons under disability includes married women.

2. Franchise.

So far as concerns the franchise, all white women of the age of 21 or over have the right to vote, provided they are Union nationals and have resided in any electoral division for at least three months. Conviction for certain criminal offences is a disqualification.

The Mandated Territory of South West Africa.

Europeans.

The social status of women in South West Africa is the same as in the Union. In the political arena, however, there is this difference : that the women have no franchise for parliamentary purposes. In municipalities, where the franchise is based on property qualification, the position of the woman is identical with that of the man.

Although the question of parliamentary franchise for women has been raised on a previous occasion in the Legislative Assembly, it does not appear to be an urgent matter in South West Africa. One hears so seldom that it is even mentioned in public discussions that it can safely be assumed that the women here do not desire it.

Natives.

In regard to natives, there can of course be no question of franchise either for Parliament or for municipalities, as the native population has no such institutions. But, beyond that, the social status of the woman is practically equal to that of the man.

It is noteworthy that succession to the chieftainship in a number of tribes in the territory is through the mother, and that the " lobola " system is not practised.

Belgium.

February 20th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a memorandum containing information relating (1) to the civil status of women in Belgium, (2) to the political status of women in Belgium.

As regards possible action by the League of Nations in the matter of the status of women, the Belgian Government feels bound to point out that to its mind the problem is one of an essentially internal character; questions relating to the civil status of women are closely bound up with the conception of marriage now current *in each separate State.*

On the other hand, questions relating to the political status of women are governed by the constitutional law of *each State* and must of necessity be examined in the light of the internal policy pursued by each State.

I. Civil Status of Women.

In principle, a woman of full age not subject to the obligations resulting from matrimony is, for civil purposes, on a footing of equality with men of full age ; like them, she has the free disposal of her person and property, may leave her family, contract marriage, buy, sell, alienate, mortgage and institute legal proceedings.

Recent legislation has removed from the Belgian Civil Code certain provisions which conflicted with this principle, though without completely destroying it.

For example, the Law of January 7th, 1908, permits women to act as witnesses in acts before the civil authorities ; the Law of August 10th, 1909, permits them to act as guardians ; the Law of December 16th, 1922, permits them to witness notarial documents.

Under the Civil Code, a married woman was placed, as a consequence of the marital authority (the special rights vested in husbands) in a position of complete legal incapacity.

This position was completely changed by the Law of July 20th, 1932, as a result of which the legal capacity of married women is, in a great many cases, general and complete. This applies to women who are judicially separated from their husbands (Article 1449) ; or to cases in which the husband is, in law or in fact, incapable of exercising the prerogatives deriving from the marital authority (Article 222 (1) and (2)) ; or again in cases in which the husband

[1] See document C.310.M.163.1935.V.

has given his wife a general authority to perform the acts enumerated in Articles 215 and 217 of the Civil Code (Article 221). The legal capacity of women married under a contract of dowry or under a contract of separate estates is general, though limited to certain stated acts or property (Articles 1449-1576).

On the other hand, every married woman, irrespective of the matrimonial regime to which she is subject, enjoys full legal capacity in respect of the administration of her reserved property. She is free to perform acts of disposal under the same conditions, though only if she enters into a contract or commitment in the joint interests of herself and her husband, or of the children of their union (Article 224(*b*)).

In the last place, a woman duly authorised to follow a profession or calling distinct from that of her husband enjoys general legal capacity in civil matters, though only in respect of acts connected with her own profession or calling (Articles 216 (3) and 220).

In all other cases, the principle of the legal incapacity of married women remains ; though, even then, numerous exceptions are made to the traditional rule.

For example, a woman can, without requiring to be authorised thereto either by her husband or by the courts, make a will, recognise a natural child, perform conservatory acts, cancel a donation to her husband made since the marriage or withdraw sums, including pensions, from the General Savings Bank to an amount not exceeding 500 francs monthly, etc.

In conclusion, it may be said that the constant evolution of Belgian law on this subject tends to give to women a generous measure of liberty calculated to satisfy their legitimate aspirations, subject only to the maintenance of the family as a social entity.

II. Political Status of Women.

Under Belgian law, women are eligible for membership of the political assemblies on an equality with men.

They are also qualified to hold public office — for example, as ministers, members of permanent councils, burgomasters and aldermen.

As regards the franchise, the law makes no distinction between the sexes for the purpose of communal elections ; for parliamentary elections, on the other hand, Article 2 of the Electoral Code restricts the franchise to women falling within the following categories :

(1) Widows, not having remarried, of soldiers who lost their lives during the war, up to January 1st, 1919, or, alternatively, their mothers, if widows, together with the widowed mothers of unmarried soldiers ;

(2) Widows, not having remarried, of Belgian citizens shot or killed by the enemy during the war, or, alternatively, their mothers, if widows, together with the widowed mothers of such citizens who had remained single ;

(3) Women condemned to imprisonment or preventive detention for patriotic reasons during the period of enemy occupation.

The elections to the provincial assemblies are not governed by any fixed rules. Before each election, Parliament decides whether the elections for the provincial councils shall be based on the communal or the general franchise ; hitherto, it is always the general franchise which has been adopted.

Brazil.

January 28th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

I have the honour to inform you that Brazil supported the adoption of the nineteenth resolution of the Seventh International Conference of American States of Montevideo in favour of civil and political equality for women ; it also followed with keen interest the proposal made by certain American countries to extend to the whole world a resolution confined to America — a proposal which is meeting with a wide measure of approval in the League of Nations.

I would likewise inform you that paragraph 1 of Article 113 of the Brazilian Constitution reads as follows :

> " All citizens are equal before the law. No privileges shall be granted and no discrimination made on the ground of birth, *sex*, race, occupation of the person concerned or his parents, social class, wealth, religious belief or political ideas."

June 18th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

Additionally to my note, of January 28th, 1936, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a more detailed reply to Circular Letter 160.1935.V, of October 24th, 1935, concerning the political and civil status of women.

2. You will find enclosed various memoranda on the different aspects of the problem — namely :

(*a*) Legal status of women under existing Brazilian constitutional, civil and criminal law ;

(*b*) Women's political rights ;

(*c*) Conditions of female labour in Brazil;

(*d*) Education, schools, universities, vocational training, etc.;

(*e*) Public offices and posts held by women in Brazil.

3. As regards the Convention on nationality, signed by Brazil at Montevideo on December 26th, 1933, I have to inform you that it has not yet been ratified, but that the Brazilian Government intends to submit it to the Legislature for approval in the near future.

(Signed) José Carlos DE MACEDO SOARES.

LEGAL STATUS OF WOMEN UNDER EXISTING BRAZILIAN CONSTITUTIONAL, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LAW.

The movement in favour of civil law equality of the sexes originated in the Civil Code, although that code did not go quite so far as the preliminary draft on the subject of married women. Article 6, II, of the Civil Code places a married woman under certain disabilities during the continuance of the state of marriage. But as the husband cannot do certain things without the consent of the woman who, by marriage, has become his consort and his associate and aid in the performance of his family duties (Article 240), this provision of Article 6, II, is really more of a survival from the past than an actual expression of the principles embodied in the code, as the following statement will show.

Under the 1891 Constitution, women were not excluded from public office nor from the exercise of political rights. The juridical and political rights of women were not, however, precisely and clearly defined until the promulgation of the Electoral Code and, later, the Constitution of 1934.

We can situate the exact *juridical* position of women by examining the principles of the Constitution concurrently with those of the Civil Code — *i.e.*, constitutional law concurrently with the ordinary law of Brazil.

Constitutional Law.

1. Any woman born in Brazil, even though she be the daughter of a foreigner, is deemed to possess Brazilian nationality, unless her father was resident in Brazil in the service of his country (Constitution, Article 106 *a*).

§ 1. — The daughter of a Brazilian father or mother, if born abroad while her parents were on public service, or if, on attaining her majority, she has opted for Brazilian nationality, is also deemed to possess Brazilian nationality (Constitution, Article *cit.*, *b*).

§ 2. — A foreign woman who has obtained naturalisation in accordance with the law.

2. A Brazilian woman who marries a foreigner does not thereby lose her Brazilian nationality, nor does a foreign woman acquire Brazilian nationality on marrying a Brazilian (Commentary on Article 107).

3. Any Brazilian woman, whether married, spinster or widow, may occupy public office, under the conditions defined by law (Constitution, Article 168).

4. As an official, she is entitled to the safeguards accorded by the Constitution and by law to public officials (Constitution, Articles 169 and 170).

A woman occupying a public position, married to a military officer or civil official who is liable to be transferred from one place to another, may at her request be granted leave of absence without pay when her husband has been transferred, otherwise than at his own request, to another place in the national territory or abroad.

Such leave of absence continues for the duration of the husband's mission or new duties, up to a maximum of three years.

5. As soon as she attains the age of 18 years, a woman may cause her name to be placed on the electoral roll in accordance with the law.

Women who occupy a paid official post must cause their names to be so entered, and voting is for them compulsory (Constitution, Articles 108 and 109).

Civil Law.

6. The Federal Constitution and the Brazilian Civil Code do not allow divorce — *i.e.*, the dissolution of marriage *inter vivos* — but they do allow separation *a mensâ et thoro.*

Separation may take place by mutual arrangement or by operation of law.

In the case of separation by mutual arrangement, the spouses decide, according to the terms of their marriage contract, what allowances each shall make to the other and what allowances they are to make to the children.

Proceedings for judicial separation are begun by an ordinary action, which may only be brought by one of the spouses.

Judicial separation may be granted on the following grounds (Civil Code, Article 317) :

(*i*) Adultery;

(*ii*) Attempted murder;

(*iii*) Bodily injury or serious moral hurt;

(*iv*) Wilful desertion lasting two consecutive years.

7. When judicial separation is granted at the instance of the wife, and the wife is indigent, the husband is bound to pay her alimony as fixed by the judge (Civil Code, Article 326).

8. When judicial separation has been granted, children under age are entrusted to the care of the innocent party. If both husband and wife have been guilty, the mother is entitled to keep with her the girls under age and the boys up to the age of 6 (Civil Code, Article 326, paragraphs 1 and 2).

For serious reasons, the judge may in all cases make other arrangements in the interest of the children (Civil Code, Article 327).

9. Spinsters, women separated from their husbands, and widows possess exactly the same civil rights as men (general principle of the Civil Code).

10. A woman of over fifty may only marry on the understanding that her property and her husband's property shall be separate (Civil Code, Article 258, § 1, pr. and n. II).

11. The husband is the head of the family and is, as such, its representative; he administers the joint estate; his domicile determines the domicile of the family; he must provide for the maintenance of the family and may, if necessary, authorise his wife to engage in an occupation (Civil Code, Article 233).

Sole Subsection. — If the husband is in distant parts or his whereabouts is unknown, if he is serving a term of imprisonment of more than two years or has been placed under a disability by the courts, the wife may :

(*a*) Administer the joint estate;

(*b*) Dispose freely of her own property and alienate joint movables and the movables of her husband;

(*c*) Administer the movables of her husband;

(*d*) Alienate joint immovables and the immovables of the husband with the judge's special permission (Civil Code, Article 251).

12. Except in the cases provided for in the sole subsection set out in the previous section, the wife must obtain her husband's permission to :

(*a*) Alienate, hypothecate or burden with charges *in rem* the immovables or rights *in rem* on immovables belonging to third parties;

(*b*) Be a party to legal proceedings, as plaintiff or defendant, in connection with these same rights;

(*c*) Provide surety;

(*d*) Make a gift or any considerable grant out of the joint estate or income.

Observation. — These restrictions are also binding on the husband, who cannot perform these acts without his wife's consent (Civil Code, Articles 235 and 241).

13. Nor can a wife, without her husband's consent :

(*a*) Accept or refuse an inheritance or legacy;

(*b*) Accept appointment as guardian or as curator, or other public charge;

(*c*) Take proceedings at law in civil or commercial matters, except in the cases specified in the sole subsection of Section 11 above, and in Sections 14, 16 and 17 hereinafter;

(*d*) Exercise any of the liberal professions;

(*e*) Contract an obligation that may involve alienation of property made joint by marriage;

(*f*) Accept a trusteeship (Civil Code, Article 242).[1]

Sole Paragraph. — Permission granted by a judge may take the place of the husband's (or wife's) consent (Civil Code, Articles 237 and 245).

14. A woman engaged in a lucrative occupation is entitled to perform all acts inherent in the exercise of, or necessary to safeguard, the said occupation, and to dispose freely of the product of her labour (Civil Code, Article 246).

15. Unless he raise formal objection, the husband's consent is not necessary :

(*a*) For the purchase, even on credit, of household necessaries;

(*b*) For borrowing the sums required for the purchase of such necessaries;

(*c*) For contracting obligations in connection with the wife's business or occupation.

A married woman may be a party to legal proceedings in matters connected with her work, without the assistance of her husband (Article 11 of Decree No. 22132, of November 25th, 1932).

16. A woman who holds a public appointment or has for more than six months been carrying on an occupation outside her home is deemed in every case to have received her husband's permission (Civil Code, Article 247).

17. A married woman may without permission :

(*a*) Exercise her proper rights in respect of children born of a previous marriage;

---

[1] Sections 13 and 15 are not concordant with the spirit of the Constitution in the matter of women's status, but the Legislature has not yet taken any decision on this subject.

(*b*) Free from encumbrance or claim immovables forming part of the joint estate which the husband has encumbered or alienated without her consent or without the express permission of a judge;

(*c*) Avoid sureties given or gifts made by the husband in violation of those provisions of the law which oblige him to obtain his wife's consent, or the judge's permission if the wife's refusal is unreasonable;

(*d*) Claim joint estate, whether movables or immovables, given or transferred by the husband to a concubine; the wife possesses this right whether she be cohabiting with her husband or not, and even if the gift is disguised as a sale or otherwise (Civil Code, Article 248).

Sole Subsection. — The concubine of a married testator may not benefit under his will or appointment or be his legatee (Civil Code, Article 1719, III).

(*e*) Dispose of property acquired in accordance with the previous paragraph, and of all other property possessed by her in her own right, except immovables;

(*f*) Request action for the maintenance of the *statu quo* and take such proceedings as, on account of her dowry or other property subject to her husband's administration, it may be competent to her to take against the latter;

(*g*) Bring an action for the annulment of marriage;

(*h*) Bring an action for separation;

(*i*) Petition for alimony;

(*j*) Make a will or statement of her last wishes (Civil Code, Article 248).

18. If the marriage contract provides that the estate of husband and wife shall be separate, the wife may stipulate that her estate shall remain under her sole control (Civil Code, Article 276).

If separation of estate has been brought about by operation of law (see Section 10 above), the wife also has sole control of her own estate.

19. When the estate of husband and wife is separate, the wife is bound to contribute to the household expenses from the income of her own estate, in proportion to its value as compared with the husband's estate, unless there be some contrary provision in the marriage contract (Civil Code, Article 277).

20. If the husband received a dowry from his wife on marriage, the wife may petition at law for the dowry to be constituted a separate estate when the husband's affairs are so disordered that there is reason to fear that his estate will not be sufficient to guarantee the estate of the wife.

In such case, the dowry is administered by the wife (Civil Code, Article 408 and 309).

21. The wife may own, administer, enjoy and freely dispose of her own estate outside the dowry, but she may not alienate immovables without her husband's consent (Article 310).

22. A mother who contracts a new marriage does not lose the right to keep with her the children born of a previous marriage (Civil Code, Article 329).

23. If the husband does not or cannot exercise the paternal power, such power reverts to the wife (Civil Code, Article 380).

24. A mother who contracts a new marriage forfeits, in respect of the children born of a previous marriage, the exercise of the rights of paternal power, but she recovers those rights if she becomes a widow (Civil Code, Article 303).

25. Affiliation proceedings may be voluntary or compulsory — *i.e.*, by operation of law.

26. Proceedings to determine the identity of the mother are only precluded when their object is to attribute an illegitimate child to a married woman or a child born of incest to a spinster.

27. The mother exercises the paternal power over her illegitimate children (Civil Code, Article 360). A child who has been lawfully acknowledged, if a minor, is placed under the power of that parent which has acknowledged him; if both have acknowledged him, he is placed under his father's power.

28. Rights of succession are the same for men and women.

Nevertheless, a daughter who loses her honour while living in her father's house may be disinherited (Civil Code, Article 1744, III).

29. When the system adopted under the marriage contract is that of joint estate, the surviving spouse, as head of the family, remains in possession of the inheritance until partition has been effected (Civil Code, Article 1579).

If, however, the survivor is the wife, she does not possess this right unless she was living with her husband at the time of his decease (same Article, § 1).

Military Service.

30. Women are exempt from military service, which is compulsory by law for all male razilians (Constitution, Article 163).

Mothers' Welfare.

31. The staffs of maternity and child welfare services and services concerned with the home and women's work are as far as possible composed of properly qualified women and their

supervision and direction is also, whenever possible, entrusted to women (Constitution, Article 121, § 3).

32. Any woman official who is an expectant mother is entitled to three months' leave of absence with full pay (Constitution, Article 170, 10).

33. A workwoman who is an expectant mother is entitled to a period of rest before and after confinement, without loss of wages or situation.

Generally speaking, the law protects working women in cases of invalidity, maternity and sickness (Constitution, Article 121, § 1 (*h*)).

34. The International Conventions on Female Labour are in force in Brazil.

The Constitution (Article 121, § 1 (*d*)) prohibits the employment of women and children in unhealthy industries.

Criminal Law.

35. The fact that any crime has been committed against a woman may be deemed to be an aggravating circumstance on the ground that the victim was of the weaker sex (Codification of the Criminal Laws, Article 39, § 5).

36. The fact that a crime is committed by husband against wife, or wife against husband, is also deemed to be an aggravating circumstance (Codification, Article 39, § 9).

37. The fact that a woman has committed a crime in order to defend the rights of her family or to avenge her husband's honour is deemed to be an extenuating circumstance (Codification, Article 42, §§ 2 and 3).

38. Any dishonouring or sexual offence committed by a civilised person against a native woman is regarded as an aggravating circumstance, even if the act was committed at the suggestion or with the consent of the victim, her father, her husband, her brother, or the chief of her tribe (Codification, Article 205, § 1).

39. Any person who, by force or threats, commits an indecent assault upon another person of either sex, shall be liable to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from one to three years.

Any person who may have procured, encouraged or facilitated the corruption of another person of either sex under the age of 21 by inciting that person to commit acts of indecency, by corrupting his or her innocence, or by perverting his or her morals in any way, shall be liable to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from six months to two years.

Any person who corrupts another person under 21 years of age, of either sex, by committing with or against that person any acts of indecency, shall be liable to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from two to four years (Codification, Article 266).

40. Any person guilty of deflowering a female minor by persuasion, guile or fraud, shall be liable to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from one to four years (Codification, Article 267).

41. The rape of any woman of honourable character, whether *virgo intacta* or not, shall be punishable with a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from one to six years.

If the victim is a woman of easy virtue or a prostitute, the offender shall be sentenced to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from six months to two years.

If the crime has been committed with the connivance of two or more persons, the penalty shall be increased by one-fourth (Codification, Article 268).

42. Any person who, by persuasion or trickery or by violence, has enticed or abducted from her home, for immoral purposes, a woman of honourable character, whether of full age or under age, whether a spinster, married woman or widow, without, however, having committed any sexual offence against her, shall be liable to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from one to four years.

If the abducted person is over 16 but under 21 years of age, and if she went with the offender of her own free will, the penalty shall be a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from one to three years.

If the abduction was followed by deflowerment or rape, the offender shall be liable to a penalty corresponding to the crimes he has committed, increased by one-sixth (Codification, Article 270).

43. If the abductor releases his victim without having committed any sexual offence against her or dishonoured her in any way, the penalty shall be a term varying from six months to one year.

If he does not release her, or refuses to divulge her whereabouts, the penalty shall be a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from two to twelve years (Codification, Article 271).

44. Abduction is presumed to have been committed with violence whenever the victim is under 16 years of age.

45. The ordinary sentences are increased by one-sixth :

(1) If the criminal is a minister of any religious denomination ;

(2) If he is married ;

(3) If he is the attendant or servant of the victim or of any member of the victim's family.

Sentences are increased by one-fourth :

(4) If the criminal is a relative in the ascending line, a brother, or brother-in-law, of the victim ;

(5) If he is the victim's guardian or curator, is responsible for her education, or has her in his custody, or exercises any other form of authority over her.

Sole Subsection. — In addition to the penalty and loss of civil rights, the relative in the ascending line loses all rights conferred on him by law over the person and property of the victim (Codification, Article 273).

46. Any person who by trickery, violence, threats, abuse of power, or any other means of coercion, induces another to satisfy the immoral desires or lascivious passions of a third person, or who procures, encourages or facilitates the prostitution of another for the satisfaction of the said desires and passions of a third person, shall be sentenced to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from two to three years.

If the crime is committed by an ascendant in respect of a descendant, by a guardian, curator or any person responsible for the education of a minor, in respect of that minor, or by a husband in respect of his wife, the offender shall be sentenced to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from two to four years.

In addition to this sentence and the loss of civil rights, the following penalties are imposed :

Upon the father and mother : Loss of all rights that the law confers on them over the person and property of the child whom they have delivered over to prostitution ;

Upon the guardian or curator : Instant deprivation of his charge ;

Upon the person responsible for the education of the minor : Deprivation of the right to teach in any educational or training establishment or to direct any such establishment or to be a member of its staff ;

Upon the husband : Loss of his rank as head of the family. A criminal prosecution may only be undertaken against the husband on the complaint of the wife (Codification, Article 277).

47. Any person who suborns, entices or corrupts a female minor, whether she be *virgo intacta* or not, even if she be a consenting party, to satisfy the immoral desires of another ; any person who suborns, entices or corrupts a woman of full age, whether *virgo intacta* or not, by means of threats, violence, fraud, trickery, abuse of power, or any other means of coercion, to satisfy the immoral desires of another ; any person who, by any of the above means, even on account of debts, compels a woman of full age or a female minor, whether *virgo intacta* or not, to remain in a brothel, therein obliging her to engage in prostitution ; any person who manages or operates a tolerated brothel, or receives in the house in which he resides persons of different sexes or of the same sex coming together there for the purpose of committing immoral acts ; any person who induces women, whether by playing on their weakness or distress or by constraining them by intimidation or threats, to engage in prostitution ; any person who, for himself or for another, on his own responsibility or on the responsibility of another, in any way aids or abets the traffic of prostitution, shall be sentenced to a term varying from one to three years' rigorous imprisonment and to a fine varying from one to two contos of reis.

The crimes referred to in this section shall be punishable in Brazil even if one or several of the constitutive acts were committed abroad (Codification, Article 278).

48. Simple adultery on the part of a married women is punishable with a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from one to three years.

The husband shall be subject to the same penalty if he keeps a concubine, and the concubine shall also be subject to the same penalty (Codification, Article 279).

49. " Polygamy " is punishable with a term of imprisonment varying from one to six years.

For the purposes of criminal law, " polygamy " means marriage contracted more than once, the previous marriage not having been dissolved by a decree of nullity or by the decease of the other consort (Codification, Article 283).

50. Any woman who feigns to be pregnant or passes off another's child as her own, or who, having in fact given birth to a child, living or stillborn, dissembles the fact or substitutes another child for her own, shall be sentenced to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from six months to two years (Codification, Article 285).

51. Infanticide committed by a mother in order to hide her shame shall be punishable with a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from three to nine years.

If the above-mentioned motive be absent, the punishment shall be a term varying from six to twenty-four years.

52. Deliberate abortion is a crime punishable according to the circumstances.

If abortion took place with the consent of the pregnant woman, the person who caused the abortion shall be liable to a term of imprisonment varying from one to five years. A pregnant woman who has deliberately caused a miscarriage by employing the means requisite for that purpose shall be liable to the same punishment. Such punishment shall be reduced to two-thirds if the offender committed her crime in order to hide her shame (Codification, Articles 300 and 301).

53. The profanation of a dead body shall be punishable with a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from two months to one year (Codification, Article 355).

54. Any person who disguises his or her sex by wearing in public, with intent to deceive, clothing appropriate to the other sex, shall be sentenced to a term of rigorous imprisonment varying from fifteen to sixty days (Codification, Article 379).

Women's Political Rights.

The Federal Constitution, promulgated in 1934, established equality of political rights between men and women.

The previous Constitution, although it did not expressly recognise this equality, was not opposed to it in principle, since, while it was in force, the State of Rio Grande do Norte granted women the vote. In that part of the Brazilian Federation, however, they were only allowed to vote at the municipal and State elections.

When the Commission met to draw up the preliminary draft of the present Constitution, the head of the Provisional Government, in response to an appeal signed by some ten thousand Brazilian citizens, allowed women to be represented on it.

The President of the Federation for Women's Progress submitted her suggestions in writing to the Commission responsible for drawing up the preliminary draft, and these were in the main accepted and incorporated in the text which was subsequently submitted to the Constituent Assembly.

In the Constituent Assembly, legislation in favour of women was supported by a group of sympathetic members including Dr. José Carlos de Macedo Soares, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Under the articles inserted in the Federal Constitution, women enjoy the same political rights as male citizens.

As regards nationality, equality is secured to them under Article 106, paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*). Brazilian women retain their nationality when they marry foreigners. They are electors, and may occupy any post filled by election (Articles 108 and 109). In accordance with the law, they may hold any public office (Article 168) except those connected with military service (Article 163). As regards individual rights and guarantees, the Constitution not only grants women complete equality with men (Article 113, § 1), but also accords them the benefit of various measures for the protection of mothers and pregnant women (Article 121, § 1, paragraphs (*a*), (*d*) and (*h*); Article 138, paragraphs (*c*), (*e*) and (*f*); Article 141; and Article 170, No. 10).

Article 121, § 3, of the Constitution provides that, in making appointments to the maternity and infant welfare services and the services connected with the home and women's work, preference shall be given to women. This also applies to the supervision and direction of those services.

The text of the articles of the Federal Constitution referred to is given below :

Article 106. — The following are Brazilian citizens :

(*a*) Persons born in Brazil even if their father is a foreigner, provided he has not been sent to Brazil in the service of the Government of his country;

(*b*) Children of a Brazilian father *or mother*, if their parents are public officials, and, apart from such cases, those who, on attaining their majority, opt for Brazilian nationality.

. . . . . .

Article 108. — Brazilians *of either sex* over 18 years of age who have their names entered on the register in accordance with the law shall have the right to vote.

Article 109. — Subject to the exceptions provided for by law, men *and women* holding paid public offices, shall be required to have their names entered on the register and to vote. Those who fail to do so shall be liable to the penalties laid down by law.

. . . . . .

Individual Rights and Guarantees.

Article 113. — The Constitution ensures to Brazilians and foreigners residing in the country the inviolability of rights concerning freedom, the necessities of life, individual safety and property in the following terms :

(1) All persons shall be equal before the law. No privileges shall be granted and no distinction made on the ground of birth, *sex*, race, the occupation followed by the person concerned or his parents, social class, wealth, religious beliefs or political ideas.

. . . . . .

Organisation of Labour.

Article 121. — The law shall encourage the protection of production, and shall establish conditions of labour in town and country with a view to the social protection of the worker and the economic interests of the country.

§ 1. — Labour legislation shall take account of the following principles among others, the aim of which is to improve conditions of labour :

(*a*) Equal pay for equal work, irrespective of age, *sex*, nationality or civil status . . .

(*d*) Children under 14 not to be employed; young persons under 16 not to be employed on night-work, and young persons under 18 and *women* not to be employed in unhealthy industries. . . .

(*h*) Medical and sanitary assistance to be given to workers, including *pregnant women workers;* the latter to be granted leave before and after confinement without being required to forfeit their

wages or employment on that account; a provident fund to be established, equal contributions being made by the Union, the employer and the employee, to cover old age, invalidity, *maternity*, industrial accidents and death. . . .

§ 3. — In making appointments to the maternity and infant welfare services, and in the services connected with the home and women's work, *preference shall be given to competent women*. This shall also apply to the supervision and direction of those services.

. . . . . .

Article 138. — In accordance with the respective laws, the Union, the States and the municipalities shall be responsible for : . . .

(*c*) The protection of *mothers* and infants. . . .

(*e*) The protection of young persons from *exploitation of every kind*, and from physical, moral or intellectual neglect.

(*f*) The introduction of legislation to reduce infant mortality and morbidity, and of measures of social hygiene to prevent the spread of infectious diseases.

. . . . . .

Article 141. — *The protection of mothers* and infants shall be compulsory throughout the whole of the national territory, and the Union, the States and the municipalities shall allocate 1 % of their revenue from taxation to that purpose.

. . . . . .

Article 163. — All Brazilian citizens shall be liable, in such form as may be provided by law, for military service and other duties necessary for national defence. In the event of mobilisation, they shall be employed, according to their qualifications, either in the armed forces or in the internal services. *Women shall be exempt from military service.*

. . . . . .

Public Officials.

Article 168. — Public offices shall be open to all Brazilians, *irrespective of sex* or civil status, subject to the conditions laid down by law.

. . . . . .

Article 170. — The Legislature shall vote the Statute of Public Officials in accordance with the following rules, which are already in force : . . .

(10) Officials shall be entitled to annual holidays with full pay ; *a woman official who is pregnant* shall be entitled to three months' leave with full pay.

Conditions of Labour for Women in Brazil.

Under the Brazilian Constitution, women have the same rights in the social sphere as men. For instance, Article 121, § 1, paragraph (*a*), prohibits the payment of a different wage for the same work on the ground of age, sex, nationality or civil status. .

Certain restrictions on female labour are provided for under the national legislation with a view to the protection of the race.

In order to protect women's health, the Brazilian law prohibits their employment on night-work or in unhealthy industries or underground.

Article 121 of the Constitution, referred to above, provides for the establishment of better conditions of employment for women, with a view to their social protection.

A workwoman who is a mother is entitled to two special daily rest-periods of half an hour each during the first six months after confinement.

Establishments employing at least thirty women over 16 years of age must provide suitable premises where nursing mothers can leave their babies and where they will be properly looked after.

Medical assistance is provided for mothers before and after confinement, without deduction from their wages.

A female public official is entitled to three months' leave — *i.e.*, six weeks before and six weeks after confinement, with full pay.

Under Decree No. 21417-A, of May 17th, 1932, concerning the protection of female labour, which was promulgated before the new Constitution came into force, women were granted only two months' leave during pregnancy, or three months in cases of absolute necessity, on production of a medical certificate.

Women in all occupations can belong to a provident fund, to which an equal contribution is made by the Union, the employer and the employee, covering old age, invalidity, maternity, industrial accidents and death.

Superannuation and pension funds are now working satisfactorily for railway, harbour, aviation, shipping, bank, commercial and mining employees, women being admitted to all these occupations except mining, where they are not allowed to work underground. The Ministry of Labour is considering drawing up a scheme for a superannuation and pension fund for industrial workers.

Under Article 139 of the Brazilian Constitution, the Union, the States and the municipalities are alike responsible, in accordance with the respective laws, for protecting mothers, and are required to allocate 1 % of their revenue from taxation to the institutions established for that purpose.

All women, whatever their occupation, are given fifteen days' holiday with full pay.

Married women may use their wages in whatever way they think fit, but, under the Brazilian Civil Code, paternal authority rests with the husband as head of the family, or, failing him, with the wife.

The social laws for the protection of women cover all occupations, except as regards the special regulations relating to rural workers and the application of those laws to certain occupations which need to be specially regulated.

The liberal professions, the public service, agriculture, industry and trade are all open to women, and in those occupations they enjoy the same rights and advantages as men.

Women also have the right to belong to their trade unions and to fill the highest posts therein.

Women likewise have the right to vote, and hence to represent the people in the Legislative Chambers, and to fill posts under the public administration.

Suggestions for that Part of the Preliminary Draft relating to the Status of Women which deals with Women's Claims.

To sum up, we consider that the preliminary draft relating to the status of women should contain the following principles :

(*a*) Equal pay for equal work, irrespective of sex, age or nationality ;

(*b*) Medical assistance and compulsory rest for mothers, six weeks before and six weeks after confinement, without deduction of pay, in all occupations ;

(*c*) The granting of fifteen working-days' holiday each year with full pay ;

(*d*) The establishment in all occupations of compulsory social insurance covering invalidity, old age, industrial accidents and death ;

(*e*) Compulsory protection for mothers ;

(*f*) The woman's right to make use of her salary in whatever way she thinks fit ;

(*g*) Prohibition to employ women underground or in unhealthy work, so as to protect their health in the interests of the race and the nation ;

(*h*) Women's right to hold public offices which are filled by election, and to represent the people ;

(*i*) Preference to be given to women in the maternity and infant welfare services and the inspectorate of female labour.

Education.

1. *Schools, Universities, Vocational Training, etc.*

In Brazil, girls have the same educational opportunities as boys.

Article 149 of the Constitution of July 14th, 1934, stipulates that "*every child has the right* to education. This must be provided by the family and by the public authorities. The latter must provide education for Brazilians and foreigners domiciled in Brazil, so that they may be able to play a useful part in the moral and economic life of the nation and implant the consciousness of human solidarity in the Brazilian mind."

(a) *Elementary Education.* — There is no uniform legislation governing elementary education in Brazil ; each State has its own autonomous system.

In the majority of States, elementary education is given in mixed classes of boys and girls. In 1932, out of a total of 2,071,399 pupils on the register, 983,522 were girls (approximately 47 %).

In the same year, the number attending elementary schools was 1,422,841, of whom 677,151 were girls — *i.e.*, approximately 48 %.

It is interesting to note that, although the number of boys on the register and the number of boys attending school is greater than the number of girls, more girls than boys complete the course. In 1932, of the 124,025 pupils who completed the course, 63,210 were girls — *i.e.*, over 50 %. The reason is that, especially in rural districts, boys are employed for ordinary everyday jobs and leave school earlier.

An examination of the statistics of the various States or political areas reveals the existence, in some cases, of slight variations which are worthy of note. For instance, in the State of Rio Grande do Norte, the number of girls who completed the elementary course in 1932 was 1,711, as against 1,382 boys — *i.e.*, 57 %. In the State of Rio Grande do Sul, on the other hand, the number of girls who completed the elementary course amounted to barely 45 %.

(b) *Secondary Education.* — Secondary education, which is regulated by national legislation, is given by public institutions run by the Union, the States and the municipalities, and also by private institutions, associations and religious communities. The former — that is to say, the public schools — are co-educational ; the latter are usually for boys or girls only.

In 1932, the total number of pupils on the secondary education register, which covers both courses held under the Federal Law and independent courses in science and art, was 56,208. Of this number, only 10,121 were girls — *i.e.*, 18 %.

It would be wrong to conclude from these figures that women's education in Brazil begins and ends with the elementary stage, since girls who continue their studies usually attend normal schools or teachers' training establishments.

In many of these institutions, the courses are divided into two parts, one of which closely follows the secondary school curriculum.

(c) *Universities.* — In university education, which is governed by Decree No. 19,851, of April 11th, 1931, no distinction is made between the sexes. During the last twenty years, the number of women students in the higher educational establishments has steadily increased. In 1932, out of a total of 23,569 students, 2,202 were women, representing approximately 9 %.

The branches of university education usually taken up by girls are the teaching of music, particularly the piano (1,236), pharmacy (254), odontology (162), medicine (144), law (121). Women are also represented in other branches, such as engineering, in which the number of women students on the register in 1932 was 14.

(d) *Vocational Training.* — Women's vocational training, which is given in the form of courses or at schools, is still very limited. The only specialised profession proper to women is teaching, particularly elementary teaching.

Nevertheless, there is an increasing number of institutions which give girls specialised training in the industrial and domestic arts, nursing and obstetrics, and in various commercial occupations (typewriting, secretarial work, accountancy and bookkeeping).

In the various schools, excluding teachers' training colleges, particulars of which are given below in a separate paragraph, the number of women on the register in 1932 amounted to 27,118 out of a total of 42,975.

The branches of technical training most commonly taken up by girls were domestic arts (elementary and middle grade), 15,684 (there were no men on the register for these courses); commercial training, 6,949 out of a total of 21,606; artistic training (singing and music, middle grade, and various industrial arts, such as drawing, painting, sculpture, etc.), 4,083 out of a total of 5,071.

The courses in general nursing, obstetrics and social work were attended by 279 girls out of a total of 298 students.

2. *Elementary Teaching.*

In 1932, the total number of elementary-school teachers in Brazil was 58,989, of whom 45,960, or 81 %, were women. Elementary teaching may therefore be regarded in Brazil as a typically feminine profession.

Taking all branches and grades of teaching together, the number of teachers was 76,009, of whom 51,142 were women.

Elementary-school teachers are trained in official or recognised colleges and in educational establishments belonging to universities (São Paulo and Federal District).

In 1932, the total number of teachers' training colleges was 216; there were 25,036 students on the register, of whom 21,951 were women (87 %).

3. *Administration.*

As regards school administration, women are obtaining more and better posts each year.

Until quite recently, in some States, even the most advanced (such as São Paulo), school management was not entrusted to women. It was understood that administrative posts should be reserved for men.

To-day, however, all school administrative posts (heads, inspectors, technical assistants) are open to women.

In certain States, courses in school administration are being organised which are open to both men and women.

In one State, Rio de Janeiro, there is now a woman Director of Education.

Public Offices filled by Women in Brazil.

1. *Federal Government.*

(*a*) There is at present one woman member of the Chamber of Deputies, representing the State of São Paulo.

(*b*) Commissions. — A delegate of the women's associations served on the Commission which drew up the preliminary draft of the Constitution (1932/33).

Federal (Administrative) Posts. — There is a woman director of the Certificated Trained Nurses' Branch of the National Department of Public Health.

There are seven women consuls *de carrière*, six of whom are at present working in the Department for Foreign Affairs, while the seventh is in charge of the Brazilian Consulate at Liverpool.

Brazil was represented by women delegates at the following women's international congresses : Rome, 1923 ; Berlin, 1929 ; Istanbul, 1935 ; Pan-American Congress at Baltimore, 1922 ; Pan-American Congress at Washington, 1925.

Women technical advisers were sent to the following official conferences : League of Nations ; seventh American International Conference, 1932 ; second Women's International Congress, Rio de Janeiro, 1931 ; second National Convention for Women's Progress, Bahia, 1934 ; International Labour Conference (a woman member of the Government delegation).

2. *States.*

There are ten women deputies in the following States : Amazonas, Maranhão, Rio Grande do Norte, Alagôas, Sergipe, Bahia, Santa Catharina, São Paulo (three deputies, one of whom has now resigned).

There are three Directors-General or Secretaries in the State Government service : one Secretary for Education in the State of Pará (1934-35) ; one in the State of Rio (1936) ; and a Secretary for Labour in the State of Rio (1935-36).

The following members of State General Councils are women : Assistance : State of Bahia (1936) — a representative of the Federation for Women's Progress and Director of the Association for Economic and Social Action ; Education : State of Bahia (1936) — the President of the Bahia Federation for Women's Progress.

3. *Municipalities.*

Since 1928, when, for the first time, a woman was elected Mayor at Lages, a large number of women have obtained control of municipal affairs in the communes of various States. In other communes, women are acting as municipal superintendents.

4. There are no women judges.

There are two women public prosecutors, one in the State of Sergipe and the other in the State of Minas Gerães.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

September 1st, 1936.

Status of Women in English Law.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, in submitting the following statement as to the existing political and non-political status of women under the law of England, desires to point out that its study of the subject is not yet complete and that it may be necessary to supplement the information given by a further memorandum in due course. It should also be pointed out that no observations such as are contemplated in paragraph 1 of the Assembly's resolution of September 27th, 1935, have yet been prepared.

In English law, the principle of the equality of the sexes has received wide recognition and effect has been given to that principle in various branches of the law affecting the political and civil (or legal) status of women, married and unmarried. The following is a summary of the more important legislative provisions.

I. General Provisions.

Eligibility of Women for the Exercise of Public Functions, Appointment to Civil and Judicial Offices and for any Profession.

The Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919, declared the general principle that a person shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage from the exercise of any public function, the holding of civil or judicial office or the carrying-on of any civil profession or from membership of any incorporated society, and shall not be exempted by sex or marriage from liability to serve as a juror.

This general principle is qualified, however, by provisions which give power (*a*) to regulate the mode of admission of women to the Civil Service and the conditions of their service, and to reserve to men posts in the colonial, diplomatic and consular services, and (*b*) to dispense with the presence of men or women on juries in certain circumstances. Further particulars of the effect of these qualifying provisions will be given under appropriate headings below.

II. Status of Women in Political Matters.

1. *Parliamentary and Local Government Franchise.*

Women were first admitted to the parliamentary and local government franchise in 1918, though not on the basis of complete equality with men. In 1928, provision was made by the Representation of the People (Equal Franchise) Act, 1928, for the complete assimilation of the franchises of men and women. Persons of either sex who are of full age

(*i.e.*, 21) can accordingly vote at parliamentary and local government elections if, having fulfilled the necessary qualifications as to residence, etc., they are registered as electors.

2. *Eligibility for Membership of Legislature.*

(a) *House of Lords.* — The right to sit in the House of Lords of peers so entitled is recognised by the issue of a writ of summons to such peers on the commencement of each new Parliament. Under the common law, a woman is unable to sit in the House of Lords, since she is disqualified from receiving the writ; and the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act has been held not to remove this disqualification.

(b) *House of Commons.* — The Parliament (Qualification of Women) Act, 1918, enacted that a woman shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage from being elected to, or sitting, or voting as a member of the House of Commons.

3. *Eligibility for Membership of Councils of Local Authorities.*

Women are eligible for membership of councils of local authorities by reason of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919. Disqualification by sex or marriage for the office of (*a*) county or borough councillor or alderman, (*b*) urban district councillor and (*c*) parish councillor had previously been removed by the Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Act, 1907, and Section 23(2) and Section 3(2) respectively of the Local Government Act, 1894.

III. Status in Non-political Matters.

1. *Unmarried Women.*

Generally speaking, the legal position of an unmarried woman is the same as that of a man.

2. *Married Women.*

(a) *Acquisition and Disposal of Property: Liability in respect of Torts, Contracts, Debts and Obligations.* — A married woman is capable of acquiring, holding and disposing of property and of rendering herself liable in respect of torts, contracts, debts and obligations and is subject to the law relating to bankruptcy and to the enforcement of judgments and orders in all respects as if she were a single woman. Certain limitations which until recently have existed in these matters were removed by the Law Reform (Married Women and Tortfeasors) Act, 1935. Section 125 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1914, which was repealed by the Act of 1935, had previously made a married woman carrying on trade or business subject to the bankruptcy laws as if she were a single woman and had made judgments and orders for sums of money obtained against her available for bankruptcy proceedings as though she were personally bound to pay the judgment debt or sum.

(b) *Domicil.* — The legal domicil of a married woman follows that of her husband.

(c) *Divorce.* — Since 1923, a wife has been able to petition for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of her husband's adultery (Matrimonial Causes Act, 1923, repealed and re-enacted in Section 176 of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1925).

Before the Act of 1923, while adultery of the wife was a sufficient ground for divorce by the husband, the adultery of the husband was not in itself a sufficient ground for the wife, since she had to prove in addition either desertion or cruelty by her husband before she could obtain the relief of a divorce.

(d) *Judicial Separation, Desertion and Maintenance.* — Under Section 185 of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1925, a petition for judicial separation may be presented to the High Court either by a husband or wife on the ground of adultery, cruelty, desertion without cause for not less than two years or failure to comply with a decree of restitution of conjugal rights.

A court of summary jurisdiction may also make a separation order (1) on the application of a wife whose husband has been guilty of aggravated assault, desertion, persistent cruelty to her or her children, or wilful neglect to maintain her or her children, is an habitual drunkard or drug addict, has insisted on sexual intercourse whilst he is suffering to his knowledge from a venereal disease or has compelled her to submit to prostitution; (2) on the application of a husband whose wife is an habitual drunkard or has been guilty of persistent cruelty to his children.

3. *Generally.*

(a) *Position of Wife and Unmarried Mother in relation to Children: Guardianship.* — The Guardianship of Infants Act, 1925, extends to the guardianship of infants the principle of equality in law between the sexes declared by the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919. The Act provides that a court in determining questions relating to the custody, upbringing or the administration of property belonging to an infant shall regard the welfare of the infant as the paramount consideration and shall not take into account whether any claim of either parent in the matter is superior to that of the other. The mother of an infant is also given the same powers to apply to the court in respect of any matter affecting the infant as are possessed by the father.

(b) *Liability for Maintenance.* — Sub-sections (2) and (4) of Section 14 of the Poor Law Act, 1930, as amended by the Law Reform (Married Women and Tortfeasors) Act, 1935, place on the mother of an illegitimate child an obligation whilst unmarried or a widow to maintain the child until the age of 16 and render a married woman with property subject to the same liability as her husband for the maintenance of her children.

(c) *Marriage.* — At civil law, any woman is capable of marrying in the same circumstances as a man.

The Age of Marriage Act, 1929, renders void any marriage between persons either of whom is under the age of 16.

China.

September 2nd, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

I have the honour to convey to you the following information which I have received from my Government.

In the first place, the principle of equality between men and women in the legal sphere and also in the economic, social and educational spheres is laid down in the Declaration (§ 12 of Internal Policy) made by the first national meeting of Kuomintang delegates. It is also stated that the progress and development of women's rights should be promoted.

Moreover, in its decisions on the subject of the feminist movement, the second national assembly of Kuomintang delegates, in view of the foregoing principle, requested the Government to expedite measures for the protection of women's rights.

Lastly, Article 6 of the Constitution of the Chinese Republic for the period of tutelage of the Kuomintang lays down that : "All citizens of the Chinese Republic, irrespective of sex, race, religion or class, are equal before the law ". Consequently, all rights provided by law are granted to Chinese women without distinction, and, whether at public or private law, in the same way as to men.

As regards labour legislation, women are protected in numerous ways. Article 7 of Chapter 2 of the Factory Act (promulgated on December 30th, 1932) prohibits the employment of women for the following work :

(1) Work involving the handling of explosive, inflammable or poisonous substances ;

(2) Work carried out on premises where the atmosphere is polluted by harmful dust, smoke or vapours ;

(3) Cleaning, greasing and inspection of machinery in motion or dangerous driving-gear ; repair, fixing and removal of belts or ropes ;

(4) Work on high-tension electric conduits ;

(5) Handling of molten metals or ore residues ;

(6) Heating of boilers ;

(7) Other dangerous or morally harmful work.

Article 13 of the same Act prohibits the employment of women on night-work between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.

Article 24 provides that equal wages shall be paid to men and women workers in cases where they perform the same work and produce the same output.

Under Article 37 of the same Act, workwomen are allowed eight weeks' leave before and after confinement. During this period, they are paid full wages if they have been employed in the factory for more than six months, and half wages if they have been employed for less than six months.

Moreover, the regulations issued under the Act contain the following provisions :

Workwomen must be medically examined before they are engaged ; the work allotted to them must depend on their state of health (Article 18).

The employer who engages workwomen must provide a room in which they can nurse their babies and, where possible, a nursery with attendants or nurses to look after the children (Article 20).

Colombia.

April 28th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

I. In Colombia, as far as labour problems are concerned, women enjoy the same guarantees as are granted to men, since the legal regime of the country makes no difference as regards sex. Women are entitled to maximum working hours, compensation for labour accidents, compulsory collective insurance, Sunday rest, the use of day nurseries for their children, and, in short, all the protection afforded by the social laws.

Accordingly, the Government of Colombia considers that at the present time women are safeguarded by the national legislation from the point of view of their conditions of labour, and will be still further safeguarded in future when some of the Conventions adopted by this country as a Member of the International Labour Organisation at Geneva are put into force.

May 6th, 1936.

II. As regards civil rights, women of full age, whether married or single, enjoy the same rights in Colombia as men and are therefore fully qualified to carry out all the acts of civil life.

As regards political rights — *i.e.*, rights of taking part in public affairs — women do not possess them in Colombia, since in virtue of the Constitution they cannot exercise electoral functions either as electors or as candidates, nor can they occupy public posts involving the exercise of authority or jurisdiction. Nevertheless, in the draft Legislative Act reforming the existing Constitution, which has already been approved at three readings in each of the Legislative Chambers at the extraordinary sessions during the early months of the present year, the principle is laid down that women may exercise employments involving jurisdiction and authority. This draft needs to be considered and approved in the same manner by both Houses in the next Legislature at second and third readings before the principle in question can be embodied in the fundamental Charter of the Republic.

In view of the character of the Colombian woman, it may be asserted that the great majority of them do not wish to take an active part in politics, being convinced that if they intervene in the ardent party struggle they will lose social prerogatives which give them greater satisfaction than they could derive from the triumph of their political ideals. In Colombia, where the home is the most sacred of institutions, it has not been thought necessary to confer equality of political rights on women, because they themselves consider these rights as useless, if not as positive drawbacks, for either they would not wish to exercise them against the political creeds of their husbands or their exercise might be a constant source of conflict in the home.

In the world feminist movement, the Colombian woman has displayed her activities in fields very far removed from the militant politics of parties. Her feminism is displayed in the sphere of co-operation with man, who to-day finds in her a true collaborator in his intellectual and scientific activities. The old interpretation of the biblical judgment which condemns man alone to work has changed, for the Colombian woman to-day prefers to give it a broader significance and one more in keeping with her true mission as man's companion, an interpretation which dignifies her and raises her to the position which is her due.

The Colombian woman is to-day beginning to enjoy an education which is in accordance with modern progress and which will qualify her to render effective service in nearly all the fields of science.

The foundation of institutions at which women may prepare for the baccalaureate with the same curriculum as men is an important step forward, opening up new horizons for women of ability anxious to take up a career, as they can now, after due preparation, enter the university, which has opened its doors to them — a measure that constitutes a very significant conquest.

This revolutionary change has aroused unwonted enthusiasm, and the women of to-day are taking energetic steps to cultivate their minds and acquire knowledge which will free them from the melancholy idleness in which they lived in former times.

A proof that the Colombian woman is non-politically minded is the little inclination that she shows for the study of law — a profession which is more bound up with politics than any other. She is convinced that her beneficial influence over the destinies of her country is decisive and effective, but believes that it can better be exercised by placing her influence and her heart at the service of loftier and nobler ideals than those which characterise party strife.

It is well known that our women show a preference for the study of medicine and kindred studies — nursing, pharmacy, laboratory studies, infant and social welfare, dentistry, etc. — branches in which they have shown that they possess the necessary ability and zeal to crown their efforts with success.

The School of Engineering is attended by numerous girls anxious to specialise in the arts of decoration and draughtsmanship.

It is to be hoped that, as our women are now entering the university after a proper preparation in the matriculation institutions, the first Colombian women doctors will soon graduate.

Feminism in Colombia attaches special importance to the preparation of women to be mothers, for it is profoundly convinced that on this depends the greatness of a people. In this important sphere, it has done all in its power to convince women about to become mothers that it is a privilege and not a burden which nature has imposed on them in the lofty mission of maternity.

The diffusion of a knowledge of ante-natal hygiene, the cares and duties of nursing mothers, the establishment of day nurseries for the children of women obliged to work, the compulsory course of puericulture which is given in women's colleges, the adequate preparation of girls about to marry in order that they may be the best teachers of their children — all these are ambitions which Colombian feminism is widely carrying into practice.

It is a very legitimate aspiration to secure for female labour equal remuneration with that of men when this labour is carried out in identical conditions. A no less important task is to give women self-confidence and the certainty that, owing to their ability and qualifications, they can compete with men in all the fruitful fields of human endeavour.

Estonia.

July 8th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs has the honour to forward herewith certain extracts from Estonian law, representing the provisions which at present govern the political and civil status of women in Estonia.

From the very first days of the foundation of the Estonian Republic, it was found that the system set forth in these extracts no longer corresponded to existing circumstances, and was in contradiction with the constitutional system, which is based on the principles of equality between the citizens and of individual liberty, together with the right to take part in political activities. In order to reform the civil law, the Government appointed a special commission, which drew up a preliminary draft civil code which is to be put into force as from next year.

This draft is intended to establish equality between men and women before the law, not only as regards family law, but also as regards the law of inheritance. Although, in family law, the privileged position of the husband has been retained, the wife is nevertheless an independent person and enjoys full rights as such. In decisions affecting family affairs, in the event of disagreement, the husband's opinion prevails, but the wife is entitled to appeal against the husband's decision to the court of guardians.

For regulating the material relations between husband and wife, the Hungarian law was taken as a model. Husband and wife themselves control and manage the property they brought in on contracting marriage, and the wife is bound to bear an equal share with her husband of the expenses resulting from their conjugal life.

In the law of inheritance, there is complete equality between the two sexes.

Legal Status of Women in Estonia.

I. *In Public Law.*

The status of women in public law is governed by paragraph 6 of the Constitution of the Estonian Republic : " All the citizens of the Republic are equal before the law. Privileges or prejudices arising from birth, denomination, sex, social situation or ethnic origin no longer exist. The division into ' classes ', and titles, are abolished."

Accordingly, in the exercise of electoral rights, both in elections to Parliament and in communal elections, the principle of equal rights between the sexes is paramount. Women have the right both to elect and to be elected.

Also under paragraph 6 of the Constitution of the Republic, women have full liberty in public life and in the choice of a profession.

II. *In Private Law.*

The status of women in private law is governed (*a*) by rules relating to civil rights dating from different periods, which were codified in the middle of the nineteenth century in four codes, the most important of which is the code of Baltic civil law of November 12th, 1864, and (*b*) by the Law relating to the Contracting of Marriage, of October 27th, 1922.

Under the above-mentioned laws, unmarried women enjoy the same rights as men, if, with the consent of their parents, they have been removed from the latter's power. They have not, however, the right to become guardians (Code of Baltic Civil Law, 317), nor, under certain rural local laws (*codex cil.* 2065), may they appear as witnesses to the signature of wills.

On the contracting of marriage, the husband becomes his wife's guardian (*codex cil.* 11). He has the right to insist upon his wife's obedience and submission to his will, to determine the place of domicile and to insist that his wife accompany him (*codex cil.* 8).

Grounds of divorce are the same for the husband and for the wife (Marriage Act of 1922).

If, on divorce, the husband is declared guilty, he is obliged to provide for his wife's needs. This obligation becomes void on the conclusion of a fresh marriage on the part of the wife (*codex cil.* 124).

Husband and wife are subject to the same legal provisions in the matter of adoption (*codex cil.* 175).

Property brought in by the wife on contracting marriage, as well as property acquired by husband and wife together or separately, or accruing to them in any other manner, is managed by the husband, who has the right of use thereof, save in so far as otherwise provided by law or by marriage contract (*codex cil.* 12).

The " reserved " estate *(bona receptitia)* of the wife does not come under the husband's management, nor has he the right of use thereof (*codex cil.* 27). Before alienating immovable property belonging to her, the wife must nevertheless ask her husband's consent (*codex cil.* 29).

The husband is not obliged to provide security as regards the movable property belonging to his wife which comes under his management and of which he has the right of use, whereas in order to alienate or pledge immovable property entered in the wife's name, the latter's consent is necessary.

The fact that husband and wife lead a separate existence in no way affects their respective rights to the property ; likewise, the obligation on the part of the husband to provide for his wife's needs is not rendered void by this fact (*codex cil.* 9, 128).

The matrimonial situation of the wife in regard to the property may be modified by marriage contract, whereas any contract regulating the reciprocal personal relations between husband and wife is deemed null and void (*codex cil.* 7, 37, 38).

The wife may not enter into service under legal contract without her husband's consent (*codex cil.* 4194). The wife has the right to dispose freely of income accruing from such service, which forms an integral part of her " reserved " estate.

The husband is entitled to insist that his wife shall take an active part in the household duties and, if need be, that she shall contribute to the upkeep of the house (*codex cil.* 8).

As regards the exercise of the paternal power over the legitimate children, in the case of a difference of opinion between the parents, the father's will prevails (*codex cil.* 197). " Reserved " estate belonging to the children is, until they attain majority, managed by the father, and he has the right of use thereof. At this death, or in case of other impediment, the management devolves, on the same basis, upon the mother (*codex cil.* 215, 277, 278).

The principles governing the rights of inheritance, in case of the death of the husband or wife, show wide divergencies. Generally speaking, they are different for the husband and for the wife. Under the rural local laws, the husband receives the larger part of the inheritance, whereas under the urban laws, the proportion of the inheritance which the surviving spouse receives does not depend on the latter's sex.

Where there are children born of the marriage, the widow disposes, as a general rule, of the whole of her husband's property until her death. This right lapses on the conclusion of a second marriage ; in that case, the inheritance is divided, and the widow receives a part equal to that of the child.

Where there are no children born of the marriage, the widow receives a part of the inheritance, but she has not the right to dispose of the entire inheritance until her death.

India.

April 6th, 1936.

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to forward a memorandum on the political and civil status of women in British India. In view of the magnitude of this question in relation to the laws of India, it has been found impossible to compile an exhaustive description within moderate limits.

2. As regards the action which the League of Nations might take in these matters, I am to observe that this is a domestic concern of peculiar complexity in view of (1) the close connection between religious and social custom in India, and (2) the variety of religions and races in the country.

The Secretary of State, who has consulted the Government of India on the subject, is therefore unable to suggest any action whereby the League could assist the peoples of India to solve their difficulties and to remove such inequalities as exist. The leaders of public opinion in the country are alive to the problems, and there is no reason to suppose that any intervention from outside would assist in the gradual but sure process of solving them.

Memorandum on the Political and Civil Status of Women in British India.

So far as British India is concerned, the political and civil status of women may be considered under three main heads :

(1) Their position under the law of the country ;
(2) Their right to vote and stand for election to Legislatures ;
(3) Their right to enter Government service and other professions.

1. *Position of Women under the Law of the Country.*

Category (1) above may again be subdivided as follows :

(*i*) Right to inherit ;
(*ii*) Status under marriage laws ;
(*iii*) Right to practise as legal practitioners ;
(*iv*) Eligibility to serve as jurors and assessors.

(i) *Right to inherit.*

The consolidated law applicable to intestate and testamentary succession in British India is contained in the Indian Succession Act, 1925. The important provisions relating to succession to intestate property are contained in Sections 32 to 49 of the Act. These provide for the succession of a daughter and a widow to a male deceased's property. The Parsees are governed in the matter of intestate succession by Sections 50 to 56 of the Act, which provide that females, including a daughter, a widow and a mother, get a share in the property with the male heirs. This Act, however, governs succession, etc., in the case of communities other than Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Sikh and Jaina. The great bulk of the Indian population consists of Hindus and Mohammedans. The Mohammedan and Hindu laws, although the latter varies widely in different parts of India, are personal and not territorial laws.

Under the *Mohammedan* Law of Succession, the husband or wife, and females as well as cognates, are recognised as competent to inherit. Parents and ascendants are given a right to inherit even when there are male descendants. Under the *Hindu* law there is a close

connection between religion and succession to property, the preferable right to perform the obsequies and subsequent rites being regarded as governing the question of the preferable right to succession of property or inheritance. Consequently, agnates generally exclude females from inheritance. It has, however, been enacted (Act II, of 1929) in respect of the property of males not held in coparcenary and not disposed of by will, that a son's daughter, daughter's daughter, sister and sister's son shall in this order be entitled to rank in the order of succession next after a father's father and before a father's brother provided that a sister's son shall not include a son adopted after the sister's death.

A Hindu widow takes only a restricted estate in the property of her husband, and on her death such property passes to the heirs of her husband except such portion as may have been alienated by her for legal necessity. Alienations of her husband's estate or portions thereof for legal necessity, which includes the payment of her husband's debts and other charges on the estate, such as the payment of maintenance to female members of the family, debts incurred by the widow for her own maintenance, debts incurred for the funeral obsequies of her husband and for other primary religious purposes, are valid and bind the actual reversioner succeeding to the estate on the death of the widow. A widow of a Hindu coparcener cannot claim partition under the joint Hindu family system. In Bombay, however, a sister or a daughter inherits properties. In Malabar, widows and children (including female children) also inherit under Sections 23 and 24 of the Malabar Marriages Act, 1896.

On the whole, Hindu women suffer under certain disabilities in the matter of inheritance. Orthodox Hindu opinion has generally been opposed to removal of them on religious grounds. A number of resolutions and Bills designed to ameliorate the position of women in this and other social matters has from time to time been brought forward in the Legislature by non-official members. There is a marked tendency among the more advanced sections of Indian political opinion towards improving the civil status of women, especially in regard to inheritance and their position under the marriage laws.

The following private Bills relating to inheritance are now pending before the Central Legislature :

(1) *The Hindu Women's Rights to Properly Bill.* — It aims at securing the following results :

(*a*) No woman because of her sex shall be excluded from the right of owning property gained by inheritance, on partition, settlement, gift or present, or be deemed to be disqualified from having a right in property.

(*b*) The property of a Hindu dying intestate shall first devolve upon his wife, mother, daughters and wife of a predeceased son along with his sons, and all of them shall have equal shares in the property. The widow and daughters of a coparcener having no sons shall succeed to his share after his death and it shall not lapse to the surviving coparceners of the family. The widow and the daughters of a coparcener having sons shall succeed to his share. The widow and the daughters of a coparcener shall have a share equal to that of his son if he has any, but shall not claim partition during his life-time.

(*c*) The interest in property going to the shares of a Hindu woman as a widow, daughter, mother or otherwise of a coparcener under this Act shall be absolute and not limited.

(2) *The Hindu Widows' Maintenance Bill.* — According to this, a widow of a deceased coparcener in a joint Hindu family not having any son shall be entitled to get as maintenance a life estate in the share which her husband, if alive, would have got on partition in the joint family property, such widow being further entitled to demand for her maintenance a partition in the same manner in which her husband, if alive, would have been entitled to.

(3) *The Hindu Widows' Right of Inheritance Bill.* — The objects of this measure are as follows :

(*a*) Where the husband was at the time of his death a member of a joint Hindu family, she shall be entitled to such share of the joint family property as her husband would have been entitled to, had a partition taken place in his life time, and may also sue for partition. This share shall become her absolute property.

(*b*) Where the husband of a widow was at the time of his death a member of a joint Hindu family, she shall, subject to the right of another widow, take his property absolutely and not merely as a life interest.

(4) *The Adoption Validating Bill.* — No adoption by a Hindu shall be invalid by reason only that the adoptive father could not have legally married in her maiden state the genitive mother of the adopted son.

(5) *The Moslem Personal Law (Shariat) Application Bill.* — It provides that notwithstanding any custom, usage or law to the contrary, in all questions regarding succession, special property of females, betrothal, marriage, divorce, maintenance, dower, adoption,

guardianship, minority, bastardy, family relations, wills, legacies, gifts, partitions, any religious usage or institution including Wakf (trust and trust property), the rule of decision in cases where the parties are Moslems shall be the Moslem Personal Law (Shariat).

(ii) *Status under Marriage Laws.*

In regard to inheritance, the status of married women in India under the Indian Succession Act, and Hindu and Mohammedan laws has been stated above. Among Christians, the rights and remedies of a deserted wife are governed by Part VI of the Indian Divorce Act, 1869. Under this Act, she can claim divorce, judicial separation and maintenance in certain circumstances. The parties are at liberty to marry again after divorce has been obtained. Parsees, are governed in matters relating to marital rights by the Parsee Marriage and Divorce Act, 1865. This Act prohibits remarriages save after divorce during the lifetime of a first wife or husband, provides punishment for bigamy and permits judicial separation, divorce, maintenance and remarriage in certain circumstances. A Mohammedan wife who is deserted by her husband is entitled to sue him for maintenance in a civil court. She cannot however get a decree for past maintenance unless such claim is based on specific agreement. If a Mohammedan marries a second wife during the lifetime of the first wife, as he is entitled to do, the rights of the first wife are not in any way affected except that she, with her co-wife, succeeds jointly to the share in her husband's property allowable to a wife under the Mohammedan law. A Mohammedan marriage may be dissolved, in the lifetime of the parties thereto, either by act of the husband or wife or by mutual agreement, or by a judicial order of separation, or it may be annulled.

A Hindu wife deserted by her husband can claim restitution of conjugal rights or maintenance. The mere fact that the husband has married a second wife does not entitle her to refuse conjugal rights to the husband or to claim separate maintenance. Otherwise, a Hindu marriage is indissoluble and no divorce is allowed except in the case of marriages under the Special Marriage Act, 1872. Section 488 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, also prescribes a summary remedy for married women of all religions or communities to claim maintenance from their husbands.

A majority of Hindu widows are not allowed by social custom to remarry, but such remarriages are valid in law according to the Re-marriage of Hindu Widows Act, (XV, of 1856). Marriage of children at a tender age was formerly a common practice in India, but such marriages are not so common now. Child marriages are not invalid, although the Child Marriage Restraint Act, 1929, makes marriages of males below 18 years and of girls below 14 years punishable offences.

The Special Marriage Act, 1872, which provides a form of marriage for persons who do not profess the Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Mohammedan, Parsee, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina religion and a form of optional marriage for persons who profess the Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina religion, penalises married persons marrying again under the Act and also bigamy. The Indian Divorce Act also applies to marriages performed under the Special Marriage Act. Succession to the property of any Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina who marries under this Act is regulated by the provisions of the Indian Succession Act 1925.

The Married Women's Property Act, 1874, provides that the wages and earnings of any married woman, who did not profess the Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina religion, or whose husband at the time of such marriage did not profess any of these religions, acquired or gained by her after the passing of the Act in any employment, occupation or trade carried on by her and not by her husband, and also any money or other property so acquired by her through the exercise of any literary, artistic or scientific skill, and all savings from and investments of such wages, earnings and property, shall be deemed to be her separate property.

Hindu women labour under disabilities in this matter similar to those stated in the last paragraph 1 (i) above, and any move in the direction of removing these is apt to be opposed by orthodox Hindu opinion.

There is a marked tendency among the more advanced sections of Indian political opinion towards improving the position of women under the marriage law. The following non-official Bills to remove certain disabilities in this matter are now pending before the central Legislature :

(1) *The Hindu Marriage Validity Bill.* — It is intended to secure that no marriage among Hindus shall be invalid by reason that the parties thereto do not belong to the same caste, any custom or any interpretation of Hindu law to the contrary notwithstanding.

(2) *The Arya Marriage Validation Bill.* — The Bill is intended to place beyond doubt the validity of inter-caste marriages among Arya Samajists who form an appreciable number of the Hindu population of India.

The object underlying this Bill and the Hindu Marriage Validity Bill mentioned above is to promote solidarity of Hindus by making inter-caste marriages among the various castes of Hindus permissible and also to legalise such marriages in the interests of parties to such marriages and their issue.

(3) *The Moslem Dissolution of Marriage Bill.* — The Bill enumerates the grounds on which a married Moslem woman may bring a suit against her husband for the dissolution of her marriage, and provides that the conversion of a married Moslem woman to a faith other than Islam shall not by itself operate to dissolve her marriage.

(4) *The Parsee Marriage and Divorce Bill.* — The Parsee Marriage and Divorce Act at present in force was passed in 1865. The present Bill, which is intended to replace that Act, purports to bring its provisions up to date so as to conform to the change that has taken place in the sentiments and views of the Parsee community.

(iii) *Right to practise as Legal Practitioners.*

Under the Legal Practitioners (Women) Act (XXIII, of 1923) women are entitled to be enrolled and to practise as legal practitioners.

(iv) *Service as Jurors and Assessors.*

Under Section 319 of the Criminal Procedure Code, women are exempted from the liability to serve as jurors and assessors in criminal courts.

2. *Women's Right to vote and stand for Election to Legislatures.*

Women have been enfranchised under the existing constitution in all provinces having legislative councils, except the North-West Frontier Province. They are eligible for election or nomination to all provincial legislative councils (except Bengal, North-West Frontier Province and Assam) and to the Central Legislative Assembly from these provinces if they are otherwise qualified. As regards the Council of State, women have been enfranchised but they cannot stand for election or be nominated. Under the new Constitution, women will be entitled in all provinces to vote on the same qualifications as men, and will further be entitled to claim differential qualifications peculiar to themselves. Any qualified woman voter will be entitled to stand as a candidate for any seat on the same terms as men, and women will moreover in most provinces have special seats set apart for them. The same will in general be the case with the new Federal Legislature, when it comes into being.

3. *Women's Right to enter Government Service and Other Professions.*

Governments in India have at present full discretion in making women eligible or ineligible for appointment to posts under their control. The position under the new Constitution will, however, be different. Section 275 of the Government of India Act, 1935, provides that a person shall not be disqualified by sex for being appointed to any civil service of, or civil post under, the Crown in India, other than such a service or post as may be specified by any general or special order made (*a*) by the Governor-General in the case of services and posts in connection with the affairs of the Federation; (*b*) by the Governor of a province in the case of services and posts in connection with the affairs of the province; (*c*) by the Secretary of State in relation to appointments made by him.

This is a matter in which both the Governor-General and the Governors will, under the new Constitution, act on the advice of their Ministers, and the provisions of Section 275 of the Act quoted above are sufficient to safeguard the legitimate interests of women in the sphere of public services. As regards professions other than Government service, the legal profession has been dealt with in paragraph 1 (iii) above. There is no legal bar to women entering any profession.

Latvia.

March 3rd, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

I. Status of Women under the Current Latvian Civil Code.

Under existing Latvian law, a married woman is under the *mundium* (marital authority) of her husband. The husband has for example the right under Article 8 of the Civil Code (1) to insist on his wife's obedience and submission to his will, and (2) to determine the place of conjugal domicile and to insist that his wife accompany him. Under Article 11 of the Civil Code, "by the fact of marriage, the husband becomes the marital guardian (adviser or assistant) of his wife", and Article 12 provides that "in virtue of the marital tutela, the husband has power to control and manage the whole joint estate, both estate brought in by him on contracting marriage and estate brought in by his wife, as well as property acquired by them together or separately in the course of their married life or property accruing to them in any other manner, save in so far as otherwise exceptionally provided by law or by contract". Article 13 of the Civil Code provides that, in the event of a dispute, all property subject to the *jus mariti* must, *prima facie*, be recognised as belonging to him. If, however, the wife lays claim to a part of such property, she must prove that she has brought in such part on contracting marriage or has acquired them separately for herself, or that they have accrued to her personally in some other manner.

Under Article 27, the " reserved " estate *(bona receptitia)* of the wife, which may be exempted from the *jus mariti* under Article 12, includes (1) all property brought in by the wife on contracting marriage of which she has expressly retained the management and use, (2) property which has accrued to her subject to such a reservation, (3) property she has acquired by her own labour with her husband's knowledge and consent, (4) property she has received from her husband as pocket money, and (5) savings made by her out of the income from her " reserved " estate. Article 29 provides as follows : " Before alienating immovable property constituting a ' reserved ' estate, the wife must take her husband's opinion. The acts by which she has contracted undertakings of any kind in relation to such estate must be signed by the husband in his capacity as adviser. In default of such signature, the wife may refuse to fulfil the undertaking she has assumed unless it is subsequently confirmed by the husband's consent." Article 31 provides that " if the husband is prevented from managing the joint estate by absence, sickness or any other reason, the wife may only assume the management of such estate in conformity with the general law concerning the management of the affairs of another person as *negotiorum gestor*. In certain cases, a tutela must be instituted for the purpose.".

The wife's rights in relation to her husband are defined in Article 9 as follows : " The wife is entitled to require of her husband (1) maintenance in accordance with the position and financial standing of her husband, whether she has brought in property at the time of contracting marriage or not, and (2) protection and assistance for all purposes of life, in particular in connection with legal issues ".

The proprietary rights of husband and wife are governed by provisions which vary in different parts of the country and in different towns.[1] The relation between husband and wife may also be determined by contract (Article 32). According to the provincial law of Vidzeme and Kurzeme, for example, as also in accordance with the law in force in the towns of Kurzeme, the reciprocal material rights legally appertaining to husband and wife are regulated as follows :

Article 41. — During the continuance of the marriage, the husband is entitled, not only to manage, but also to have the use of his wife's movable or immovable property, her capital and her rights of user over the property of others. The husband's right covers both property the wife has brought in at the time of contracting marriage, and property acquired by her, or accruing to her during the continuance of the marriage, other than her " reserved " estate, which is not subject to the husband's management or use.

Article 43. — Without the wife's assent, the husband is not entitled to alienate, pledge or encumber with debts, servitudes or hypothecary obligations, immovable property (or rights in respect of immovable property) subject to his management. Any action at variance with this provision is invalid.

Article 44. — In Vidzeme, the husband cannot assign or pledge obligations contracted in his wife's behalf or in behalf of persons who have left property to his wife, or receive payments in respect of such obligations, without his wife's explicit consent. Any action at variance with this provision is invalid. The husband has, however, the right at all times to exact payment in respect of obligations of this kind if he anticipates that they will prove difficult to collect, or if his wife's interests so require for any reason. On the other hand, the husband has the right in Vidzeme to exact payment in respect of such obligations, and to assign them or receive money without the issue of any special power of attorney by the wife.

Article 45. — In virtue of the husband's usufructuary right (Article 41) he receives all interest or income from land or other immovable property belonging to his wife, as also all interest due in respect of obligations contracted in his wife's favour, or income due in respect of his wife's rights in regard to immovable properties ; and he is his wife's representative in respect of her usufructuary rights.

Article 49. — The husband is not bound to submit accounts for the management of property belonging to the wife, but is required to take care of such property and exercise the same vigilance in respect of it as he exercises in respect of his own property.

Article 52. — Action taken by the husband within the limits of the administrative powers entrusted to him cannot, even if it proves to be inopportune, be contested by the wife in relation to third parties who have acquired rights of any kind as a result of such action. The wife is, however, entitled to protest against action involving danger to her property, and to appeal to the courts to restrain her husband's rights in this connection by transferring the management of the property to herself. The income from such property must, however, be used in such case to meet the expenses of their conjugal life.

The question of debts contracted by married women is governed by Articles 54, 55 and 56 :

Article 54. — Debts contracted by the wife before marriage shall be covered first by her " reserved " estate, and then, if that estate be inadequate, by the estate brought in on the contraction of the marriage and managed by the husband, and lastly by estate she has acquired during the continuance of the marriage by inheritance or in some other manner.

Article 55. — The husband shall not be bound to recognise debts contracted by his wife during the continuance of the marriage. He cannot therefore be obliged to pay such debts out of the wife's estate managed by him. Creditors may, however, file their claims against the " reserved " estate of the wife or, after dissolution of marriage, against the whole of her estate of which the husband has then no longer the usufruct and which he no longer has the right to manage.

[1] On the matter of Latvian civil law, a distinction must be drawn between the general law and the provincial or special law which is in force only in particular towns or districts of Latvia.

Article 56. — As an exception, the husband is not only bound to recognise the following acts of his wife, but is also responsible for them out of his own estate :

(1) Acts connected with the requirements of conjugal existence or her own requirements and the requirements of members of her family, including such contracts as the wife may have concluded within these limits — for instance, in respect of the engagement of female domestic servants ;

(2) If the acts were done at the husband's behest whether general or particular, explicit or implied ;

(3) All debts contracted in cases of urgent necessity ;

(4) All debts through which and in so far as the husband has derived advantage.

In the towns of Vidzeme, husband and wife possess joint estate as defined in Articles 79, 80 and 81, the contents of which are as follows :

Article 79. — When husband and wife are subject to the law in force in the towns, their several properties shall become joint estate on marriage, irrespective of the status of each property concerned.

Article 80. — Under the concept of the joint nature of the estate, the whole of the estates of both husband and wife, including the estates they have brought in on contracting marriage and any estates which have lawfully come into the possession of one or the other, or of both, or which they have acquired, constitute their joint property during the continuance of the marriage, no part thereof belonging separately either to husband or wife.

Article 81. — The joint estate of husband and wife may not include :

(1) Rural demesnes and, in general, immovable property situate outside the towns, in so far as the status of such property is governed by provincial law ;

(2) Such " reserved " estate of either husband or wife as may not, in virtue of a contract or in the cases specified in Article 27, become joint estate.

As a matter of fact, however, subsequent to the agrarian reform, there no longer exist any of the rural demesnes mentioned in paragraph 1.

The special provincial law still in force in Latvia also includes provisions governing the material relations between husband and wife. For instance, Article 945 of the Provincial Code of Vidzeme contains the following provisions : " If husband and wife belong to the peasant class of Vidzeme, their estate shall be joint during the continuance of marriage, if no other arrangement has been made by contract in court before the solemnisation of marriage."

Article 946 also refers to this point : " A husband and wife belonging to the peasant class of Vidzeme shall, provided no other arrangement has been made under contract concluded between them prior to their marriage, have a right of joint ownership over their combined estate." Consequently, after her husband's death, the wife is responsible out of her dowry for debts left unsettled by the husband. To meet such debts, the whole of the movable property of the wife and monies and capital that have come into possession of the husband must be utilised, in addition to the " reserved " estate of the husband. If all the debts are not thus met, one-third of the recoverable claims must be met as far as necessary out of the immovable property of the wife. These provisions, however, apply solely to such debts as the husband may have contracted during the continuance of marriage or in connection with the contracting of marriage. The wife is not liable to meet her husband's debts out of other monies and capital belonging to her. Similarly, she cannot be made liable for debts incurred as a result of a crime committed by her husband or as a result of his prodigality.

Under Article 70 of the Peasant Code of Kurzeme, the law does not admit joint estate of husband and wife belonging to the peasant class of Kurzeme unless they have concluded at court a contract stipulating that such joint estate shall exist.

In the matter of political status, women enjoy in Latvia the same rights as men. As regards the right to vote and be voted for at elections to Parliament — at present dissolved by the authoritarian Government — both sexes possessed complete equality (Law concerning Elections to the Saeima, Articles 1 and 21). Similarly, women are not precluded from occupying responsible posts in Government or municipal services or from exercising the liberal professions.

On marriage, the wife acquires the name and nationality of her husband (Article 5 of the Civil Code, Article 7 of the Nationality Law). A divorced woman retains her husband's surname, but the court may at her request allow her to reassume her maiden name. If marriage is dissolved owing to the misconduct of the wife, the court may at the husband's request forbid the wife to use her husband's surname (Article 61 of the Marriage Law). A divorced woman, if indigent, may claim alimony : so may the husband, if he is indigent and if the woman possesses sufficient means. The guilty party forfeits the right to claim alimony (Article 60 of the Marriage Law and Articles 62 and 63 of the new draft Civil Code).

II. Status of Women under the New Draft Civil Code now being prepared.

Under the new Latvian draft Civil Code, the civil status of women will be radically altered ; they will no longer be subject to marital authority *(mundium)*, and husband and wife will

enjoy equal personal and proprietary status. These relations are defined in Articles 66 to 86 and 197 to 199 of the new draft :

Article 66. — The marriage tie imposes on the husband and wife the duty to be faithful to one another, live together, take care of each other, and take due thought for the well-being of the family.

The fact of living separately shall not, however, be deemed a fault on the part of the spouse who has left the home if the reason was that the other spouse abused his or her rights, or if the fact of continuing to live together would have constituted a danger to life or health, or might have caused the breakdown of family life, or if one of the spouses can invoke a legitimate reason in favour of the dissolution of marriage.

Article 67. — In their conjugal life, husband and wife shall enjoy equal rights. Failing an agreement between them, the husband's wishes shall prevail ; among other matters, it is for him to decide the place of conjugal domicile.

The wife is not bound to obey her husband's orders if the latter abuses his rights.

Article 68. — The wife shall be responsible for the household duties. She shall at the same time, as far as possible, assist her husband in his work.

Article 69. — The wife shall assume the name and nationality of her husband.

Article 70. — Independently of the proprietary relations between husband and wife, the wife shall be entitled to represent her husband within the limits of the household. Unless otherwise proved by circumstances, business concluded by her within these limits shall be recognised as having been concluded on behalf of her husband.

When sufficiently serious reasons exist, the husband may restrict or annul these rights of his wife ; such restriction or annulment shall, however, only have effect as against third parties if the latter have been notified of the fact, or if an entry on the subject has been made in the register of the proprietary relations between husband and wife (Article 139).

Article 71. — A wife shall have the right to appear in court personally, either as appellant or defendant. In disputes with third parties, the husband acts as administrator of the property forming part of the joint estate (Article 77).

In disputes with third parties concerning the property of the wife in respect of which a right of management and usufruct has been conferred on the husband under the marriage contract (Article 107), the husband shall be the lawful representative of his wife.

If a joint estate has been instituted under the marriage contract (Article 98), the husband shall act in matters connected with such estate.

If the husband fails to defend his wife's interests, or disposes of his wife's estate or of the joint estate without his wife's consent, the latter may herself undertake the defence of her rights at law.

Article 72. — Independently of the nature of their proprietary relationship, either spouse shall be entitled to make testamentary provision for the disposal of his or her property in accordance with the general provisions governing such acts.

Article 73. — Each of the spouses shall be entitled to dispose of the property belonging to him or her before marriage. As regards property acquired during the continuance of marriage, each spouse shall possess separately :

(1) The property he or she has acquired by work or other personal effort ;

(2) The property he or she has acquired without payment therefor ;

(3) The income from his or her " reserved " estate ;

(4) The estate which, in view of the legal material relationship, is defined as " reserved " estate under a duly registered marriage contract (Article 139) ;

(5) Property which has been substituted for the property mentioned in the previous paragraphs (1 to 4).

Article 74. — Neither spouse shall have the right to manage the property of the other (Article 73), to make use of it or to dispose of it in any other way without a power of attorney or the assent of the other. In the absence of explicit prohibition to manage or enjoy the usufruct of the above-mentioned property, it shall be presumed that such consent has been given.

Article 75. — Either spouse whose property is managed by the other spouse shall be entitled to ask for accounts thereof. Previous renunciation of the right to withdraw the power of management or to ask for accounts shall be deemed invalid.

Article 76. — The spouse who manages the property of the other shall be responsible for losses occasioned by serious negligence on his or her part.

As from the date on which one of the spouses has withdrawn from the other the right to manage his or her property or, in general, when one of the spouses is under the obligation to restore the said property, that spouse shall be responsible under the general rules of law.

Article 77. — Except the property specified in the second part of Article 73, all that husband and wife may have acquired during the continuance of marriage, either jointly or severally, but with the help of their joint resources or active assistance by the other spouse, shall be regarded as their joint property during the continuance of marriage.

In case of doubt, it shall be presumed that property acquired during the continuance of marriage has been acquired by both spouses acting together. In the interests of third parties, it shall be presumed, failing proof to the contrary, that all articles situate in the joint premises of the husband and wife are their joint property.

Article 78. — The joint property of husband and wife shall be managed by the husband, who shall be bound to render due account of his management to his wife at her request.

Only with the wife's consent may the husband alienate, pledge or encumber immovable property forming part of the joint estate.

Property forming part of the joint estate may be managed by the wife at her request :

(1) If, by leaving the property to be managed by the husband, such property is likely to be lost or injured, and if the husband is unable to provide sufficient surety for the property managed by him ;

(2) If the husband does not fulfil his duties in the matter of the maintenance of his wife and children.

Article 79. — The expenses of the family and of the joint household shall be covered, in the first instance, by the property forming part of the joint estate. If the property forming part of the joint estate is not sufficient, husband and wife are bound to provide resources out of their " reserved " estate (Article 73) in proportion to the financial situation of each.

Article 80. — Immovable property or rights *in rem* forming part of the joint estate of husband and wife must be entered in the Land Register in their joint names.

Each spouse shall have the right to demand from the other the entry in the Land Register, in their joint names, of the immovable property, or right thereover, forming part of their joint estate (Article 77).

Article 81. — Each spouse is responsible for his or her own debts to the extent of the whole of his or her " reserved " estate and to the extent of his or her property forming part of the joint estate.

Article 82. — If one of the spouses has alienated or pledged an object belonging to husband and wife jointly, the person who has received this article must be regarded as its lawful possessor if he was unaware, or if it was not his duty to ascertain, that the article belonged to the other spouse or to both jointly, or that it was alienated or pledged against the will of that other spouse.

Article 83. — Transactions between husband and wife and testamentary dispositions of one in favour of the other shall be admissible if concluded or made in accordance with the general provisions of the law. If, however, the wife has alienated part of her dowry and the person who gave her this dowry is still alive, the consent of that person is necessary during the five years following the marriage. Without such consent, the wife may dispute the validity of the transactions thus concluded.

Article 85. — Apart from the cases of revocation of a gift which are provided for in the provisions concerning gifts, a donor may revoke a gift made after betrothal or during the continuance of marriage :

(1) If the spouse who received the gift dies without issue ;

(2) If the marriage was dissolved owing to the misconduct of the spouse who received the gift ;

(3) If the marriage has been declared null and void and the donor, at the time of his making the gift, was under an excusable error concerning the supposed married state.

Paternal Power in Personal Relations.

Article 197. — Children are subject to the paternal power until they attain their majority (age of 21). So long as the marriage tie exists, paternal power is exercised jointly by father and mother. In the case of differences of opinion between husband and wife, the directions of the father shall prevail.

Article 198. — If the mother observes that the father's wishes or acts are harmful to the children, she may ask the Court for the Protection of Orphans to call upon him to amend his directions or acts. The Court for the Protection of Orphans may even, if it thinks it necessary, entrust the upbringing of the children to the mother alone.

Article 199. — Parents shall be bound, according to their financial and social standing, to protect the life and assure the well-being of the children subject to their power and to provide these children with food, clothing and necessary care, and to see to their upbringing and education.

The father shall be primarily responsible for the maintenance of the children until such time as they can support themselves, though the mother must share this obligation to the extent that her financial resources allow.

If the children possess " reserved " estate, whereas the parents have not sufficient means at their disposal to support the cost of their children's maintenance and upbringing, these costs may be met out of the income derived from the " reserved " estate of the children ; if this income is not sufficient, part of the " reserved " estate of the children may be used for this purpose after the permission of the Court for the Protection of Orphans has been obtained.

Monaco.

October 29th, 1935.

[*Translation.*]

1. *Public Law.*

In Monaco, women are not entitled to vote nor are they eligible for membership of any public body.

As regards the protection of women, prostitution is prohibited in Monaco and professional *souteneurs* are punished under the Criminal Code.

2. *Private Law.*

From the standpoint of private law, the present legal status of women is governed by the Monaco Civil Code, which was promulgated by Sovereign Ordinance of November 6th, 1913.

The provisions contained therein are identical with the rules of the French Civil Code.

3. *Nationality.*

Article 5 of the Constitutional Law of 1911, Article 6 of the Treaty of 1918 with France and the Convention of October 7th, 1919, between France and Monaco make it impossible, in the absence of previous agreement with the French Government, to introduce into the laws of the Principality the principle of the equality of the sexes in the matter of nationality.

Norway.

January 28th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

The information given below is in reply to Circular Letter 160.1935.V, of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, dated October 24th, 1935.

By a series of reforms going back almost a hundred years, the Norwegian Legislature has introduced a constantly increasing degree of equality between the sexes. Special rules nevertheless remain in force in certain respects, more particularly those referred to below.

Under the Law of February 9th, 1912, a certain number of public posts are not open to women. These are : Membership of the Council of State and of the diplomatic and consular services, ecclesiastical office in the National Church, military posts and civilian posts in the army administration. In 1930 and 1934, the Government introduced a Bill to amend this rule in such a way that the only exceptions to the rule of equality would be those made in regard to ecclesiastical and military posts and civilian posts in the army administration. No decision was taken by Parliament on these proposals, however. In 1936, the Government will submit to Parliament a new Bill to make women eligible for all posts except those of a military character.

Women are exempt from the obligation to perform military service (Law No. 6, of June 21st, 1929, § 6).

Any man acquiring the nationality of a foreign State loses his right to vote in public affairs while at the same time retaining his Norwegian nationality. By a decision of June 25th, 1935, amending the Constitution, an exception to this rule was made in favour of women resident in Norway who acquire foreign nationality by marriage ; in such cases, they do not forfeit their right to vote unless they leave the country.

The Law of July 25th, 1913, on Trades and Handicrafts (§ 11, paragraph 2 ; § 13, part 1) contains certain provisions of minor importance, the effect of which is that man and wife are not placed on the same footing as regards the right to exercise a manual trade.

Under the Guardianship Law it is, as a rule, the father who is the guardian of young children born in wedlock and the mother who is the guardian of those born out of wedlock.

A woman — but not a man — is entitled to ask that a " legal guardian " *(Lagvergé)* be appointed to assist her with advice and guidance in property matters (cf. N.L. 3-19-41 : Law of October 12th, 1857, § 3 ; Law of March 27th, 1869, § 3, and Guardianship Law, § 105).

The Married Persons' Property Law of May 20th, 1927 (§ 7, second paragraph, and § 31), places women in a legal position which, in certain respects, is more favourable than that of their husbands.

As regards allodial rights and rights of primogeniture, men take precedence over women.

The Norwegian Government intends to pursue its efforts to bring about the greatest possible degree of equality between the sexes, and will support any proposals for international action likely to promote such equality in as many countries as possible.

New Zealand.

April 17th, 1936.

I desire to advise you that the existing national law of this Dominion governing the political and civil status of women is contained in the British Nationality and Status of Aliens (in New Zealand) Amendment Act, 1934-35. This Act has brought the legislation into conformity with the provisions of the Hague Convention dealing with the nationality of women, and adopted the law of the United Kingdom on the point. The New Zealand Act, however, went further than the United Kingdom Act, and it provides that any woman who was a British subject prior to marrying an alien, and who has acquired the nationality of the husband by reason of the marriage, may make a declaration, under Section 3 of the Act, that she desires to retain, while in New Zealand, the rights of a British subject. Such declaration, when duly made and registered, confers the rights, but not the status, of a British subject, and is strictly limited in its operation to New Zealand only.

Netherlands.

February 27th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

In accordance with the views expressed by the Netherlands delegation in the First Committee of the sixteenth Assembly, the Netherlands Government is of opinion that, generally speaking, the problem of the political and civil status of women can only be dealt with on a national basis. The social and political position both of men and women must be determined in accordance with the requirements of the public interest, which may vary according to time, place and circumstances.

Her Majesty's Government would not refuse, in the proper circumstances, to become a party to international agreements dealing with special problems connected with the status of women. The question of the nationality of women having been settled in the Treaty drawn up by the Conference at The Hague in 1930, the Netherlands Government cannot, for the time being, conceive of anyother points on which international regulation would at present be desirable. For these reasons, the Netherlands Government hopes that the League of Nations will refrain from taking up the problem of the status of women.

As the Secretary-General also asks the Netherlands Government for information regarding the political and civil status of women under Netherlands law, I may add the following particulars :

In the Netherlands, the political status of women is identical with that of men. As regards the franchise and eligibility to membership of the States-General and other representative bodies, there is no discrimination between men and women. Under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, every Netherlands subject may be appointed to any Government post. Nevertheless, this general rule does not preclude the possibility of special conditions being attached to appointment to a specific post. There are, moreover, certain functions (those of judge and notary public) which are not open to women.

As regards civil status, men and women are, in principle, equal, the only exception being that a woman cannot be appointed as an arbitrator (Article 622 of the Code of Civil Procedure).

As regards matrimonial law, there are several matters in which the legal position of married women differs from that of their husbands. In the first place, the married woman generally requires the assistance of her husband in the performance of judicial acts. In the second place, the husband is the head of the matrimonial partnership ; it is he who administers the property of the union and that of the wife. Nevertheless, a woman can, on marriage, reserve to herself the administration of her own property, together with the right to dispose freely of the income from such property. During marriage, the children are under the authority of both parents, though, generally speaking, this authority is exercised by the father alone. Guardianship over natural children simultaneously recognised by both parents belongs, in principle, to the father.

June 4th, 1936.

Further to my letter of February 27th last, the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs has the honour to transmit to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations the following information relating to the Netherlands overseas territories.

Regarding the policy to be followed in this matter, as set out in the above-mentioned letter, there is nothing to add in respect of the overseas territories.

As regards the political and civil status of women in those territories, it should be noted that, in the case of women subject to European law, it does not, generally speaking, differ greatly from that of women in the home country. In these territories, nevertheless, women do not enjoy the franchise ; they are, however, entitled to be nominated or elected to the Volksraad of the Netherlands Indies. A similar rule as regards eligibility for membership of the Staten was recently introduced into the laws of Surinam and Curaçao, but it has not yet come into force.

In view of the great diversity of conditions in this respect, an account of the status of women not subject to European law in the Netherlands overseas territories would not appear to serve any useful purpose.

Poland.

March 21st, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

The Ministry of Justice has the honour to transmit the following information relating to the legal status of women in Poland :

I. Political and Public Rights.

In Poland, women enjoy full political rights (Article 7 of the Constitution of April 23rd, 1935 ; *Legal Gazette of the Polish Republic*, No. 30, item 227) ; they have the right to elect and to be elected to the Legislative Chambers (Articles 33 and 47 of the Constitution ; Articles 2 and 4 of the Regulations regarding Elections to the Diet, Law of July 8th, 1935 ; *Legal Gazette*,

No. 47, item 319; Articles 3 and 4 of the Regulations for Election to the Senate, Law of July 8th, 1935; *Legal Gazette*, No. 47, item 320); women are therefore entitled on the same footing as men to take part in legislative work and thus to exercise their influence on the administration of public affairs.

Women are admitted to positions in the civil administration of the State (Article 6 of the Law of February 17th, 1922, on the Civil Administration of the State; *Legal Gazette*, No. 21, item 164), not excepting the functions of judges (Articles 82, 191), magistrates (210), judges of commercial courts (Decree of the President of the Republic of February 6th, 1928, relating to the Organisation of Public Courts; *Legal Gazette*, 1932, No. 102, item 863); on the other hand, women cannot exercise the functions of jurymen (Article 214 of the Decree relating to the Organisation of Public Courts), notaries (Article 7 of the Statute of Notaries Public, Decree of the President of the Republic of October 27th, 1933; *Legal Gazette*, No. 84, item 609), municipal magistrates in labour courts (Article 8 of the Decree of the President of the Republic of October 24th, 1934, regulating the Status of Labour Courts; *Legal Gazette*, No. 95, item 854). Women are also admitted to the Bar and may freely exercise the profession of advocate (Article 9 of the Decree of the President of the Republic of October 7th, 1932, regulating the Bar; *Legal Gazette*, 1932, No. 86, item 733).

Women of Polish nationality lose all the rights which they enjoy in political and public life when they acquire a foreign nationality by marriage (Articles 1, 10 and 13 of the Law of January 20th, 1920, on Polish Nationality; *Legal Gazette*, No. 7, item 44).

II. Private Rights.

With few exceptions, women enjoy unrestricted civil rights. For instance, they possess full legal capacity in civil matters (Articles 7 and 8 of the P.C.C. (Civil Code of the Kingdom of Poland of 1825); § 17 and § 18 of the A.C.C. (General Austrian Civil Code of 1811); § 1 and § 104 of the G.C.C. (German Civil Code of 1900) and in commercial matters (Article 12 of the Commercial Code of 1934; *Legal Gazette*, No. 57, item 502). Women may contract obligations in respect of bills of exchange (Article 76 of the Decree of the President of the Republic of November 14th, 1924, regulating Questions relating to Letters of Exchange; *Legal Gazette*, No. 100, item 926) and cheques (Article 27 of the Decree of the President of the Republic of November 14th, 1924, concerning Cheques; *Legal Gazette*, No. 100, item 927).

Women's rights are at present subject in Poland to certain very slight restrictions (1) as regards family rights and (2) the right to administer joint property.

Ad 1.

(a) *In the Former Congress Kingdom.* — Both parents exercise parental power; in case of difference of opinion, however, the opinion and desires of the father prevail (Article 337 of the P.C.C.); the father may place a child under guardianship against the desire of the mother and may even give his consent to adoption (Article 326 and 311 of the P.C.C.). The grandfather or great-grandfather has a right of guardianship over the children to the exclusion of the wife (Articles 369 and 371 of the P.C.C.); if a mother exercising guardianship remarries, she must call a family council to decide whether she should retain guardianship (Article 361 of the P.C.C.). For the duration of the marriage, the administration and usufruct of the property of the children appertain to the father, who represents the children in all civil acts (Article 341 of the P.C.C.). The father has the right to appoint a guardian for his children, in case, after his decease, the mother does not desire to assume guardianship; on the other hand, the mother does not enjoy this right (Article 364 of the P.C.C.). In case of annulation of marriage, divorce or separation, if both spouses are of good faith or innocent, the father has the right of guardianship of the children (Articles 354 and 356 of the P.C.C.). Similarly, the guardianship of children legitimated by a decree of the Sovereign belongs to the father when both parents have applied for legitimation (Article 358 of the P.C.C.). The father has the right to emancipate the children; the mother only enjoys this right if the father is no longer living or if he has been deprived of parental power (Article 468 of the P.C.C.). If a mother exercising trusteeship remarries, she must call a family council to decide whether she should retain the trusteeship (Article 471 of the P.C.C.).

(b) *In the Territories formerly annexed by Austria.* — Parental power belongs exclusively to the father (§ 147 of the A.C.C.), who represents his minor children in all civil acts and administers their property (§ 149 and § 151 of the A.C.C.). The father has the right to emancipate the children (§ 174 of the A.C.C.). A married woman requires the consent of her husband in order to assume guardianship (§ 193 and § 255 of the A.C.C.), and a woman guardian must be assisted by a man deputy guardian in the cases provided for in § 211 of the A.C.C.

(c) *In the Territories formerly annexed by Germany.* — Parental power belongs primarily to the father (§ 1627 of the G.C.C.); the mother cannot exclude from guardianship a person appointed as guardian by the father (§ 1782 of the G.C.C.). The Chamber of Guardians must provide the mother with an adviser in the cases provided for in § 1687 of the G.C.C. The mother loses parental power if she contracts a new marriage (§ 1697 of the G.C.C.). A woman married to another person than the father of the ward can only become a guardian with the consent of her husband.

Ad 2.

As regards the right to administer joint property in the districts of the Polish Republic which remain subject to the Polish Civil Code and the German Civil Code, the administration and usufruct of the property of the wife belong to the husband for the duration of the marriage (Articles 192 and 193 of the P.C.C. and § 1363 of the G.C.C.); the wife can only withdraw the administration and usufruct of the property from the husband by judicial means and in the cases provided for by law (Articles 199 and 203 of the P.C.C. and § 1418 of the G.C.C.).

In this connection, it should be pointed out that, in the former Congress Kingdom, a married woman can, in principle, bring an action in court without her husband's authorisation, but must, with certain exceptions, obtain his authorisation or summon him conjointly in cases relating to property of which the husband possessed the right of administration and usufruct in accordance with law or agreements concluded between the husband and wife (Article 182 of the P.C.C. within the meaning of Article XII of the Provisions promulgating the Commercial Code of June 27th, 1934; *Legal Gazette*, No. 57, item 503). A married woman requires her husband's authorisation to conclude contracts or to carry out acts relating to property the administration and enjoyment of which is in the hands of the husband (Article 184 of the P.C.C. of 1825). If the husband refuses the wife permission to bring an action in court, or to carry out an act, the wife may request such permission from the court (Articles 1653 to 1658 of the Civil Procedure Code of 1864). The restrictions imposed on the wife's right to dispose of property the administration of which is entrusted to the husband only apply in respect of acts *inter vivos*. The wife may by testament dispose of such property without the husband's authorisation (Articles 189 of the Polish Civil Code and 905 of the Nap. Civil Code). In case of a declaration of bankruptcy, the right granted to the husband to administer and enjoy the property of the wife reverts to the latter for the duration of the bankruptcy (Article IX of the Provisions promulgating the Law on Bankruptcy, Decree by the President of the Republic of October 24th, 1934; *Legal Gazette*, No. 93, 1934, item 835).

In the territories formerly annexed by Germany, the wife requires her husband's authorisation to dispose of property the administration of which is entrusted to him (§ 1395 of the G.C.C.). She cannot bring an action in court in respect of such property without her husband's authorisation; but, if the husband refuses his authorisation, the court may grant it at the request of the wife (§ 1395 and § 1402 of the G.C.C.).

In the districts formerly annexed by Austria, there is a legal presumption, so long as the wife does not contest it, that she has entrusted to her husband the administration of her property (§ 1328 of the A.C.C.); consequently, the wife may at any time withdraw the administration of her property from her husband without having recourse to the courts.

All the civil codes in force in the territory of the Polish Republic provide that the wife has the legal domicile of her husband (Article 32 of the P.C.C.), that she bears his name (Article 212 of the Law on Marriage of 1836, § 92 of the A.C.C., § 1355 of the G.C.C., Article 101, Vol. X, Part I, of the *Collection of Russian Laws*). At the present time, in accordance with the opinion given on April 18th and May 2nd, 1935, by the United Civil Chambers of the Supreme Court, and the judgment of the Supreme Court, No. 298/1934, a woman may resume her own family name in case of annulation of marriage or divorce (see also § 1577 of the G.C.C.).

It should be pointed out that in the eastern voivodeships which are subject to the system of Vol. X, Part I, of the *Collection of Russian Laws*, women's rights in civil matters are not restricted either from the point of view of family law or of the right of administering the joint property of the spouses (Vol. X, Part I, Articles 109, 110, 114, 115 and 116 of the *Collection of Russian Laws*).

The above particulars show that, with the exception of the restrictions mentioned, women in Poland are entitled to carry out the various legal acts, and to contract obligations on the same footing as men.

Danzig.

December 14th, 1935.

[*Translation.*]

In reply to the enquiry by the League of Nations regarding the legal position of women in the Free City of Danzig, I have the honour to state that women are placed in a position of complete equality with men in political and civil matters. According to Article 73, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, men and women shall have the same civil rights and duties. Article 80 of the Constitution provides that marriage shall rest upon the equality of rights of both sexes. According to Article 91, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, all nationals of either sex are admitted to official positions in accordance with their qualification and capacity.

We cannot make any proposals.

Czechoslovakia.

September 5th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

In reply to your Circular Letter 160.1935.V, of October 24th, 1935, I am instructed by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to communicate to you the following information regarding the political and civil status of women in Czechoslovakia :

Under Article 106 of the Constitutional Charter of the Czechoslovak Republic, dated February 29th, 1920, no privileges of sex, birth or profession are recognised. The purpose aimed at by the Treaty on Equality of Rights, signed at Montevideo on December 26th, 1933 — *i.e.*, that women should be treated on a footing of equality with men in public and civil life — is thus attained in practice in Czechoslovakia, since it forms an integral part of her Constitution.

In this connection, women enjoy all political rights in Czechoslovakia (active and passive right of suffrage) ; they are admitted to the exercise of all the liberal professions (the Bar, for example) ; their right to occupy a post in the public administrations (for example, in the magistrature) is in no way restricted, nor that of engaging in commerce or exercising a calling. All forms of education (studies) are open to them.

In principle, there is no difference between men and women, even under civil law. Certain provisions of family law concerning the relations between husband and wife and those between parents and children alone show certain differences.

Article I of the Treaty of Montevideo (" that men and women shall have equal rights ") aims at absolute equality between men and women, even in all branches of family law. In this respect, Czechoslovak legislation is not in full accordance with it. It is, however, impossible at present to consider in Czechoslovakia any reform of family law making women absolutely equal with men.

As long as an authoritative interpretation of Article I on the lines mentioned above has not been given, the Czechoslovak Government will be unable to consider acceding to the Treaty of Montevideo.

Turkey.

February 28th, 1936.

[*Translation.*]

The Turkish Civil Code makes, in principle, no distinction between men and women as regards their legal position, and grants them equal rights.

Certain social considerations, however, such as the necessity for protecting the interests of the conjugal union, have led to a few exceptions being made in respect of married women. Of these exceptions, the following may be mentioned as examples. The right to represent the conjugal union is given to the husband ; in the absence of agreement between the father and the mother in regard to the joint exercise of paternal power, the father's decision is effective ; the domicile of a married woman is deemed to be the same as that of her husband ; whatever the terms of the marriage contract, a married woman cannot carry on any trade or profession without the consent, either express or implied, of her husband. All this, however, does not confer on the husband any kind of marital guardianship. Even in the event of disagreement, although the husband, as head of the conjugal union, is entitled to take a decision in cases where the wife's individual rights are not formally laid down, this decision is not absolute ; should there be abuse of this right by the husband, the wife is entitled to appeal to the judge, who may authorise her to carry on a trade or profession if the interests of the conjugal union make it necessary for her to do so.

A married woman may appear in court as plaintiff or defendant.

She retains the ownership, administration and free enjoyment of her property. The husband may, however, require his wife to contribute to the support of the union.

The law provides, in a general way, for the separate ownership of property as between the parties to a marriage. The latter are, however, free to adopt, according to their marriage contract, the system of joint or common property. In this case, the wife retains the ownership of the property she brought with her at the time of the marriage and also of such property as she has subsequently acquired. It is, however, the husband alone who has the right to administer this property.

In the matter of succession, the principle of equality of rights as between the parties to a marriage is recognised. Article 439 and the following articles of the Turkish Civil Code, which determine the legal heirs, are based on this principle.

Children of both sexes have equal rights of succession, and the deceased's estate is divided into equal portions (Article 439). The same is true as regards the father and mother, grandparents and great-grandparents of the deceased party to a marriage. The law, moreover, makes no distinction on the ground of sex as regards the descendants of grandparents. When an estate is divided, however, the rural property is allotted to those of the male children who seems to be capable of looking after it ; in the event of abstention on their part, the daughters may claim the property, provided that either they personally or their husbands are capable of managing it.

Women have votes and are eligible for election. They may take part in both parliamentary and municipal elections (Law No. 2599, of December 11th, 1934, amending Articles 10 and 11 of the Constitutional Law ; Municipal Law No. 1580, of April 14th, 1930).

PART II. — COMMUNICATIONS FROM WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.

The following communication has been received from the Pan-Pacific Women's Association :

June 13th, 1936.

Re Enquiry into Status of Women, Civil and Political, under the Law.

This Association would respectfully submit to your consideration the necessity of not losing sight of the fact that there are many problems and many matters of fact relating to such status of women, which are regulated customs, which have the force of law in less forward areas, and even in areas where some measure of progress towards modern conditions has been made. At best, such customs may amount to severe restrictions on liberty ; at worst, to customary law akin to slavery.

We should esteem it of great value to this enquiry if you could draw the attention of Governments to the desirability of including in their replies a summary of the laws affecting women in the colonies, protectorates and mandated areas under their jurisdiction, and also information on all native marriage customs, sanctions, sales, purchase and/or arbitrary disposal of the persons of women or their property.

The women of the Pan-Pacific Women's Association attach great importance to these problems as affecting the well-being and peace of the Pacific countries. They are within the competence of the League of Nations Council directly as far as the mandated territories are concerned, while some of their aspects may be treated by the Slavery Commission.

But still, it seems, a number of these problems are outside the competence of these bodies though well within the framework of Article 23 of the Covenant. These customary restrictions and/or abuses may not come within a survey of strictly *national law*, but still ought, having the effect of law, to be included in any real survey of the position.

The Association therefore respectfully submits to the League of Nations that a survey should be made of these questions for the common advancement, both material and spiritual, of the peoples and races of the Pacific area.

(Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.)

Official No.: A.33.1936.V.

Addendum.

Geneva, June 21st, 1938.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

Communications from Governments and Women's International Organisations

Note by the Secretary-General.

In a communication dated June 15th, 1938, the Netherlands Government amplified the information on page 28 of document A.33.1936.V as follows:

> "In the Netherlands Indies, an Ordinance of February 28th, 1938, lays down that women may be nominated and elected to the municipal councils. As to franchise, the 'Volksraad' has expressed the hope that the Government of the Netherlands Indies will as soon as possible introduce women's franchise for elections to the various representative bodies in the Netherlands Indies, in the case both of Netherlands women and of native women and women belonging to other categories. In response to this recommendation, the Government of the Indies has under consideration the question whether it would be expedient to introduce the proposed reform.
>
> "The rules relating to the eligibility of women for membership of the 'Koloniale Staten' of Surinam and the 'Koloniale Raad' of Curaçao have now come into force. The Governors may include women among the persons nominated by them to sit on these bodies."

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL
1936. V. 8. Addendum.

[Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: C. 543. M. 351. 1936. V.

Geneva, January 4th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

CONDITIONS OF VOTING REQUESTS FOR ADVISORY OPINIONS FROM THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND FROM THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

CONTENTS.

	Page
Note by the Secretary-General	1
Government Observations of :	
Australia	2
Belgium	2
United Kingdom	2
China	3
Denmark	3
Ecuador	4
Estonia	4
Finland	5
Latvia	5
Netherlands	5
Poland	6
Portugal	11
Sweden	13
Turkey	14
Memorandum by the International Labour Office	15
Annex: Report presented by the Representative of Italy and adopted by the Council on January 23rd, 1936	17

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

In pursuance of the report adopted by the Council on January 23rd, 1936 (see Annex), the Secretary-General requested the Members of the League to communicate to him by November 1st any observations they might wish to make on the question " in what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion may be requested under Article 14 of the Covenant " (*i.e.*, an advisory opinion of the Permanent Court).

The replies which have been received are reproduced in the present document, which the Secretary-General has the honour to submit to the Council and circulate to the Members of the League.

The Director of the International Labour Office has requested the Secretary-General to communicate to the Council the memorandum reproduced below. The subject there discussed was in 1929 brought to the attention of the Committee of Jurists on the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice in a memorandum which that Committee decided to communicate to the Council, but it was not discussed by the Council.[1]

[1] The document distributed to the Council (document C.146.1929.V), now out of print, consisted of the memorandum of the International Labour Office and a letter from the Chairman of the Committee of Jurists to the Director of the International Labour Office (for these documents and for the discussion in the Committee of Jurists, which considered itself incompetent, see Minutes of the Committee of Jurists, pages 75 and 76 and Annexes 5 and 13).

S. d. N. 690 (F.) 640 (A.) 1/37. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1936. V. 9.

GOVERNMENT OBSERVATIONS.

Australia.

Telegram of November 3rd, 1936.

Commonwealth Government of Australia is in favour of necessity for unanimity by Council or Assembly under Article 14 of Covenant pertaining to requests for advisory opinions in all cases where the question relates to a substantive dispute or to the validity of material legal contentions. If the question is definitely one of procedure then the Commonwealth Government feels that a simple majority should be sufficient.

Belgium.

[*Translation.*] November 3rd, 1936.

The Government considers that the adverse vote of a minority of its members cannot prevent the Council's asking the Court for an advisory opinion.

In the light of a most valuable principle, to which the Secretariat has drawn the attention of Member States, it can, in the first place, be allowed that the opposition of one or both the parties need not prevent the Council from validly deciding to seek the opinion of the Court. Nor is there any reason why the opposition of any other Member of the Council should be allowed to prevent the Council's proceeding with its request.

It has been suggested that the procedure might be varied according as to whether the opinion would, or would not, deal directly with the substance of the dispute, whether it would, or would not, prejudge the substance of the dispute or, lastly, whether it would, or would not, be dealing with a specific case. These distinctions are certainly worthy of consideration; but apart from the fact that they would frequently be difficult to apply in practice, their adoption would necessitate the amendment of the Covenant, whereas the solution advocated above would only require agreement on a certain — logical and reasonable — interpretation of the present provisions of the Covenant. A request for an advisory opinion may, indeed, be regarded as a question of procedure, not requiring unanimity but merely a majority, irrespective of whether the opinion deals with a question of form or a question of substance. This view would appear to be all the more justified as the request for an advisory opinion is merely one of the Council's means of having light thrown on problems referred to it, and such opinions are not in themselves binding.

United Kingdom.

October 23rd, 1936.

In the resolution adopted by the Assembly in 1928, the question at issue was put as follows: " Whether the Council or the Assembly may, by a simple majority, ask for an advisory opinion within the meaning of Article 14 of the Covenant ". A study of the discussions which have taken place on this point in various organs of the League and of the opinions expressed by text-book writers seems to show that if the question is put in this way, so that the answer must be a simple " Yes " or " No ", applicable to all cases, there is a wide divergence of views both between Members of the League and between the jurists who have written on the subject, and it does not seem likely that further study of the question would result in unanimity.

In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are disposed to think that the question is not really one to which a simple affirmative or negative answer, applicable in all circumstances, can be given, and they note that in the resolution adopted by the Assembly of 1935 the question is put in a different form: " In what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion may be requested under Article 14 of the Covenant ".

The view which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are at present disposed to adopt is that the question whether unanimity is necessary for a decision to ask for an advisory opinion, or whether it is to be regarded as a matter of procedure for which a simple majority suffices, depends upon the circumstances of the case and the nature of the question which it is proposed to put to the Court. It is not difficult to imagine circumstances (particularly when the Council or the Assembly is not dealing with a dispute) where a decision to ask for an advisory opinion may properly be regarded as a matter of procedure within the meaning of Article 5 (2) of the Covenant. On the other hand, where the Council or the Assembly is dealing with a dispute, and the question which it is proposed to put to the Court relates to the substance of the dispute (or to the validity of material legal contentions advanced by one party or the other), so that the effect of the opinion would be substantially equivalent to deciding the dispute between the parties, His Majesty's Government consider that the absolute unanimity prescribed in Article 5 (1) is necessary. The Covenant imposes on the Members of the League no obligation to submit any particular dispute to judicial settlement (except in so far as such an obligation may result from Article 12 in the case of a dispute likely to lead to a rupture), and such an obligation can only result from commitments which a State

has voluntarily accepted, either by signing the Optional Clause or in some other manner. In the case of a dispute to which no such commitment is applicable, it appears to His Majesty's Government impossible to interpret the last sentence of Article 14 of the Covenant in such a way as to enable a Member of the League to be forced against its will to submit the dispute to the Permanent Court. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are not impressed by the argument which in this connection is based upon the distinction between a decision of the Permanent Court and an advisory opinion. There has never been a case yet in which the Council has not acted upon an advisory opinion which it has requested, and if the opinion is not to be acted upon, to obtain it would serve no useful purpose, while a failure by the Council to act upon it might well be regarded as lacking in respect to the Court. Moreover, the practice and procedure of the Court in dealing with advisory opinions have now been largely assimilated to that applicable in contentious cases. For these reasons, and in view of the authority which attaches to an opinion by the Permanent Court, His Majesty's Government find it impossible in the present connection to draw any practical distinction between the effect of a judgment and that of an advisory opinion. In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government consider that, where the matter which it is proposed to refer to the Court relates to the substance of a dispute, it is impossible to regard the matter as one of procedure, and that to hold that in such a case an advisory opinion can be asked for by a simple majority would be inconsistent with the principles adopted by the League in dealing with the judicial settlement of disputes.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom do not propose in this memorandum to discuss the question whether, in certain circumstances, " limited unanimity " — *i.e.*, excluding the representatives of the interested parties — may suffice. They are, however, not at present convinced that cases exist where a rule other than absolute unanimity or a simple majority is applicable, at any rate in the absence of a definite treaty provision to that effect.

His Majesty's Government are therefore disposed to think that the question under discussion is not one to which an answer of universal application can be given, but must be determined according to the circumstances of each particular case, the general principle being that a simple majority suffices where the question is really one of procedure, but that unanimity is required where something more than procedure is involved, particularly where the question which it is proposed to put to the Court relates to the substance of a dispute. If this be the correct principle, it would obviously be impossible to lay down any hard and fast criterion for deciding into which category a particular case falls, and there would no doubt be border-line cases, but on the basis of this principle a jurisprudence could probably be developed which should enable most cases, at any rate, to be decided without serious difficulty.

China.

[*Translation.*] November 26th, 1936.

The Chinese Government, having studied this question, pronounces definitely in favour of a majority vote in the Assembly or the Council for requests for advisory opinions from the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The Chinese Government does not think it necessary to recapitulate all the arguments that have already been advanced in support of this view. It would merely point out that its attitude, dictated by the desire to found international relations on a basis of law, is in strict conformity with the attitude adopted by China in her relations with other States. A faithful supporter of the Covenant, the Chinese Government is prepared to agree to anything that may facilitate the development of the law, the prescriptions of which all the Members of the League have undertaken to observe " as the actual rule of conduct among Governments".

Furthermore, in the Chinese Government's view, a request for an advisory opinion from the Court is a matter of procedure, and should therefore be decided by a majority vote in the Assembly or the Council, as provided in Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Covenant.

Denmark.

[*Translation.*] August 20th, 1936.

The Danish Government considers that there can be no legitimate doubt that an advisory opinion may be asked from the Court by the Council or the Assembly by a resolution adopted by a simple majority. The Danish Government cannot recognise the justice of the chief argument put forward in support of the necessity of a unanimous resolution — namely, that in practice such an opinion is considered to possess an authority equal to that of a judgment strictly so-called, and that a simple majority of the Council or the Assembly can thus produce a final decision in a dispute involving a State which has not consented to a legal decision by the Court. The question of the authority to be attached in practice to the Court's advisory opinions must depend in each particular case on the contents of those opinions, and has nothing to do with the question of the necessity of unanimity or a majority in bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Danish Government considers that this is a case falling under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Covenant.

GOVERNMENT OBSERVATIONS.

Australia.

Telegram of November 3rd, 1936.

Commonwealth Government of Australia is in favour of necessity for unanimity by Council or Assembly under Article 14 of Covenant pertaining to requests for advisory opinions in all cases where the question relates to a substantive dispute or to the validity of material legal contentions. If the question is definitely one of procedure then the Commonwealth Government feels that a simple majority should be sufficient.

Belgium.

[*Translation.*] November 3rd, 1936.

The Government considers that the adverse vote of a minority of its members cannot prevent the Council's asking the Court for an advisory opinion.

In the light of a most valuable principle, to which the Secretariat has drawn the attention of Member States, it can, in the first place, be allowed that the opposition of one or both the parties need not prevent the Council from validly deciding to seek the opinion of the Court. Nor is there any reason why the opposition of any other Member of the Council should be allowed to prevent the Council's proceeding with its request.

It has been suggested that the procedure might be varied according as to whether the opinion would, or would not, deal directly with the substance of the dispute, whether it would, or would not, prejudge the substance of the dispute or, lastly, whether it would, or would not, be dealing with a specific case. These distinctions are certainly worthy of consideration; but apart from the fact that they would frequently be difficult to apply in practice, their adoption would necessitate the amendment of the Covenant, whereas the solution advocated above would only require agreement on a certain — logical and reasonable — interpretation of the present provisions of the Covenant. A request for an advisory opinion may, indeed, be regarded as a question of procedure, not requiring unanimity but merely a majority, irrespective of whether the opinion deals with a question of form or a question of substance. This view would appear to be all the more justified as the request for an advisory opinion is merely one of the Council's means of having light thrown on problems referred to it, and such opinions are not in themselves binding.

United Kingdom.

October 23rd, 1936.

In the resolution adopted by the Assembly in 1928, the question at issue was put as follows: " Whether the Council or the Assembly may, by a simple majority, ask for an advisory opinion within the meaning of Article 14 of the Covenant ". A study of the discussions which have taken place on this point in various organs of the League and of the opinions expressed by text-book writers seems to show that if the question is put in this way, so that the answer must be a simple " Yes " or " No ", applicable to all cases, there is a wide divergence of views both between Members of the League and between the jurists who have written on the subject, and it does not seem likely that further study of the question would result in unanimity.

In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are disposed to think that the question is not really one to which a simple affirmative or negative answer, applicable in all circumstances, can be given, and they note that in the resolution adopted by the Assembly of 1935 the question is put in a different form: " In what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion may be requested under Article 14 of the Covenant ".

The view which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are at present disposed to adopt is that the question whether unanimity is necessary for a decision to ask for an advisory opinion, or whether it is to be regarded as a matter of procedure for which a simple majority suffices, depends upon the circumstances of the case and the nature of the question which it is proposed to put to the Court. It is not difficult to imagine circumstances (particularly when the Council or the Assembly is not dealing with a dispute) where a decision to ask for an advisory opinion may properly be regarded as a matter of procedure within the meaning of Article 5 (2) of the Covenant. On the other hand, where the Council or the Assembly is dealing with a dispute, and the question which it is proposed to put to the Court relates to the substance of the dispute (or to the validity of material legal contentions advanced by one party or the other), so that the effect of the opinion would be substantially equivalent to deciding the dispute between the parties, His Majesty's Government consider that the absolute unanimity prescribed in Article 5 (1) is necessary. The Covenant imposes on the Members of the League no obligation to submit any particular dispute to judicial settlement (except in so far as such an obligation may result from Article 12 in the case of a dispute likely to lead to a rupture), and such an obligation can only result from commitments which a State

has voluntarily accepted, either by signing the Optional Clause or in some other manner. In the case of a dispute to which no such commitment is applicable, it appears to His Majesty's Government impossible to interpret the last sentence of Article 14 of the Covenant in such a way as to enable a Member of the League to be forced against its will to submit the dispute to the Permanent Court. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are not impressed by the argument which in this connection is based upon the distinction between a decision of the Permanent Court and an advisory opinion. There has never been a case yet in which the Council has not acted upon an advisory opinion which it has requested, and if the opinion is not to be acted upon, to obtain it would serve no useful purpose, while a failure by the Council to act upon it might well be regarded as lacking in respect to the Court. Moreover, the practice and procedure of the Court in dealing with advisory opinions have now been largely assimilated to that applicable in contentious cases. For these reasons, and in view of the authority which attaches to an opinion by the Permanent Court, His Majesty's Government find it impossible in the present connection to draw any practical distinction between the effect of a judgment and that of an advisory opinion. In these circumstances, His Majesty's Government consider that, where the matter which it is proposed to refer to the Court relates to the substance of a dispute, it is impossible to regard the matter as one of procedure, and that to hold that in such a case an advisory opinion can be asked for by a simple majority would be inconsistent with the principles adopted by the League in dealing with the judicial settlement of disputes.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom do not propose in this memorandum to discuss the question whether, in certain circumstances, " limited unanimity " — *i.e.*, excluding the representatives of the interested parties — may suffice. They are, however, not at present convinced that cases exist where a rule other than absolute unanimity or a simple majority is applicable, at any rate in the absence of a definite treaty provision to that effect.

His Majesty's Government are therefore disposed to think that the question under discussion is not one to which an answer of universal application can be given, but must be determined according to the circumstances of each particular case, the general principle being that a simple majority suffices where the question is really one of procedure, but that unanimity is required where something more than procedure is involved, particularly where the question which it is proposed to put to the Court relates to the substance of a dispute. If this be the correct principle, it would obviously be impossible to lay down any hard and fast criterion for deciding into which category a particular case falls, and there would no doubt be border-line cases, but on the basis of this principle a jurisprudence could probably be developed which should enable most cases, at any rate, to be decided without serious difficulty.

China.

[*Translation.*] November 26th, 1936.

The Chinese Government, having studied this question, pronounces definitely in favour of a majority vote in the Assembly or the Council for requests for advisory opinions from the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The Chinese Government does not think it necessary to recapitulate all the arguments that have already been advanced in support of this view. It would merely point out that its attitude, dictated by the desire to found international relations on a basis of law, is in strict conformity with the attitude adopted by China in her relations with other States. A faithful supporter of the Covenant, the Chinese Government is prepared to agree to anything that may facilitate the development of the law, the prescriptions of which all the Members of the League have undertaken to observe " as the actual rule of conduct among Governments".

Furthermore, in the Chinese Government's view, a request for an advisory opinion from the Court is a matter of procedure, and should therefore be decided by a majority vote in the Assembly or the Council, as provided in Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Covenant.

Denmark.

[*Translation.*] August 20th, 1936.

The Danish Government considers that there can be no legitimate doubt that an advisory opinion may be asked from the Court by the Council or the Assembly by a resolution adopted by a simple majority. The Danish Government cannot recognise the justice of the chief argument put forward in support of the necessity of a unanimous resolution — namely, that in practice such an opinion is considered to possess an authority equal to that of a judgment strictly so-called, and that a simple majority of the Council or the Assembly can thus produce a final decision in a dispute involving a State which has not consented to a legal decision by the Court. The question of the authority to be attached in practice to the Court's advisory opinions must depend in each particular case on the contents of those opinions, and has nothing to do with the question of the necessity of unanimity or a majority in bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Danish Government considers that this is a case falling under Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Covenant.

Ecuador.

[*Translation.*] September 24th, 1936.

Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations mentions as a function (compulsory and not optional) of the Permanent Court of International Justice that of giving an advisory opinion on any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

According to the system laid down in the Covenant (Article 5, paragraph 1), however, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting. But this unanimity can only be necessary for questions of substance discussed and settled either by the Assembly or the Council in pursuit of the essential aims assigned to the organs of the League of Nations in the preamble to the Covenant.

A mere request for an opinion to the Permanent Court of International Justice may be a preliminary to the institution of proceedings before the same Court, the Assembly or the Council ; and in this sense it is not a question of substance requiring unanimity for decisions. We therefore consider paragraph 2 of the same Article 5 to be applicable to these cases, this paragraph laying down that all matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council shall be regulated by those bodies and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

Questions of procedure may, however, arise in connection with matters already under consideration by the Assembly or the Council which may require an opinion from the Permanent Court to clear up certain points. In such a case, a simple majority of votes is sufficient for submitting a request for an advisory opinion to the Court. But it is also possible that any Government Member of the League, which is represented on the Assembly or the Council, may desire, with a view to clearing up any point of international law or of the interpretation of treaties, or other similar matters, to propose to the Council or the Assembly the desirability of consulting the Court ; in such a case, those bodies may accept the proposal by a simple majority of votes and ask the Court for an opinion, this possibility being also provided for in Article 17, paragraph 1, of the Covenant.

Accordingly, in the Government of Ecuador's view, the system laid down in the Covenant and the provisions of Article 14, Article 5, paragraphs 1 and 2, and Article 17, paragraph 1, taken in conjunction with the fundamental aims mentioned in the preamble of the Covenant, are such as to make it quite clear that the Assembly and the Council are fully entitled to address requests for an advisory opinion to the Permanent Court of International Justice by a simple majority of votes.

Estonia.

[*Translation.*] September 7th, 1936.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs has the honour to communicate the following observations concerning advisory opinions.

Advisory opinions are a means by which the Council or Assembly can consult the Court on any dispute or point of law.

So long as it is a question of obtaining advisory opinions to clear up points of law on matters arising in the conduct of ordinary League business which are not directly prejudicial to the interest of any Member, the Estonian Government can see no objection to such opinions being regarded as mere matters of procedure ; it is therefore in favour of enabling the Council and Assembly to request such opinions by a mere majority vote. Insistence on unanimity in such cases would make procedure unduly rigid and thus might hamper the organs of the League in their work.

The question takes on a different aspect when an advisory opinion is designed to assist the Council in settling a dispute submitted to it by the parties, or one of the parties, under a provision of the Covenant. An advisory opinion, in regard to which the Court deliberately follows the contentious procedure, is more or less equivalent to a judgment and places the Council in possession of the legal bases of any settlement of the dispute. Having regard to the very high authority which the Court enjoys, it must be recognised that, in practice, if not in law, its opinion is binding upon the Council. In this way, a request for an advisory opinion has the effect of substituting legal proceedings before the Court for conciliation proceedings before the Council. Being firmly attached to the principle of compulsory arbitration, the Estonian Government would not object to this, but would prefer that the Court's competence in such cases should be explicitly defined and that States should be asked to consent beforehand to the reference of their disputes, pending before the Council, to the Court for an advisory opinion. The Estonian Government considers, moreover, that such consent might be given by means of a special protocol similar to that embodying the valuable optional clause providing for the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

This method would also have the advantage of avoiding discussion on the thorny question whether the relevant decisions require unanimity or merely a majority. As the consent of the parties would have been given in advance, the Council can take its decision without concerning itself with the opposition of either of the parties, which hitherto has constituted the most serious impediment to the Council's action in such matters. As the votes of the parties would no longer be taken into account, the unanimity rule could be applied without any question arising.

Finland.

[*Translation.*] October 29th, 1936.

In connection with the proposals for the reform of the Covenant, the Finnish Government, in agreement with the Governments of the other northern countries, has already expressed the opinion that it would be eminently desirable that requests for advisory opinions of the Permanent Court of International Justice should be facilitated and that it should therefore be agreed, at least as a general rule, that such requests may be conveyed to the Court as the result of mere majority decisions. Such is still the Finnish Government's view. If, however, the other Member States of the League of Nations are not all prepared to accept such a rule outright, the Finnish Government ventures to suggest a compromise solution based upon a classification of the cases in regard to which advisory opinions might be requested. The Finnish Government has no desire to deal exhaustively with this aspect of the problem in the present memorandum and confines itself to pointing out that certain advisory opinions may not involve more than the elucidation of a legal point incidental to a much bigger problem. In such a case, the advisory opinion would not prejudge that problem in its entirety, so that here at least a simple majority decision in favour of the request should be all that is required. It is, however, conceivable that, even in cases in which the advisory opinion merely deals with one detail of a comprehensive problem, the Court cannot settle that detail without so far prejudging the main issue that, by implication, its opinion settles the latter also. In such cases, a stricter procedure in respect of votes on requests for advisory opinions would perhaps be justified. This applies *a fortiori* to cases in which the subject of the advisory opinion is not merely one detail of a comprehensive problem but the whole matter at issue.

If such a classification of the cases in regard to which advisory opinions might be requested is accepted as a basis for the rules governing votes, it will still be necessary to face the fact that, generally speaking, their application will require to be studied separately in regard to each case as it arises.

Latvia.

[*Translation.*] December 22nd, 1936.

While it does not feel able to express any definite opinion for or against the necessity of a unanimous vote by the Council or the Assembly on requests for advisory opinions, the Latvian Government would stress the fact that the chief difficulty does not appear to lie in the question frequently raised during the discussions on the conditions of voting requests for advisory opinions, and particularly in the First Committee in 1928, as to whether such a vote must be unanimous, or whether a simple majority may suffice, but rather in the question what weight and what authority should be attached to advisory opinions given by the Permanent Court of International Justice.

This points to a distinction between requests for advisory opinions relating to disputes and those dealing with points of law, and it would be more practical to turn this distinction into one between requests for advisory opinions entailing political consequences and requests for opinions which do not entail such consequences.

While it realises the existing difficulties, which would also have to be overcome in order to decide in which of these two classes a request for an advisory opinion should be placed, the Latvian Government is inclined to think that the best solution would be to decide that a simple majority will suffice in the case of the second class of requests, while a unanimous vote would remain the rule in the case of the first class.

Netherlands.

[*Translation.*] October 29th, 1936.

At the sixteenth Assembly, in the course of the discussion in the First Committee, it was suggested that the decline in the business of the Court might be due to the conditions which hitherto have governed the obtaining of advisory opinions from it. Assuming this to be correct, such consultation might become more frequent were it laid down that henceforward decisions to request an opinion might be taken by a majority vote of the Council. Though it would have been happy to contribute, through its reply, to a solution likely to increase the Court's activities, the Netherlands Government cannot support an interpretation of the Covenant under which decisions to request an advisory opinion might, as a general rule, be taken by a majority of the Council. In the minds of the authors of the Covenant, the unanimity rule, as laid down in Article 5, was one of the essential principles of the League's constitution, so that it may only be disregarded in cases in which an exception has expressly been made. To regard the consultation of the Court as a matter of procedure within the meaning of paragraph 2 of Article 5 of the Covenant would, however, appear to be inadmissible. Even though the Court's opinions are binding neither upon the Council nor upon the parties, it must nevertheless be recognised that the distinction between consultation of the Court and the appointment of a committee of experts is enhanced by the Court's

unique position as the juridical organ of the community of nations. It is scarcely likely that, having refrained from making the Court's jurisdiction compulsory, the authors of the Covenant would have attempted, by this indirect means, to compel States to agree to all disputes being taken before the Court, irrespective of their wishes. The fact that the Court itself has more and more closely assimilated its advisory procedure to its contentious procedure is a further reason for ceasing to regard consultation of the Court as a matter of procedure.

In the opinion of the Netherlands Government, the only cases in which the principle of unanimity may really be departed from are those in which unanimity in the Council is, under special provisions, not required for decisions on the merits. Such a case might arise if the Council were empowered, under a special Convention, to take decisions on the merits of a case by a majority vote. Similarly, in the event of a dispute between two Members of the League which is likely to lead to a rupture and is brought before the Council under Article 15 of the Covenant, the Council would be entitled to ask the Court for an advisory opinion even if the parties did not consent. For it would appear to be illogical that, while competent to decide upon the merits of a dispute without the parties' consent, the Council should require to obtain such consent in order to ask the Court for an opinion on points of law arising in the course of its examination of the dispute. The attitude taken up by the Permanent Court in the case of Eastern Carelia in 1923, when it declared itself unable to give an opinion because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics refused to take part in the proceedings, is not in contradiction with the rule set forth above, as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was not then a Member of the League.

Poland.

[*Translation.*] September 22nd, 1936.

On September 28th, 1935, the Assembly expressed the desire that the Council "should examine in what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion might be requested under Article 14 of the Covenant".

The Council having asked, by its resolution of January 23rd, 1936, to be informed of the views of Members of the League on this subject, the Polish Government now has the honour, in reply to the Secretariat's invitation, to communicate the following observations :

The real crux of the problem which the Council is called upon to consider is whether the decision to apply to the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion under Article 14 of the Covenant must necessarily be unanimous, or whether a majority vote may suffice.

This being a legal question, its solution should be attempted by legal methods. Such a solution cannot, moreover, be sought elsewhere than in the Covenant itself, more particularly in Article 5, which governs the matter and which reads as follows :

> " 1. Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.
>
> " 2. All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting."

This text suggests two observations. In the first place, paragraph 1 does not merely say " except where otherwise provided " but " except where otherwise *expressly* provided ", to emphasise the strictness of the rule laid down. In the second place, paragraph 2 enumerates the exceptions to the rule in paragraph 1, so that its terms are in no wise amenable to extensive interpretation.

Apart from a few occasions on which it was merely raised incidentally, the problem of the conditions of voting requests for advisory opinions was first brought up in general in 1926 at the Conference of States Signatories of the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which had been called together to examine the reservations attached by the American Senate to the accession of the United States. The fifth of these reservations was obviously prompted by the conviction that requests for advisory opinions are governed by the unanimity rule. This is very clearly confirmed by the following passage from a speech by Senator Walsh :

> " Under the Covenant of the League of Nations, each of the great nations had a representative on the Council of the League ; and any one of them, therefore, because the Council proceeds by unanimity, can prevent submission to the Court of any request for an advisory opinion which it does not want to have submitted. This reserve gives to the United States exactly the same power. . . . "

The fifth American reservation gave rise to protracted discussions in which, however, no real attempt was made to come to grips with the problem. For the most part, speakers merely pointed out the difficulties of the question, while recognising that the Conference was not competent to settle it. In the end, the Conference confined itself to expressing the view that, in any case, the United States should be assured of a position of equality with Members of the League.

Consideration of the American reservations was resumed in 1929 concurrently with the proceedings for the revision of the Statute of the Court. A Committee of Jurists framed a

draft protocol which was adopted by the Conference of States and subsequently signed by almost all the Members of the League. Although that protocol laid down no specific rule regarding the voting of requests for advisory opinions, paragraph 5 was so drafted as to appear indirectly to recognise the need for unanimity.

The problem was formally brought before the First Committee of the Assembly in 1928 through a motion of the Swiss delegation recommending the Council " to consider whether it would not be desirable to submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice, for an advisory opinion, the question whether the Council or the Assembly can, by a simple majority, request an advisory opinion under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations ".

The Swiss proposal led to a comprehensive discussion in which clear-cut opinions were for the first time expressed. On the substance of the question, opinion was divided; nevertheless, the predominant view was that recourse to the Court would be premature and inadvisable and that it would be wiser to leave the question open and not attempt to force an immediate solution. The report of the Committee merely expressed the hope " that the Council would have a study made of the question when circumstances permitted."

The Swiss proposal was revived in 1935 by five States: Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. After keen discussion, in which the views of 1928 were repeated even more categorically, the First Committee submitted its report to the Assembly. The latter adopted the resolution referred to at the beginning of this statement.

To leave no doubt as to its attitude to this problem, the Polish Government must state that, in its view, decisions of the Council or the Assembly to request advisory opinions must always be absolutely unanimous.

This opinion, which the Polish Government has already maintained on several occasions, has a secure and firm foundation both in the provisions of the Covenant and in the real character of advisory opinions.

* * *

It is clear from the various discussions of this problem that the chief legal argument — and in the present instance, legal considerations are paramount — advanced in favour of the theory that a majority vote is enough, is that advisory opinions have not the same binding force as judgments. As its name implies — it is argued — an advisory opinion is one which does not bind the authority by which it is requested. The Council is always free to adopt or reject it. The Council, it is true, has generally tended to fall in with the views expressed in advisory opinions, but that is merely due to the Court's prestige. A request for an advisory opinion is, therefore, nothing more than a form of investigation. Intrinsically, it does not differ from the appointment of a committee of enquiry or a committee of experts — in other words, it is a mere matter of procedure which, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, the Council or Assembly can decide by a simple majority vote.

The weaknesses of such reasoning are sufficiently obvious. In the first place, it should be observed that, even if it were true that the Council remains entirely free to adopt the Court's opinions or not, as it thinks fit, it would by no means follow that such opinions are to be assimilated to the reports of a committee of enquiry. Even if advisory opinions were distinguished by no other features than their particularly authoritative character and the practical consequences that that entails, this would in itself prevent their being ranked with mere methods of investigation. In law, no doubt, advisory opinions have no binding force. The Council will nevertheless always tend to follow them, to avoid finding itself at variance with the Court.

The Council might, perhaps, have been able to retain a certain independence and freedom of action in regard to advisory opinions if the procedure had always been that of a consultation of the Court, in the strict sense of the term — that is to say, if the opinions were given confidentially and intended solely for the use of the Council, and if no contact were established with the parties. Such was, perhaps, the original idea of those by whom Article 14 of the Covenant was drafted, but in any case the Court departed from this conception from the very outset. It applied, in respect of opinions, the full contentious procedure with the same opportunities for argument on both sides and the same publicity; it has even provided in the Rules of the Court for the appointment of national judges. In this connection, it is of interest to quote a passage from the report of a Committee of Three appointed by the Court in 1927 :[1]

> " The Court, in the exercise of this power, deliberately and advisedly assimilated its advisory procedure to its contentious procedure; and the results have abundantly justified its action. Such prestige as the Court to-day enjoys as a judicial tribunal is largely due to the amount of its advisory business and the judicial way in which it has dealt with such business. In reality, where there are, in fact, contending parties, the difference between contentious cases and advisory cases is only nominal. The main difference is the way in which the case comes before the Court . . . So the view that advisory opinions are not binding is more theoretical than real."

It should be noted that, until very recently, the Statute of the Court made no reference to the advisory procedure; the assimilation of the procedure in these two classes of cases was brought about by the Rules of the Court. The new Statute which came into force on February 1st, 1936, gave formal sanction to the previous practice and the provisions of the Rules of the Court by expressly providing in Article 68 as follows : " In the exercise of its advisory functions, the Court shall further be guided by the provisions of the Statute which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which it recognises them to be applicable ".

---

[1] See the fourth annual report of the Court, page 72.

The Court certainly cannot be blamed for attaching to its opinions the same procedural guarantees as to its judgments or for endowing them with increased value and authority. On the other hand, it is impossible to close one's eyes to this state of affairs and to its natural consequences.

The Court's attitude in the case of the status of Eastern Carelia gives an idea of its own conception of the task conferred upon it by Article 14 of the Covenant. In its Opinion of July 23rd, 1923, it expressed the following views :

> " The Court is aware of the fact that it is not requested to decide the dispute, but to give an advisory opinion. This circumstance, however, does not essentially modify the above considerations. The question put to the Court is not one of abstract law, but concerns directly the main point of the controversy between Finland and Russia, and can only be decided by an investigation into the facts underlying the case. Answering the question would be substantially equivalent to deciding the dispute between the parties. The Court, being a Court of Justice, cannot, even in giving advisory opinions, depart from the essential rules guiding their activity as a Court."

The foregoing observations on the Court's advisory functions are all the more valuable as they come from the most authoritative source. If the words " advisory opinions " could be given their ordinary and usual meaning — that on which the advocates of the majority rule attempt to base their argument — the absence of Russia could in no way have prevented the Court from expressing its opinion on the questions submitted to it in the light of the documentary material alone, though naturally — such information being incomplete — with the necessary reservations. The Court, however, refused to do this and gave the absence of Russia as its reason — a line of argument which can only be justified on the assumption that the consultation of the Court initiated a suit in the proper sense of the term. Similarly, the fact that Russia was not a member of the League could only affect the Council's competence in the matter; it could not constitute an obstacle preventing the Court from advising the Council on certain legal aspects of the case.

The close assimilation of the Court's advisory functions to those of a tribunal which declares the law — an assimilation, be it repeated, which was brought about at the very outset — is an established fact, which must be duly taken into account. It follows that, between the matters of procedure referred to in Article 5, paragraph 2, and a request for an advisory opinion, there is a difference which precludes any analogy between the two. The conclusions of the report of a committee of enquiry drawn up in private and in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Council and the pronouncements on points of law of an opinion are two totally different things ; the distinction between the two cannot, moreover, be reduced to the difference in the degree of authority enjoyed by the bodies from which they respectively emanate.

Advisory opinions, indeed, have come to resemble judgments of the Court ; they contribute to the same extent to the precedents of the Court and play the same part in its work of developing international law and deducing its rules.

The logical consequences of this position in fact and in law are easily perceptible. It has frequently been pointed out, with justice, that, in contentious cases, the recognition of the majority rule with regard to requests for advisory opinions is almost tantamount to imposing, by roundabout methods, compulsory arbitration on the parties contrary to Article 12 of the Covenant, which expressly leaves the parties free to choose between arbitration or judicial settlement and enquiry by the Council. It is clear that a party having recourse to the Council expects a political settlement of its case untrammelled by legal considerations. In such a case, a majority decision to consult the Court is equivalent to the substitution of a judicial for a political settlement without the consent of those concerned, with the additional risk that, once the case has been settled legally, the Council's proper task of mediation will become more difficult.

Even in matters where a clear-cut dispute has not developed, the importance of advisory opinions is no less great and their true character remains the same. Mention has already been made above of the importance of advisory opinions in the Court's body of precedents and of their importance in the development of the international law which governs relations between States. An advisory opinion involves findings on points of law which may affect the interests of States. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the effects of such opinions are not confined to the case in which they are rendered, but that, as is well known, their findings on points of law also influence the decisions of other jurisdictions.

The champions of the majority rule lay great emphasis upon the difference between the Council, as the political authority, and the Court, as the legal authority. When, they argue, the Council has recourse to the Court, it is solely to obtain information on certain points of law; the Court's legal findings are merely intended to guide the Council in reaching the final decision which it alone is competent to render.

Closer scrutiny of this argument soon reveals its fallacies.

If the Council requires enlightenment on certain questions of law, clearly that can only mean that such questions have actually been raised and that the States at issue are relying in their contentions on what they claim to be their rights. The Court, it is true, only pronounces upon the legal aspect of the case; but the Council could scarcely declare it to have been mistaken ; for the Council, the Court's opinion is bound to carry great weight, and its political task may well be complicated by such an opinion, with which it would be very difficult for it not to comply.

All these considerations directly raise the question whether, in the circumstances, such a serious step as a consultation of the Court can be regarded as equivalent to the appointment

of a mere committee of enquiry. Surely the answer can only be in the negative, and that would in itself be enough to settle the matter.

Opponents of the unanimity rule have professed to find an argument in Article 14 of the Covenant on the ground that, having signed the Covenant, Members of the League who bring a dispute before the Council know to what they are laying themselves open, as Article 14 provides that the Council may request an advisory opinion in all disputes.

This argument clearly is the result of confused thinking. No one would deny that the Council has power to consult the Court; the difficulty is how the decision to request such an opinion is to be taken. The two questions are distinct and are separately dealt with in the Covenant.

Consideration must also be given to another contention, according to which the unanimity theory would be contrary to the provisions of the Covenant or of special conventions empowering the Council to take decisions either by an ordinary majority vote, or by a special majority vote, or by a qualified unanimous vote — that is to say, unanimously, the votes of the parties to the dispute being left out of account, as provided, for example, in Article 15. It would, it is argued, be paradoxical to require unanimity for a request for an opinion when such unanimity is not necessary for a decision on the merits.

The force of this argument is seen to be only apparent when it is considered that, in the above-mentioned case, it is the provisions which establish special conditions in regard to voting which themselves invest the Council with power to pronounce upon the issues before it. By proceding in this way, the signatories of parties to the clauses in question gave the competence conferred by those clauses to the Council and only to the Council. To attempt, by the roundabout method of an advisory opinion and, without their consent, to have such matters decided by another authority would be the exact opposite of what they intended. In so far, therefore, as advisory opinions are concerned, unanimity is required in all the cases cited and for the same reason that applies to the cases dealt with in Article 15 of the Covenant.

The exact terms of Article 5 of the Covenant may now be usefully re-examined.

It is clear that, while enumerating certain exceptions to the unanimity rule, paragraph 2 is completely silent with regard to requests for advisory opinions. The fact becomes particularly significant when it is considered that, at the same time, Article 14 of the Covenant invested the Court, for the exclusive use of the Council and the Assembly, with advisory functions quite foreign to a court of justice. Had the authors of the Covenant intended that requests for advisory opinions were to be treated as " the matters of procedure " mentioned in paragraph 2, it is inconceivable that, while expressly mentioning the appointment of committees of enquiry whose character could scarcely be in doubt, they should have omitted to mention the very special powers of the Council and Assembly to consult the Court. The omission from the text of any reference to requests for advisory opinions supplies a decisive argument against any attempt to assimilate them to matters of procedure within the meaning of paragraph 2.

* * *

This study of the problem would be incomplete without consideration of the intermediate theories which were also put forward in the course of the discussions and which can be briefly summarised as follows :

(*a*) Advisory opinions may be requested by a majority decision, but if such opinions are of a nature to decide issues of substance, the majority must include the votes of the States parties to the dispute, unless they have accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

(*b*) The question of the conditions of voting requests for advisory opinions assumes a different complexion in each case, and the reply must vary according to circumstances. If the opinion requested would decide the substance of the dispute before the Council or the Assembly, the procedure in regard to the vote would be the same as that required in respect of the question actually at issue; as a rule, that is to say, a unanimous decision would be necessary. When the opinion would not have any bearing upon the substance of the dispute, a majority vote may suffice.

It will be seen that the first theory differs essentially from the second in that the only rule which it recognises is the majority rule, though at the same time it concedes that, in cases in which the opinion would decide issues of substance, the majority must include the parties. Both theories, however, have this in common; that they are prompted by considerations of practical expediency. Another and more important feature which they have in common and which perhaps derives from the first is that they both are entirely without any foundation in the provisions of the Covenant.

It need not be pointed out that the theory outlined under (*a*) above would introduce a new voting procedure unknown to the Covenant, in the text of which it would require to be inserted if it is to be generally binding. Such a procedure would be not so much a rule already embodied, even if only implicitly, in the provisions in force as an actual addition to the Covenant. Furthermore, is not the concession in regard to the parties to the dispute — obviously made to escape the criticism that they are being forced to accept compulsory arbitration — really a disavowal of the whole theory that a majority vote is sufficient on the ground that an advisory opinion is nothing more than a means of investigation ? If this is not the case, what logical reason can there be for the rule that the majority must include the votes of the parties to the dispute ?

Both theories would make procedure differ according to the questions put to the Court. There is no justification for making such a distinction in regards to the conditions for voting

a request for an opinion or for treating the request sometimes as a mere act of procedure and sometimes as a matter calling for unanimity. The questions brought before the Court may indeed vary, but the intrinsic character of the opinion does not change any more than the character of a judgment changes according, for example, as it deals with a plea to the jurisdiction, or is declaratory, or it orders a payment to be made. Whenever the Court gives an opinion, it rules upon a question of law, and thus each time adds to its body of precedents.

But even if for the moment we accepted the theory that on questions not affecting the substance of the dispute an opinion might be requested by a majority decision, the difficulty would then be to decide which questions came within this category.

It would be very difficult to lay down any hard and fast definition, and opinions on the matter might easily differ. Who then would decide between them ? Who is competent to decide ? In this connection, it is sufficient to recall the discussion which took place in the Council in 1931 in the course of the Sino-Japanese dispute, when it was proposed to send an invitation to the United States. We have here a new and no less complicated problem which creates a new difficulty and thereby makes both the above theories unworkable.

Similar practical considerations should be borne in mind when considering the all too frequent objection that the application of the unanimity rule to requests for advisory opinions paralyses the action of the Council. This argument should be used with some caution, especially when interpreting the Covenant. In the Covenant, there are many cases of the highest importance in which the Council might find itself greatly hampered by the need for unanimity. If the above argument is to be used, it will be necessary in all such cases to reduce this rule, which constitutes the fundamental principle of the League's constitutional charter, to a dead letter. No attenuation or modification of the unanimity rule can be introduced otherwise than through an amendment to the Covenant. In the form in which it is at present embodied in the Covenant, it is obligatory and must be strictly observed. To return once more to the above-mentioned argument, it is necessary to enquire whether there is any real justification for the assertion that the application of the unanimity rule to requests for advisory opinions hampers the Council in its work. If it requires enlightenment on a point of law, the Council can at any time apply to the Legal Section of the Secretariat or consult a committee of legal experts which it can set up by a mere majority vote. The argument is therefore without foundation.

* * *

After the foregoing legal considerations, attention may also be turned to the practical aspects of the problem.

It may be asserted with some confidence that the acceptance of the majority rule in respect of requests for opinions might be highly detrimental to the Court's prestige. Its opinions ought to be adopted by the Council and it must never be forgotten that such adoption must be unanimous. It cannot, however, be denied that, while unanimous agreement on the part of Members of the Council to approach the Court affords some guarantee that the latter's opinion will also be unanimously accepted, a procedure under which decisions to request opinions can be forced through by a majority vote would inevitably incline members of the minority to oppose the adoption of the Court's opinions ; and, obviously, it is not the theory that the advisory opinion binds no one and that the Council is free to reject it which would deter the dissentients from using their right of veto. As a result, cases in which the Court's opinions failed to secure adoption through lack of unanimity would become frequent. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the mischievous and harmful consequences which this would have for the prestige and authority of the highest international jurisdiction. In this connection, attention may very usefully be directed to the prudent warning of that eminent lawyer, now President of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Sir Cecil Hurst, who in 1928 was the United Kingdom delegation's representative on the Committee :

> " If it were now to be definitely laid down that a majority of the Council could seek the Court's opinion, it was necessary to consider what the effect of such a rule would be. Was it likely that the minority — against whose desires the question had been formulated — would accept that solution ? The almost inevitable result of the crystallisation of the doctrine that opinions might be asked for by a majority vote would be to divide the Council itself with respect to its practice of adopting without question the opinions rendered. Could that be a good result from the point of view of the Court's prestige ? It would reduce the Court to the level of a mere committee of enquiry."

In order to exhaust the problem, consideration must also be given to the suggestion that the question of the conditions of voting requests for opinions should be submitted to the Court for an advisory opinion. This was put forward in the first place at the Conference of States in 1926. The suggestion was revived in the Swiss proposal of 1928, and again by the five States in 1935.

The Polish Government does not think it useful or wise to have recourse to this procedure, the results of which, in its opinion, could not, in any case, prove entirely satisfactory.

There is little prospect of a request in that form being unanimously supported in the Council, though even the advocates of the majority rule could not in this case question the need for unanimity, as the matter would be no longer one of procedure in a specific case, but a question of the general interpretation of the Covenant. But even assuming that such unanimity is secured, the question would then arise of who is competent to interpret the Covenant. Is the Court itself competent to do so ? Undoubtedly it can interpret the

Covenant, like any other international Convention — but solely for the purposes of a specific case. Under Article 36 of its Statute, it can also settle disputes regarding the interpretation of a treaty, but only within the limits laid down in Article 59 of the Statute, which provides that the decision of the Court has no binding force except between the parties and in respect of the particular case. It is a generally recognised principle that the only authority competent to interpret a law is that by which the law was made. There can be no doubt that the Court is not competent to give an abstract interpretation of the Covenant which would be binding upon Members of the League and, finally, dispose of any difference of opinion in this respect. It may appositely be pointed out that, by a strange coincidence, the suggestion that the Court be asked finally to settle this matter by an advisory opinion was supported by the advocates of the majority rule, who emphasise the non-binding character of advisory opinions.

Nor can the Polish Government agree to the view that to settle this problem is a matter of any urgency. In this connection, it prefers to be guided by the wise and prudent practice of the Council, which has always attempted to obtain the unanimous consent of its Members before requesting an advisory opinion. The twenty-eight advisory opinions hitherto given by the Court, indeed, do not include a single precedent for a request decided upon by a mere majority vote. An attempt is sometimes made to use the case of Turkey in the matter of the frontiers of Iraq as an example of such a decision. But though the statements made by the Turkish delegate when the Court's opinion was adopted seem to show that Turkey had been opposed to the Court being consulted, the Minutes contain no evidence whatever of any formal opposition to the adoption of the report regarding the request for an advisory opinion; the case is not, therefore, conclusive.

The practice followed by the Council has had no unfortunate results on the cases considered. On the contrary, it has frequently been instrumental in avoiding painful conflicts, and also in safeguarding the Court's prestige. The Polish Government therefore considers that the proper course is to continue this practice, the results of which have not been bad, and which is in conformity with the Covenant.

Portugal.

[*Translation.*] November 1st, 1936.

The Council of the League of Nations has asked Member States to express their views on the question in what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion may be requested under Article 14 of the Covenant.

It should, at the outset, be emphasised that what is at present required of Member States is not that they should make proposals *de jure constituendo* — that is to say, indicate the system which they regard as most appropriate and most expedient in regard to advisory opinions — but that they should resolve questions *de jure constituto* — that is, *interpret* the Covenant in the light of the cases and circumstances in which the Council or Assembly may, according to positive international law, request an advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The question of whether the present system is good or bad or whether it should be maintained or abrogated is not at present at issue.

What is required is that the system should be defined and that an end should be put to the present diversity of interpretations and the uncertainties to which they give rise.

Legal Character and Binding Force of Advisory Opinions.

According to Article 14 of the Covenant, " the Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly."

The Court thus discharges a two-fold function, at once *judicial* and *advisory*, as it delivers *judgments* at the suit of the parties to disputes and *opinions*, at the request of the Council or Assembly, either upon *actual disputes* or upon *hypothetical questions* — that is to say, upon questions which are not the subject of an actual dispute or, in the words of the Court itself " d'une opposition de thèses juridiques ou d'intérêts entre deux personnes " (a conflict of legal claims or interests between two parties).

In the first case, the decisions taken are applicable as they stand; they have the force of *res judicata*, are legally binding upon the parties and have the character of authoritative awards — that is, of judgments in the strict sense of the term. In the second case, they are not applicable as they stand, do not possess the force of *res judicata* and are not binding upon the parties, where the subject is an actual dispute, or even upon the Council or Assembly, which can always depart from the Court's findings without infringing the Covenant; they are merely the *opinions* of an *advisory body*.

In a majority of cases, no doubt the Council or Assembly will, *in actual fact*, be bound by advisory opinions, as these issue from the authority officially recognised as most competent to settle questions of international law and to deal impartially with disputes between States.

Even after a question has been elucidated by the Permanent Court of International Justice, however, the Council or Assembly remain free, *legally*, to take such decisions as they may think fit, particularly — and this is a point of essential importance — as the Council issues its recommendation or recommendations as a *mediator*; they are therefore *political*

rather than legal in character, " the recommendations *which are deemed just and proper* in regard " to the dispute (Covenant, Article 15, paragraph 4).

Even when the advisory opinion has been delivered, there is, therefore, nothing to prevent the Council from drawing up a report at variance with its findings and from recommending a settlement which, though less strictly legal, is more appropriate to the circumstances, more likely to be freely accepted by *both parties* and more in keeping with the requirements of international peace and the common interests of the nations.

It may, however, be objected that though in any given dispute the Council may depart from the *legal findings* of the Court's opinion and recommend such political settlement as it deems proper, or even more equitable and, *de jure constituendo*, juster, the fact remains that it can no longer represent it as the settlement demanded by *positive law*, just as consultation of the Court on a given *point of law* would prevent the Council's taking decisions contrary to the Court's opinion on that point.

That means that though the Court's opinions are not *absolutely binding* upon the Council, which in any given dispute may always draw up a report containing recommendations which differ from the settlement suggested in the advisory opinion, they are nevertheless binding on the Council in that the latter cannot represent recommendations not in keeping with the advisory opinion as inevitable under international law, as this would mean dissenting from the Court's interpretation and application of that law.

Is this contention justified ?

We think not.

When a public authority is required by law to give opinions at the request of another authority, such opinions have no binding force unless the law explicitly provides to the contrary ; this is especially the case when the decisions of the consulting authority are not legally subordinated to prior consultation of the advisory authority.

Now, prior consultation of the Court is not provided for in Article 14 of the Covenant, which, moreover, does not make its advisory opinions binding.

Such being the case, the authority of such opinions, their binding force, if any, will be, not legal, but political or moral ; they will have no authority *de jure*, but merely *de facto*, and, in our opinion, the latter need not be taken into account in determining their legal character.

Neither is it possible to maintain that the judicial character of the Permanent Court prevents its acting in certain cases as a mere advisory body ; for though the desirability of investing the same tribunal with judicial and advisory duties is indeed open to discussion, there is *no legal impediment* to such a combination of functions, which is common in municipal law, particularly in the case of administrative tribunals.

Unanimity or Majority.

The question is asked whether Council or Assembly decisions to request an advisory opinion must always be unanimous, or whether a majority will suffice.

This question has been answered in various ways : some insist upon absolute unanimity, others are content with unanimity apart from the representatives of the parties to the dispute, while still others favour a mere majority decision — not to mention those who demand unanimity in some cases while contenting themselves with a mere majority in others.

What is the cause of these differences of opinion ?

Apart from certain exceptions expressly indicated in the Covenant, decisions both of the Council and Assembly always require the agreement of all members represented at the meeting (Article 5).

The whole problem is thus reduced to the question of whether there is or is not any special rule under which the decisions in question can be taken by a majority vote.

In certain quarters it is argued — to our opinion rightly — that such a rule is to be found in paragraph 2 of Article 5, which reads as follows :

> " *All questions of procedure* at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointing of committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly and by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting."

The point to be settled, therefore, is whether advisory opinions are or are not to be classed as matters of *procedure.*

Views differ, because while certain authorities on international law regard advisory opinions as mere opinions without binding force, others take the view that a request for an advisory opinion means leaving the dispute to be settled by the Court instead of the Council, or, in other words, that, in fact, a request for an advisory opinion is tantamount to a surrender of jurisdiction on the part of the authority to which the opinion is to be given.

Now, if the advisory opinion is binding upon the Council, if it is virtually to settle the dispute and if, therefore, what takes place is really a kind of *delegation of powers* to the Court, the request cannot, it is argued, be classed with mere *matters of procedure.*

Is this really the case ?

We have already seen that, legally speaking, advisory opinions are not binding upon the Council or Assembly, as their force is that not of arbitral or judicial decisions but of mere

opinions ; this is true, irrespective of their *de facto* authority or their moral or political force, and irrespective of the rules followed by the Court in framing them.

The Court's advisory procedure may be and, indeed, is attended by the same guarantees as those which ensure the legal value of its judicial decisions and justify the presumption *juris et de jure* that they are in accordance with the law ; the truth is, however, that such guarantees are not sufficient to alter the *legal* character of the Court's findings, which always take the form of a mere opinion and not of a judgment in the strict sense of the term.

There can be no doubt that an advisory opinion concerning any given dispute will be based upon a consideration of all the aspects of the case, so that the Court's findings will be in every way identical with the decision it would have taken had the parties asked it to determine the dispute judicially.

We repeat, however, that this identity of content is not enough to divest the advisory opinion of its peculiar legal character and justify its being considered, not as a mere opinion, but as a judgment.

It is indeed argued that, though the above statement is true in *abstract* law, in *theoretical* law, it is not in accordance with *real law* — that is, the law of actual realities — since the latter show that, save in quite exceptional cases, requests for advisory opinions are, in fact, equivalent to a complete *change of jurisdiction*, whereby the settlement of disputes is transferred from the Council or Assembly to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

That is true.

But as we have already shown, the *legal possibility* of the Court's opinion not being followed — a possibility which is in no way nullified by any *absolutely insurmountable* obstacle in actual practice — justifies the view that consultation of the Permanent Court is a mere matter of *procedure*, such as can be settled by a majority decision.

However great the moral and *de facto* authority of an advisory body, either in municipal or international law, it does not make that body's *opinions* binding unless such binding force is specifically conferred upon them by the rules defining the advisory body's jurisdiction.

If the law requires any administrative or deliberative body to consult a given advisory body without, however, specifically investing that body's opinions with *legal* binding force, failure to consult the advisory body would be universally regarded as a mere *procedural irregularity*, and consultation as a mere *matter of procedure*, unless at any given time it could be established that a rule of law had grown up through usage ; this is clearly not the case with regard to requests for advisory opinions, which, even if rarely, have nevertheless on occasion — at least twice — been decided on by a majority vote.

To sum up : the Permanent Court of International Justice may be *consulted* on *actual disputes* or *differences* or on *points of law* — that is to say, on questions not forming the subject of an actual dispute ; but in all these cases, the advisory opinions will always, legally speaking, be of a non-binding character and may therefore be requested either by the Council or by the Assembly in virtue of a majority decision.

Sweden.

[*Translation.*] October 30th, 1936.

The advisory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice is based upon Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which provides that " The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly ". The question on which the Circular Letter invites the Swedish Government to express an opinion is that of the rules which should govern Council or Assembly decisions regarding the consultation of the Court. The essential provisions in this matter are those of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 5 of the Covenant, which read as follows :

> " 1. Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.
>
> " 2. All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting."

The Swedish Government has on several occasions expressed the view that decisions relating to the consultation of the Court should be regarded as matters of procedure within the meaning of paragraph 2. That paragraph expressly provides that decisions to appoint committees to investigate particular matters, including therefore decisions to appoint a committee of jurists to examine a point of law, are to be regarded as matters of procedure. Now it is clear that the examination of a question of law by the Court affords the League in general, as well as the interested parties, fuller guarantees of reliability than its examination by a committee of jurists appointed *ad hoc*. If the majority rules are to be different in the two cases, it would appear that those governing decisions to consult the Court need not be as strict as the rules applicable to decisions to obtain the opinion of a committee of jurists, since

the risk that the Council or Assembly will be led to base its recommendations on an incomplete or unreliable consideration of the matter would be greater in the latter case than in the former.

To this argument it has been objected, more particularly, that, in practice, an advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice is binding upon the parties whose interests may be concerned. To admit that the Court may be consulted under a majority decision would therefore be tantamount — whenever the advisory opinion related to a current dispute — to obliging the parties by roundabout means to accept compulsory arbitration in disputes which they may have expressly excepted from the arbitration treaties to which they are parties or which they may be unwilling to submit to arbitration for some other reason.

To this objection the Swedish Government replies that it is, indeed, to be assumed that the Council or Assembly will fall in with the Court's findings on points of law, but that this does not in the least mean that its final recommendation will be confined to reproducing those findings.

In the case of a dispute brought before it under Article 15 of the Covenant, the Council is required to make known " the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto ". It may therefore, even while recognising that the contentions of one of the parties are justified in law, recommend a solution based on equity. Even though the Court may, for example, have stated that a claim for damages brought by either of the parties is legally justified, the Council is not thereby precluded from taking the view that the circumstances of the case call for a recommendation that the claim be reduced or even withdrawn. In such a case, the Court's opinion would have cleared up the legal position, without, however, having the character or the scope of an arbitral award. It should, moreover, be pointed out that even a unanimous recommendation adopted by the Council under Article 15 has not the same binding force as a legal judgment or an arbitral award, its effects being limited.

Or it might be that the question of law submitted to the Court merely represents one aspect of the dispute and that, for this reason alone, the Council cannot confine itself in its recommendation to a mere reproduction of the findings of the Court.

It should furthermore be pointed out that the fact that a majority decision was enough would not mean that every proposal to request the opinion of the Court would always obtain the support of a majority. If it was clear at the outset that a legal opinion could not contribute to the settlement of the dispute, there is, indeed, every reason to suppose that it would be impossible to find a majority to support recourse to the Court. In cases of this kind, so far as is known, the majority has never hitherto appointed a committee of jurists, even when it could unquestionably have done so.

The view that unanimity, including the votes of the parties, is always necessary before the Court can be asked for an advisory opinion would appear to lead to inadmissible results.

Under provisions of the Peace Treaties and certain special treaties, the Council is empowered to decide questions of substance by a mere majority vote. The contention that, when such a question is under examination, the Court cannot be consulted save by virtue of a unanimous decision would clearly be illogical.

The Council might also desire to consult the Court on a question held by a majority of its Members to be a question of procedure, but regarded by one of them as a question of substance requiring unanimity — *e.g.*, whether a State not represented on the Council should be invited to take part in its proceedings. In such a case, it would be equally inadmissible that the veto of a single Member should prevent the Council from asking the Court for an advisory opinion.

If, in connection with a dispute brought before the Council under Article 15 of the Covenant, one of the parties contends that the matter lies solely within its domestic jurisdiction, within the meaning of paragraph 8, the Council might desire to consult the Court and it would clearly be inadmissible to insist that it could not proceed to do so unless all its Members, including the parties, were agreeable.

These examples would appear to establish clearly that in any case the unanimity rule could not be accepted as generally applicable to the decisions here considered.

If in the view of any Member State it did not, by the mere fact of entering the League, agree that the Council or Assembly should be free to apply to the Court for an advisory opinion, even if certain of their members dissented, it is fully entitled to urge its own interpretation of the Covenant before the Court. If the Court were asked, against the wishes of any State, for an advisory opinion affecting its interests, that State could in the course of the proceedings defend its view and see that it was duly considered. The Court has, indeed, shown in practice that it believes that it should itself consider whether it can give an advisory opinion that has been requested by the Council without the agreement of one of the parties to the dispute.

Turkey.

[*Translation.*] November 2nd, 1936.

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs considers it to be preferable that requests for advisory opinions should be made by unanimous vote.

MEMORANDUM BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

1. On September 28th, 1935, the Assembly of the League of Nations adopted a resolution calling upon the Council to examine in what circumstances and subject to what conditions the Permanent Court of International Justice may be asked for advisory opinions under Article 14 of the Covenant. In pursuance of this resolution, the Council decided on January 23rd, 1936, to invite Members of the League to state their views on the subject.

The purpose of the present memorandum is to explain the attitude of the International Labour Office to the above-mentioned resolution of the Assembly.

2. The question whether decisions of the Council or Assembly to ask the Permanent Court of International Justice for advisory opinions must be unanimous or whether a majority vote is sufficient has long been a subject of debate. The various discussions on this subject have seemed to reveal a tendency to consider the question more or less in the abstract. The Labour Office prefers to adopt a different approach to the problem, its interest in the exercise of the Court's advisory jurisdiction being practical and specific. For the Labour Organisation, indeed, this is an organic question of fundamental importance.

3. Article 37 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation (Article 423 of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding articles of the other Treaties of Peace) reads as follows :

> " Any question or dispute relating to the interpretation of this Part of the present Treaty or of any subsequent convention concluded by the Members in pursuance of the provisions of this Part of the present Treaty shall be referred for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice."[1]

The effect of this article is to give the Permanent Court of International Justice a general jurisdiction over the activities of the International Labour Organisation.

4. Generally speaking, the Court's jurisdiction is of two kinds : the contentious jurisdiction, in which the Court's findings take the form of judgments, and the advisory jurisdiction, in which they take the form of opinions. Article 14 of the League Covenant provides, in the first place, that the Court " shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it " ; and, in the second place, that it " may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly ".

5. In the exercise of its contentious jurisdiction, the Court delivers judgments deciding between the parties. But according to Article 34 of its Statute, " only States or Members of the League of Nations may be parties in cases before the Court ". It follows that the contentious jurisdiction can only be exercised in the case of a dispute between States. Otherwise recourse can only be had to the Court under the advisory procedure. Not being States, the International Labour Organisation's own organs — that is, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office or the International Labour Conference — have no direct access to the Court ; so that their only means of bringing matters before it is recourse to the advisory procedure through the Council or Assembly, in accordance with Article 14 of the Covenant.

6. Experience has shown that, in practice, the Court's jurisdiction under Article 37 of the Constitution of the Labour Organisation normally takes the advisory form. On six different occasions, indeed, the Court has already passed upon questions directly concerning the Labour Organisation, and on each of these it was the advisory procedure that was followed. This fact alone suffices to show that, to the Labour Organisation, the conditions governing votes upon requests for an advisory opinion of the Court are a matter of vital importance. The manner in which this question is settled will, indeed, largely determine the Organisation's possibility of access to its proper judge.

7. During the discussions preceding the adoption by the Assembly of the resolution of September 28th, 1935, the general issue does not appear to have been regarded as entailing a choice between two mutually exclusive courses. It was maintained that the majority principle and the unanimity principle were not absolutely irreconcilable, and that the procedure to be adopted might vary according to the circumstances of each case. This view would appear to have prevailed, as the resolution adopted by the Assembly recommends the examination of " the question in what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion may be requested ".

However that may be, the Labour Office has no desire to express an opinion on the problem in general. It prefers to limit its remarks to the question of the exercise of the jurisdiction provided for in Article 37 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation. It proposes to show that, whatever the procedure thought to be expedient or necessary in other cases, there is no need for unanimity in the Council or Assembly in order to request the Court's opinion on the interpretation of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, or of the Conventions adopted thereunder.

---

[1] The French text of this provision reads as follows :

" Toutes questions ou difficultés relatives à l'interprétation de la présente Partie du présent Traité et des conventions ultérieurement conclues par les Membres, en vertu de ladite Partie, seront soumises à l'appréciation de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale."

8. In this connection, the most obvious argument is that, having been duly provided for, the jurisdiction defined in Article 37 of the Labour Organisation's Constitution must be allowed to function. Now under the various instruments by which these matters are at present governed, the power to consult the Court is vested exclusively in the Council and Assembly of the League. It therefore follows of necessity that, in order to obtain a decision of the Court in the form of an advisory opinion, the Labour Organisation is obliged to make application to the Council or Assembly.

On such occasions, the Council or Assembly doubtless may, of their own motion, add to the initial question any question they may choose, as their own right to consult the Court is unrestricted. But, in such cases, they could not entirely hold up such requests for an opinion, as this would be equivalent to preventing the exercise of the jurisdiction provided for in Article 37 of the Labour Organisation's Constitution. Under that article, the Council and Assembly have an organic function to perform, and it is inconceivable that they should be able, whenever they think fit, to evade the performance of a duty arising out of the very treaties by which they themselves were created.

9. The view that, in certain cases, the Court can only be asked for an advisory opinion if the Council or Assembly are unanimously in favour of such a request is to be explained by the fact that the Court's opinion is regarded as equivalent to a decision by the Council or Assembly themselves. Such is, indeed, usually the case, but it would appear to be obvious that insistence on unanimity would be quite unjustifiable when the Court's opinion is to be sought under a clause previously accepted by all members of the Council or Assembly. Now such precisely is the position in regard to a request for an opinion under Article 37 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation.

Members of the League are Members of the Labour Organisation also and, as such, are bound by Article 37 of the Organisation's Constitution. It is clear that the States Members of the Council or Assembly could not oppose the application of a provision previously accepted by and binding upon them all. It is scarcely conceivable that any State could refuse, as a Member of the Council or Assembly, to allow the exercise of a jurisdiction which it had formally accepted as a Member of the Labour Organisation. Even if, generally speaking, the unanimity principle be inherently reasonable, its application in such a case would clearly be contrary to all the canons of law.

10. It should further be pointed out that the procedure of the International Labour Organisation is not based upon the principle of unanimity. On the contrary, the Organisation's Constitution expressly provides that the decisions of the Organisation's competent organs require, according to circumstances, either a plain majority or a stated special majority. In no case does the Constitution require unanimity. The purpose of these rules would therefore be defeated if it were laid down that a unanimous decision of the Council or Assembly of the League is required to give effect to a request for an opinion formulated by a body whose decisions, as provided in the treaties, only require a majority.

11. In actual fact, the question of the conditions that should govern votes on requests for opinions to the Permanent Court of International Justice has, to some extent been linked up with the question of the accession of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Court. In this connection, it is important to note that, since August 20th, 1934, the United States has been a member of the International Labour Organisation. It therefore takes part in the sessions of the International Labour Conference and, on account of its industrial importance, is entitled, of right, to a seat upon the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. In this way, it is enabled to discuss, on a footing of perfect equality with all other States, any request for an advisory opinion arising within the Labour Organisation.

Generally speaking, moreover, it may be observed that, by becoming a Member of the International Labour Organisation, the United States accepted the provisions of Article 37, as of all the other articles of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation.

12. By inviting the Council to examine in what circumstances and subject to what conditions the Court may be asked for an advisory opinion, the Assembly would appear to have recognised, as stated above, that unanimity in the Council or Assembly is not, generally speaking, an indispensable condition which must be fulfilled before the advisory procedure can be set in motion.

The International Labour Office has deliberately confined itself in the present memorandum to considering the special case of requests for opinions addressed to the Court under Article 37 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation and initiated by its organs. It finds that, in this case, the Court's jurisdiction has been formally pre-established by an unambiguous text binding upon all Members of the League of Nations. Such being the case, it considers that the Council or Assembly is obliged to transmit to the Court any request for an advisory opinion under Article 37 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, and that, in such cases, the Council's or Assembly's decisions do not require to be unanimous.

ANNEX.

REPORT PRESENTED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF ITALY AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL ON JANUARY 23RD, 1936.

The resolution adopted by the Assembly on this subject on September 28th, 1935, was as follows :

" The Assembly,

" Whereas by its resolution of September 24th, 1928, it expressed the desire that the Council, when circumstances permitted, would have a study made of the question whether the Council or the Assembly may, by a simple majority, ask for an advisory opinion within the meaning of Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations ;

" Observing that such a study has not yet been made and that uncertainty on the matter still persists and may have contributed to diminish the activity of the Permanent Court of International Justice ;

" Considering that it is desirable for the security of the legal rights of Members of the League of Nations that, in cases where it appears indispensable for the accomplishment of the task of the Council or the Assembly that advice should be obtained on some point of law, such advice should, as a general rule, be requested from the Permanent Court of International Justice :

" Expresses the desire that the Council will examine the question in what circumstances and subject to what conditions an advisory opinion may be requested under Article 14 of the Covenant."

The Assembly wishes the Council to examine the circumstances and conditions in which, in application of Article 14 of the Covenant, an advisory opinion can be asked.

The mere statement of the question shows its complexity. It is, moreover, a question which has given rise to many discussions in which very different opinions have been put forward.

It seems, then, that it would be well that the Members of the League should have the opportunity of expressing their views.

Accordingly, subject to my colleagues' observations, I feel I may propose that the Council instruct the Secretary-General to invite the Members of the League to express their views, if they so desire, by a fixed date. This date should be chosen in such a way as to permit of a serious study of the problem. To facilitate this study, the Secretary-General might draw up for the use of the Members of the League a memorandum calling their attention to the occasions on which the problem has been discussed in various organs of the League and giving references to the principal authors who have examined it.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

(Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League).

Official No: C.543(a).M.351.1936.V.
Geneva, January 21st, 1937.

CONDITIONS OF VOTING REQUESTS FOR ADVISORY OPINIONS FROM THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS.

Note by the Secretary-General.

Since the publication of document C.543.M.351.1936.V., on January 4th, 1937, the following reply has been received:-

---

NORWAY.

January 13th, 1937.

The Norwegian Government being one of the signatories of the draft presented to the Assembly in 1935, does not feel that it is necessary to submit observations on the subject of the above-mentioned circular letter (C.L.63.1936.V.).

The Norwegian Government begs however to draw attention to the declarations made by the Norwegian delegate in the course of the discussion of this question in the First Committee of the Assembly.

Series of League of Nations
Publications
V.LEGAL
1936.V.9(a).

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

(Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League).

Official No : C.543(b) M.351(b) 1936.V.

Geneva, January 22nd, 1937.

CONDITIONS OF VOTING REQUESTS FOR ADVISORY OPINIONS FROM THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS.

Note by the Secretary-General.

Since the publication of document C.543(a). M.351(a).1936.V., on January 21st, 1937, the following reply has been received :

SWITZERLAND

(Translation) January 20th, 1937.

The Federal Council does not feel that it is necessary to present further observations on the subject of advisory opinions. As you are aware, the question was raised by Switzerland in 1928, and we had the occasion at the Assembly of 1928 and that of 1935 to express our views. We have nothing particular to add to the observations already made; perhaps only we might renew the expression of our desire that a study of this question should be undertaken by the Council of the League of Nations.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V.LEGAL
1936.V.9(b)

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937

1 - 12

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

League of Nations Publications.

V. LEGAL.

Ser. L.o.N. P.		Pages
1937.V.1.	Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism — Report adopted by the Committee on April 26th, 1937.	269-275
1937.V.2.	Conditions of voting Requests for Advisory Opinions from the Permanent Court of International Justice — Observations submitted by the Government of Chile.	276
1937.V.3.	Status of Women — Communications received from Governments and Women's International Organisations since September 1936.	277-317
1937.V.4.	Ratification of Agreements and Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations — Eighteenth List.	318-384
1937.V.5.	Ratification of International Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations — Results of the Seventh Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.	385-405
1937.V.6.	Status of Women — Communications received from Governments and Women's International Organisations since September 1936.	406-411
1937.V.7.	*Idem.*	412-413
1937.V.8.	*Idem.*	414
1937.V.9.	*Idem.*	415
1937.V.10.	Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism (Geneva, November, 16th, 1937).	416-425
1937.V.11.	Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court (Geneva, November 16th, 1937).	426-435
1937.V.12.	Status of Women — Communications received from Governments and Women's International Organisations since September 1936.	436-444

[Communicated to the Council
and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **C. 222. M. 162.** 1937. V.

Geneva, April 26th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM

REPORT ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APRIL 26TH, 1937

CONTENTS.

Page

Report 2

Appendix I. — Draft Convention for the International Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism 3

Appendix II. — Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court 8

S.d.N. 1040 (F.) 865 (A.). 5/37. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 1.

REPORT ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APRIL 26TH, 1937.

The Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism, set up under the resolution adopted by the Council on December 10th, 1934, held its third session at Geneva from April 20th to 26th, 1937.

The following were present at this session of the Committee: [1]

His Excellency Count CARTON DE WIART (Belgium), Minister of State, *Chairman;*
accompanied by M. Simon SASSERATH, Advocate in the Brussels Court of Appeal, Professor in the Belgian Institute of Graduate Studies.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS, C.B.E., K.C. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
Substitute: Mr. L. S. BRASS, Assistant Legal Adviser, Home Office.

Mme. Matilde HUICI (Spain), Advocate;
Substitute: M. Cipriano RIVAS CHERIF, Consul-General of Spain at Geneva.

M. Jules BASDEVANT (France), Professor in the Faculty of Law of Paris, Legal Adviser to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic.

M. Paul SEBESTYÉN (Hungary), Ministerial Counsellor of Section in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
accompanied by M. Eugene ASZTALOS, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Justice.

M. Lucien BEKERMAN (Poland), Public Prosecutor in the Court of Cassation, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Justice.

His Excellency M. V. V. PELLA (Roumania), Roumanian Minister at The Hague, Professor in the Faculty of Law of the University of Bucharest;
Substitute: M. Slavko STOYKOVITCH, Chief Representative of the Yugoslav Government in the Mixed Arbitral Tribunals.

M. E. DELAQUIS (Switzerland), Professor in the University of Geneva.

M. Victor BROWN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Secretary of Embassy.

The Committee considered the report and resolution on the international repression of terrorism (document A.72.1936.V [2]) which were adopted by the Assembly of the League on October 10th, 1936, together with the observations contained in the replies received from Governments or formulated during the discussions in the First Committee of the Assembly.[3]

In the light of the new material afforded by a study of the above-mentioned documents, the Committee proceeded to hold a general discussion on the problem of the international prevention and punishment of terrorism, and this was followed by a final review of the two draft Conventions drawn up by the Committee at its second session (January 1936).

When revising the first draft, which deals with the prevention and punishment of terrorism (Appendix I), the Committee thought it proper to define the situations in which acts of terrorism assume an international character, and which are the primary justification for international co-operation to prevent and punish such acts.

Furthermore, to meet a trend of opinion which received definite expression in the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly, the Committee embodied in the draft Convention a clause emphasising that States are under an obligation—imposed, indeed, by international law—themselves to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of any other State.

With the object of avoiding difficulties in the interpretation of the Convention and defining the exact sense and scope of some of its clauses, the Committee found it necessary to lay down in a general provision what is to be understood by " acts of terrorism " within the meaning of the proposed Convention.

With regard to the clauses providing for various forms of co-operation between States in the prevention and punishment of terrorism, the Committee came to the conclusion that certain amendments were necessary in order to make it clearer that the legal rules held by the different contracting parties as to political offences are not affected.

The Committee's attention was also drawn to the question of civil war. The Committee took the view that this is a question which is clearly outside the scope of the Convention.

The other amendments to the original draft Convention are due to the Committee's desire either to make the text clearer or to limit the scope of the Convention to those situations of which

---

[1] M. E. J. GAJARDO (Chile), His Excellency M. Ugo ALOISI and Professor Tommaso PERASSI (Italy) were not present at this session.

[2] See Minutes of the First Committee of the Seventeenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly (1936), pages 84-85.

[3] See documents A.24.1936.V, A.24(*a*).1936.V, C.552.M.356.1936.V and C.194.M.139.1937.V.

it is absolutely to take account if acts of terrorism of an international character are to be effectually prevented and punished.

In revising the second draft Convention—that for the creation of an International Criminal Court (Appendix II)—the Committee was chiefly influenced by the desire expressed by the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly. It is plain from the new amendments that States which become parties to this Convention cannot rely upon the International Criminal Court in their relations with States which are parties only to the first Convention (that for the prevention and punishment of terrorism).

The other amendments to the second Convention are mainly due to the observations made by various Governments on the organisation and working of such a Court.

In submitting the present report and the two draft Conventions appended embodying the results of its work, the Committee expresses the hope that it may have provided a useful basis for the deliberations of the Diplomatic Conference which, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League on October 10th, 1936, is to meet in 1937.

April 26th, 1937. *(Signed)* H. CARTON DE WIART,
Chairman.

Appendix I.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM.

[*Translation.*]

Article 1.

1. Acts of terrorism within the meaning of the present Convention are criminal acts which are directed against a State and which are intended or calculated to create a state of terror among individuals, groups of persons or the general public.

2. The object of the present Convention is to ensure co-operation between the High Contracting Parties for the prevention and punishment of such acts when they are of an international character, it being the duty of States to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State.

Article 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties should make the following acts committed on its own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1:

(1) Any act intended to cause death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to:

(*a*) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(*b*) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(*c*) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity.

(2) Wilful destruction of or damage to public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party.

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public.

(4) The manufacture, obtaining, or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present Article.

(5) Any attempt to commit any of the acts falling within the present Article.

Article 3.

1. Each of the High Contracting Parties should also make the following actions criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to acts of terrorism directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the acts of terrorism are to be carried into execution:

(*a*) Any agreement to commit any of the acts mentioned in Article 2 (Nos. (1) to (4));

(*b*) Any direct public incitement, whether successful or not;

(*c*) Any successful private incitement;

(*d*) Any wilful complicity;

(*e*) Any help given towards the commission of such an act.

2. Acts of participation in the offences falling within the present Convention shall be treated as separate offences when the persons committing them can only be brought to trial in different countries.

Article 4.

Without prejudice to the characterisation of offences and to other special provisions of national law relating to the persons and property mentioned in Article 2, no High Contracting Party shall make any distinction as regards the protection afforded by criminal law between acts, falling under Articles 2 and 3, directed against the Party itself and similar acts directed against another High Contracting Party.

Article 5.

1. In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is accepted, foreign convictions for any of the acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 will, within the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, be taken into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

2. Such convictions will, further, in the case of High Contracting Parties whose law recognises foreign convictions, be taken into account, with or without special proceedings, for the purpose of imposing, in the manner provided by that legislation, incapacities, disqualifications or interdictions whether in the sphere of public or of private law.

Article 6.

In so far as *parties civiles* are admitted under the domestic law, foreign *parties civiles*, including, in proper cases, a High Contracting Party, should be entitled to all rights allowed to nationals by the law of the country in which the case is tried.

Article 7.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below, the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been, or may hereafter be, concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall henceforward, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below and subject to reciprocity, recognise the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 as extradition crimes as between themselves.

3. For the purposes of the present Article, any act specified in Articles 2 and 3, if committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom it is directed, shall also be deemed to be an extradition crime.

4. The obligation to grant extradition under the present Article shall be subject to any limitations recognised by the law of the country to which application is made.

Article 8.

1. When the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised by a High Contracting Party, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country after the commission abroad of an offence mentioned in Articles 2 or 3 should be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed in their own country, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. The provisions of the present Article shall not apply if, in similar circumstances, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 9.

Foreigners who are on the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 should be prosecuted and punished as though the act had been committed in the territory of that High Contracting Party, if the following conditions are fulfilled—namely, that:

(*a*) Extradition has been demanded and could not be granted for a reason not connected with the act itself;

(*b*) The law of the country of refuge recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners;

(*c*) The foreigner is a national of a country which recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners.

Article 10.

The provisions of Articles 8 and 9 shall also apply to acts referred to in Articles 2 and 3 which have been committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against which they were directed.

As regards the application of Articles 8 and 9, the High Contracting Parties do not undertake to pass a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed by the law of the country where the offence was committed.

Article 11.

Each High Contracting Party should take on his own territory appropriate measures to prevent any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article 12

1. The carrying, possession and distribution of firearms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition and explosives should be subjected to regulation, and it should be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute them to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by the domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles.

2. Manufacturers of firearms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, should be required to mark each arm with a serial number and factory mark permitting it to be identified, and to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

Article 13.

1. The following acts should be punishable:

(*a*) Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration of passports or other equivalent documents;

(*b*) Bringing into the country, obtaining or being in possession of such forged or falsified documents knowing them to be forged or falsified;

(*c*) Obtaining such documents by means of false declarations or documents;

(*d*) Using any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. The wilful issue of passports, other equivalent documents, or visas by competent officials to persons known not to have the right thereto under the laws or regulations applicable, with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention, should also be punishable.

3. The provisions of the present Article shall apply irrespective of the national or foreign character of the document.

Article 14.

1. The results of the investigation of offences provided for in Articles 2, 3 and 13 should in each country and within the framework of the law of that country be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. Such service should be in close contact:

(*a*) With the police authorities of the country;
(*b*) With the corresponding services in other countries.

3. It should furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3 and 13 and should, as far as possible, keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

Article 15.

Each service, so far as it considers it desirable to do so, should notify to the services of the other countries, giving all necessary particulars:

(*a*) Any act mentioned in Articles 2 and 3, even if it has not been carried into effect, such notification to be accompanied by descriptions, copies and photographs;

(*b*) Any search for, any prosecution, arrest, conviction or expulsion of persons guilty of acts dealt with in the present Convention, the movements of such persons and any pertinent information with regard to them, as well as their description, finger-prints and photographs;

(*c*) Discovery of documents, arms, appliances or other objects connected with acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 12 and 13.

Article 16.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request in accordance with their domestic law and practice.

2. The transmission of letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention should be effected:

(*a*) By direct communication between the judicial authorities; or

(*b*) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries, or by direct communication from the authority of the country making the request to the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made; or

(*c*) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request direct to the competent judicial authority, or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made, and shall receive direct from such authority the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request.

3. In cases (*a*) and (*c*), a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the superior authority of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letters of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority making the request, provided always that the country to which the request is made may require a translation in its own language, certified correct by the authority making the request.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method or methods of transmission mentioned above which he will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, his existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. Execution of letters of request shall not give rise to a claim for reimbursement of charges or expenses of any nature whatever other than expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present Article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws.

Article 17.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of the limits of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 18.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment, the characterisation of the various acts dealt with in the present Convention and the determination of the applicable penalties and of the methods of prosecution and trial depend in each country upon the general rules of the domestic law. It, further, does not impair the right of the High Contracting Parties to make such rules as they consider proper regarding the effect of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty.

Article 19.

If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

Article 20.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall be both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and on behalf of any non-member State represented at the Conference which drew up the present Convention or to which a copy thereof is communicated for this purpose by the Council of the League of Nations.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Article 21.

1. After the . . . ., the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 20 on whose behalf the Convention has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

Article 22.

Any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State which is prepared to ratify the Convention under the second paragraph of Article 20, or to accede to the Convention under Article 21, but desires to be allowed to make reservations with regard to the application of the Convention, may so inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall forthwith communicate such reservations to all the Members of the League and non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited and enquire whether they have any objection thereto. Should the reservation be formulated within two years from the entry into force of the Convention, the same enquiry shall be addressed to Members of the League and non-member States whose signature of the Convention has not yet been followed by ratification. If, within six months from the date of the Secretary-General's communication, no objection to the reservation has been made, it shall be treated as accepted by the High Contracting Parties.

Article 23.

Ratification of or accession to the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation are in conformity with the rules contained in the Convention.

Article 24.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may at any time declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 25.

The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the . . . ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration.

Article 26.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 27.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by means of a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

Article 28.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 20. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, ... in a single copy, which will be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

Appendix II.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT.

[*Translation*]

Article 1.

An International Criminal Court for the trial, as hereinafter provided, of persons accused of an offence dealt with in the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is hereby established.

Article 2.

The Court shall be a permanent body, but shall sit only when it is seized of proceedings for an offence within its jurisdiction.

Article 3.

1. In the cases referred to in Articles 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, each High Contracting Party to the present Convention shall be entitled, instead of prosecuting before his own tribunal, to send the accused for trial before the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party shall further be entitled in the cases mentioned in Article 7 of the said Convention, instead of extraditing, to send the accused for trial before the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a Party to the present Convention.

3. The provisions of the present Article shall be applicable only if the accused is a national of a State which is a Party to the present Convention and if the offence is directed against the interests of a High Contracting Party to the present Convention.

Article 4.

The Court shall be composed of judges chosen from among jurists who are acknowledged authorities on criminal law and who are or have been members of courts of criminal jurisdiction or possess the qualifications required for such appointments in their own countries.

Article 5.

The Court shall consist of five regular judges and five deputy judges, each belonging to a different nationality, but so that the regular judges and deputy judges shall be nationals of the High Contracting Parties.

Article 6.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State in respect of which the present Convention is in force may nominate not more than two candidates for appointment as judges of the Court.

2. The Council of the League of Nations shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

Article 7.

1. Judges shall hold office for ten years.

2. Every two years, one regular and one deputy judge shall retire.

3. For the first period of ten years, the order of retirement shall be determined under the authority of the Council of the League of Nations by drawing lots.

4. Judges may be re-appointed.

5. Judges shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled.

6. Nevertheless, judges, though replaced, shall finish any cases which they have begun.

Article 8.

A judge appointed in place of a judge whose period of appointment has not expired shall hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 9.

1. Deputy judges shall be called upon to sit in the order laid down in a list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly, to age.

Article 10.

1. Members of the Court may not participate in the settlement of any case on which they have previously been engaged in any capacity whatsoever. In case of doubt, the Court shall decide.

2. Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, give a solemn undertaking in open Court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

Article 11.

1. Any vacancy, whether occurring through the expiration of a judge's term of office or for any other cause, shall be filled as provided in Article 6.

2. In the event of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall take effect on notification being received by the Registrar.

Article 12.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of the other members he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Article 13.

The High Contracting Parties shall grant the members of the Court diplomatic privileges and immunities when engaged on the business of the Court.

Article 14.

1. The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for two years; they may be re-elected.

2. The work of the Registry of the Court shall be performed by the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice, if that Court consents.

Article 15.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. For any particular case, the President may take the opinion of the Court and the Court may decide to meet elsewhere.

Article 16.

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to send a person for trial before the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 17.

The Court shall apply the substantive criminal law of the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. Any dispute as to what substantive criminal law is applicable shall be decided by the Court.

Article 18.

If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not sit to hear a particular case, he shall so notify the President as soon as he has been informed that the Court is seized of that case.

Article 19.

1. The presence of five members shall be necessary to enable the Court to sit.

2. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

Article 20.

If the Court has to apply, in accordance with Article 17, the law of a State of which no sitting judge is a national, the Court may invite a jurist who is an acknowledged authority on such law to sit with it in a consultative capacity as a legal assessor.

Article 21.

As soon as the Court is seized of a case, the President of the Court shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, and the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. These States, and any other States, may put before the Court the results of their investigations and any evidence and objects connected with the crime which they have in their possession; these shall be included in the file of the case.

Article 22.

1. The Court shall be seized of a case by an indictment issuing from a High Contracting Party.

2. The right to conduct the prosecution shall rest with the State against which the offence was committed. Failing that State, it shall belong to the State on the territory of which the offence was committed, and failing also that latter State, then to the State by which the Court was seized.

3. The State which seizes the Court shall at the same time name the agent by whom it will be represented.

4. The Court must not proceed further with the case if the charge is withdrawn.

Article 23.

Any State or person injured by an offence may constitute itself or himself *partie civile* before the Court, inspect the file, submit a statement of its or his case to the Court, and take part in the debates.

Article 24.

The file of the case and the statement of the *partie civile* shall be communicated to the person who is before the Court for trial.

Article 25.

The parties may propose the hearing of witnesses and experts by the Court, which shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts.

Article 26.

1. The Court shall decide whether a person who has been sent before it for trial shall be placed or remain under arrest. Where necessary, it shall determine on what conditions he may be provisionally set at liberty.

2. The State on the territory of which the Court is sitting shall place at the Court's disposal a suitable place of internment and the necessary staff of warders for the custody of the accused.

Article 27.

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall at its demand be addressed by the High Contracting Party on the territory of which the Court is sitting to the State competent to give effect to such letters of request.

Article 28.

No examination of the person sent to the Court for trial, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for that person, the representatives of the State against which the offence was directed or on the territory of which the offence was committed or which laid the case before the Court and the representatives of the *parties civiles*, or after due summons to such persons to be present.

Article 29.

1. Accused persons may be defended by advocates belonging to a Bar.

2. If provision is not made for the conduct of the defence by a barrister chosen by the accused, the Court shall assign to each accused person a counsel selected from advocates belonging to a Bar.

Article 30.

1. The hearings before the Court shall be public.

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned and unanimous judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place *in camera*. Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

Article 31.

The Court shall sit in private to consider its judgment.

Article 32.

The decisions of the Court shall be by majority of the judges.

Article 33.

Every judgment or order of the Court shall state the reasons therefor and be read at a public hearing by the President.

Article 34.

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person sent before it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been sent for trial.

Article 35.

1. The Court may sentence the persons sent before it to restore property or to pay damages.

2. The Court shall decide whether any restitution or confiscation of any object is to be made.

3. High Contracting Parties in whose territory objects to be restored or property belonging to convicted persons is situated shall be bound to take all the measures provided by their own laws to ensure the execution of the sentences.

4. The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply to cases in which pecuniary penalties imposed by the Court or costs of proceedings have to be recovered.

Article 36.

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by the High Contracting Party which shall be designated by the Court.

2. The Court shall determine the way in which any fines shall be dealt with.

Article 37.

If sentence of death has been pronounced, the State designated by the Court to execute the sentence shall be entitled to substitute therefor the most severe penalty in its national legislation involving loss of liberty.

Article 38.

The right of pardon shall be exercised by the State which has to enforce the penalty. It shall first consult the President of the Court.

Article 39.

1. Against convictions pronounced by the Court, no proceedings other than an application for revision shall be allowable.

2. The Court shall determine in its rules the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

3. The States mentioned in Article 22, and the persons mentioned in Article 29, shall have the right to ask for a revision.

Article 40.

1. The salaries of the judges shall be payable by the States of which they are nationals on a scale fixed by the High Contracting Parties.

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

Article 41.

The Court's archives shall be in the charge of the Registrar.

Article 42.

The Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure.

Article 43.

1. The Court shall decide any questions as to its own jurisdiction arising during the hearing of a case; it shall for this purpose apply the provisions of the present Convention and of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the general principles of law.

2. Should a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, dispute the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts, this issue shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 45.

Article 44.

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning:

(*a*) The election of judges;

(*b*) The organisation of the Registry;

(*c*) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all financial and administrative questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;

(*d*) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

2. The Government of the Netherlands shall be requested to convene this meeting as soon as possible after the present Convention enters into force.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. On all questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3, decisions shall be taken by a majority of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

Article 45.

If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the Parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

Article 46.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State on whose behalf the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism has been signed.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League. The Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The deposit of an instrument of ratification of the present Convention shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of or accession to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 47.

1. After . . ., the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State which has not signed this Convention. Nevertheless, the deposit of an instrument of accession shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of or accession to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 46 and the first paragraph of the present Article.

Article 48.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates or oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may, at any time, declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in Articles 46 and 47 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 49.

The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day following the receipt by the Secretary-General of the ... instrument of ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration. Nevertheless, its entry into force shall be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 50.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the ... instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 51.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

Article 52.

1. The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 46 and 47. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

2. Denunciation of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism shall *ipso facto* involve denunciation of the present Convention.

Article 53.

A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 48, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, ..., in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States represented at the Conference.

[Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **C. 283. M. 184.** 1937. V.

Geneva, July 8th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

CONDITIONS OF VOTING REQUESTS FOR ADVISORY OPINIONS FROM THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

OBSERVATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHILE

June 2nd, 1937.

In your communication C.L.63.1936.V, you ask to be informed of my Government's views regarding the question in what circumstances and subject to what conditions, the Permanent Court of International Justice may be asked for an advisory opinion under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. That Article provides that the Court may give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

My Government believes that, according to the terms of your enquiry, the possibility of a reform of Article 14 is not contemplated. According to the text at present in force, advisory opinions may only be requested by the Council or the Assembly and the question is whether such requests require a unanimous decision or whether a mere majority decision will suffice. That means that the problem to be settled is whether a request for an advisory opinion is a matter of procedure or a matter of substance. Plausible arguments have been advanced in support of both these views.

In 1920, during the discussion of the reform proposals put forward by the delegation of the Argentine Republic, under which the Court would have been empowered to deliver advisory opinions at the request of the Governments of States Members of the League of Nations, the distinguished British jurist Sir Cecil Hurst argued that the adoption of the Argentine amendment would have the effect of introducing, indirectly, compulsory jurisdiction in virtue of unilateral action. It was this objection that led to the rejection of the Argentine amendment. My Government nevertheless considers that this objection, like others which were raised, is unfounded. It considers that, in the very nature of things, an advisory opinion has no binding force but is merely one among a number of means of throwing light upon a given question, and thus making it easier to form an opinion on that question. An advisory opinion delivered at the request of one or several Governments would not therefore be binding.

My Government's views on the subject of conciliation have been set out in a Memorandum of May 18th, 1936, which has been published and communicated to the Governments of friendly countries. The Memorandum confirms and corroborates, in the matter of conciliation, the opinion set out above-namely, that an advisory opinion delivered by the Permanent Court of International Justice at the request of one or several Governments can have no binding force.

In the Memorandum, indeed, my Government maintains that if a State claims, and a Commission of Investigation and Conciliation agrees, that a dispute relates to a question which, under international law, is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the State concerned, the Commission will record this fact and make no recommendation as to the settlement of the dispute. The Memorandum adds, however, that, either at the request of the State concerned or *motu propio*, the Commission may apply to the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion on the matter, and that to permit of such a course the States should propose the amendment of the instruments in force as regards the competence of the Court to deliver such opinions.

As my Government considers they have no binding force but are nevertheless of very great value as a means of elucidating international difficulties, and may be of great assistance in defining such difficulties and even in facilitating their settlement, it inclines to the view that advisory opinions may be requested in virtue of a mere majority decision.

---

[1] Observations received from Governments down to January 22nd, 1937, were published in documents C.543.M.351.1936.V, C.543(*a*).M.351(*a*).1936.V and C.543(*b*).M.351(*b*).1936.V, and reproduced in document C.S.P.5, together with an extract from the Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on January 23rd, 1937, when it was decided to refer the question to the Special Committee set up to study the Question of the Application of the Principles of the Covenant.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 2.

[Communiqué au Conseil et aux Membres de la Société.]

No officiel : **C. 283. M. 184.** 1937. V.

Genève, le 8 juillet 1937.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

CONDITIONS DE VOTE DES DEMANDES D'AVIS CONSULTATIF ADRESSÉES A LA COUR PERMANENTE DE JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE

OBSERVATIONS DU GOUVERNEMENT DU CHILI[1]

Le 2 juin 1937.

Dans votre communication C.L.63.1936.V, vous exprimez le désir de connaître l'opinion de mon Gouvernement sur les hypothèses et conditions nécessaires pour demander un avis consultatif à la Cour permanente de Justice internationale quand il s'agit d'appliquer les dispositions de l'article 14 du Pacte de la Société des Nations. Selon cet article, la Cour permanente donnera des avis consultatifs sur tout différend ou tout point dont la saisira le Conseil ou l'Assemblée.

Mon Gouvernement croit que les termes de la consultation excluent la possibilité de réformer l'article 14 du Pacte. D'après le texte en vigueur à présent, ces avis consultatifs peuvent être demandés seulement par le Conseil ou l'Assemblée et il s'agit de savoir si, pour les demander, l'unanimité est nécessaire ou si une simple majorité suffit. En somme, le problème qui se pose est d'établir si la demande d'un avis consultatif est une question de procédure ou une question de fond. Les deux thèses ont été soutenues avec des arguments plausibles.

En 1920, lors de la discussion du projet de réforme présenté par la délégation de la République Argentine qui accordait à la Cour le droit d'émettre des avis consultatifs à la requête des gouvernements des Etats membres de la Société des Nations, l'éminent juriste britannique sir Cecil Hurst a dit que l'adoption de l'amendement argentin aurait pour effet d'introduire, par voie indirecte, la juridiction obligatoire d'une action unilatérale. C'est en vertu de cette objection que l'amendement argentin a été rejeté. Mon Gouvernement croit, néanmoins, que cette objection ainsi que d'autres qui ont été formulées ne sont pas justifiées. Il croit qu'un avis consultatif, par sa nature même, n'est pas obligatoire, mais constitue un élément illustratif, comme un autre quelconque, ayant pour objet de contribuer à former une opinion sur une question déterminée. Un avis consultatif donné à la requête d'un ou de plusieurs gouvernements ne serait donc pas obligatoire.

La doctrine de mon Gouvernement en ce qui concerne la conciliation a été exposée dans un mémorandum du 18 mai 1936, qui a été publié et communiqué aux gouvernements des pays amis. Le point de vue de mon Gouvernement, tel qu'il apparaît dans ce mémorandum, confirme et corrobore, dans le domaine de la conciliation, la thèse que je viens d'énoncer, à savoir, qu'un avis consultatif donné par la Cour permanente de Justice internationale à la requête d'un ou de plusieurs gouvernements ne saurait avoir de force obligatoire.

En effet, dans le mémorandum en question, mon Gouvernement déclare que, si un Etat prétend, avec l'assentiment d'une commission d'investigation et de conciliation, que le désaccord porte sur une question que le droit international laisse à la compétence exclusive de cet Etat, la commission de conciliation et d'investigation en prendra acte et ne recommandera aucune solution. Néanmoins — ajoute le mémorandum — la commission, à la requête de l'Etat intéressé ou *motu proprio*, pourra demander, à cet égard, un avis consultatif de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, et pour que cela soit possible les Etats devraient proposer l'amendement des pactes en vigueur en ce qui concerne la compétence de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale pour donner ces avis consultatifs.

Etant donné que mon Gouvernement considère qu'ils n'ont pas de force obligatoire, mais sont toutefois d'une très grande utilité pour éclaircir les difficultés internationales et peuvent fournir des éléments précieux pour les préciser et même pour leur trouver une solution, il serait disposé à appuyer la thèse de la majorité, pure et simple, pour les demander.

---

[1] Les observations reçues des gouvernements au 22 janvier 1937 ont été publiées dans les documents C.543.M.351. 1936.V, C.543(*a*).M.351(*a*).1936.V et C.543(*b*).M.351(*b*).1936.V ; elles ont été reproduites dans le document C.S.P.5, en même temps qu'un extrait du procès-verbal de la séance du Conseil du 23 janvier 1937, à laquelle il fut décidé de soumettre la question à un Comité spécial pour l'étude de la mise en œuvre des principes du Pacte.

S. d. N. 1.185. 7/37. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Série de Publications de la Société des Nations

V. QUESTIONS JURIDIQUES

1937. V. 2.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council, and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 14.** 1937. V.

Geneva, August 24th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

CONTENTS

Page

Introductory Note 3

Part I. — Communications from Governments:

Australia 4
Bulgaria 17
China 18
Czechoslovakia 35
Denmark 19
Egypt 20
Finland 23
Iceland 29
India 24
New Zealand 30
Roumania 33
Sweden 35
Turkey 36

Part II. — Communications from Women's International Organisations:

International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship 37
World's Young Women's Christian Association 56
St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance 56
International Council of Women 73
Equals Rights International 75
"Union internationale des Ligues féminines catholiques" 79
Women's Consultative Committee on Nationality 80

3096-S.d.N. 1130 (F.) 1025 (A.) 8/37. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 3.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The present document is a continuation of the document which was published on September 29th, 1936, under the number A.33.1936.V (Legal.1936.V.8), and which contained the communications received down to that date from Governments and women's international organisations in accordance with the Assembly's resolution of September 27th, 1935, regarding the Status of Women.[1]

In the Assembly's resolution, a distinction was drawn between :

(*a*) " The question of conditions of employment " which the Assembly declared to be " a matter which properly falls within the sphere of the International Labour Organisation ", and

(*b*) " The question of the political and civil status of women ".

It was the second question only which the Assembly resolved to refer to the Governments with a request for their observations and for information as to the status of women under their respective national laws, and which, at the same time, it invited the women's international organisations to continue to study with a view to drawing up statements for its consideration.

The communications received from Governments and organisations have been filed in their entirety and can be consulted at the Secretariat. In editing them for publication in the present document the following principles have been applied :

(i) Wherever it could conveniently be separated from the main body of the communication, detailed information regarding the " conditions of employment " of women has been omitted from the present document and placed at the disposal of the International Labour Organisation. This rule, which appeared to be the necessary result of the Assembly's decision,[2] has led to the exclusion of a certain amount of material dealing with laws and regulations which exclude women from dangerous or unhealthy occupations or prescribe conditions for their employment in commerce, industry and agriculture, or dealing with women's wages, with the comparative succcess of men and women in obtaining particular forms of employment, and so forth.

(ii) On the other hand, in order to avoid any danger of too restrictive an interpretation of the Assembly's decision, information as to whether women have the legal right to enter public services or engage in particular professions or kinds of occupation, and information as to the position of women in regard to social legislation, have been reproduced in the present document.

(iii) The Assembly's invitation was addressed to women's international organisations. The Secretary-General has, therefore, felt unable to transmit to it the views of national organisations. One such statement, presenting the joint views of ten Danish women's organisations, was received through the intermediary of the Danish Government and that of two international organisations. Another, drawn up by the Australian Federation of Women Voters and accompanied by observations from the New South Wales Committee of the Federation, was forwarded to the Secretariat by the Commonwealth Government at the request of the Federation. A third statement giving the views of the British branch of the Open Door International (The Open Door Council), was forwarded by the international organisation in question.

---

[1] The document of 1936 contains statements from the Governments of the Union of South Africa, Belgium, Brazil, United Kingdom, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Estonia, India, Latvia, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland and Turkey; and from the Pan-Pacific Women's Association.

[2] In communicating the Assembly's decision to the organisations, the Secretary-General pointed out that their statements should " deal with the political and civil status of women and not with questions regarding the conditions of employment of women, which the Assembly has considered to fall within the sphere of the International Labour Office."

PART I. — COMMUNICATIONS FROM GOVERNMENTS.

Observations and statements as to the political and civil status of women have been received from the following Governments :

Commonwealth of Australia.

LAW OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

April 22nd, 1937.

I have the honour to inform you that under the law of the Commonwealth and the States of Australia, apart from the nationality and domicile of married women, which are governed by those of the husband, and the restrictions on the employment of married women in the public service, the political and civil status of women is substantially the same as that of men. There are, however, certain minor restrictions for the protection of women, and the rates fixed for the basic wage of women are lower than those awarded for men.

Recently, an Act was passed by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia to give effect to the provisions of the Hague Nationality Convention in connection with the nationality of married women, which mainly provides for the elimination of statelessness. This Act goes further than the Convention by providing that in the case of a woman who has acquired a foreign nationality by marriage she may still enjoy within Australia and its territories all the privileges of British citizenship. This provision, however, does not apply outside Australia.

As regards the principle that a woman on marriage shall not lose her nationality or acquire a new nationality without her consent, the Commonwealth Government is prepared to adopt this principle and to amend the Australian Nationality Law accordingly, provided the Governments in the United Kingdom and in the other self-governing Dominions do likewise, so that uniformity of nationality laws throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations may be preserved. Such uniformity is regarded as being of prime importance and essential in the interests of the system of Imperial naturalisation now in force.

In the Commonwealth and the States, women are eligible for appointment to the Public Service, and to civil and judicial offices, and for admission to the practice of any of the professions. They enjoy parliamentary franchise and may be elected as members of the Commonwealth or State Parliaments and local governing bodies.

In regard to bankruptcy, which comes within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth, there is no discrimination in respect of women except that the separate property of a married woman, the income of which is subject to restraint on anticipation, is not divisible amongst creditors, but the Court has power on the application of the trustees to order that the whole, or some part of that income shall be paid to the trustee for distribution amongst the creditors, and in the exercise of that power the Court shall have regard to the means of subsistence available for the woman and her children.

A woman enjoys the same rights as a man under the Commonwealth Old Age and Invalid Pensions, and is entitled to draw the old-age pension at the age of 60, whereas in the case of a man the age is 65.

The only disability on entrance to and employment in the Commonwealth Public Service applies to married women. Under Section 49 of the Public Service Act, no married woman is eligible for employment, either permanently or temporarily in the Commonwealth Service, and every female officer is deemed to have retired from the Service upon her marriage, unless in either case the Public Service Board certifies that there are special circumstances which make such employment desirable.

Attached hereto are detailed statements which have been compiled by the State Governments setting out the political and civil status of women in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania.

STATUS OF WOMEN IN NEW SOUTH WALES.

Political.

Under the laws of New South Wales, women enjoy equal political rights with men. The Parliamentary franchise was extended to them by the Women's Franchise Act, No. 54, 1902.

The Women's Legal Status Act, No. 50, 1918 removed all legal impediments to the election of women to the Legislative Assembly, and the Constitution (Amendment) Act, 1925, No. 1 of 1926, authorised the appointment of women as members of the Legislative Council while the Legislative Council was a nominee Chamber. Since the reconstitution of the Legislative Council by the Constitution Amendment (Legislative Council) Act, 1932, No. 2, 1933, any person, male or female, with the specified qualifications is eligible for election as a member of the Legislative Council.

So far as the civic field in this State is concerned it may be stated that, generally speaking, women have equal rights with men.

Under the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1919, which applies to Municipal and Shire Councils in this State, and the Sydney Corporation Act, 1932-1934, which applies to the City of Sydney, there is no differentiation between sexes as to the qualifications necessary to be enrolled as an elector for the purpose of electing the Municipal or Shire or Sydney City Council, as the case may be. Every person whose name is on the roll of electors is qualified to hold civic office and subsequently to be elected as Mayor or President of a Shire Council.

In respect of the servants of Councils it is provided by Statute that Councils shall appoint only qualified persons as Town or Shire Clerks, auditors, engineers and Health inspectors. Persons of either sex may secure the necessary qualifications to act in the respective capacities, and several women have passed the examination and are certified to act as Town or Shire Clerks.

Public Service.

Section 41 of the Public Service Act, 1902, provides that :

> " The Board may make regulations for facilitating the employment of women in those departments or branches of the Public Service in which it may seem desirable to employ them ; and such regulations may determine the salary or wages to be paid to women employed on any particular work or class of work, and may provide generally for all matters relating to the examination of female candidates for employment, which may require special provision."

Provision is made for the employment of females as medical officers, office assistants, shorthandwriters and typists, machine operators, library assistants, ticketwriters, folders, sewers, nurses, attendants, domestic workers, and in other capacities. The number of females employed in such positions under the provisions of the Public Service Act is approximately four thousand.

Female employees do not receive the remuneration paid to males performing similar duties. In the Department of Public Instruction female teachers are paid four-fifths of the male salaries, while in other branches of the Service the difference between the remuneration of males and females performing the same duties is regulated by the difference in the living wages prescribed by the Industrial Tribunals for males and females — see under " Industry ".
Section 42 of the Public Service Act, 1902, provides :

> " Except in the Department of Public Instruction no married woman shall be eligible for appointment to any office in the Public Service if her husband is already in the employment of the State, unless the Board certifies in each case that there are special circumstances which make such appointment desirable."

Teachers.

In October, 1932, the Married Women (Lecturers and Teachers) Act of that year was promulgated. This Act restricts the employment of married women as lecturers and teachers in the Department of Education in order to provide employment for ex-students of the Teachers' Colleges who were awaiting appointment as teachers. Section 3 provides for the cessation of the services of a woman teacher upon her marriage unless she was under Bond to serve the Department for a specified period, in which case the retention of her services until the expiration of that period rested with the Minister, or unless the Public Service Board had, prior to her marriage, certified that it was in the public interest that her services should be retained.

The Act also provides that the services of all married women teachers, or lecturers, employed in the service of the Department at the inception of the Act, namely, November 30th, 1932, should cease to hold office (Section 2) unless the Public Service Board certified (1) that it was in the public interest that their services should be retained ; (2) that the teacher was living apart from her husband and was not receiving adequate support from him ; and (3) that the income of the teacher and her husband, apart from her salary as a teacher, was insufficient for the maintenance of themselves and their dependents, having regard to their financial commitments.

Section 2 further provides that no married woman should be appointed to the Service after November 30th, 1932, unless the Board had certified to the Minister that there were special circumstances which made her employment desirable in the public interest. The renewal of these certificates of retention is subject to annual review of each case.

The re-employment of married women who were married prior to the passing of the Act, was also provided for on a temporary basis.

The above-mentioned Act was amended in 1935, to the effect that those women teachers who were employed by the Department and married prior to November 30th, 1932, and who were still employed at the passing of the amending Act, shall continue to be employed as teachers. In the case of those women for whom the Public Service Board had not issued certificates of retention beyond December 31st, 1935, the amending Act provided that they should have the right of election as to whether they should remain in the service as above, or whether they should be retrenched under the old Act.

The amending Act provides, further, for the employment of married women and for the re-employment of those dispossessed of office under the provisions of Section 2 of the old Act. No married woman shall be appointed unless the Public Service Board has previously certified that there are special circumstances which make her employment desirable in the public interest. Provision is also made for the renewal of a certificate issued in these circumstances. For those dispossessed of office under Section 2 of the old Act, provision is made for their re-employment, provided that the Board certifies beforehand that the combined income of her husband and herself from all sources, other than income derived from her personal exertions, is inadequate for the support of herself, her husband, and dependents. Such employment is to be on a temporary basis.

Police Force.

Women can be appointed to Public Office in the capacity of women police (special constables) or as matrons to attend to female prisoners. Suitable women are appointed from time to time in such capacities, though at present there are no vacancies. Experience shows that as a general rule widows of deceased members of the Police Force are better fitted for these positions than other women. The senior of the Women Special Constables holds the rank of sergeant, and the total number of women special constables in the employ of the Department is eight and that number is found adequate for requirements. The number of matrons in the Police Service is six (four permanent and two relieving).

Professions.

There is no discrimination against women in New South Wales in respect to their entrance into the professions of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and optometry.

So far as the legal profession is concerned, Section 2 of the Women's Legal Status Act, 1918, provides that " a person shall not by reason of sex be deemed to be under any disability or subject to any disqualification to be appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, or of a district Court of New South Wales, or Chairman of Quarter Sessions, or a Stipendiary or Police Magistrate, or a Justice of the Peace, or to be admitted and to practise as a barrister or solicitor of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, or to practise as a conveyancer; any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding".

Industry. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Income Tax.

In the Income Tax Law of this State, comprised in the Income Tax (Management) Act, 1936, and the Special Income and Wages Tax (Management) Act, 1933/34, there is no differentiation as to the manner in which male and female taxpayers shall be assessed.

Legal.

Domicile.

The law in New South Wales is the same as the English Common Law.

Married Women's Property.

The Married Women's Property Act, 1901, as amended, consolidates enactments relating to rights and liabilities of married women. Provision is made in that Act (*inter alia*) that a married woman is capable of holding property and of contracting (Section 3 (1)), that property of a married woman married after April 17th, 1893, shall be held by her as her separate property (Section 5) and that property of a married woman acquired on or after that date by a woman married before that date shall be held by her as her separate property (Section 8).

Divorce.

The law of New South Wales as to this is contained in the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1899, as amended.

Guardianship of Infants.

Reference should be made as to this to the Infants' Custody and Settlements Act of 1899, as amended by subsequent Acts, and the Testator's Family Maintenance and Guardianship of Infants Act, 1916, as amended by subsequent Acts.

Bankruptcy.

The present law as to this is contained in Commonwealth Statutes.

Maintenance.

This is awarded under the above Testator's Family Maintenance, etc., Act, as amended by subsequent Acts, and the Deserted Wives and Children Act, 1901, as amended by subsequent Acts, and in the case of illegitimacy, the Child Welfare Act, 1923, as amended.

Nationality.

The present law as to this is contained in Commonwealth Statutes.

Prostitution.

The offences connected with prostitution are set out in the Vagrancy Act, 1902, as amended by subsequent Acts, and Sections 91C and 91D of the Crimes Act, 1900, as amended.

Bastardy.

Attention is invited to the Acts referred to under " Maintenance ".

Criminal Law and Sexual Offences.

The Crimes Act, 1900, as amended by subsequent Acts, contains the general criminal law.

General: Jury Service.

Women cannot sit on juries in New South Wales.

Status of Women in Victoria.

Public Office, etc.

Sex or marriage does not debar any woman from exercising any public function or holding any civil or judicial office or post or from practising any profession or admission to any incorporated society, unless specifically debarred therefrom by any special Act, but women have no liability to serve as jurors. See Women's Qualification Act, 1928.

Under Section 46 of the Public Service Act, 1928, the Public Service Commissioner (who is the authority regulating, subject to that Act, employment, classification, etc., in the public service) may make regulations for facilitating the employment of women in those branches of the public service in which it seems desirable to employ them and such regulations may determine their salary or wages, etc. Under Section 47 of the same Act, married women are debarred (subject to a possible exemption in the case of sewing-mistresses in State schools and matrons, warders and attendants in gaols, hospitals, asylums, etc.) from employment in the Public Service; and women who marry whilst in the Service immediately retire. (In fact, women are not generally employed in the Public Service doing the same class of work as men except in the teaching profession, and as typists, stenographers, etc., and in those capacities the standard of salary or remuneration of women is generally lower than the corresponding standard for men.)

Domicile.

The law governing the domicile of women, so far as it affects their status in Victoria, is the common law of England. The principal rules are :

(1) The domicile of a married women is, during coverture, the same as, and changes with, the domicile of her husband.

(2) The domicile of a legitimate or legitimated minor is, during the lifetime of the father, the same as, and changes with, the domicile of the father.

(3) The domicile of an illegitimate minor or of a minor whose father is dead is, whilst the minor lives with the mother, the same as, and changes with, the domicile of the mother.

Married Women's Property.

The provisions of the English Married Women's Property Acts (45 and 46 Vict. C.75 and 56 and 57 Vict. C. 63) have been reproduced in Victorian law, with very little modification, in the Married Women's Property Act, 1928. The effect is to place a woman in very much the same position as a man with respect to her separate property. It should be noticed in this context that bankruptcy is the subject of Commonwealth legislation.

Divorce and Judicial Separation.

These matters are governed in Victoria by the Marriage Act, 1928, and minor amendments thereof.

The grounds of judicial separation are adultery, cruelty and desertion. No distinction is made between husband and wife upon these grounds.

The grounds of divorce vary to some extent according to whether the respondent is husband or wife. Habitual drunkenness in a man is a ground of divorce if associated with cruelty or failure to support his wife; in a woman if associated with neglect of domestic duties or unfitness to carry them out. A single act of adultery is a ground of divorce if the guilty party is the wife; where the guilty party is the husband there must be repeated adultery or adultery in the conjugal residence or adultery combined with bigamy or cruelty or in certain other circumstances of aggravation.

Guardianship and Custody of Infants.

This matter is governed by Part VII of the Marriage Act, 1928. The paramount consideration is the welfare of the infant. No material distinction is drawn between mother and father in their rights to custody, or to appoint guardians, etc. The provisions are taken from the English Act 15 and 16 Sec. V. C.45. The rights of the mother of an illegitimate child are the same as those of a mother of a legitimate child whose father is dead.

Bankruptcy.

This is a matter upon which the Commonwealth Parliament now legislates and the Victorian State law on the subject is now almost, if not quite, defunct.

Maintenance.

The Maintenance Act, 1928, Part I, deals with the maintenance by husbands, fathers, etc., of destitute or deserted wives or children and the circumstances in which such maintenance will be enforced. No burden is placed on a wife of supporting her husband in any circumstances, but the mother of an illegitimate child may be directed to contribute to the support of her child either in conjunction with the father or, if she alone is able to do so, solely. It should also be noticed that under the Marriage Act, 1928, alimony in cases of divorce or judicial separation is payable ordinarily only by the husband, except in the case of an order by the court upon a decree nisi for dissolution of marriage securing the settlement of such gross or annual sum upon the other party (whether husband or wife) as seems reasonable having regard to his or her fortune — a provision only resorted to in cases where the wife had a considerable fortune. See Marriage Act, 1928, Section 95, as amended by Marriage (Divorce) Act, 1933, S.4.

Nationality.

Questions of naturalisation, immigration, etc., are dealt with by the Commonwealth Parliament.

Franchise.

No distinction is made on the ground of sex in the franchise in Victoria whether with respect to qualification as a member of, or an elector of, either of the Houses of the Legislature, or (in the sphere of local government) of any municipal council.

Poor Law and Unemployment Insurance.

There is no law in Victoria corresponding to the laws of England known by those names. Various pension schemes — old age and invalid pensions, etc. — are governed by Commonwealth legislation, and there is in Victoria the series of Acts known as the Unemployment Relief Acts (No. 4079 of 1932, etc.). Under these Acts, the Unemployment Relief Fund is raised by taxation upon very much the same basis as income tax, and is available for the sustenance of persons both male and female who are in need owing to unemployment. There is legally no distinction between men and women as to the right to receive sustenance, but male workers only may be required to work upon certain works for municipalities, etc., in return for their sustenance. In fact, however, almost all sustenance is paid to males, because there is at present a shortage in this State of female labour so that women are not as a rule able successfully to apply for sustenance upon the ground that they cannot obtain employment.

Lead Protection (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Work in Mines (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Income Tax.

Victorian law on this subject is now covered by the Income Tax (Assessment) Act, 1936. There is no discrimination thereunder between women and men. This Act introduced for the first time an allowable deduction in respect of her husband from the income of a wife who is supporting her husband, and thus removed the last distinction on this matter. Income tax is also the subject of Commonwealth legislation.

Bastardy.

The provisions of Part I of the Maintenance Act, 1928, already referred to, relating to the maintenance of children by their father, apply whether the children are illegitimate or born in wedlock. Part II of the same Act provides for orders for the payment of confinement expenses. With regard to the ordinary rule (viz., that the evidence of a woman alleging for the purpose of claiming maintenance or confinement expenses, that a man is the father of her child, must be corroborated in some material particular) it should be noted that in Victorian law under Sections 20 and 31 of the Maintenance Act (dealing with maintenance and confinement expenses respectively) the need for corroboration does not arise unless and until the putative father has denied the allegation on oath.

The legitimation of children born out of wedlock is dealt with by Part II of the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act, 1928. Where the parents of an illegitimate child later marry one another (provided there was no legal impediment to the marriage at the time of the birth), (*a*) the father may at any time effect the legitimation of the child as from the date of birth; but (*b*) the mother is only able to effect such a legitimation if the father is dead or unable to himself apply by reason of wounds, shock, or disorder the result of war service. The mother has also to obtain the certificate of a law officer to the effect that the proof of fatherhood is conclusive before she can successfully apply.

The effect of legitimation is for all practical purposes to place the legitimated child on the same footing as if born in wedlock.

Criminal Law.

There is no discrimination in the substantive criminal law of Victoria as between women and men except in those cases (viz., sexual cases) where the distinction arises from the nature of the offence itself. The crime of infanticide has not been the subject of legislation in Victoria — all criminal killings remain either murder or manslaughter; the offence of concealment of birth of a child is a misdemeanour capable of being committed by any person either man or woman.

With respect to punishment women may not be put to hard labour (§ 508, Crimes Act, 1928) or be whipped or put in irons (*Ibid.*, §§ 509-511).

With respect to evidence and procedure, the same rules apply to men and women and the same immunities with respect to giving evidence apply to the wife or husband (as the case may be) of the person charged.

Sexual Offences, Prostitution, etc.

The basis of the criminal law in these matters is the common law of England as modified by various statutory enactments of this State.

Special attention is drawn to the following enactments:

Crimes Act, 1928, §§ 40-67 (sexual offences, etc., generally);
Crimes Act, 1928, §§ 456-457 (verdicts);
Crimes Act, 1928, §§ 501-502 (search warrants for girls, etc.);
Police Offences Act, 1928, § 6 (soliciting prostitution);
Police Offences Act, 1928, § 29 (reformatory for women or girls);
Police Offences Act, 1928, § 69 (idle and disorderly persons, etc.);
Police Offences Act, 1928, § 72 (rogues and vagabonds, etc.);
Police Offences Act, 1928, § 73 (incorrigible rogues);
Police Offences Act, 1928, §§ 79-81 (prostitution, brothels, etc.).

Status of Women in Queensland.

The trend in Queensland, especially in recent years, is in the direction of recognising the equality of the sexes.

Industry and Employment. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Professions.

(*a*) The Legal Practitioners Act of 1905 confers on women the right of practising as barristers, solicitors or conveyancers. Some women have already qualified in those professions and are duly practising therein.

(*b*) In regard to such professions as the medical, optical and pharmaceutical professions, there is no direct statutory recognition of permitting women to qualify but there is no statutory objection, and hence women have qualified and entered upon these professions.

The Dental Act, 1902, specifically includes women.

Certain occupations however are precluded from women, *i.e.*, those involving risk or which would properly be carried on by men. For instance, under the Mines Regulation Act, no female shall be employed below ground in any mine. And under the Inspection of Machinery Acts, no female is allowed to operate a lift, or take charge of or control any engine, or clean machinery while some part is in motion. (See Section 14 of the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1915.)

Political and Civil Status.

Women in Queensland have full voting rights under the Elections Acts for the election of representatives to Parliament.

Moreover, the Elections Acts give statutory recognition to the right of a woman to be qualified for nomination as a candidate for election to Parliament. In Queensland, one woman has served a term as member of the Legislative Assembly.

Women are also competent to be appointed as Justices of the Peace, and several women have been so appointed.

Properly Rights.

Queensland has adopted the English law in relation to the rights of property and of the power of making contracts in respect of married women. Married women may acquire and dispose of property, may contract debts, and sue and be sued and can make a will (see generally the Married Women's Property Acts, 1890 to 1897).

Guardianship.

The Guardianship and Custody of Infants and Marriages of Minors Amendment Act of 1928 gave equal rights to the mother of the infant to apply to the Court in respect of any matter affecting the infant as are possessed by the father.

In fact, where, in any proceeding before a Court, the custody or upbringing of an infant or the administration of any property belonging to or held in trust for an infant or the application of the income thereof is in question, the Court, in deciding the question, shall regard the welfare of the infant as the first and paramount consideration and shall not take into consideration whether from any other point of view the claim of the father, or any right at common law possessed by the father in respect of such custody, upbringing, administration or application is superior to that of the mother or the claim of the mother is superior to that of the father.

Service on Juries.

Women, if they so desire, can submit their names for enrolment on the jury panel. Jury service with women is not compulsory but voluntary (see Jury Act, 1929).

Land Laws.

Section 61 of the Land Acts provides that an unmarried female under the age of 21 years or a married woman, unless she has obtained an order for judicial separation or an order protecting her separate property shall not be competent to apply for a selection subject to the condition of personal residence.

Divorce.

Divorce is founded originally on the old English law, but the grounds were recently added to by the Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Act of 1923. The law as to alimony in case of divorce is practically the same as in England.

Unemployment Insurance.

Women have the same rights as men in relation to unemployment insurance, provided they conform to the prescribed conditions.

Income Tax.

Women are on the same footing as men if they have incomes.

Criminal Law.

Same as males except that a woman committing an offence under coercion of her husband is not to be held guilty of the offence. Sexual offences are dealt with in Part XXII of the Criminal Code (Sections 208 to 229) and Section 701.

Status of Women in South Australia.

(Part I.)

In South Australia, women have the same political status as men, and may be elected to and vote for either House of Parliament.

The professions of law, medicine, etc., are open to women who are required to qualify in the same manner as the men.

Under the Sex Disqualification Removal Act, 1921, women are eligible for appointment as Justices of the Peace and notaries public. A number of women have been appointed as Justices. Further, as two Justices of the Peace sitting together may form a Court of Summary Jurisdiction (Police Court) or Local Court of Limited Jurisdiction (Civil Court having jurisdiction to hear claims up to £30) with practically the same powers as a Special Magistrate, it follows that women may sit as members of these courts. Sometimes, particularly in matrimonial and maintenance cases in the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction, one of the two presiding Justices is a woman. The Children's Court is presided over by a Special Magistrate, but he is often accompanied by women Justices.

Under the Juries Act, 1927, however, women are not eligible to sit on juries in civil or criminal cases.

In the Licensing Act, 1932, provisions have been made which will eventually eliminate the employment of barmaids. Under this Act, in a few years' time no woman except the publican's wife, daughter, or sister, step-daughter, or mother may serve intoxicating liquor in

any bar-room. If the publican is a woman then she, her daughter, sister, stepdaughter, or mother may serve drinks.

Women employed in the Public Service are in the same position as men, except that their salaries are generally on a lower scale and they must resign on marriage.

Married Women.

The domicile of a married woman follows that of her husband, except that under the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1929, for the purpose of divorce, judicial separation and other similar relief under the said Act, a deserted wife who was domiciled in this State at the time of desertion is deemed to have retained her South Australian domicile although since the desertion her husband may have acquired a new domicile.

By virtue of the Married Women's Property Acts a married woman is capable of acquiring, holding and disposing by will or otherwise of any real or personal property as her separate property in the same manner as if she were a feme-sole. Every married woman has in her own name, against all persons whomsoever, including her husband, the same civil remedies and also (subject to certain exceptions with respect to her husband) the same remedies and redress by way of criminal proceedings for the protection and security of her own separate property as if such property belonged to her as a feme-sole.

Every married woman is in her own right entitled, and is deemed so to do where she contracts otherwise than as agent, to contract with regard to her separate property, and the contract then binds her separate property and is enforceable at law. The provisions of this paragraph do not, of course, apply where the property is subject to restraint on anticipation.

Further, every married woman having separate property is liable to maintain her destitute husband and certain destitute near relatives in the same manner as her husband is liable to maintain her near relatives.

Other than the few exceptions set out above the political and civil status of women in South Australia corresponds with that of the men.

Industrial Legislation. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Status of Women in South Australia.

(Part II.)

Domicile.

The common law applies as in England except as altered by the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1929, as amended by Section 5 of Act No. 2259. The effect of the alteration is that a deserted wife who is domiciled in the State at the time of desertion is deemed to have retained her South Australian domicile although since the desertion her husband may have acquired another domicile. And where pursuant to an order of any Court or any instrument a woman and her husband live separate from each other and at the time when such separation commences the husband is domiciled in South Australia such woman is deemed to retain her South Australian domicile.

Property.

At common law and in equity, the law as to married women's property is similar to English law prior to the passing of the Married Women's Property Acts. Married Women's Property Acts are in force in South Australia and are similar in their effects to those of the English Acts.

Torts. Contracts.

South Australian law is similar to English law on these subjects, except that in South Australia a husband is not liable for his wife's torts. See Act No. 1084 of 1912, Section 2.

Bankruptcy.

This matter is subject to Commonwealth legislation and the law thereon is contained in the Commonwealth Bankruptcy Acts, 1924 to 1933. Section 8 provides that the Act shall apply to all debtors, including married women.

Guardianship.

The law on this subject is similar to the law in force in England prior to the passing of the English Guardianship of Infants Act, 1925. The South Australian Guardianship of Infants Act, 1887, is in most respects similar to the English Guardianship of Infants Act, 1886.

Maintenance, Poor Law and Bastardy.

Maintenance. — A woman can obtain a separation from her husband in a summary Court upon proving certain facts. She is entitled then to custody of children, protection and maintenance for herself and children.

Both the husband and the wife can seek separation or divorce under the Matrimonial Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

The wife can claim maintenance if left without support; and husband can sue wife f maintenance if he is in need and entitled. These actions are under summary procedur

Both men and women are liable to support their children, grand children, parents ar grandparents.

Poor Law. — Relatives liable to support destitute persons are husbands and wive children and grandchildren, parents and grandparents of such person.

Ration relief (outdoor) and indoor home is provided. No difference is based on sex.

N.B. — Payment of old-age and invalid pensions are provided for pursuant to Commo wealth law.

Bastardy. — Mother is liable to support child. She can claim a maintenance order an judgment of paternity if able to prove case.

No corroboration needed *unless and until* defendant denies paternity.

Father is liable to pay up to 20/– per week maintenance. Child takes mother's nam Upon marriage, mother and her husband may adopt. Husband becomes liable to keep chil after marrying the mother, but the father's liability continues.

Divorce.

Grounds for divorce and judicial separation are the same for a wife as for a husband, an in any action for divorce the Court may make any order which it thinks proper for maintenanc of one party to the marriage by the other party. The law is contained in the Matrimonia Causes Act, 1929, as amended by Acts Nos. 2259 of 1935 and 2293 of 1936.

Unemployment Insurance.

There is no provision for unemployment insurance in South Australia for men and women There is provision, however, for unemployment relief which is applicable equally to both mer and women. See Unemployment Relief Council Act, 1930.

Prostitution.

Special laws exist in South Australia to restrict the rights of common prostitutes as in England. See Police Act, 1936, sections 63, 83, 85 and 117.

Lead Protection. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Income Tax.

Income Tax laws apply equally to both males and females.

Criminal Law.

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act No. 2252 of 1935 applies generally to both males and females.

Juries.

Women are not required to serve as jurors in South Australia. See Juries Act, 1927.

Status of Women in Western Australia.

General.

Under the laws of Western Australia, females already have for all purposes, with a few minor exceptions, the same status as males. That is to say, subject to certain conditions and disqualifications general to both sexes, females equally with males can be elected to either House of Parliament, and have the same voting rights as males as electors.

This applies also in relation to membership of municipal, road board and other local Government bodies, and voting at the election of such members.

Also females, whether married or unmarried, can hold and deal with real and personal property as their separate estate to the same extent as males, and carry on any class of business in their own name and for their own benefit.

Females can be admitted to the practice of professions, *e.g.*, law, medicine, chemistry, etc.

Females are not competent to sit as jurors on either criminal or civil juries; and under the Licensing Act, 1911, a female cannot hold a publican's general licence or wayside-house licence if she is under thirty years of age, or is a married woman residing with her husband.

Apart from the two latter exceptions, there is no disability in the matter of political and civil status suffered by females which is not also suffered by males.

Domicile.

The domicile of a feme-sole can be altered by her in the same way as if she were a man. Upon marriage, a woman becomes a dependent person as far as domicile is concerned, an duntil death, divorce or nullity of marriage her domicile is that of her husband. There is an exception to this rule in one particular case and that is the following : For the purposes of divorce, a deserted wife who was domiciled in Western Australia at the time of desertion is deemed to have retained her Western Australia domicile notwithstanding that her husband may have since the desertion acquired a foreign domicile (Supreme Court Act No. 36 of 1935, Sec. 71).

Married Woman's Property.

A married woman has all the rights and liabilities of a man with regard to her separate estate, but the liabilities are limited to the separate estate and are not personal.

Divorce.

The following grounds for divorce are virtually the same for both men and women :

(1) Adultery.
(2) Desertion.
(3) Drunkenness, combined with cruelty or failure to maintain in the case of a man, and combined with failure to perform her domestic duties in the case of a woman.
(4) Imprisonment, with an additional ground for a wife shortening the period and lessening the type of offence if coupled with failure to maintain.
(5) Attempt to murder or to inflict grievous bodily harm on the petitioner.
(6) Lunacy.
(7) Ante-nuptial incontinence.

In addition, a wife may petition for divorce if she has been separated from her husband under an order of a competent court or by virtue of a deed of separation for a period of three years, and her husband has been liable during that period to make periodical payments by way of maintenance and has failed to do so either entirely or repeatedly and habitually (Supreme Court Act No. 36 of 1935, Sec. 69).

Where a wife has appeared as the respondent in a suit for divorce, she has the right to call upon her husband to secure the costs of the action and in the event of his failing to do so, he cannot proceed with his petition (Rule 72).

A husband who petitions for divorce successfully on the ground of his wife's adultery may be awarded damages and costs against the co-respondent. No such right belongs to a wife who petitions successfully on the ground of her husband's adultery.

Guardianship of Infants.

The father is the guardian by nature and nurture of his legitimate children and entitled to their custody and control until they attain the age of 21 years. If the children are illegitimate, the mother is *prima facie* entitled to their custody up to the age of 14 years.

By the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1920-1926, on the death of the father, the mother is constituted guardian of the children either solely or jointly with a guardian appointed by the father. On the death of the mother, the father is the guardian either solely or jointly with any person appointed by the mother to act with him in that capacity. A very strong case must be made out before the Court will deprive a father of the guardianship of his children.

Section 2 of the Guardianship of Infants Act 1926 (W. A.) provides that:

"Where in any proceeding before any court . . . the custody or upbringing of an infant . . . is in question, the court, in deciding that question shall regard the welfare of the infant as the first and paramount consideration, and shall not take into consideration whether from any other point of view the claim by the father, or any right at common law possessed by the father, in respect of such custody, upbringing, administration or application is superior to that of the mother, or the claim of the mother is superior to that of the father".

By Section 3 of the same Act, it is provided that :

"The mother of an infant shall have the like powers to apply to the court in respect of any matter affecting the infant as are possessed by the father".

Right of Appointment to Public Office.

Women have equal rights with men to appointment to public office, but in fact rarely avail themselves of that right.

Bankruptcy.

There is no limitation under our Bankruptcy law to the effect that a married woman may only be made bankrupt in respect of her separate estate, nor is a married woman made subject to the Act solely by reason of her having carried on trade or business. If a married woman is made bankrupt and if she owns property the income of which is subject to a restraint on anticipation, the Court may order the income to be paid to the trustee for distribution among the creditors, subject to the claim of the married woman and her children for their maintenance. But, subject to that power of the Court, separate property of a married woman, subject to restraint, is not property divisible amongst her creditors.

Maintenance.

On any decree for dissolution or nullity of marriage, the Court may, if it thinks fit, order that the husband shall secure to the wife such gross sum of money or annual or monthly or weekly sum of money as having regard to her fortune, if any, to the ability of her husband and to the conduct of the parties, the Court may deem reasonable. On the application of either party the amount of the payments may be increased or decreased or the order discharged altogether, if the Court is satisfied that the circumstances of the parties warrant such a change or discharge. Under the Married Women's Protection Act, 1922, a married woman whose husband during the preceding six months has been guilty of :

(1) Cruelty to her or any of her children.

(2) Adultery.

(3) Desertion.

(4) Failure to maintain her or any of her children,

may apply for protection under the Act. An order made upon proof of any of these offences may relieve the applicant from the obligation to cohabit with her husband, grant her custody of the children and order the payment of maintenance for her or any of her children. It will be noticed that the offences (1) and (4) may be committed against any child of the wife (*e.g.*, an illegitimate child or child by a former marriage) and also that payment of maintenance for any such child may be ordered by the Court. The proceedings under this Act are summary and comparatively free from publicity, and the protection afforded by the Act is very frequently sought. The Children's Court has power to order the payment of maintenance for children both legitimate and illegitimate, and has wide powers for enforcing such orders. Liability for maintenance of a legitimate child lies firstly on the father, then on the mother, then step father, then step mother, then brothers and sisters, and lastly on grand parents. Liability for maintenance of an illegitimate child lies firstly on the father, then on the mother's husband, then the mother.

Nationality.

The nationality of a married woman is that of her husband. A successful application for naturalisation automatically naturalises the wife and infant children of the applicant.

Franchise.

Women have the same voting rights and obligations as men. They are eligible to become members of Parliament and/or of local governing bodies. There are two female members of the Western Australian Parliament, as at present constituted.

Prostitution.

In Western Australia, it is an offence to keep a house to which persons may resort for the purposes of prostitution, or to procure a woman (of any age) to become a prostitute. It is also an offence for a prostitute to solicit for the purpose of prostitution, though in this case the soliciting must constitute something more than mere accosting for that purpose. The offence is coupled with that of riotous behaviour by a prostitute in a public place and is apparently regarded as an offence because it is likely to bring about a breach of the peace. It is an offence for a male person to live wholly or in part on the proceeds of prostitution. Despite the fact that the keeping of a brothel constitutes an offence, they exist more or less openly. Their proprietors are periodically prosecuted and fined for their activities, but no attempt is made by the police to remove them. Their inmates, if they become infected with venereal disease, are obliged to report periodically to the health authorities for inspection.

Lead Protection. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

The Poor Law.

Commonwealth legislation provides for old-age pensions for (broadly speaking) all persons, other than aliens, Asiatics and Aboriginal natives, who have property or money equalling in value not more than a certain sum. Women who qualify for this pension in all other respects become eligible to receive it at the age of 60 years. Men are not eligible until they reach 65 years of age. A woman is not disqualified from receiving the old-age pension by reason only of the fact that she is married to an alien, an Asiatic or an Aboriginal native.

State legislation provides for the establishment of poor houses.

There is also provision for deserted wives and children or near relatives to apply to the Courts for attachment of the property of the person liable for their support (9 Victoria, cap. 2). As a matter of Government policy, relief to destitute women and children is provided also through the Child Welfare Department upon proof that there is no person liable for their support or that if there is a person so liable every effort has been made to enforce his

obligations, and in addition that the applicant cannot find employment. Such relief is at the rate of nine shillings per head with a maximum of £3.3.0 per week per family. The mother of a family would not be expected to obtain employment, and an unmarried mother is not expected to find employment while she is nursing a child. Unemployment relief has been a large item in Government expenditure over the past years of depression, but is gradually decreasing.

Unemployment Insurance.

There is no form of unemployment insurance in Western Australia.

Bastardy.

Bastardy and affiliation proceedings are governed by the Child Welfare Act, 1907-1927, and jurisdiction in these matters is now vested solely in the Children's courts.

Upon the hearing of a complaint against any person in respect of the maintenance of an illegitimate child of which the defendant is alleged to be the father, no order can be made upon the evidence of the mother unless her evidence is corroborated in some material particular or if the Court is satisfied that at the time the child was begotten the mother was a common prostitute. Slight evidence of corroboration is sufficient, its sufficiency being purely a matter for the discretion of the Bench, but there must be some corroboration. Proceedings may be laid against the father for maintenance or for confinement expenses either before or after the birth of the child.

Income Tax.

A recent provision allows a married man to deduct from the taxable amount of his income a sum not exceeding £50 per annum payable to his wife by way of an allowance. This provision apparently does not operate in the case of a married woman who makes to her husband such an allowance, but apart from that men and women are on an equal footing with respect to income tax.

Criminal Law.

A married woman is not free from criminal responsibility for doing or omitting to do an act merely because the act or omission takes place in the presence of her husband. A married woman is not criminally responsible for doing or omitting to do an act which she is actually compelled by her husband to do or omit to do, and which is done or omitted to be done in his presence, except in the case of an act or omission which would constitute an offence punishable with death, or an offence of which grievous bodily harm to the person of another, or an intention to cause such harm is an element, in which case the presence of her husband is immaterial.

A husband and wife are not criminally responsible for conspiracy between themselves alone.

When a husband and wife are living together, neither of them incurs any criminal responsibility for doing or omitting to do any act with respect to the property of the other except in the case of an act or omission of which an intention to injure or defraud some other person is an element and except in the case of an act done by either of them when leaving or deserting or when about to leave or desert the other. Subject to that provision, a husband and wife are each of them criminally responsible for any act done by him or her with respect to the property of the other which would be an offence if they were not husband and wife. But neither of them can institute criminal proceedings against the other while they are living together. Upon the prosecution of a husband on the complaint of his wife for an offence committed with respect to her property and upon the prosecution of a wife on the complaint of her husband for an offence committed with respect to his property, the wife or husband, as the case may be, is a competent and compellable witness. The wife or husband of a person charged with a number of offences, all in the nature of sexual offences, is a competent and compellable witness either for the prosecution or defence at every stage of the proceedings and without the consent of the person charged. Subject to that provision a husband is not compellable in any proceedings to disclose any communication made to him by his wife during marriage, and a wife is not compellable in any proceedings to disclose any communication made to her by her husband during the marriage (Criminal Code, 1914). The punishment of whipping cannot be inflicted upon a female. In the event of a woman being pregnant while she is under sentence of death, execution may be delayed until the birth of her child.

Sexual Offences.

The offence of rape is not a capital offence in Western Australia, but is punishable with imprisonment with hard labour for life with or without whipping.

The consent of a girl under the age of 16 years to be carnally known or indecently assaulted by any man (the age is 17 when the man is her teacher, employer or guardian) is not recognised by law.

It is a defence to a charge of having or attempting to have unlawful carnal knowledge of a girl under 16 years of age to prove that the accused person believed on reasonable grounds that the girl was of or above the age of 16. A person cannot be convicted of such an offence upon the uncorroborated testimony of one witness.

Jury Service, Trades, Professions, etc.

Women are not eligible or liable for jury service. Every profession is open to women. Most trades are governed by the provisions of industrial awards delivered under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, and numbers of the awards make no provision for females employed in the industry concerned. At the same time there is no actual prohibition against their being so employed. Married women find it very difficult to obtain employment, although some who practised a profession before marriage have continued to do so after it with varying degrees of success. The basic wage for men, as provided by the Arbitration Court is £3.12.0 per week, while that for women is £1.18.11 per week, though it must be remembered that the wage for men is regulated on the assumption that he has himself, a wife and two children to support, while that for women assumes that the woman has only herself to support. The various industrial awards allow a margin above the basic wage for the skill of the worker.

Work in Mines. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Status of Women in Tasmania.

Except as is otherwise set out below, the status of unmarried women and widows of adult age in Tasmania is in no way to be differentiated from that of the adult man.

Married Women.

Section 3 of the Married Women's Property Act, 1935, confers upon married women the amplest powers of holding real and personal property and of contracting. The position of the married woman is assimilated to that of the feme-sole.

Women generally.

Scattered throughout Tasmanian Statute Law will be found numerous disabilities of women, sometimes of the whole sex and sometimes merely of married women. These may take the form of either a capacity conferred upon the male sex *eo nomine* with an implied exclusion of the female sex, or an actual expressed incapacity of the female sex. In the absence of any index of Tasmanian Statute Law it would be hopeless to attempt to enumerate the cases in which such disabilities are suffered under Tasmanian Law. The following are cited as examples only :

(*i*) Section 52 of the Public Service Act, 1923 (inserted by the Amending Act, 18, Geo. V. No. 18), debars married women from employment in the Public Service of the State.

(*ii*) Women are not eligible for service on juries in Tasmania (The Jury Act, 1899, Section 4).

(*iii*) Section 29 of the Mines and Works Regulation Act, 1915, prohibits the employment for hire in or about a mine of any female excepting in the case of clerical employment.

On the other hand, the law of Tasmania occasionally invests women with an ability not possessed by a man. For instance, a wife who is deserted by her husband at a time when the husband (and consequently the wife) is domiciled in Tasmania may, upon the continuance of the desertion for the statutory period, institute divorce proceedings against her husband based on his desertion of her notwithstanding the fact that the husband's domicile (and, therefore, the wife's) is no longer Tasmania. This will be found in the Matrimonial Causes Amendment Act, 1919, Section 3 inserting in the Principal Act a new Section 14*b* (see last paragraph thereof). Furthermore the statutory period of desertion is only two years for the deserted wife while it is three years for the deserted husband.

In general terms, it is provided by the Acts Interpretation Act, 1931, Section 24, that in the construction of any Tasmanian Statute " words importing the masculine gender shall include females ".

The relevant extracts from the Statutory Provisions are as follows :

Section 3. — Married Women's Property Act.

(1) A married woman shall be capable of acquiring, holding, and disposing of any real or personal property in the same manner in every respect as if she were a feme-sole.

(2) A married woman shall be capable of entering into and rendering herself liable in respect of any contract, and of suing and being sued, either in contract or in tort, or otherwise, in all respects as if she were a feme-sole; and any damages or costs recovered by her in any such action or proceeding shall be her property; and any damages or costs awarded against her in any such action or proceeding shall be recoverable from and payable by her in the same manner in every respect as if she were a feme-sole.

(3) The marriage of a woman shall not affect any contract or liability entered into, or incurred, by her before marriage.

Section 52. — Public Service Act.

(1) No married woman shall be employed either permanently or temporarily in the Service unless the Commissioner certifies in any special case that there are special circumstances rendering her employment desirable.

(2) Every female employee who marries after appointment to any position shall be deemed thereupon to have retired unless the Commissioner certifies as provided by Sub-section (1) hereof, that the retention of her services is desirable.

Section 29. — Mines and Works Regulation Act. (Omitted. See Introduction to the present document.)

Section 14b. — Matrimonial Causes Amendment Act.

Any wife who at the time of the institution of the suit has been domiciled in Tasmania for two years and upwards may present a petition to the Court praying that her marriage may be dissolved on one or more of the grounds following :

I. That her husband has without just cause or excuse deserted the petitioner and without any such cause or excuse left her continuously deserted during two years and upwards.

II. That her husband has during three years and upwards been an habitual drunkard, and either habitually left the petitioner without the means of support, or habitually been guilty of cruelty towards her.

III. That at the time of the presentation of the petition her husband has been imprisoned for a period of not less than three years, and is still in prison under a commuted sentence for a capital crime, or under sentence to penal servitude for seven years or upwards, or has within five years undergone frequent terms of imprisonment, and has been sentenced in the aggregate to imprisonment for three years or upwards.

IV. That within one year previously her husband has been convicted of having attempted to murder the petitioner, or on the ground that her husband has repeatedly during that period assaulted and cruelly beaten the petitioner.

V. That her husband has since the celebration of his marriage and after the First day of January, One thousand nine hundred and twenty, been guilty of adultery.

VI. That her husband has for a period or periods of not less in the aggregate than seven years, within ten years immediately preceding the filing of the petition, been a lunatic or person of unsound mind and is unlikely to recover from such lunacy or unsoundness of mind, or has been confined as such in any hospital or other institution in accordance with the provisions of ' The Mental Diseases Hospitals Act ' for a period of or periods not less in the aggregate than seven years, within ten years immediately preceding the filing of the petition, and is unlikely to recover from such lunacy or unsoundness of mind.

If in the opinion of the Court the petitioner's own habits or conduct induced or contributed to the wrong complained of under this section, such petition may be dismissed. Provided always that the Court may, if it thinks fit, notwithstanding that the petitioner has been guilty of conduct which would disentitle such petitioner to relief as provided in Section 20 of the Principal Act, if satisfied that it is in the interest of all parties that the marriage should be dissolved, pronounce a decree declaring that such marriage be dissolved.

A deserted wife who was domiciled in Tasmania at the time of desertion shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to have retained her Tasmanian domicile notwithstanding that her husband may have since the desertion acquired any foreign domicile.

Bulgaria.

[*Translation.*] June 3rd, 1937.

I. Situation of Women as regards Private Law.

Unmarried Women.

As regards private law, the legal situation of unmarried women is absolutely the same as that of men, with the three following exceptions, which also apply to married women :

(*a*) Women cannot witness certificates of births, marriages and deaths (Article 120 of the Law on Persons) ;

(*b*) A woman cannot be a guardian nor a member of a family council, unless she is mother or grandmother (Article 51 of the Law on Persons) ;

(*c*) In the inheritance of immovable property regarded as fixtures, the female descendant heirs receive a share half as great as that of the male descendants.

Married Women.

A married woman retains her full legal capacity. Financial relations between married people are regulated on the basis of a complete separation of property between husband and wife ; as regards private law, complete equality exists between husband and wife. Causes of divorce are the same for both husband and wife. However, the closeness of the marriage tie results in certain restrictions in the legal situation of women.

A. *Restrictions in the Interest of the Unity of the Family.*

I. A wife has the same domicile as her husband ; a widow keeps that domicile until she acquires another (Article 9 of the Law on Persons).

II. While the marriage lasts the paternal power is exercised by the father. The mother only exercises this power if the father is dead, has been deprived of his paternal power, or is absent (Article 62 of the Law on Persons). The father has the right to impose on the surviving mother, by provisions in his will or by authentic deed, definite conditions concerning the education of the children or the administration of their property. The mother may, nevertheless, ask for the abolition of these conditions from the family council, which makes a decision on her request (Article 77 of the Law on Persons).

III. An unmarried male under disabilities has the father as his legal guardian or, if the father is dead, the mother. When an illegitimate child is acknowledged by both parents, the father is legal guardian.

IV. A married woman cannot enter into business without the express or tacit authorisation of her husband. This authorisation is taken for granted if the woman is publicly known to be trading, unless the husband explicitly expresses his opposition. If the husband is absent or under guardianship, having been deprived of his legal rights, the regional court grants the necessary authorisation. Even if a woman is engaged in business, she cannot be a member of a commercial company which entails unlimited responsibility without express authorisation from her husband, or from the court in the case of the absence or illness of her husband (Article 9 of the Law on Trade). A husband may withdraw the permission to trade granted to his wife, but the withdrawal must be approved by the Court, which will have previously heard the woman (Article 12 of the Law on Trade).

V. The husband may ask for the annulling of the contract of service concluded by his wife by sending a request to that effect to the conciliation court. The court may accede to that request only if the maintenance of the contract of service seems harmful to the relations between husband and wife and if the husband brings proof that he has the means of meeting the household expenses.

B. *Limitations in the Interest of Third Parties.*

Articles 741 and 742 of the Law on Trade set forth the legal but not incontestable presumption that property acquired by the wife of a bankrupt belongs to the husband and that it has been acquired with his money. This property is included in the bankrupt's total estate.

C. *Restrictions in the Interest of the National Economy.*

Male descendants have the right to keep to themselves the shares of their female co-heirs in unbuilt property if the latter are already married, on paying them the price of those shares on evaluation (Article 420, paragraph 2, of the Law on Inheritance). The restriction in the rights of succession of women mentioned above (*loc. cit.*) has also as its basis the safeguarding of the interests of the national economy.

II. *Situation of Women as regards Public Law and Political Situation.*

Women may fill any State office if they satisfy the required conditions. They are excluded only from a military career and, in conformity with the canons of the Orthodox Church, from all ecclesiastical offices.

No restrictions exist concerning the education of Bulgarian women. They have access to all schools and universities except military schools and religious academies and seminaries.

Women may exercise all professions and all trades, with a few exceptions as a result of industrial legislation for protecting female labour.

As a general rule, Bulgarian women have no political rights. They have no vote at the legislative elections and cannot stand as candidates. However, a recent law has given the vote in municipal elections to married women of full age who are or have been mothers of legitimate children (Article 5, Decree Law for the Election of Members of Municipal Councils). This law is the first step towards political equality for Bulgarian women.

China.

[*Translation.*] June 22nd, 1937.

I have the honour to convey to you certain information supplementing that communicated to you by the Permanent Bureau of the Chinese Delegation in a letter dated September 2nd, 1936.[1]

The principle of the equality of the sexes set out in Article 6 of the Provisional Constitution of the Chinese Republic at present in force, is reproduced in Article 8 of the Draft Constitution made public on May 5th, 1936, which will become final after adoption by the People's Congress at the end of this year.

The new text, however, is simplified. The words " All citizens of the Chinese Republic

[1] See document A.33.1936.V.

without distinction of sex, race, religion or class, are equal before the law " have been replaced by " The citizens of the Chinese Republic are all equal before the law ", all persons of Chinese nationality being citizens of the Chinese Republic according to Article 3 of the Draft Constitution.

The principle of the equality of the sexes is embodied in the Civil Code, chiefly as regards the family and succession and criminal law; in particular, Chapter 17 of the Criminal Code relating to offences against marriage and the family.

With regard to the steps that might be taken by the League of Nations in the matter of the status of women, my Government has, for the moment, no suggestions to put forward.

Denmark.

[*Translation.*] June 14th, 1937.

I. For elections to the Rigsdag, Municipal Councils and other similar assemblies, the *conditions governing the franchise and eligibility* are the same for men and women.

II. Under the Law of March 4th, 1921, all *posts and offices under the State and Communes* prescribed by law are open to men and women on equal conditions, with the exception of military posts and posts for which ecclesiastical ordination is required. Similarly, men and women are equally bound to discharge the duties incumbent upon them.

III. From the point of view of *civil law*, men and women are equal in principle, so that there is no special situation applicable to women, unless this is provided for by way of exception, for example, in the following cases :

(1) The provision laid down in Article 6 of the Law of June 30th, 1922, on the conclusion and dissolution of marriage, which prescribes that the minimum age for the conclusion of marriage shall be 21 years for a man and only 18 years for a woman, and the provision laid down in Article 16 of the same law which prescribes that a woman who has already been married may not contract a new marriage before the expiry of a period of ten months after the termination of the previous marriage, unless she has been with child since a period previous to the termination of the said marriage or ten months have elapsed since the termination of her cohabitation with her first husband.

(2) The provision of Article 6 of the Law of June 30th, 1922, on minority and guardianship, which declares that the father is the natural guardian of his legitimate minor child, whereas the mother becomes so only by the death of the father, or if the latter cannot exercise guardianship because he is himself a minor, or because he has been deprived of the right of guardianship.

(3) The provision of Article 11 of the Law of March 18th, 1925, on the legal effects of marriage, whereby a woman, dealing with a third party, is authorised, on the responsibility of the husband and wife jointly, to perform such ordinary legal acts as may be necessary to ensure her individual requirements.

(4) The provision of Article 2, point 2, of the Law of April 20th, 1926, on the right of inheritance between husband and wife and the non-divisibility of estates, whereby the husband may decide by will that his wife, as long as she remains a party to the non-divisibility, shall not have access to the property included in the estate, except with the consent of a curator, and may appoint the person responsible for exercising such functions.

IV. From the point of view of *public law*, the following rules are in force :

Under Article 3 of the Law of April 18th, 1925, on the acquisition and loss of nationality, a foreign woman acquires Danish nationality by her marriage with a Dane, whereas the marriage of a Danish woman and a foreigner does not confer Danish nationality on the latter.

As regards Articles 2 and 6 of the same law, which deal with the acquisition of Danish nationality by foreign nationals by reason of their birth in Denmark or of a prolonged sojourn in the country and the loss of Danish nationality by reason of birth or sojourn abroad, the rule is that married women cannot personally acquire or lose nationality in virtue of the above-mentioned reasons, whereas a woman who has married a man affected by these provisions always follows the status of her husband, irrespective of whether she herself fulfils the conditions laid down in the rules in question.

Apart from these measures, the two sexes are in principle assimilated from the point of view of public law. The provision of Article 4 of the aforesaid law, whereby the naturalisation of a married man applies also to his wife, does not in point of fact constitute inequality between the sexes, since in practice a woman is required to join in her husband's application for naturalisation, and, in the contrary event, she is as a rule explicitly excluded from the effects of naturalisation in virtue of a special provision of the naturalisation law in question.

As regards the provision laid down in Article 5 of the above-mentioned law concerning the loss of Danish nationality by a person who becomes a national of another country, the two sexes have in principle been assimilated. Since, however, in the application

of the said provision, this interpretation applies only to the methods of acquiring nationality which are recognised by the general public law of the European countries without requiring that a similar rule shall exist under Danish legislation, a Danish woman loses her nationality by marriage with a foreigner, if she thereby acquires the latter's nationality, whereas it is hardly admissible that a Dane should lose his nationality by marriage with a foreign woman, even if the effect of such marriage were to confer on him his wife's nationality.

The provision of Article 5, point 2, of the same law, whereby the loss of Danish nationality in the case of a person who is a Dane by birth ensues only after such person has become established abroad, is of importance chiefly to women who marry foreigners and to illegitimate children born of a Danish mother who acquire foreign nationality by reason of the subsequent marriage of their parents.

Article 8, point 1, of the said law contains the following special provision relating to women : " Women who, on the date of the entry into force of the present law, have lost Danish nationality by contracting marriage with a man who does not possess Danish nationality may recover it by applying to the Ministry of the Interior, if they have originally acquired the said nationality by their birth and have not ceased to live in the Kingdom since the conclusion of the marriage. If they establish themselves abroad, they lose Danish nationality."

V. *Compulsory military service* applies only to men, under the provisions of Article 88 of the Constitutional Law (*Cf.* Law of June 8th, 1912).

VI. In the exercise of medical professions, midwives' posts have been reserved for women, but doctors are authorised to fulfil the duties generally undertaken by midwives in confinements.

Egypt.

[*Translation.*]

Note on the Political, Legal and Economic Status of Egyptian Moslem Women.

The modern Western legislative systems make no distinction between questions relating to personal status and those relating to the daily life of the citizen within the frontiers of his country.

Thus the Civil Code of each State contains provisions governing the various stages in the life of the citizen from his birth to his death. The same applies to the Courts to whose jurisdiction he is amenable and which have cognisance of these questions.

Nevertheless, the competence of the Courts in Egypt is governed by laws modelled principally on those which were in force in the Ottoman Empire, by reason of the relations of suzerainty which formerly bound Turkey to Egypt. These laws make a distinction, as regards judicial organisation, between the different Egyptian communities. The differentiation is based sometimes on religion, sometimes on race, and leaves each Court to settle disputes in conformity with the laws governing the parties who come within its jurisdiction.

The application of the laws relating to civil matters comes within the competence of the Civil Tribunals (National and Mixed). Most of the provisions governing such questions are taken from the modern European legislative systems, more particularly French legislation.

The application of laws concerning the personal status of Moslems comes within the competence of the Personal Status Courts known as Mehkemeh Sharia. These courts apply Moslem Law according to the Hanafite rite.

The said provisions of Moslem Law have been collected and published by Kadry Pasha. They were recently partially amended by reference to other Moslem rites (See Laws No. 25 of 1920, No. 25 of 1929 and No. 78 of 1931).

Having regard to the foregoing considerations, it is a simple matter to examine the status of Egyptian Moslem women under the laws of the country.

Political Rights of Egyptian Moslem Women.

The political status of Moslem or non-Moslem women is the same as that of men (Article 3 of the Constitution).

Nevertheless, the electoral law has explicitly restricted the rights of voting and election to men, to the exclusion of women (Article 1 of Law No. 11 of 1923). It may be noted that Moslem law makes no distinction between men and women from this point of view.

Under Moslem Law, a woman may not reign, and so far the various Moslem countries have always followed this tradition, which is, moreover, in the case of Egypt embodied in an explicit text (Article 5 of the Royal Rescript dated April 13th, 1923).

Women possess the same rights as men as regards eligibility for public office and participation in societies and associations.

The law on civil pensions, which grants only to a few officials of the male sex the privilege of enjoying their right to a pension or indemnity in case of resignation, grants this right to

women officials if they resign on account of marriage. Further, the Egyptian legislator has enacted several provisions determining the status of women from the point of view of nationality (See Articles 14, 15 and 17 of Law No. 19 of 1929 and of February 27th, 1929, as amended by Law No. 92 of 1931).

Personal Status of Women.

On this point, reference need simply be made to the provisions of the law published in Kadry Pasha's Code of Personal Status and to the laws amending it.

It is of interest to note a special advantage accorded to women under the terms of Article 24 of Law No. 78 of 1931. The rule of ordinary law, which provides that every case must be brought before the defendant's court, grants women the right, in questions of personal status, to have the case brought before whatever court they may designate.

As regards the right to alimony women possess the following two privileges : (1) although the salaries of State officials are not transferable and not distrainable, a woman may apply for distraint up to the amount of one quarter of such salaries ; (2) the alimony in question may not be the object of distraint except by reason of another claim for alimony.

Article 209 of Kadry Pasha's Code provides, in Chapter 3, under the head of " Marital Power ", that a husband may take only moderate disciplinary measures against his wife when she commits a fault or blameworthy act concerning the punishment of which the law remains silent. Nevertheless, a husband is never permitted to employ violence against his wife even for a plausible reason. The right of discipline is granted to the man only in his capacity as father and head of the family, responsible for the expenses of the household and for keeping order within it. This right of discipline is designed to correct the woman if her conduct is unseemly. Consequently, it cannot be employed by the man for purposes of vengeance or in an arbitrary fashion. If circumstances demand resort to correction, this must not exceed the bounds strictly necessary to achieve its purpose. The disciplinary sanctions laid down in the Koran are accordingly admonition, conjugal abandonment and corporal punishment. These various sanctions are specified in order, so that no one punishment may be resorted to until a lesser punishment has been tried in vain. If one punishment has produced its effect, the more serious punishment must not be employed.

Status of Women under Civil Law.

A woman enjoys the same rights as a man on reaching her legal majority (21 years). She then becomes free as regards her acts and no longer depends upon anyone ; it is immaterial whether she is married or not.

Article 4 of Kadry Pasha's Code of Personal Status stipulates that a promise of marriage and betrothal shall not be binding upon the parties, who retain the right to break off the marriage.

Article 217 of the same Code grants to the husband alone, to the exclusion of the wife, the right of divorce.

The civil tribunals, both native and mixed, have generally adopted this view.

Status of Women under Commercial Law.

The law makes no distinction between men and women as regards their rights and obligations in commercial matters. Nevertheless, certain measures have been taken under the Mixed and Native Codes to protect the wife of a merchant who has been declared bankrupt.

Status of Women under Penal Law.

The law makes no distinction between men and women as regards procedure or penalties except in the matter of adultery, when the penalty is heavier for the woman than for the man.

Similarly, in the matter of abduction, the penalty is heavier when the victim is of the female sex (Articles 250, 251 and 252 of the Penal Code).

Nevertheless, the application of the Penal Code varies in certain respects as regards the procedure of execution. Thus women are never sentenced to hard labour or to be handcuffed or chained (Article 15 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). When a woman with child is sentenced to death, the penalty cannot be carried out until after her confinement (Article 263 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

If a woman and her accomplice are caught in the act of adultery, the husband alone has the right of legal excuse if he commits murder.

Social Status of Women.

The legislator has quite recently taken measures for the protection of women. With this object, Law No. 80 of 1933 was promulgated, concerning conditions for the employment of women in industry and commerce. Furthermore, a department has been created at the Ministry of Commerce and Industry known as the Labour Department, one of whose duties it is to supervise the strict application of the aforesaid law and the achievement of its objects.

Before concluding this study, it may be useful to allude briefly to polygamy and the legal value of women's testimony.

Polygamy.

Under Moslem law, a man may have four wives at once, but he must treat them all on a footing of equality ; if, for reasons of preference or any other reason, he cannot do so, he is

recommended to have only one. The Koran contains the following text on the subject : " If you fear to be unjust, wed only one ", and further on :

" You can never treat all your wives alike, however earnestly you may wish it."

Testimony.

The value of a woman's testimony varies according to the case. It may sometimes be equal to that of a man, as in the case of criminal actions. In certain suits it is not customary for the Court to admit a man's testimony, for example, in the case of a woman's confinement, or as regards a woman's hidden vices, which may be alleged by the husband in an action for the dissolution of marriage. There are other cases in which the testimony of men alone is admitted, such as actions which would offend the susceptibility of a woman or which she cannot endure, either for humanitarian reasons or reasons of modesty.

Nevertheless, it has been agreed to accept the testimony of a woman in a case of murder if this is the only available means of ascertaining the truth, including the particular case in which the crime has been committed in a place where there were only women.

Finally, in other cases, women and men are allowed to give evidence equally, although a man's testimony is regarded as twice as valuable as that of a woman.

Annex.

TEXT OF THE LAWS MENTIONED IN THE NOTE.

Political Questions:

(1) Articles 3 and 21 of the Constitution of April 19th, 1923.
(2) Article 1 of Electoral Law No. 11 of 1923.
(3) Article 5 of the Royal Rescript dated April 13th, 1922.
(4) Articles 58 and 59 of Law No. 37 of 1929 on civil pensions.
(5) Articles 14, 15 and 17 of the Nationality Law of 1929.

Personal Status:

(1) Articles 436 and 437 of the Code of Native Procedure.
(2) Article 1 of the Decree dated November 26th, 1890.
(3) Article 1 of the Law of October 12th, 1918.

} Distraint of one quarter of salary in payment of alimony.

Commercial Code:

Articles 5, 109, 362, 365 (Native) and Articles 11, 114, 372 and 379 (Mixed).

Penal Code:

(1) Articles 15, 201, 235, 236, 250, 251 and 252 of the Penal Code.
(2) Article 263 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Social Laws:

Law No. 80 dated July 10th, 1933.

RULINGS OF THE COURTS.

Right of Discipline.

If a husband, in administering punishment to his wife, has exceeded the limits authorised and caused her injury he shall be punished.

Court of Cassation, March 3rd, 1934, Review *Al Mouhama*, fifth year, page 107, No. 99.
Court of Cassation, December 18th, 1923, *Official Bulletin*, year 1935, page 134.

Right of Divorce.

This right is reserved exclusively to the Moslem husband, who may exercise it at will. Thus a woman is never authorised to claim damages in case of divorce. The only compensation to which she is entitled is the arrears of her dowry.

Mixed Court of Appeal, June 20th, 1933, *Gazette* 1913, Page 55, No. 99.
Cairo Court of Appeal, December 18th, 1928, Review *Al Mouhama*, eighth year, pages 497 and 325.

Contrary Opinion.

Divorce is in principle prohibited and is permitted only in case of necessity. Accordingly, it does not depend on the husband's caprice ; it is a limited right, of which only reasonable use can be made. If the husband divorces his wife without cause, he is guilty of an abuse of his right and owes reparation for the damage caused, whether material or moral.

Chebin El Kom, December 10th, 1930, Review *Al Mouhama*, eleventh year, page 540, No. 277.
Cairo Court of First Instance, December 10th, 1932, Review *Al Mouhama*, thirteenth year, page 1133, No. 564.

Breaking-off of Betrothal.

Betrothal or promise of marriage does not constitute a contract carrying with it an obligation ; hence, if one of the parties fails in his undertakings, that party does not incur any responsibility. Further, the man has the right to take back whatever he may have advanced as dowry or given as a present, provided always that such dowry or presents are still available. The man may not therefore in any case be prosecuted for damages, nor may any attempt be made to determine the reason for which he has broken off the marriage.

Native Court of Appeal, December 17th, 1931, Review *Al Mouhama*, twelfth year, page 855, No. 422.
Alexandria Court of First Instance, November 14th, 1930, *Official Bulletin*, thirty-second year, page 76, No. 30.
Native Court of Appeal, May 23rd, 1926, *Official Bulletin*, twenty-seventh year, page 68, No. 45.

In cases concerning the breaking-off of a marriage, the Mixed Tribunal generally adopts this view, although in certain cases it may order the payment of damages. The Mixed Tribunal lays down as a condition that, if the man is to be regarded as responsible, he must have committed some fault independent of the actual breaking-off of the marriage, and that such fault must have caused injury to the other party. The responsibility in that case ensues from a quasi civil offence and not from the breaking of a contract. Most of the cases of this kind brought before the courts refer to sexual relations alleged to have taken place between the betrothed parties.

The Mixed Tribunal, when ordering payment of damages, argues that the promise of marriage was employed by the man as a means of seduction whereby the woman had been induced to yield. The Court convicts by reason of the sexual relations which have taken place and not by reason of the non-execution of the undertaking. The promise of marriage must, however, have been given previous to such sexual relations and must have been the determining cause in inducing the woman to yield. If the woman's misconduct is due to strong reciprocal feelings of sympathy, there are no grounds for reparation, either material or moral, even if a promise has been given in the meantime.

Alexandria Mixed Summary Tribunal, March 13th, 1915, *Gazette*, fifth year, page 108, No. 279.
Alexandria Mixed Summary Tribunal, January 29th, 1916, *Gazette*, sixth year, pages 76 and 239.
Alexandria Mixed Summary Tribunal, February 24th, 1923, *Gazette*, fourteenth year, page 40, No. 55.
Alexandria Court of Appeal, February 20th, 1930, *Gazette*, twentieth year, page 207, No. 196.

Finland.

[*Translation.*] June 11th, 1937.

Finland has nothing essential to add to previous information in regard to the status of women in Finland. As has been made plain in the information referred to, women are the legal equals of men in Finland for all essential purposes. There is not therefore at present any feminist issue to speak of in Finland; but feminist organisations aim at securing amendment in minor matters of such restrictions as are still imposed by law on women and slight improvements in their general position.

There are still restrictions on the appointment of women to certain posts; and the women's organisations have done everything in their power to do away with these restrictions. One of them is that no woman has hitherto been ordained priest. The Government has not failed to give attention to the aspirations of feminist circles in these matters.

The establishment of the nationality of the wife independently of that of her husband has also aroused interest in feminine circles; but the current Finnish law already makes provision to enable women to have a nationality other than that of their husband in certain cases. Accordingly, what interests the women workers' organisations is not so much the introduction of independent nationality during marriage as the establishment of the principle that any change of nationality during marriage requires the consent of both the married persons, and the creation of facilities to enable women to acquire their former nationality in the event of dissolution of their marriage. The Finnish Government for its part has always maintained the conception of the unity of the family; but, within the limits of this principle, it is prepared to consider the elimination of difficulties arising for women as a result of their husbands having a different nationality, and to take into consideration in this connection the above-mentioned views of the women's organisations.

As regards social legislation for the protection of women, opinions on the subject differ in Finland, as in a number of other countries, even in feminine circles. One section of the feminine organisations is in favour of doing away with special legislation in this matter. The women workers' organisations on the other hand take the view that the special legislation in question does not discriminate against them, but is to their advantage, and is moreover necessary to safeguard the welfare of future generations. The Finnish Government itself has always maintained (as may be gathered from Finnish internal legislation as well as from Finnish activities in connection with the International Labour Organisation) that there is nothing in this protective social legislation which conflicts with the principle of legal equality; and it proposes to adhere to this view.

All the women's organisations further attach importance to the principle of the same wage being paid for the same work to men and women. The Finnish Government does not, however, believe there is any appreciable inequality in this matter in Finland. In so far as there is inequality, it is the result rather of social conceptions, economic conditions and other circumstances which it is often difficult to modify directly by legislative action. So far as the Finnish Government is concerned, it will endeavour, within the limits of practical politics, to aim at the fullest possible equality in this connection also.

It will be clear from what has been said that, in the Finnish Government's opinion, there is no pressing feminist question at the present time in Finland and that (so far, at any rate, as

Finland is concerned) international conventions on the subject are unnecessary, except perhaps in the case of regulation of the nationality of married women in certain cases. But in this matter, as in other questions relating to the equality of women, the Finnish Government is ready to negotiate with a view to international co-operation for improvement of the status of women, even where the position in Finland would not be affected.

India.[1]

June 17th, 1937.

So far as British India is concerned, the political and civil status of women may be considered under three main heads :

(1). Their position under the law of the country ;
(2). Their right to vote and stand for election to Legislatures and Local Bodies ;
(3). Their right to enter Government service and other professions.

Category 1 above may again be subdivided as follows :

(*i*) Right to inherit ;
(*ii*) Status under marriage laws ;
(*iii*) Guardianship of children ;
(*iv*) Appointment as honorary magistrates ;
(*v*) Right to practise as legal practitioners ;
(*vi*) Eligibility to serve as jurors and assessors ;
(*vii*) Differences of punishment ;
(*viii*) Appearance in Civil Courts ;
(*ix*) Offences against women.

1. Position of women under the law of the Country.

(i) Right to inherit.

The consolidated law applicable to intestate and testamentary succession in British India is contained in the Indian Succession Act, 1925. The important provisions relating to succession to intestate property are contained in Sections 32 to 49 of the Act. These provide for the succession of a daughter and a widow to a male deceased's property. The Parsees are governed in the matter of intestate succession by Sections 50 to 56 of the Act which provide that females including a daughter, a widow and a mother get a share in the property with the male heirs. This Act however governs succession, etc., in the case of communities other than Hindu, Muhammadan, Buddhist, Sikh and Jaina. The great bulk of the Indian population consists of Hindus and Muhammadans. The Muhammadan and Hindu Laws, although the latter varies widely in different parts of India, are personal and not territorial laws.

Under the *Muhammadan* Law of Succession, the husband or wife, and females as well as cognates, are recognised as competent to inherit. Parents and ascendants are given a right to inherit even when there are male descendants. Under the *Hindu* Law there is a close connection between religion and succession to property, the preferable right to perform the obsequies and subsequent rites being regarded as governing the question of the preferable right to succession of property or inheritance. Consequently, agnates generally exclude females from inheritance. It has, however, been enacted (Act II of 1929) in respect of the property of males not held in coparcenary and not disposed of by will, that a son's daughter, daughter's daughter, sister and sister's son shall in this order be entitled to rank in the order of succession next after a father's father and before a father's brother provided that a sister's son shall not include a son adopted after the sister's death.

A Hindu widow takes only a restricted estate in the property of her husband, and on her death such property passes to the heirs of her husband except such portion as may have been alienated by her for legal necessity. Alienations of her husband's estate or portions thereof for legal necessity, which includes the payment of her husband's debts and other charges on the estate, such as the payment of maintenance to female members of the family, debts incurred by the widow for her own maintenance, debts incurred for the funeral obsequies of her husband and for other primarily religious purposes, are valid and bind the actual reversioner succeeding to the estate on the death of the widow. In Bombay, however, a sister or a daughter inherits properties. In Malabar, widows and children (including female children) also inherit under Sections 23 and 24 of the Malabar Marriages Act, 1896.

On the whole, Hindu women suffer under certain disabilities in the matter of inheritance. Orthodox Hindu opinion has generally been opposed to removal of them on religious grounds. A number of Resolutions and Bills designed to ameliorate the position of women in this and other social matters has from time to time been brought forward in the Legislature by non-official members. There is a marked tendency among the more advanced sections of Indian

---

[1] The Government of India requests that this memorandum may be treated as substituted for the memorandum published in document A.33.1936.V.

political opinion towards improving the civil status of women, especially in regard to inheritance and their position under the marriage laws. In 1937, the Central Legislature passed the Hindu Women's Rights to Property Bill promoted by a non-official member of the Legislative Assembly. Under this measure, the property of a Hindu governed by the Dayabhag school of Hindu Law and the separate property, if any, of a Hindu governed by any other school of Hindu Law or by customary law dying intestate shall devolve upon his widow along with his lineal descendants, if any, in like manner as it devolves upon a son : provided that the widow of a predeceased son shall inherit in like manner as a son if there is no son surviving of such predeceased son, or as a son's son if there is surviving a son or a son's son of such predeceased son. This applies also to the widow of a predeceased son of a predeceased son. In the case of a Hindu governed by any school of Hindu Law other than Dayabhag or by customary law, dying intestate and having at the time of his death an interest in a Hindu joint family property his widow shall have in the property the same interest as he himself had. Any interest thus devolving on a Hindu widow shall be the limited interest known as a Hindu woman's estate, provided, however, that she shall have the same right of claiming partition as a male owner.

The following private Bills relating to inheritance are now pending before the Central Legislature :

(1) *The Hindu Widow's Maintenance Bill.* — According to this, a widow of a deceased coparcener in a joint Hindu family not having any son shall be entitled to get as maintenance a life estate in the share which her husband, if alive, would have got on partition in the joint family property, such widow being further entitled to demand for her maintenance a partition in the same manner in which her husband, if alive, would have been entitled to.

(2) *The Hindu Widow's Right of Inheritance Bill.* — The objects of this measure are as follows :

(*i*) Where the husband was at the time of his death a member of a joint Hindu family, she shall be entitled to such share of the joint family property as her husband would have been entitled to, had a partition taken place in his lifetime, and may also sue for partition. This share shall become her absolute property.

(*ii*) Where the husband of a widow was at the time of his death a member of a joint Hindu family, she shall, subject to the right of another widow, take his property absolutely and not merely as a life interest.

(3) *The Adoption Validating Bill.* — No adoption by a Hindu shall be invalid by reason only that the adoptive father could not have legally married in her maiden state the genitive mother of the adopted son.

(4) *The Moslem Personal Law (Shariat) Application Bill.* — It provides that notwithstanding any custom, usage or law to the contrary, in all questions regarding succession, special property of females, betrothal, marriage, divorce, maintenance, dower, adoption, guardianship, minority, bastardy, family relations, wills, legacies, gifts, partitions, any religious usage or institution including *Wakf* (trust and trust property), the rule of decision in cases where the parties are Moslems shall be the Moslem Personal Law (Shariat).

(ii) Status under Marriage Laws, etc.

In regard to inheritance, the status of married women in India under the Indian Succession Act, and Hindu and Muhammadan Laws has been stated above. Among Christians, the rights and remedies of a deserted wife are governed by Part VI of the Indian Divorce Act, 1869. Under this Act she can claim divorce, judicial separation and maintenance in certain circumstances. The parties are at liberty to marry again after divorce has been obtained. Parsees are governed in matters relating to marital rights by the Parsee Marriage and Divorce Act, 1936. This Act prohibits remarriages save after divorce during the lifetime of a first wife or husband, provides punishment for bigamy, and permits judicial separation, divorce, maintenance and remarriage in certain circumstances. A Muhammadan wife who is deserted by her husband is entitled to sue him for maintenance in a civil court. She cannot, however, get a decree for past maintenance unless such claim is based on specific agreement. If a Muhammadan marries a second wife during the life-time of the first wife, as he is entiled to do, the rights of the first wife are not in any way affected except that she with her co-wife succeeds jointly to the share in her husband's property allowable to a wife under the Muhammadan Law. A Muhammadan marriage may be dissolved, in the lifetime of the parties thereto, either by act of the husband or wife or by mutual agreement, or by a judicial order of separation, or it may be annulled.

A Hindu wife deserted by her husband can claim restitution of conjugal rights or maintenance. The mere fact that the husband has married a second wife does not entitle her

to refuse conjugal rights to the husband or to claim separate maintenance. Otherwise a Hindu marriage is indissoluble and no divorce is allowed except in the case of marriages under the Special Marriage Act, 1872. This rule, however, is not of universal application and in certain Hindu castes divorce is permitted, if a custom to that effect is established. Section 488 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, also prescribes a summary remedy for married women of all religions or communities to claim maintenance from their husbands.

A majority of Hindu widows are not allowed by social custom to remarry, but such remarriages are valid in law according to the Re-marriage of Hindu Widows Act, 1856 (XV of 1856). Marriage of children at a tender age was formerly a common practice in India, but such marriages are not so common now. Child marriages are not invalid, although the Child Marriage Restraint Act, 1929, makes marriages of males below 18 years and of girls below 14 years punishable offences.

The Special Marriage Act, 1872, which provides a form of marriage for persons who do not profess the Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Muhammadan, Parsi, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina religion and a form of optional marriage for persons who profess the Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina religion, penalises married persons marrying again under the Act and also bigamy. The Indian Divorce Act also applies to marriages performed under the Special Marriage Act. Succession to the property of any Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina who marries under this Act is regulated by the provisions of the Indian Succession Act, 1925.

The Married Women's Property Act, 1874, provides that the wages and earnings of any married woman, who did not profess the Hindu, Muhammadan, Buddhist, Sikh or Jaina religion, or whose husband at the time of such marriage did not profess any of these religions, acquired or gained by her after the passing of the Act in any employment, occupation or trade carried on by her and not by her husband, and also any money or other property so acquired by her through the exercise of any literary, artistic or scientific skill, and all savings from and investments of such wages, earnings and property, shall be deemed to be her separate property.

Hindu women labour under disabilities in this matter similar to those stated in the last sub-paragraph of paragraph 2 above, and any move in the direction of removing these is apt to be opposed by orthodox Hindu opinion.

There is a marked tendency among the more advanced sections of Indian political opinion towards improving the position of women under the marriage law. The Parsi Marriage and Divorce Act, 1936, of which mention has been made above, was recently passed by the Indian Legislature. This Act replaces the Parsi Marriage and Divorce Act, 1865, and brings its provisions into conformity with the views now prevalent among enlightened members of the Parsi community. The Indian Legislature has also passed in its last session (1937) the Arya Marriage Validation Act. This Act is intended to place beyond doubt the validity of inter-caste marriages among Arya Samajists, who form an appreciable number of the Hindu population of India. The object underlying this Act is to promote solidarity of Hindus by making inter-caste marriages among the various castes of Hindus permissible to the extent provided in the Act and also to legalise such marriages in the interests of parties to such marriages and their issue.

The Muslim Dissolution of Marriage Bill, promoted by a non-official Member, is now pending before the Central Legislature. The Bill enumerates the grounds on which a married Muslim woman may bring a suit against her husband for the dissolution of her marriage, and provides that the conversion of a married Muslim woman to a faith other than Islam shall not itself operate to dissolve her marriage.

(iii) Guardianship of Children.

Under the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, females are eligible equally with males for appointment as guardians of their children.

Under Section 60 of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 (39 of 1925), a father may by will appoint a guardian of either sex for his child during minority. This section has however no application in the case of Hindus, Muhammadans, Buddhists, Sikhs and Jainas, who are governed in the matter by their personal law. Under the Hindu Law, the father has the first claim and after him comes the mother. The Muhammadan Law gives the custody of a young child — for a boy the limit is fixed at seven years and for a girl when she attains puberty — to the mother or a near female relative. After a boy has attained his seventh year or a girl has attained puberty, the right to his or her custody belongs to the father, subject to the consideration of the welfare of the child. A mother however loses her right if she has married a man who is not closely related to the minor or lives a life of open immorality or if her occupation is such as to make it difficult for her to look after the child properly or if she neglects to take proper care of the child. According to the Muhammadan Law the right of guardianship with respect to a minor's property belongs to the father.

As a rule, the mother is the guardian of her illegitimate children, and as such is entitled to their custody.

(iv) Appointment as Honorary Magistrates.

Women are eligible for appointment as honorary magistrates. There are no women honorary magistrates in the Punjab, Bihar, Assam, North-West Frontier Province, Coorg,

Delhi, Baluchistan and Ajmer-Merwara. The number of women honorary magistrates in the other Provinces of British India is as below :

Madras	79		*Brought forward:*	126	
Bombay	23		Central Provinces . .	13	(Central Provinces 7; Berar 6)
Bengal	14	(All in Calcutta)	Orissa	1	
United Provinces . .	10		Sind	4	
Carried forward:	126		Total	144	

(v) Right to practise as Legal Practitioners.

Under the Legal Practitioners (Women) Act, 1923 (XXIII of 1923) women are entitled to be enrolled and to practise as legal practitioners.

(vi) Liability to serve as Jurors and Assessors.

Under Section 319 of the Criminal Procedure Code women are exempted from the liability to serve as jurors and assessors in criminal courts.

(vii) Differences of Punishment.

Criminal Procedure Code, 1898. — Section 393 of the Code provides that a woman shall not be punished with whipping; and under Section 302 the execution of capital sentence passed on a pregnant woman is postponed, and the High Court may, if it thinks fit, commute the sentence to transportation for life.

(viii) Appearance in Civil Courts.

Under Section 132 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, women who according to the customs and manners of the country ought not to be compelled to appear in public are exempt from personal appearance in court. Under Section 56 of the same code, a woman is exempt from arrest or detention in civil prison in execution of a decree for payment of money.

(ix) Offences against Women.

The Indian Penal Code makes special provision for offences connected with women — *e.g.*, causing miscarriage and kindred acts (Sections 312 to 318), assault with intent to outrage a woman's modesty and insult to a woman (Sections 354 and 509), kidnapping or abducting a woman for an immoral purpose (Section 366 : kidnapping from lawful guardianship is an offence if the female minor is under 16 ; the age in regard to males is 14), procuration of girls (Sections 366A and B, 372, 373), and rape (Section 376). Of offences relating to marriage, those punishable under Sections 493 (cohabitation caused by deceitfully inducing a belief of lawful marriage), and 497 (adultery), are punishable only when the offender is a man, and in the case of an offence under Section 498 (enticing or taking away a married woman), the woman herself is not liable even as an abettor.

Section 552 of the Code of Criminal Procedure empowers a Presidency Magistrate or District Magistrate to make an order, on complaint on oath, for the immediate restoration of an abducted woman or of a female child under the age of 16 years.

2. Women's Right to vote and stand for Election to Legislatures and Local Bodies.

(i) Women have been enfranchised and are eligible for election or nomination on the same terms as men to the Legislative Assembly and to the Council of State. These arrangements will, however, be superseded on the setting up of the Indian Federation under the Government of India Act, 1935.

Under the new Constitution, women are entitled in all provinces to vote for the provincial legislatures on the same qualifications as men, and are further entitled to claim differential qualifications peculiar to themselves. Any qualified woman voter is entitled to stand as a candidate for any seat on the same terms as men, and women, moreover, in most provinces have special seats set apart for them. The same will in general be the case with the new Federal Legislature, when it comes into being.

(ii) Provincial Elections.

The result of the recent provincial elections showed :

(1)	Number of women elected to seats reserved for them	41
(2)	Number elected to seats not reserved	10

No women have been included in the new Ministries. The proportion of women voters who exercised the franchise is compared with the proportion of the total number of persons who exercised the franchise in the table below :

	Percentage of women votes polled	Percentage of votes (men and women) polled
Madras Assembly	31.5	51.6
Madras Council	55.1	80.8
Bombay Assembly	42.4	51.7
Bombay Council	56.4	77.4
Bengal Assembly	5.2	41.5
Bengal Council	20.5	46.6
United Provinces Assembly	19.3	58.3
United Provinces Council	35.5	70.2
Punjab Assembly	33.56	63.7
Bihar Assembly	7.9	59.22
Bihar Council	67.34	66.89
Central Provinces and Berar Assembly	24.5	74.2
Assam Assembly	29.23	71.35
Assam Council	91.57	94.04
North-West Frontier Province Assembly	71.4	72.8
Orissa Assembly	6.62	58.87
Sind Assembly	34.7	54.2

In most provinces women have the same rights as men to vote and stand for election to Local Bodies.

(iii) Nationality.

Effect has been given to the terms of the League of Nations Convention relating to the conflict in Nationality laws which bear on the nationality of married women. The Indian Naturalisation Act was amended in 1936 so as to :

(1) Provide that a married woman whose husband acquires British Indian Nationality during marriage shall only acquire such nationality if she makes a declaration of her desire to do so, and

(2) Protect such a woman from loss of British Indian Nationality as a consequence of the loss of such nationality by her husband unless by reason of the acquisition of a new nationality by her husband she also has acquired that nationality.

(iv) Literacy of Males and Females.

The following figures show the literacy of males and females in India according to the 1931 census :

Total population aged 5 years and over			Literate		
Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
296,301,570	153,778,322	142,523,248	28,138,856	23,969,751	4,169,105

3. Women's Right to enter Government Service and Other Professions

Governments in India had, under the old constitution, full discretion in making women eligible or ineligible for appointment to posts under their control. The position under the new constitution is, however, different. Section 275 of the Government of India Act, 1935, provides that a person shall not be disqualified by sex for being appointed to any civil service of, or civil post under, the Crown in India other than such a service or post as may be specified by any general or special order made :

(*a*) By the Governor-General in the case of services and posts in connection with the affairs of the Federation ;

(*b*) By the Governor of a Province in the case of services and posts in connection with the affairs of the Province ;

(*c*) By the Secretary of State in relation to appointments made by him.

This is a matter in which under the new constitution the Governors, and after the setting up of the Indian Federation the Governor-General, will act on the advice of their Ministers, and the provisions of Section 275 of the Act quoted above are sufficient to safeguard the legitimate interests of women in the sphere of public services. As regards professions other than Government service, the legal profession has been dealt with in paragraph 7 above. There is no legal bar to women entering any profession.

Iceland.

January 14th, 1937.

I. Introduction.

Since the colonisation of Iceland in the latter half of the ninth century and down to our own time, there has been under Icelandic law a great distinction between the legal status of men and women, although the conditions varied in different historical periods. The political and social position of women in Iceland has on the whole been similar to that in other Scandinavian countries. Throughout the ages women enjoyed no political rights and their civic rights were in many respects inferior to those of men, especially as regards property rights, right to succession and marriage. It is not until the middle of the nineteenth century that we observe in legislation a tendency to extend the civic rights of women and to create a greater equality between the sexes. This tendency may be traced to the ideal of equality which followed the French Revolution. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, women in Iceland united in the campaign for the extension of women's rights, on the model of foreign organisations. Owing to this struggle, together with the whole nation's growing sentiment for equality, women in Iceland now legally enjoy, in nearly all respects, the same social and political privileges as men, as may be seen from the following particulars :

II. The Political Status of Women.

1. *Nationality* (Act No. 34, of 1935).

The conditions for obtaining or losing the right of Icelandic citizenship are the same for men and unmarried women. On the other hand, a married woman acquires the nationality of her husband. A woman, who by birth is an Icelandic subject, but marries an alien, does not, however, lose her Icelandic nationality as long as she resides in Iceland.

2. *Right of obtaining Public Poor Relief* (Act No. 135, of 1935).

Formerly it was a principal rule that a married woman was entitled to poor law relief in the parish or union where her husband was chargeable. Under Act No. 135, of 1935, every person who becomes chargeable to the parish is entitled to poor relief in the parish where he or she is domiciled. This provision applies to men and women alike. Thus a husband and wife who do not cohabit may be chargeable to separate parishes.

3. *Right to hold Public Office, etc.* (Act No. 37, of 1911).

The said Act of 1911 granted to women the right to study and pass final examinations in all educational establishments on equal terms with men, the University of Iceland included. The same Act extended to women the right to hold any office under the Crown, temporal or spiritual, on equal terms with men.

4. *Franchise and Eligibility to the Althing (the Icelandic Parliament)* (Act No. 18, of 1934, cp. Section 28, of the Icelandic Constitution).

Women, married and single, now enjoy voting privileges and the right of election to and sitting in the Althing on equal terms with men. This right was first extended to women by an Act of Parliament in 1915.

5. *Right to vote at Municipal Elections and to be elected a Councillor* (Act No. 119, of 1933).

Women in Iceland are qualified to vote in all matters relating to local government, rural and urban, and are eligible to serve as members of municipal bodies on equal terms with men. This right was first granted to women under Act No. 49, of 1909.

From the foregoing may be seen that in Iceland women now fully enjoy political equality with men in all respects.

III. The Status of Women under Civil Law.

1. *Personal Rights.*

Women attain majority (the right to manage their own personal and pecuniary affairs) and lose such right in the same way as men (Act No. 60, of 1917). Thus women, married and single, attain majority when they have reached the lawful age, which is the same for men and women. Both sexes have the right to choose their own place of dwelling and their personal occupation when they have reached the age of 16, and right of property when they have reached the age of 21. There is, however, the difference between the status of men and women in this respect, that a widow and a woman who has obtained judicial separation or divorce has

the right to manage her own property although she is younger than 21 years. On the other hand, a widower and a man who has divorced his wife does not attain majority until he is 21 years of age. A woman who has attained majority may be appointed guardian for infants on the same terms as men.

2. *Family Rights.*

Women have the *right of consent to matrimony* after the age of 21 years. Women under that age must obtain the consent of their parents or guardian to marry. The same rule applies to men (Act No. 39, of 1921). The *conditions for the celebration of marriage* are the same for men and women, with the exception that it is forbidden to marry men under 21 years, whereas a woman may be married when she has attained the age of 18 years. Prior to the celebration of marriage there is a *betrothal or promise of marriage*, which, however, may be broken by either party without special reasons. Provided that the party mainly responsible for the breach of promise of marriage shall make good to the other party any financial loss sustained in consequence of the intended marriage, *e.g.*, loss of employment, purchase of articles intended for the future home, etc. If a girl engaged to be married gets with child by her fiancé during the time of engagement, and the fiancé subsequently breaks the promise of marriage, the woman may claim (immaterial) damages for disturbance of her conditions of life. The grounds on which a petition for the dissolution of marriage may be presented are the same for husband and wife.

After marriage the wife has the right to use her husband's surname (Act No. 54, of 1925). It is held that she does not lose the right to use her husband's surname after divorce has taken place. Husband and wife have equal right to decide where to make their mutual home.

Rules as to the right of husband and wife to hold and dispose of property are to be found in Act No. 20, of 1923. Husband and wife enjoy equal property rights. The general rule is that either party disposes of his or her separate property, if such property exists (property is usually made separate by means of a marriage settlement), moreover husband or wife dispose of any property held by him or her prior to marriage, and of property acquired by him or her after marriage. The right to dispose of property is, however, subject to some mutual restrictions, to the effect that the consent of both husband and wife may be required to make a disposition valid.

Husband and wife are liable for the maintenance of each other as long as the marriage contract is in force, and neither party can become chargeable to the parish as long as the other party has the means to maintain him or her. If a husband or wife shall neglect his or her liability for the maintenance of the other party, such party may claim that the other by order of a magistrate be made liable to maintain him or her, and is entitled to assistance from the proper authorities for recovering the alimony.

The *relation of parents to their children* is dealt with in Acts Nos. 46 and 57, of 1921. Husband and wife have joint care and custody of their legitimate children, there being no difference between the right of father and mother. On the other hand the mother of an illegitimate child alone has the right of care and custody of her child, in the same manner as husband and wife jointly have of their legitimate child. The father of a bastard child is liable to contribute towards the maintenance and education of his child. If he does not pay such contribution of his own free will, the mother may have an order made on him for payment, and she is entitled to assistance from the proper authorities for recovering such payment, free of charge to herself.

3. *Right of Succession.*

Under Icelandic law, down to 1850, women inherited only one half as compared with men, but in that year (1850) this difference was abolished. Under existing laws the status of men and women as regards right of succession is exactly the same.

4. *Financial Rights and Freedom of Trade.*

Under Icelandic laws there is no distinction between men and women in this respect. It may be mentioned in particular, that women have equal right with men to any occupation for which a licence is required, *e.g.*, commerce, innkeeping, pharmacy, etc.

As may be seen from the above, women may be said to enjoy full political and civic equality with men under Icelandic law.

New Zealand.

April 27th, 1937.

I. Civil Rights.

(1) A woman is neither permitted nor required to serve on a jury, whether a common jury, grand jury or special jury, and whether in a criminal or civil action : Juries Act, 1908, Section 3, where the term " man " is used, as throughout the Act.

(2) Membership of the Legislative Council is limited to male persons : Legislature Act, 1908, Section 2 (1).

(3) In matters depending on domiciliary status, the domicile of a married woman is that of her husband. (For statutory modification in connection with divorce, see Section III below.)

(4) The nationality of a married woman is in general that of her husband : British Nationality and Status of Aliens (in New Zealand) Amendment Act, 1934/35, Schedule. Qualifications are noted below.

(5) A woman marrying an alien does not lose British nationality unless she acquires her husband's nationality : *ibid.*

(6) A woman married to a man who during the marriage loses British nationality does not lose British nationality unless she acquires her husband's new nationality, and even if she acquires that nationality she may nevertheless by declaration retain British nationality : *ibid.*

(7) The alien wife of an alien who has become naturalised does not acquire British nationality unless she makes a declaration of her desire to do so : *ibid.*

(8) Where parentage determines whether a person is a natural-born British subject it is the father's national status that is adverted to : British Nationality and Status of Aliens (in New Zealand) Act, 1928, Second Schedule, Clause I.

(9) A woman alien seeking naturalisation if she was a British subject prior to a marriage to an alien no longer in existence can be naturalised without the requirement of four years' residence or five years in the service of the Crown : *ibid.*, First Schedule, clause 2 (5).

(10) Revocation of a husband's certificate of naturalisation may, if the Minister of Internal Affairs in certain circumstances so directs, or if she makes a declaration of alienage, operate as revocation of the naturalisation of his wife : *ibid.*, First Schedule, clause 7A.

(11) The wife of an alien enemy if she was at birth a British subject has a right, subject to the Minister's discretion, to obtain a certificate of naturalisation : British Nationality and Status of Aliens (in New Zealand) Amendment Act, 1934/35, Schedule.

(12) A woman marrying an alien and thereby acquiring his nationality may by declaration retain in New Zealand the status of a natural-born British subject : *ibid.*, Section 3.

II. Rights relating to Property, Contract and Tort.

(1) The only women who may hold a licence authorising the sale of alcoholic liquor are (*a*) a widow, (*b*) a divorcee, (*c*) a wife in whose favour a protection order made under the Married Women's Property Act, 1908, is current : Licensing Act, 1908, Section 72.

(2) A married woman living with her husband may not enter into a partnership with a person other than her husband without the consent of her husband given under seal : Married Women's Property Act, 1908, Section 29.

(3) A woman over 17 may with the sanction of the Court make a marriage settlement ; a man only if over 20 : Property Law Act, 1908, Section 99.

(4) A married woman can make a valid will, if not under 18 ; a married man, only if not under 19 ; Infants Act, 1908, Section 14.

(5) Upon the death intestate of a husband without surviving issue, the widow is entitled to £500 in addition to her share of residue : Administration Act, 1908, Section 47.

(6) Upon the death intestate of an unmarried person, the father, if surviving, takes to the exclusion of the mother ; and if the father is dead, the mother takes not exclusively like the father but equally with the intestate's brothers and sisters, or their children : Statute of Distribution, 1670 (G.B.).

(7) When a male illegitimate dies intestate without legitimate issue, his widow and mother succeed in equal shares, or if only one of them survives, she succeeds to the whole estate. But when a female illegitimate dies intestate without legitimate issue, her husband takes. When a male dies intestate, his illegitimate issue have no claim under any circumstances to his estate. But when a female dies intestate without a husband or legitimate issue, her illegitimate issue (if any) succeed ; and if there are none, and the deceased herself is illegitimate, then her mother or mother's next of kin succeed to the whole estate : *ibid.*, Sections 50, 51, 52.

(8) Trustees of the estate of a person who leaves a widow and children, when the net estate does exceed £300, may apply portions thereof to the maintenance and support of the widow and children.

(9) Special protection is given to life insurance policies taken out for the benefit of the insured's wife, or wife and children : Life Insurance Act, 1908, section 77 ; and to annuities purchased on behalf of the wife of a bankrupt annuitant : Inalienable Life Annuities Act, 1910, Section 20.

(10) When a married man leaves an estate not exceeding £10,000, the value of any succession acquired by his wife up to £5,000 is exempt from estate duty : Death Duties Act, 1921, Section 13.

(11) Succession duty on the value of the succession is payable by a wife as successor on the scale following : up to £10,000, no succession duty ; not exceeding £20,000, 2 % ; over £20,000, 4 %. A husband successor pays on the scale following : up to £500 no duty ; not exceeding £1,500, 1 % ; not exceeding £2,500, 2 % ; over £2,500, 3 % ; *ibid.*, Section 17.

(12) A wife has by common law certain powers to pledge her husband's credit for necessaries ; but not a husband his wife's credit.

(13) Words imputing unchastity to women are actionable without special damage : Judicature Act, 1908, Section 101.

III. Divorce and Family Rights and Liabilities.

(1) On a wife's suit, the husband's habitual drunkenness for four years coupled with cruelty or failure to support is a ground for divorce ; on a husband's suit the corresponding ground for four years' habitual drunkenness coupled with neglect and unfitness to discharge domestic duties : Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, 1928, Section 10 (*c*).

(2) On a wife's suit, special grounds are that the husband since the celebration of the marriage has been guilty of certain crimes : *ibid.*, Section 10 (*k*).

(3) An alleged adulterer must as a rule be joined as co-respondent ; an alleged adultress must be joined as respondent if the Court so directs : *ibid.*, Section 11.

(4) A deserted or separated wife whose husband was domiciled in New Zealand at the time of desertion or separation retains her New Zealand domicile : *ibid.*, Section 12.

(5) A wife three years resident in New Zealand and living three years apart from her husband is given a statutory domicile enabling her to obtain a divorce in the New Zealand Court : Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Amendment Act, 1930, Section 3.

(6) A wife whilst separated who is left without maintenance is deemed to have been deserted : Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, 1928, Section 13.

(7) Damages for adultery can be given only in favour of a husband petitioner : *ibid.*, Section 29.

(8) Alimony, permanent maintenance and security for costs may be ordered in favour of a wife (whether petitioner or respondent) : *ibid.*, Section 33 and Divorce Rules.

(9) On a decree for divorce or judicial separation on the ground of the wife's adultery, the Court may order a settlement of the wife's property : *ibid.*, Section 36.

(10) The rights of husband and wife to maintenance from the other upon a summary separation are conferred in slightly different terms : Destitute Persons Act, 1910, Sections 17, 23.

(11) Legitimation after marriage of a child born before marriage requires a statutory declaration by the father : Legitimation Act, 1908.

(12) If, however, a man having married the mother of a child born before marriage dies before the child has been legitimated the mother may make application for the child's legitimation : Legitimation Amendment Act, 1921/22, Section 3.

IV. Industrial Law.

Legislation dealing with factories, shops and offices contains special provision as to hours of labour and other matters as they affect females.

V. Criminal Law.

(1) A group of indictable offences against women is created by the Crimes Act, 1908, Sections 211 to 223, and 226 to 229. Corresponding acts committed against men are not made criminal.

(2) Corresponding provisions for minor offences summarily punishable appear in the Justices of the Peace Act, 1927, Sections 203, 208 to 214.

(3) There is no counterpart affecting the female sex to Sections 153 and 154 of the Crimes Act, 1908.

(4) The ages of the sexes vary for the purposes of the Children's Protection law ; generally boys are thereby protected to the age of 14, girls to the age of 16 ; Infants Act, 1908, Part IV.

NOTES AS TO TRANSITORY PROVISIONS.

The foregoing statement omits certain matters relating to rights of property which may continue at the present day having arisen under a previous law, but which could not now arise anew. Examples are :

(*i*) The estate during their joint lives that a husband acquired in his wife's land, if it accrued before January 1st, 1885.

(*ii*) A widower's tenancy by the curtesy if it arose before the Administration Act, 1879, came into force.

(*iii*) A widow's right to dower if it arose before the Real Estate Descent Act, 1874, came into force.

(*iv*) Restrictions against anticipation of income during any marriage that might at any time be subsisting, if imposed under the authority of the Married Women's Property Act, 1908, when property was settled on a woman, are still recognised, subject to the right of the Supreme Court to remove them for sufficient reasons ; but any such restriction if contained in an instrument executed on or after January 1st, 1937, is void : Law Reform Act, 1936, Section 13.

(*v*) A judgment against a married woman (whether on a contract or otherwise) for payment of a sum of money in respect of a contract entered into or debt or obligation incurred before September 18th, 1936, operates as a judgment against her property, but not as a personal judgment. Though it can be made the foundation of bankruptcy proceedings, it cannot support proceedings for committal to prison for non-payment of the judgment debt : Law Reform Act, 1936, Section 15 (*c*). But since September 18th, 1936, a married woman (except as above) is subject to the law relating to enforcement of judgments and orders as if she were a feme-sole : *ibid.*, Section 12 (*d*).

Roumania.

[*Translation.*]

May 31st, 1937.

The Roumanian Civil Code, which places women, and more particularly married women, in a state of inferiority, is simply a slightly modified reproduction of the Code Napoléon.

The characteristic effect of marriage is the transition from civil capacity to incapacity, although the old Roumanian laws, particularly those of Moldavia, treated married women with great consideration.

The incapacity of married women, which has no justification in the history of Roumanian law, calls for the strongest criticism. Since the wife now plays no less important a part than the husband in production, her subordination is simply an anomaly.

Marriage should not be regarded as a union between one who is superior and one who is inferior, but as a partnership of equals.

This attitude and this obligation are embodied in Article 6 of the Roumanian Constitution of 1923 : " The civil rights of women shall be established on the basis of complete equality between the sexes ". Pending the amendment of the Roumanian Civil Code, of which the draft has already been completed, the Law of April 20th, 1932, concerning the abolition of the civil incapacity of married women (more particularly Articles 197 to 208 inclusive of the Civil Code, paragraph 1 of Article 687 of the Civil Code, paragraph 3 of Article 950 of the Civil Code, Article 1879 of the Civil Code, and Articles 15 and 16 of the Commercial Code) recognises their legal capacity.

But even apart from marriage, the legal situation of women is characterised by a series of disabilities.

There is the question of the situation of women in relation to the problem of children born out of wedlock.

Affiliation proceedings are prohibited (Article 307). Under the new Code they are permitted (Article 311).

Every child has the right to demand that those who have imposed existence upon it shall provide it with the wherewithal to live.

Nothing can be more unfair than to lay the whole burden of the fault upon the mother.

Affiliation proceedings are a feature of the most advanced type of modern legislation.

The draft Code adopts the principle that proof of paternal descent may be established by an action in the Courts (Article 312).

The present situation, under which the woman is solely responsible for her children, is particularly serious in Roumania, since what are known as " trial marriages " exist in the villages. The man takes the woman conditionally, that is to say, with the idea of having her for his wife for a limited time. As often as not she is repudiated and is obliged to look after her children alone.

The Civil Code still contains a series of provisions which are incompatible with the new situation created by Article 6 of the Constitution, and these provisions have accordingly been abolished or amended in the new draft Code :

(1) A woman must obey her husband (abolished).

(2) A woman is bound to live with her husband and to follow him wherever he may think fit to establish his domicile.

Under the new Code, husband and wife are bound to choose their domicile together. In case of disagreement, the husband's wishes must prevail. It is open to the wife not to acquiesce in the husband's decision when this constitutes an abuse of his right.

(3) During the marriage, the father alone may exercise authority (amended in the new Code, in conformity with Article 6 of the Constitution).

(4) A woman may not be the guardian of her child; she has no powers of administration or legal power over the property of her child (amended in the new Code).

(5) A marriage cannot be dissolved except for certain specific reasons (Articles 211 *et seq.* of the Civil Code).

Nowadays, when marriage is an association voluntarily entered into, it should also be continued on the same terms.

The new Code abolishes divorce " by mutual consent ", a procedure which was both difficult and complicated and which was accordingly rarely adopted.

The above-mentioned " specific reasons " are limited by the new Code, and divorce will in future be more difficult to obtain.

(6) When marriage is dissolved by death, the widow must be poor in order to inherit; even in such a case she can obtain only the usufruct of a lawful share of the inheritance (Article 684).

Under the new draft Code, the estate is inherited on terms of reciprocity.

As regards nationality, under the Civil Code " a Roumanian woman who marries a foreigner assumes the status of her husband " (Article 19). This conception was amended by the provisions of Article 38 of the Law of February 24th, 1924, on the acquisition and loss of Roumanian nationality.

According to the new text, a Roumanian woman becomes an alien unless she has retained her Roumanian nationality under the marriage contract or in virtue of an explicit declaration, made in authentic form, before or on the occasion of her marriage. A woman thus has the option of retaining her Roumanian nationality, although the principle is that she loses it.

Some amendment of the law is necessary here.

The political rights of Roumanian women are limited. Roumanian women may be elected to municipal councils and district councils, that is to say, they may hold office under the administration. They can also elect members to these bodies.

The women's organisations are still claiming full political rights, because only when these are secured will married and unmarried women be able to obtain complete equality with men in all matters relating to the exercise of civil and political rights — more particularly the right to exercise all electoral, legislative, legal, executive, or administrative functions, including also the right to be elected or to sit or vote as a member of any constituent body exercising such functions — in all matters relating to public offices and honorary offices, and in all matters relating to the exercise of professions, trades and occupations.

The League of Nations might transform the situation of women all over the world by means of an international Convention providing that men and women shall have the same rights throughout the territory subject to the jurisdiction of the contracting countries.

Roumania has adopted all the Conventions proposed by the International Labour Office which refer to the protection of women in industry :

(1) The Convention concerning the Employment of Women before and after Childbirth.

(2) The Convention concerning Employment of Women during the Night.

(3) The recommendation concerning the Protection of Women and Children against Lead-poisoning.

(4) The recommendation concerning the Protection of Emigrant Women and Girls on board Ship.

The laws for the protection of women in industry do not at present have the desired effect. The working woman herself protests, because the need for earning her living makes her forget her own interests. She usually works for her children, and often also for her husband when he is out of work. Seeing how necessary it is to protect her, some other remedy must be found. One thing that might be done for the working woman is to protect her child and relieve her of the burden of its upkeep by creating homes for the children of working women, that is to say, institutions which would be responsible for looking after, educating and training such children. These institutions should not be regarded as charitable organisations, and every woman would be asked to pay a small sum for the maintenance of her child.

When their children are safely provided for, women will be able to enjoy the benefit of the laws for their protection. As things are now, they are entitled to complain of the restrictions which conflict with the principle of freedom of labour.

Sweden.

[*Translation.*]

July 7th, 1937.

There is complete equality between the sexes in Sweden in the matter of political rights. In 1863, the law was amended so as to grant a wide measure of communal franchise to unmarried women. A reform extending this right in principle to married women was enacted in 1908. The following year, a provision was adopted laying down the general principle of the eligibility of women for communal " positions of trust ". Universal suffrage on equal terms for both sexes was introduced in 1919 for communal elections. The law provides that women shall always be represented on certain communal administrative bodies. The Constitution was amended in 1921 to provide for women's right to vote for and be elected to the Riksdag.

As regards women's eligibility for public office, there was an evolution of opinion in the second half of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century which resulted, in 1921 — in consequence of the amendment of the Constitution and subject to certain exceptions — in the recognition of the principle of sex equality.

As regards the *acquisition and loss of nationality*, the law provides that a foreign woman who marries a Swedish national acquires Swedish nationality by her marriage, but that in all other cases the woman's position in relation to the man is practically independent. In order that the naturalisation of an alien shall entail the acquisition of Swedish nationality by his wife, it is necessary, for example, that the wife should give her express consent, failing which she would be stateless. For a Swedish woman, marriage with an alien or the naturalisation of her husband abroad does not *ipso facto* involve the loss of Swedish nationality. It may be noted, however, that the Swedish law on nationality is based on the general principle that any person who has acquired the nationality of a foreign country or has established his domicile there after such acquisition loses the status of Swedish national and that this principle applies also to a woman who, by her marriage or the naturalisation of her husband, acquires a foreign nationality.

The principle of sex equality is to-day fully recognised in matters of *civil law*. An important step as regards the recognition of women's rights in this sphere was taken in 1863, when the rule was adopted fixing the civil majority of unmarried women at 25 years of age. Later, in 1884, the age of majority was fixed for both sexes at 21 years. At that date, a woman's right of disposal over her person and property was still restricted by the marital power (*målsmanskap*) representing the right of the husband to administer the joint affairs of both parties and to represent his wife in relation to third parties. The marriage law of 1920, which is still in force, abolished the right of the husband to represent his wife and put both parties on a footing of absolute equality as regards their reciprocal obligations and duties and as regards their children. There is an explicit provision to the effect that a woman's domestic activities are to be regarded as a contribution towards the maintenance of the family. The principle of the equality of husband and wife is mitigated only by usage, which generally gives the father guardianship over legitimate minor children. In case of dissolution of the marriage, the custody and guardianship of the children is entrusted by the court to whichever of the two parties it thinks most desirable from the point of view of the children's welfare. The right of guardianship over illegitimate children is generally vested in the mother.

It will be seen from the foregoing considerations that the Swedish law places women on a footing of equality with men in political matters, in questions of civil law and in all essential matters.

Czechoslovakia.

July 5th, 1937.

[*Translation.*]

The Czechoslovak Government has nothing to add to its communication of September 5th, 1936,[1] concerning the civil and political status of women in Czechoslovakia, and, in view of the conclusions arrived at in that communication, does not consider it possible at present to state its views as to the measures which might be taken by the League of Nations on the matter in question.

---

[1] See document A.33.1936.V.

Turkey.

[*Translation.*]

April 6th, 1937.

Referring to my communication of February 28th, 1936,[1] I have the honour to remind you that Turkish law makes no distinction in principle between men and women as regards either political or civil status.

To supplement the information I conveyed to you in the above-mentioned letter, I have the honour to add that from the point of view of public law, Article 4 of the Law on Civil Servants makes no distinction between men and women as regards eligibility for public offices.

Turkish women take part in the legislative and municipal elections, and may be elected as Deputies, Town Councillors or Mayors. They may also stand for election to the general councils of the vilayets and the councils of village elders, in conformity with the pertinent laws.

Article 1 of Law No. 1111 exempting women from military service and Article 9 of Law No. 1525, which frees them from the statutory labour tax, should be mentioned in this connection.

[1] See document A.33.1936.V.

PART II. — COMMUNICATIONS FROM WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.

The following communications have been received from women's international associations :

INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF WOMEN FOR SUFFRAGE AND EQUAL CITIZENSHIP.

May 31st, 1937.

The International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship has endeavoured to collect information on ten points vitally affecting the position or status of women. The information has been collected in forty-five countries and a summary of the replies received is attached in tabular form.

Suffrage and Eligibility.

In most of the forty-five countries under review, women have full or partial political rights. In some of the countries where women have no such rights (or only very limited rights), the possibility of their obtaining full rights is not remote. For example :

In *Colombia*, the amendment to the Constitution only needs ratification ;

In *Egypt*, the Constitution does not forbid the granting of these rights ;

In *Greece*, the Constitution of 1927, Article 6, states that political rights may be granted by law ;

In *Roumania*, the Constitution, Article 6, says : " A special law, voted by a two-thirds majority, may determine the conditions under which women shall exercise their political rights " ;

In the *Netherlands Indies*, white women have eligibility rights.

Participation in Official Committees and in League of Nations Activities.

In a majority of the countries women serve on Government Commissions and other official committees, and in many they have been sent as delegates or experts to meetings of the League of Nations and to the Conferences of the International Labour Organisation.

Diplomatic Service.

The Diplomatic and Consular Services are so far open to women in only a few countries, among them being the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Brazil, Mexico and Cuba. In Brazil, for instance, there are seven women consuls.

Judges, etc.

In a number of countries women can be judges or magistrates, and can also serve on juries. Among these countries we may note the following in which women have actually been appointed to such positions or in which no bar to their appointment exists : Austria, the United Kingdom, Canada, Chile, Finland, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Sweden, the United States of America, and notably Czechoslovakia, where there are seventy-one women serving as judges in different courts. In England there are 1,200 women Justices of the Peace, *i.e.*, unpaid magistrates in the lowest courts in small towns and rural areas.

Civil Status.

Unmarried women and widows have generally the same status as men. As to married women, the question of domicile is almost uniformly settled in favour of the husband's domicile. As exceptions we may note Sweden and Iceland, where a woman has the same right as a man to choose her domicile.

Nationality.

For a variety of reasons it is becoming much more usual for a woman to be able to retain her nationality on marriage with an alien. We believe that it will soon be necessary to re-open this question internationally : anomalies are being produced as a result of the ratification of the Hague Nationality Convention by some States. In the United Kingdom, for instance, a woman marrying an alien within a dozen different nationalities,remains British ; but if she marries within half-a-dozen other nationalities she loses her British nationality.

Matrimonial Rights.

In many countries married women have a right to earn, but only with the husband's consent or authorisation. Moreover new laws have in recent years shown a tendency to interfere

with this elementary human right, and such laws constitute a very serious menace to women.

Married women can hold property in many countries, though in many this property is administered by the husband. In the following countries, however, married women have control of their own property : South Africa, Argentine, Australia, Austria, Belgium (reserved property), United Kingdom, Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, Irish Free State, Lithuania, Norway, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland (under the regime of " séparation de biens "), Syria (the woman controls her estates), Turkey, United States of America.

Divorce is allowed in most countries, but — especially in Eastern countries — the grounds for it weight the balance against women.

Alimony is often granted to women but, except in a few countries, women are also expected to contribute to their husbands' maintenance if necessary.

It is often stated that the guardianship of children is vested in both parents, but the paternal power prevails except in a few countries, viz., Australia, United Kingdom, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden.

Criminal Law.

As a rule male and female offenders are treated equally, but details have not been supplied except in regard to

Prostitution.

In many countries prostitution is a crime for the woman only and many States retain the degrading system of State or Municipal licensed houses of prostitution. Progress has been made even on this point, and procuring and traffic in women are being seriously dealt with, largely as a result of the work done by the Social Questions Committee of the League of Nations.

Public Services, Professions and Industry, Education and Training.

In most countries State and Municipal services are open to women, but it is rare to find that they have in practice equal access to the higher posts, and in many cases marriage is a bar to employment.

Of recent years women are seldom definitely excluded from any profession or occupation, but it is rare to find them in the most important position. Generally speaking women do not obtain the same salaries when employed, nor enjoy the same opportunity as men to enlarge the scope of their professional work.

In most countries all educational facilities are open to women, but in some cases these are limited, as for instance in technical schools from which girls are sometimes excluded. Also where there are separate schools for boys and girls, the latter receive less financial support from the government. India is a case in point. It is also the case that the number of women students is limited (*numerus clausus*) and in a few cases some courses of study are closed to them. Scholarships are available for women and girls in greatly reduced numbers.

* * *

In the Memorandum on Status of Women submitted to the League of Nations by the Alliance in 1935, it was claimed that there should be no distinction based on sex in regard to nationality, and that women should have equal political rights with men, this to apply to all electoral rights and to eligibility to public offices.

We also claimed equality for the married woman to dispose of herself or her property as freely as a man. We laid great stress on the need for economic equality since the principal object of the Alliance is " a real equality of liberty, status and opportunities between men and women ".

After a fuller study of the question, we stand to-day in exactly the same position. From the analysis of the position of women in forty-five countries quoted above, we may say that approximately over 150,000,000 women have obtained political rights, and probably some 200 women sit in the various parliaments of the world. A few hold or have held office as Ministers of State, and a small number are in the diplomatic service.

This limited experiment in the collaboration of women in the service of the modern world cannot give an adequate opportunity of judging the real value of women's possible contribution to the solution of the problems confronting the world to-day: problems of childhood and motherhood, and of youth ; difficulties in the lives of working people ; unemployment and leisure ; nutrition ; and last but greatest of all, Peace.

These problems should be the concern of all — men and women alike, on a plane of equality in all spheres, political, civil or legal, and economic. Men and women must be equally represented everywhere. Parental authority must be the concern of both parents equally, together with all family interests. Can either sex fight vice, disease and poverty alone ? Is not the loss of women's full co-operation the reason for past failures ?

We aim frankly at seeing an equal number of men and women governing and administering the States of the world. We think the influence of women has not yet been felt, and our claim for equality is based on an ardent desire to help to solve the problems confronting the world in the interests of all. Does not peace often depend on the energy, skill and judgment of the few men in power in different countries ? We claim to have a share in this responsibility.

We desire to take up the work for civilisation on the basis of justice, of peace, of full and equal collaboration. We want to give our best to humanity.

We consider that the data we provide shows the steady advance of women towards an equal status with men, and we think the time is ripe for international action to secure that equal status. We therefore ask the Assembly of the League of Nations to affirm the principle of the political, civil or legal, and economic equality of the sexes and to draft and adopt a convention instituting for women, married or unmarried, a status in conformity with these principles.

In this we are in agreement with other international organisations of women who have declared their belief in an equality of rights and responsibilities for men and women.

If such a convention secured the agreement of many States, as we believe to be possible, it would constitute a valuable step towards the goal at which we aim : the collaboration of the sexes for the development of peace and justice throughout the world.

ANNEX.

Tabulated information relating to the following countries.

Union of South Africa	China	Hungary	Poland
Argentine	Colombia	Iceland	Portugal
Australia	Cuba	India	Roumania
Austria	Czechoslovakia	Irish Free State	Spain
Belgium	Danzig	Latvia	Sweden
Bermuda	Denmark	Lithuania	Switzerland
Brazil	Egypt	Mexico	Syria
United Kingdom	Estonia	Monaco	Turkey
Bulgaria	Finland	Netherlands	U.S.S.R.
Canada	France	Netherlands Indies	United States of America
Ceylon	Greece	Norway	Yugoslavia
Chile			

The points on which information was requested are as follows :

Political Status.

1. Suffrage and Eligibility for Parliament : Participation in Government.
2. Suffrage and Eligibility in Local Government.
3. Official Committees of the League of Nations.
4. Diplomatic Service.
5. Judges, Juries.

Civil Status.

6. Nationality, Domicile, etc.
7. Matrimonial Rights, Women's Right to Earn, Free Administration of her Property, Right of Inheritance.
8. Divorce, Alimony, Guardianship.
9. (*a*) Criminal Law.
   (*b*) Prostitution, Procuring, Criminal Assaults.
10. (*a*) Public Service.
    (*b*) Professions and Industry.
    (*c*) Education and Training.

* * *

Union of South Africa.

Political Status.

1. Full political rights ; two women in Parliament ; can hold ministerial office.

2. Can vote for and sit on Provincial, District, Municipal Councils. Women are mayors of several towns.

3. . . .

4. . . .

5. Judicature open to women. Women can act as jurors in special cases only.

Civil Status.

Unmarried women or widows have the same status as men.

6. Married women have the husband's domicile. On marriage a woman acquires her husband's nationality. If he changes during marriage, she can retain South African nationality.

7. Married women can hold property by contract. They can carry on business, sue or be sued provided the husband consents.

8. ...

9. ...

10. ...

Argentine.

Political Status.

1. No suffrage or eligibility. No participation in Government.

2. Only in the City of Rosario (Santa Fé), and in the Province of Entre Rios. In San Juan women have municipal suffrage and the legislative vote for renewal of Executive Power.

The 1934 Constitutions of Buenos Aires and Entre Rios admit the possibility of woman suffrage if established by special laws.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No.

Civil Status.

6. Equal Nationality rights.

7. Women, single, widowed or divorced can exercise all civil rights and functions recognised by the law for men of full age (National Law 11357).

Married women can administer and dispose of their own property.

8. Each spouse is responsible for the maintenance of the other.

On divorce a woman's civil status is reduced.

She cannot contract a new marriage.

Legal separation exists.

9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) Incitement to prostitution is punishable. There are special laws to punish and suppress traffic in prostitutes.

10 (*a*) Women may be employed but cannot occupy higher posts except in the Department of Education.

(*b*) Professions on equal terms with men; arts, commerce, agriculture and industry; but earn less than men.

(*c*) Women have same education and professional training in schools and universities as men.

Australia.

Political Status.

1. Suffrage and eligibility on the same terms as men both for Federal Parliament and for the Parliaments of the six Sovereign States. The two Territories (Northern and Federal) are administered by the Federal Parliament. There are two women in the Parliament of the State of Western Australia.

2. Equal rights.

3. Yes.

Women have been sent as delegates to the League of Nations and the International Labours Organisation.

4. Women are excluded from the growing Diplomatic Service.

5. Women are not appointed as judges.

Except in Queensland, where a woman can act as juror if she notifies the electoral authorities that she wishes to do so, women cannot sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. Domicile of the husband.

A woman relinquishes her nationality on marrying a foreigner unless she does not acquire his nationality. While residing in Australia, she can make a declaration that she wishes to retain the rights of a British subject. She may, if her husband changes nationality during marriage, retain her own. If during marriage her husband becomes an enemy alien, she can remain a British subject. She can be renaturalised at her husband's death without the necessary statutory residence period.

7. Married Women's Property Act: women can hold separate property; they are liable for contracts and torts. But this liability is limited to their separate property — it is not a personal one.

8. Equal rights of guardianship.

Equal liability for alimony.

Equal divorce laws except in the State of Victoria where a woman may not apply for divorce on a single act of adultery, and a man may for such on the part of his wife.

9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) No State regulation of prostitution or licensed houses, but brothels are tolerated under certain conditions. No medical examination except in Queensland which provides medical examination of prostitutes. But women are described as "common prostitutes".

It is an offence to keep a house for prostitution purposes; an offence to procure a woman to become a prostitute or for a male to live wholly or in part on the proceeds of prostitution.

10. (*a*) Women are not usually employed on the same work as men. Married women are debarred from employment in the Government service. Women's salaries are less by £50 a year than men's.

(*b*) Professions are open to women on same terms as men but there are no women K.C.s or professors. In industry the wages board fix woman's rate at 50 % to 54 % of man's basic wage.

An equality clause exists in Queensland.

(c).....

Austria.

Political Status.

1. In principle men and women have equal political rights under the system of corporations. No voting has yet taken place. No hindrance to participation in Government but in practice it has never happened.

2. Equal rights.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. Can be judges but none have been appointed.

Can sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. A woman has her husband's domicile. She loses her nationality on marriage with an alien unless she does not acquire that of her husband or if he is stateless.

7. Women have equal property rights and equal right to make contracts.

8. .....

9. .....

10. (*a*) On principle, women can enter the State Service whether married or unmarried. There are many women in social services but under economic difficulties women have been excluded from many posts recently by law, and married women have been expelled from the public services.

(*b*) On principle all professions are open to women, married or unmarried.

(*c*) There are few women in higher schools and universities.

Belgium.

Political Status.

1. Eligibility for Senate (Article 56 of Constitution).

Eligibility for Chamber of Deputies (Law of November 16th, 1920, Article 50).

No suffrage except for a few women by war service qualification (Law of October 21st, 1921).

Three women in Senate, two in Chamber.

Can, but have not, participated in the Government. Same rule for Provincial Councils. Eight women sit on these councils.

2. Eligibility and suffrage, 185 women sit on communal councils. Women can be Mayors and Councillors with consent of their husbands. There are sixteen women Mayors, fifteen Councillors, seventeen Secretaries, and forty-four communal receivers.

3. Women have for some time sat on Ministerial Commissions.

There has been only one woman delegate to the League of Nations, to the Codification of International Law Conference at the Hague.

4. Nil.

5. Women cannot be judges.

Suffrage and eligibility for Commercial Tribunals and Conseils des Prud'hommes (Law, July 9th, 1926).

Can sit on juries (Law, December 21st, 1930, Article 2 (90)), but can get dispensation on request (Article 5 (100)).

Civil Status.

6. Different from men. An alien woman marrying a Belgian takes his nationality; a Belgian woman loses her nationality on marrying an alien if she acquires her husband's nationality on marriage (Laws, May 15th, 1922; August 4th, 1926; October 15th, 1932).

A woman is obliged to live with her husband and where he decides to reside. He is obliged to receive her.

7. A Belgian woman has the right to earn, but if married can only do so with her husband's authorisation.

Can administer only " ses biens réservés " (Article 2246 of the Code Civil).

Can make a will; recognise a natural child; withdraw up to 500 francs from the Caisse générale d'épargne et de retraite.

8. Divorce for cruelty, by mutual consent, adultery of wife, and of husband, but in latter case only if it has taken place at the conjugal domicile (Articles 387-389).

Equal alimony rights.

Paternal and maternal authority are held conjointly but delegated to father, unless in case of separation or divorce the tribunal decides otherwise in the interest of the children, or after death of the husband.

9. (*a*) Applies equally to men and women, though adultery may mean three months, to two years, prison for a woman, and for a man only one month to one year's imprisonment, and only if the adultery has taken place at the conjugal domicile.

(*b*) The Collège des Bourgmestre et Echevins control both people and places (Communal Law, March 30th, 1836, and December 30th, 1884).

Police officers can also enter these places.

Licensed houses are authorised.

Women receive cards and are obliged to submit to medical examination twice weekly. The houses, women and cards are controlled by a " police des mœurs ". In Brussels and Antwerp, licensed houses are no longer allowed.

10. .....

Bermuda.

Political Status.

1. No suffrage or eligibility and no participation in Government.
2. No suffrage or eligibility.
3. Women have served on Government Boards, appointed by the Governor.
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. British Law.
7. .....
8. There is no divorce in Bermuda.
9. .....
10. (*a*) No special discrimination against women, but they do not hold high posts.
(*b*) .....
(*c*) .....

Brazil.

Political Status.

1. Equal rights, women are entitled to be on the electoral roll. There are two women deputies in the Federal Chamber and 10 in State Legislatures.

Women are eligible to public office and are serving in several States. Three women are Secretaries of State in the States of Para and Rio, and women are members of the States Councils in Bahia.

2. Equal rights. A woman was elected mayor of Lages in 1928 and now women control municipal affairs in the communes of various States.

3. Women can serve on official committees and are doing so.

Women technical advisers have been sent to official conferences including the International Labour Organisation.

4. There are seven women " consuls de carrière ".

5. No women judges. There are two women public prosecutors, one in Sergipe and one in Minas Geraes.

Civil Status.

6. Nationality is not affected by marriage. The husband confers his domicile on his wife.

7. Spinsters, wives judicially separated from their husbands and widows have the same civil rights as men.

In marriage, a husband administers the joint estate. He must consent to her engaging in paid occupation.

The consent of either spouse is necessary to alienate property. A marriage contract may alter these dispositions, and if a woman is over 50 when she marries, the law obliges her to administer her property herself.

8. There is no divorce. In judicial separation the sexes are treated alike. An indigent wife can obtain alimony.

The paternal authority of the father prevails.

9. .....

10. (*a*) Women have same educational opportunities and university education as men, but vocational training for women is very limited.

(*b*) Liberal professions are open to women.

(*c*) .....

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility except that peeresses in their own right may not sit in the Upper House (House of Lords).

Nine women members of Parliament.

2. Equal suffrage and eligibility. There are twenty-one women on the London County Council and several hundreds on provincial Councils.

3. Women sit on Government Commissions and have been delegates to the League Assembly and Committees and to the International Labour Organisation.

4. The diplomatic service is not open to women.

5. There are no women judges, but there are 1,200 women Justices of the Peace (non-stipendiary magistrates). Women can sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. The position of an unmarried woman is the same as that of a man. A woman marrying an alien loses her nationality unless she does not acquire his by the law of his country. She takes her husband's domicile.

7. Women have the right to earn, to own and administer property and are responsible for their torts. Income tax is the husband's responsibility.

8. The divorce law is the same for both sexes. There is equal guardianship of children.

9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) There are no licensed houses, but there are special laws against women as " common prostitutes ".

10. (*a*) Women employed, but there is a marriage bar, also lower pay and unequal conditions.

(*b*) Professions open to women, with exception of State Church, Army, Diplomatic Service and Colonial and Consular Services.

In industry women are still classed with " Young Persons " for the purpose of industrial legislation. They are debarred from admission to skilled trades for the most part and the technical instruction which leads to it.

(c) .....

Bulgaria.

Political Status.

1. No suffrage or eligibility.

2. Mothers can vote under the law of January 18th, 1937, but are not eligible. Women cannot be mayors.

3. No.

4. No, though there is no law against it.

5. No, neither barristers nor judges.

Civil Status.

6. A woman has her husband's domicile (Article 3, Law 1907).

She loses her nationality on marrying an alien unless she does not acquire her husband's nationality (Article 16, Loi de Sujetion).

7. A woman has the same property rights as a man. She must have her husband's authorisation for exercising a trade, or starting a commerce or society.

She can earn without the husband's authorisation but he can ask a judge to break her contract if he can prove that he can support his family, or that the contract harms the family.

8. .....

9. .....

10. (*a*) No law forbids a woman's access to the public services but in practice she cannot succeed in the higher grades.

(*b*) Professions are open to women but in practice they cannot reach the most important posts.

(*c*) .....

Canada.

Political Status.

1. Women have suffrage and eligibility for Federal Upper and Lower Chambers and for provincial legislatures except in Quebec.

Two women appointed by Government to the Senate (Upper Chamber). Women allowed to participate in Government but none have yet been appointed.

2. Yes, and women are serving on Municipal and County Councils.

3. Yes, and have been appointed.

4. There is nothing in Canadian law to prevent women entering the Diplomatic Service, but they have not been appointed as yet.

5. No jury service for women.

No women judges appointed by Government but in cities of over 100,000 population, women magistrates are allowed; not all cities with that population have appointed women magistrates.

Civil Status.

6. Woman's domicile is that of her husband.

Woman takes her husband's nationality, but has a right to declare her own within six months after marriage.

7. Except in Quebec, married women have a right to earn, etc. This matter belongs to the Provinces under British North America Act.

8. May sue for divorce on grounds of adultery only except in Quebec. Alimony is a matter for the Province.
Guardianship is given to the husband unless he is unfit.

9. (*a*) Criminal Code of Canada deals thoroughly with prostitution, procuring and criminal assaults.

(*b*). .....

10. .....

Ceylon.

Political Status.

1. Suffrage and eligibility on same terms as men (over 21 years of age), to State Council and to office as Speaker or Ministers. There is one woman in Parliament.

2. The same equal rights for the Reformed Municipal Council.

3. All Government posts are open to women except the Civil Service.

4. No.

5. No.

Civil Status.

6. .....

7. Under the Married Women's Property Act, 1923, women have an absolute right to their own property, and can sell or dispose of it without the consent of their husbands.

8. Divorce is by mutual consent.

9. .....

10. .....

Chile.

Political Status.

1. None.
One woman represented a Governor of a Province during his absence.

2. Municipal suffrage and eligibility.
One woman elected Mayor.

3. .....

4. Women have been appointed as Consuls.

5. Women can serve as judges and on juries.

Civil Status.

6. Women have equal rights of domicile and nationality.

7. All professions open to women without any differences of conditions or remunerations. Women have equal status as regards property and inheritance rights and can make contracts.

8. .....

9. .....

10. .....

China.

Political and Civil Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility and right to participate in Government.

2.
3.
4.
5. The principle of equality between men and women in the legal sphere as also in the social and
6. educational sphere is laid down in the Declaration, paragraph 12, of Internal Policy made by the
7. first national meeting of the Kuomintang Delegates, and by Article 6 of the Constitution.
8.
9.

10. (*a*) All public services and professions are open to women. Equal wages are paid to men and
(*b*) women where they perform the same work and produce the same output.

(*c*). .....

Colombia.

Political Status.

1. No political rights. An amendment to the Constitution (1936) only needs ratification to give women rights to employment involving jurisdiction and authority.

2. .....

3. .....

4. .....

5. .....

Civil Status.

Equal civil rights for women whether married or unmarried.

6. .....

7. .....

8. .....

9. .....

10 (*a*). .....

(*b*). Women enjoy the same guarantees with regard to labour problems, as the legal regime of the country makes no difference as regards sex.

(*c*) .....

Cuba.

Political Status.

1. Women have equal suffrage and eligibility. At present several women are Members of the House of Representatives. Women may participate in Government; there has been a woman as Under-Secretary for Education, also one as Under-Secretary for Commerce.

2. Women have equal suffrage and eligibility.

3. .....

4. Women may enter Diplomatic Service. There are many as Secretaries of Legations, Vice-Consuls and Chancellors.

5. .....

Civil Status.

6.) Cuban women, according to the civil law, have identical rights with men regarding nationality,
7. } matrimonial rights, free administration of property, etc. There is a divorce law which regulates
8.) all the matters concerning alimony, guardianship of children, parental authority, etc.

9. .....

10. .....

Denmark.

Political Status.

Women have absolute equality except for Church and Army.

1. Women have equal suffrage and eligibility. Can and have participated in the Government.

2. Women have equal suffrage and eligibility.

3. Yes. Women have served as delegates and experts.

4. .....

5. Women serve on juries.

Civil Status.

6. An alien woman takes Danish nationality on marriage with a Dane. A Danish woman does not lose her nationality on marriage with an alien.

7. A woman has the right to control her own earnings and receives equal pay for equal work. She has an equal right to secure a licence for business or trade but there is only one licence per couple.

8. Parents and spouses have equal rights with a few minor exceptions.
Equal guardianship.

9. .....

10. (*a*) Women can enter public services.
(*b*) Women have access to all professions.
(*c*) .....

Danzig.

Political Status.

1.)
2.)
3. } Women have equal political rights and nationals of both sexes are admitted to official positions
4. } in accordance with their qualifications and capacity.
5.)

Civil Status.

6. Article 80 of the Constitution provides that marriage shall rest upon the equality of rights of both sexes.

7. .....

8. .....

9. .....

10. .....

Egypt.

Political Status.

1. No suffrage or eligibility though the Constitution does not forbid
No participation in Government.
2. As above.
3. No.
4. Not open to women.
5. No judges and cannot serve on juries.
Women can act as witnesses, but there must be two women to each man.

Civil Status.

6. A woman loses her nationality on marrying an alien unless she does not acquire the husband's nationality. In case of separation, a woman can, if she resides in Egypt, resume her Egyptian nationality by making a declaration.
A wife takes the husband's domicile.

7. A husband has no authority over his wife's property and she can administer and dispose of it without his consent. A husband pays a dowry to his wife at the time of marriage, otherwise she is entitled not to follow him to his home. She has full rights over her own earnings.
A woman takes a quarter of her husband's property as her inheritance on his death if there are no children, or one eighth if there are children. Girls receive half the boys' share.

8. Marital authority prevails and is a " disciplinary authority " (S.P.M.).
A woman does not contribute to home expenses (Article 206, S.P.M.).
A husband can repudiate his wife without giving a reason; a wife can only do so if there is a special clause in the marriage contract.
Divorce can be claimed by women for seven reasons including illness (Article 298; S.P.M.); disappearance (Article IV, Law 25, 1920, Article 303); condemnation (Article 12, Law, 1929); absence for three years (Article 13, Law, 1929); inability of husband to support her (Article 9, Law, 1920), etc.
The rights of parents are the same over legitimate and illegitimate children, but the father is the guardian of the child and in law the only representative of minors.
A Muslim man can marry a Christian or Jew, but a Muslim woman would have such marriage annulled. A man can have four wives if he treats them equitably.
The personal status of women varies according to whether she belongs to the Muslim or other religion but the Koranic spirit prevails.

9. Criminal law applies equally, but prison for adultery is six months for a man, two years for a woman. The code will probably be revised.

10. (*a*) Women are employed in six Ministries especially in the Ministry of Education. They receive equal pay for equal work but have only reached Class IV of the Service. Pension rights are equal.
(*b*) All professions are open to women.
(*c*) .....

Spain.

Political Status.

1. The new Constitution of the Spanish Republic of December 1931 gave Spanish women all rights. Citizens of either sex enjoy the same political status: neither sex, social position nor religious belief can be a reason of privilege or of a denial of rights.
2. All public functions are open to both sexes.
3. Yes.
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. Foreign women marrying a Spaniard can keep their nationality if they so decide.
7. Marriage is founded on absolute equality between the sexes.
8. Marriage can be dissolved either by mutual consent or for just cause. Civil law determines the investigation of paternity, but on no official document shall the legitimacy or illegitimacy of a child be mentioned.
9. .....
10. .....

Estonia.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
2. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
3. Have the right to sit on Government commissions.
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

A new Civil Code is in preparation.
6. Husband determines place of domicile.

7. The husband administers the property of both. The reserved property of the wife does not come under his management, but she must get his consent before alienating her moveable property. These rights may be modified by Courts of Guardianship or by marriage contract.

8. Grounds of divorce are the same for both sexes. Paternal power prevails.

9. .....

10. .....

United States of America.

Political Status.

1. Women are eligible for both Houses in both State and Federal Governments (Federal Law).

2. Women can and do participate in the Government.

3. Yes — to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments of the League and Social Work and Opium Committee.

4. Yes, and they have been appointed as Ministers to Denmark and Norway and in the Consular Service.

5. Yes, there are several women State Judges but no Federal Judges.

Civil Status.

6. American women can choose whether they take the nationality of their husband or keep their own.

7. These vary with the different States, but on the whole women have equal rights to earn, though in some States this equality does not apply to married women. Women usually have free administration of their property during their lifetime.

8. Divorce laws vary in different States; the preference of guardianship would be given to the mother in most cases.

9. .....

10. .....

Finland.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility.

2. Equal suffrage and eligibility.

3. Yes.

4. Women can enter the Diplomatic Service under the Law of 1927.

5. Women can be judges under the Law of 1927.

Civil Status.

6. A woman keeps her nationality on marrying a foreigner if she resides in Finland.

7. Women have the same rights and duties as men.

8. Divorce laws apply equally to both sexes. The woman has equal guardianship rights over the children.

9. .....

10. (*a*) Public services equally open to men and women. Scales of payment, pensions and other conditions apply equally to men and women.

(*b*) All professions open to women, but sex prejudice still exists to some extent.

(*c*) At the State and private universities 40 % of the students are females.

France.

Political Status.

1. None. Three women have been appointed Under-Secretaries of State.

2. None, but women have been co-opted to many municipal councils.

3. Women have served on Government Commissions and been sent as expert delegates to the League of Nations' Commissions and Assemblies.

4. Women are not allowed in Diplomatic Service.

5. Women cannot be judges and cannot sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. Woman takes her husband's domicile.

Keeps her nationality on marrying a foreigner if the first domicile is in France. An alien woman marrying a Frenchman keeps her nationality unless she claims the change or if her national law obliges her to take her husband's nationality.

7. A woman keeps her own earnings from a profession or trade. The rest of the property belongs to both spouses.

Husband administers all property without the consent of his wife but cannot sell his wife's own property without her consent.

There is a possibility of making different arrangements under marriage contracts.

8. Divorce can be obtained for adultery, violence, and certain forms of penal sentence.

A woman can claim alimony if she needs it. Father and mother are in principle guardians of the child, but the father alone exercises this authority.

9. (*a*) Criminal code treats men and women equally.

(*b*) Any procuration or debauch of minors is punishable. Licensed houses still exist in France, but some municipalities are suppressing them. Prostitutes have to register and to submit to medical examination.

10. .....

Greece.

Political Status.

1. No suffrage or eligibility but the Constitution of 1927, Article 6, states that political rights may be granted by a law.

2. A woman has the franchise at the age of 30 if she can read and write (Law, February 5th, 1930).

3. .....

4. No.

5. No.

Civil Status.

6. .....

7. A woman has the right to have a profession, but can trade only with her husband's consent.

She administers her property, except her dowry, which is administered by the husband.

8. Equal divorce. The husband alone supports the home.

The father is the guardian (Law, June 24th, 1920).

9. .....

10. (*a*) According to Article 6 of the Constitution, all public services should be open to women in principle. But neither the Diplomatic Service, nor certain ministries, nor the career of judge have yet been permitted to women. There are important differences of treatment in public and private administrations. Payment is always lower in private enterprises. There is no special legislation against married women.

(*b*) All professions are open to women with the same discriminations, but with no prohibition on work of married women, except prohibition of employment from four to six weeks before and after confinement. No allowances are given during this absence from work. About 40 % of the number of people engaged in earning their living are women.

(*c*) .....

Hungary.

Political Status.

1. Equal eligibility. Women can vote at age of 30 (men at 24).

Three women in Lower, none in Upper House.

2. Special educational qualification for women only.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. Women can neither be judges nor serve on juries.

Civil Status.

6. A woman acquires her husband's nationality on marriage.

7. A woman keeps her property during marriage and has equal rights to *aquisitio conjugalis*.

8. There is no discrimination in the divorce law. The paternal authority prevails but the husband has an obligation to consider his wife's advice. A woman can only act as guardian of her own child.

9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) The system of regulation of prostitution is in force.

10. (*a*) There is no legal foundation for discrimination but women are debarred from studying law. Academies and the higher posts in the civil service are bound by such qualifications.

(*b*) .....

(*c*) Girls' education is not so generously provided as boys'. University studies in law and theology are closed to women, and very few are admitted to the University of Technical Services.

India.

Political Status.

1. Partial suffrage and eligibility. A number of women elected (April 1937) to Provincial Legislatures.

2. Partial rights.

3. Yes.

Women have been sent as experts to the Social Questions and Labour Commissions.

4. No.

5. Not so far appointed as judges, but many are Honorary (non-stipendiary) Magistrates. Women are not eligible to serve on juries.

Civil Status.

6. Nationality laws are not yet clearly defined. Women take the nationality of their husbands and are governed by the laws of the community to which he belongs.

7. There are various systems of law.

Hindu : " Dyabhag " and " Mitakshara ". The joint family forms the nucleus of property rights. The recent " Gains and Science Act " has improved the position of women but has not satisfied their demands. Gifts and earnings before marriage belong absolutely to the wife, but if acquired after marriage she must have her husband's consent to dispose of them.

Islamic : A daugher gets a definite but not equal share of her father's property; a widow an absolute share of her husband's. A woman can possess property and has the absolute ownership of it.

Parsi : A woman owns the property which she inherits.

8. *Hindu* : Divorce is banned. A woman has no right of guardianship.
A woman has a right to maintenance.

Islamic : Divorce is recognised at the will of the husband only. A woman has a right to maintenance, and has the guardianship of children up to the age of 7.

Parsi : The laws are on modern lines of sex equality. A woman has the right to maintenance.

9. (*a*) and (*b*) The Criminal Code makes no difference as regards liability to conviction or sentence, except that the execution of a pregnant woman is " postponed ".
Both sexes are equally punishable in regard to procuration, but women are exempted from whipping.

10. (*a*) Women are not debarred from entering the public services though their number is comparatively small.

(*b*) There is no legal bar to women entering professions, and women have specially entered law medicine and teaching. There is no restriction in the arts, and women are in evidence among musicians actors, dancers, artists, sculptors. Business and commerce are a close preserve, but a few women run their own businesses, are directors of insurance companies and work in banks, generally as subordinates but sometimes as directors. In small trades — dairy produce, poultry and fuel — they sometimes outnumber men. In agriculture the proportion of women to men is one to three. Their wages are always lower than those of men.

(*c*) Only 2 % of women are literate. There is a deplorable dearth of girls' schools and no provision for technical training. There is no bar to entering universities. Women teachers in colleges have a higher scale of pay in some Provinces and they may get a higher salary than men in primary schools. Women are eligible to certain administrative educational posts but have never been appointed to higher administrative posts in either the Provincial or Central Education Departments.

Netherlands Indies.

Political Status.

1. No right to vote. Eligibility for white women.
2. No.
3. No.
4. No.
5. There are some white women attorneys.

Civil Status.

6. The law for white women is the same as in Holland. Native law prevails for native women.
7. .....
8. .....
9. .....
10. .....

Irish Free State.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility. Women could take part in government (Schedule I, Constitution of Irish Free State, No. 1, 1922, Article 3).
2. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
3. Yes.
4. .....
5. Women can serve as jurors but may claim exemption (Amendment Act No. 15, 1924, Section 3).

Civil Status.

6. .....
7. A husband is liable for his wife's torts.
8. .....
9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) There is a double standard of morality and discrimination against women. A woman can be arrested as a " common prostitute " (Criminal Amendment Law, 1935, No. 6).

10. (*a*) The Civil Service is open to women but they must retire on marriage. Widows receive the unmarried scale of pay. There are numerous examples of discrimination and there is not equal opportunity for promotion. When women competed with men in examinations where sex is not known, they won posts in the highest general service and departmental grades. Since competitive examination has been replaced by a Selection Board the posts have been exclusively allotted to men. All womens' salaries are lower than men's.

(*b*) All professions are open to women.

(*c*) .....

Iceland.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility for the Althing. Women have the right to hold office under the crown.
2. Equal rights.
3. .....
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. An alien woman acquires Icelandic nationality on marrying an Icelander. An Icelandic woman does not lose her nationality as long as she resides in Iceland.

A woman has the right to choose her dwelling place.

7. Husband and wife enjoy equal property rights. The right to dispose of property is subject to mutual consent.

A woman has the right to choose her own occupation, trade or profession.

8. Equal divorce law. Spouses are liable for the maintenance of each other but the husband is liable for the wife's torts.

Joint care and custody of children.

9. .....
10. .....

Latvia.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
2. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
3. .....
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

A new Civil Code is in preparation.

6. The husband determines the place of domicile.
7. The husband is the marital guardian and is entitled to the management and use of all property.
8. The husband has the final decision as regards the children, but the wife may appeal to the Courts.
9. .....
10. .....

Lithuania.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility. Women have not been appointed as Ministers.
2. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
3. Women have been sent as delegates to the League of Nations.
4. .....
5. Women can be judges and sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. A woman loses her nationality on marriage with an alien.

A woman has equal rights as to domicile.

7. Women have the same legal rights as men in regard to property and contracts.
8. .....
9. .....

10. (*a*) In theory, all government and municipal services are open to women on the same terms as men, but difficulties are frequently created to prevent women's advancement.

(*b*) Women are admitted to all professions. There are some difficulties in the teaching profession. In business and commerce they generally obtain only inferior positions.

(*c*) Universities are open to women but not technical schools.

Mexico.

Political Status.

1. Women have no vote or eligibility to House of Representatives or Senate. The National Revolutionary Party is making an experiment for giving franchise to women, but only as a trial. Women have not participated in Government, but have held posts as directors of schools, heads of departments, secretaries, etc.

2. Women have sometimes occupied municipal posts and are represented on the Council of Mexican Cities.

3. Yes, to the International Commission of Women, Seventh Pan-American Conference, Montevideo, 1933.

4. Yes. A woman is Envoy Extraordinary Minister Plenipotentiary to Denmark and several women are vice-consuls.

5. No, but women hold posts in connection with prevention of vice and juvenile courts.

Civil Status.

6. Equal legal status for men and women. Foreign women marrying a Mexican can acquire Mexican nationality by naturalisation. A Mexican woman who marries a foreigner does not on that account lose her nationality.

Domicile of wife is that of husband but she can be exempted if he moves to a foreign country.

7. Husband provides maintenance but wife may have to contribute to family expenses if she owns property, does remunerative work, practises a profession or carries on any business. Equal authority and privileges in home and must arrange everything by mutual agreement. A woman can take employment and practise a profession if she does not neglect her duties.

Husband and wife are able to make contracts and dispose of their own property without the consent of their spouse except as may be stipulated in marriage contract.

A wife must have judicial authority for legal acts.

8. Divorce on grounds of adultery, coercion, immoral acts, incurable insanity, absence without just cause, blows, threats or grave injuries, libel, gambling, drunkenness, mutual consent (without alimony). Alimony on both sides under different conditions.

9. (*a*) Imprisonment and fines for sexual offences, seduction or abduction.

(*b*) .....

10 .....

Monaco.

Political Status.

1. Women have no political rights.
2. .....
3. .....
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. Women take their husband's nationality and domicile.
7. .....
8. .....
9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) Prostitution is prohibited and *souteneurs* are punished.

10. .....

Norway.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility. Women admitted to all State offices except as Ministers of State.
2. Equal suffrage and eligibility.
3. Yes.
4. Women are not admitted in the Diplomatic Service.
5. Women can serve as judges, sheriffs, and superior magistrates.

Civil Status.

6. Woman takes her husband's nationality unless he is stateless or while she resides in Norway. Husband and wife can have different names.

7. Woman may have property of her own and alone disposes of it; has a right to her own earnings. Can practise a trade or profession without consent of her husband. Women cannot be clergymen but can be professors in a theological faculty. Women can sue or be sued in courts of law. Has legal right to support by her husband.

8. Equal divorce laws for men and women. Divorce given for separation for three years, disappearance for three years, adultery, mental or venereal diseases, etc.
Father and mother have equal guardianship of children.

9. (*a*) .....
(*b*) No registration of prostitutes. Solicitation in the streets is illegal both for men and women. Doctors must report venereal diseases and the patient be transferred to hospital if necessary.

10. (*a*) All State service, except the Cabinet Council, the State Church, the Diplomatic and Consular Services, and military and civil-military offices, are open to women. They can be professors in theological colleges but not clergymen.
(*b*) .....
(*c*) .....

Netherlands.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility.

2. Equal rights. There are women aldermen.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. No. Women cannot sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. The woman follows her husband's nationality and domicile.

7. The husband's consent is necessary for a wife to follow a profession.
He administers her fortune, but a wife can reserve her own part by contract.

8. .....
Both parents are guardians but the father exercises the authority.

9. .....

10. (*a*) Women can enter the Civil Service but salaries differ—as between married and unmarried officials.

(*b*) In the teaching profession, married women have been partially dismissed.
(*c*) .....

Poland.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility for Diet and Senate. Women can be Ministers and Under-Secretaries of State (Article 7 of Constitutional Law, April 23rd, 1935; Articles 33-41, Articles 2-4, Elections to Diet; Articles 3-4, Elections to Senate).

2. Equal suffrage and eligibility (Articles 3-4, Law March 23rd, 1933).

3. Women can take part in official Commissions and have been sent as delegates to the League (Article 6, Loi du Service civil d'Etat, February 27th, 1922).

4. There is no obstacle to women's participation.

5. Women can be judges and there are several. Women cannot sit on juries.

Civil Status.

6. Women lose their nationality on marriage with an alien, and an alien woman marrying a Pole gains his nationality (Articles 1, 7, 10, 13, Law January 20th, 1920).
A woman takes her husband's domicile, but may be authorised to live apart.

7. Articles 7-8 of the Civil Code of Poland.
Articles 17-18, Austrian Code.
Articles 1 and 104 of German Code of 1900.
A woman has full civil and legal capacity. May have her own banking account, etc. The husband usually administers the property of both. A woman can under certain circumstances make a contract and under the Austrian Code a woman can withdraw the authority given to her husband to administer her property without appealing to a tribunal. Under the German code each spouse keeps his or her property but the husband administers that of his wife.

8. The husband is responsible for keeping his wife unless he has no fortune and no earnings. The wife may then be responsible.
Both parents are responsible for the children but the paternal power prevails in case of divergence of opinion.

9. (*a*) .....
(*b*) Prostitution is not punished as such. But incitement to prostitution or for the gain of a third party, with or inthe presence of a minor, ot raffic abroad are all punishable.
10. .....

Portugal.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility for women heads of families or having a diploma of secondary education. Three women sit in the present Parliament.
2. .....
3. Yes.
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. .....
7. No protection of wife's earnings. Equality of spouses admitted in principle. Husband administers all property and wife cannot dispose of any without his consent. She has no right to exercise a trade or profession without her husband's consent except that of a lawyer, artist or writer.
8. Equal divorce laws for both men and women.
The mother participates in the paternal power but during marriage this right belongs to the father.
9. .....
10. .....

Roumania.

Political Status.

1. A special law voted by a two-thirds majority may determine the conditions under which women shall exercise their political rights (Article 6, Roumanian Constitution).
2. Women have municipal rights under certain conditions (Article 137, Electoral Law, 1929).
3. .....
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. A Roumanian woman retains her own nationality provided she mentions it in her marriage contract.
7. Under a law of April 20th, 1932, a woman has full legal capacity and administers her property without her husband's authorisation. She is free to follow professional or other occupations.
8. .....
9. .....
10. .....

Sweden.

Political Status.

1. Equal suffrage and eligibility. Ten women in Riksdag. None in Upper House.
Women may hold Government office.
2. Equal suffrage and eligibility. Women can be mayors. There are 171 women on Town Councils and 305 on Communal Councils.
3. Women have served on Government Commissions and been sent as delegates to the League of Nations and the International Labour Organisation.
4. .....
5. Women can be judges and serve on juries.

Civil Status.

6. A Swedish woman marrying an alien loses her nationality if she lives in her husband's country and acquires his nationality. An alien woman marrying a Swede acquires his nationality.
A woman has the same right as a man to choose her domicile.
7. Women have the same legal status as men in respect of property, right to make contracts or bring actions before the courts.
8. The causes for divorce are the same for men and women. A mother has equal rights of personal guardianship, but the father is responsible from the economic trusteeship point of view.
9. (*a*) There is no difference as between men and women (aged 21).
(*b*) Women prostitutes are treated as "vagabonds".
10. (*a*) The Civil Service is open to women with certain differences as regards salaries. Married women are not employed in certain municipal services nor by banks and insurance companies.
(*b*) All professions are open to women but as a rule they are paid less than men.
(*c*) Educational facilities are now almost the same for both sexes; there are, however, some difficulties for girls wishing to enter technical schools.

Switzerland.

Political Status.

1. Women have no rights.
2. Women have no rights.

3. Women have been members of four Federal Commissions, one Extra Parliamentary Committee and of cantonal commissions. They have been appointed experts to the International Labour Organisation.

4. No.

5. Only as children's judges in Cantons of Geneva and Neuchâtel, and children's guardians in Berne and Zurich. Eligible as prud'hommes in Basle, Geneva, Neuchâtel, Vaud, St. Gall, Zurich ; as voters in Basle Town, Geneva, Neuchâtel.

Civil Status.

6. A woman marrying an alien loses her nationality if she acquires his.

A woman takes her husband's domicile.

7. A woman has the right to her own earnings and to exercise a profession or industry without her husband's consent. Under régime " union des biens ", a woman's property remains her own, but the income goes to the husband who administers it. Under special contract for " séparation de biens ", each spouse keeps and administers his or her own property.

8. Equal grounds for divorce, viz., adultery, cruelty, desertion, incompatibility. Equal alimony if necessary.

Common guardianship of children but the paternal power prevails.

9. (*a*) ...

(*b*) No canton has the system of regulation. In most cantons prostitution is punishable for women only, but in Zurich, Geneva, Vaud and Neuchâtel, only " scandal " is punishable and for both sexes.

10. .....

Syria,

(Lebanon).

Political Status.

1. No suffrage or eligibility.
2. None.
3. .....
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. A woman marrying an alien loses her nationality if she acquires his (Arrêté No. 15, January 25th 1925, Articles 4, 5, 6, 7).

A woman takes her husband's domicile (Articles 70-71, Family Code).

7. A woman has control of her estates.

8. Divorce varies according to different religions, or to contract made at time of marriage.

Both parents exercise parental authority but the father has the final word.

9. (*a*) .....

(*b*) There is the system of state regulation. Procuring is a criminal offence.

10. .....

Czechoslovakia.

Political Status.

1. Women have equal suffrage and eligibility for both Chambers. Participation in the Government allowed, but no woman minister as yet.

2. Yes, women have equal rights, but there are only three women mayors.

3. Women are members of most important Parliamentary Committees. A woman was once an official delegate to the League of Nations and also several of them have been sent as experts.

4. Not yet, but three women are working at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

5. Women can be judges and sit on juries. There are 71 women acting as judges in different capacities.

Civil Status.

6. Woman takes husband's domicile.

She loses her nationality on marrying an alien. In Slovakia alone a woman can regain her nationality on the death of her husband or on divorce.

7. Unless specified otherwise, the husband administers his wife's fortune. She cannot carry on a trade without her husband's consent.

8. Women never have to support their husbands.

Equal divorce laws. Reasons for divorce are adultery, cruelty, abandonment, mental diseases, loose living, when conjugal life is unbearable, incompatibility.

Paternal power prevails.

9. (*a*) Licensed houses have been abolished. All regulations concerning venereal disease are applicable to all persons.

(*b*) Strict laws are applied as regards traffic and assault.

10. .....

Turkey.

Political Status.

1. Same political rights as men. Many women in Parliament.
2. Same rights as men.
3. Women serve on Government Commissions and have been delegates to the League.
4. .....
5. .....

Civil Status.

6. The woman takes her husband's domicile.
7. A woman must obtain husband's consent to exercise of profession or trade but can appeal to a judge in case of abuse of this right.

A woman can retain ownership, administration and free enjoyment of her own property, unless a system of joint property is adopted when the husband alone administers it.

8. The husband may require the wife to contribute to support of the union. He represents the conjugal union.

Both parents have joint power over children but in case of difference, paternal power prevails.

9. .....
10. .....

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Information in regard to woman's status in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reached the Alliance office in Russian and too late to make a detailed translation and study possible.

It may be stated, however, that the sexes have equal rights and status in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the only differentiation shown in the laws being in regard to industrial legislation for the protection of the health of women as mothers.

Yugoslavia.

Political Status.

1. Article 55 of the Constitution says " Each citizen shall possess the right to vote at 21. The law shall decide on women's vote". Nothing further has been done.
2. The above applies.
3. Women have not sat on Government Commissions nor been delegates to the League. But women have been appointed as experts to the International Labour Organisation and a woman was sent as expert on nationality to the Hague Conference.
4. No.
5. No.

Civil Status.

6. A woman takes her husband's nationality and domicile.
7. There is legal equality, but a wife must have her husband's consent for civil acts. " Séparation de biens " is prevalent in absence of special contract. The husband administers the property, and property acquired belongs to the husband.
8. Divorce is according to the tribunal or ecclesiastical tribunals. Muslim women are at the mercy of their husbands. The paternal power prevails. A woman may act as guardian, but only in association with another person.
9. (*a*) No unequal treatment.

(*b*) .....

10. (*a*) The Civil Service is open to women in all branches with equal rights of admission, salary and promotion. However, women cannot be judges nor serve in the diplomatic and customs services and are excluded from higher posts in the Ministry of Education. A *numerus clausus* has been introduced in the service of the Post and Telegraphs involving a reduction to 30% of women with partial secondary education, 25% of those with full secondary education, and 10% of university women.

(*b*) Entry to professions is not restricted by law, but in the teaching profession, for instance, men have priority for all higher posts (due, it is believed, to right of suffrage). In industry and commerce women have often lower wages than men, but hours, holidays, etc., are similar.

(*c*) Recently girls have not been admitted to training colleges owing to the insufficient number of schools and the greater proportion of girls wishing to enter the teaching profession. More professional schools are also needed for women so that they can qualify for skilled work.

WORLD'S YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

June 7th, 1937.

Having taken note that the question of the status of women will be discussed for the second time at the next meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations, the World's Y.W.C.A. desires once again to impress upon the Assembly the urgent need for the improvement of the status of women as already set forth in its communication of June 1935.

The Association has consistently maintained that the adoption of an international convention drawn in general terms is not an adequate method of dealing with so complicated a question as that of equality of status as between men and women in all departments of life.

It was for this reason that the World's Y.W.C.A. urged two years ago that an enquiry be made by the League into the status of women believing that the results of such an investigation should provide an effective basis for further concerted international action.

Pending the full results of the enquiry now being carried on by the League, designed to raise the status of women in all countries, the World's Y.W.C.A. believes that an analysis of the information received would indicate certain definite issues which could best be dealt with by international agreement. The Association, therefore, urges that an effort should be made as soon as possible to reach an agreement between Governments in regard to such questions.

The World's Y.W.C.A. is not planning to send to the next Assembly any report on the political and civil status of women because it is concentrating its efforts during this year on the Economic Status of Women for the investigation now being carried on by the International Labour Office. At the request of the World's Y.W.C.A., National Associations in a number of countries have therefore been collecting data on this subject during the past year.

ST. JOAN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ALLIANCE.

STATUS OF THE WOMEN OF NATIVE RACES.

May 30th, 1937.

St. Joan's Alliance, an organisation of Catholic women, stands for political, social and economic equality between men and women of whatever race. In common with other international women's organisations, St. Joan's Alliance is of the opinion that the status of women would be raised by the adoption of an International Convention granting to women equality of rights and responsibilities.

Other international women's organisations are dealing with various aspects of the status of women. St. Joan's Alliance has endeavoured to obtain information on the status of " native " women in different parts of the world, believing that no survey would be complete unless these women, for the most part inarticulate, are included.

It would be an impossible task to give a complete survey, but we have succeeded in obtaining a good deal of first-hand information about women in certain territories from Government officials, missioners of various denominations, doctors, nurses, teachers and social workers, etc., many of whom have spent a lifetime working among the peoples about which they write. The information has chiefly been obtained in reply to a questionnaire sent out by St. Joan's Alliance. The League has already received a good deal of information on the subject of the women of native races from the Mandates Commission.

AFRICA.

Introduction.

In compiling a memorandum on the status of African (native) women, it must be obvious that in so large a continent as Africa, where there are countless tribes with varying and changing customs, it is impossible to cover all the ground. It is only possible to mark a certain sameness and indicate broad deviations, showing the general attitude towards women as it emerges from the mass of material from which this memorandum has been compiled.

This survey shows African women, our fellow-women, submitted to legislation which has neither developed at a sufficient pace nor always in the right direction, and against which a reaction is beginning to set in. Nevertheless, we do not wish to deny that European influence has had a civilising effect. Wandering and warlike tribes have been pacified and stabilised. Slavery has been abolished, as well as cannibalism and ritual murders which were formerly tribal customs. Constructive work has included the foundation of schools; the provision of medical care, maternal and infant welfare, education and hygiene. It is now possible for natives to become teachers, midwives, nurses. Catholic and Protestant Missions exist in great numbers and sometimes reach districts otherwise inaccessible to outside influence. In the French Cameroons, the proportion of Christians is 50%; in the rest of Africa it is not so great but is considerable. It would be unjust not to recognise how great a part contact with white peoples has played in the development of the native races of Africa.

We urge that one of the greatest benefits that white civilisation can bestow on these races is to endeavour to raise the status of their women, which at present remains a blot on legislation which is often none other than " native custom " stamped with Government authority.

Let our correspondents speak for themselves : " Before the native court, the woman is always bound by native custom and cannot free herself from slavery and polygamy " (Gaboon). " Native courts judge according to their beliefs. It is difficult for a woman if she is a Catholic " (Cameroons). " Europeans deplore having to apply native custom " (French West Africa). " Ici, chacun fait sa coutume à soi-même " (French Territory). " The European courts are sometimes favourable to women, but above all they are anxious to preserve custom intact " (Sudan). " He is still bound to try the case according to native law and custom and as this varies so much in detail in different areas and as the Africans themselves are constantly changing, various interpretations are possible and hardly avoidable " (Cameroons).

No Administration can be called just which governs a territory where a woman is treated as a chattel to be sold by her father or alleged proprietor to a polygamist or anyone else. We claim that every woman must be permitted to choose her own partner in life despite any contract entered into in her name by any other person. We base our claim on the Christian conception of the rights of every human being and we consider that legislation, education, example and influence in Africa can and should be used to substantiate this claim.

To those objectors who tell us that if customs like the dowry system and polygamy disappear it will upset the family system of the African, it may be pointed out that slavery was once part of the family system ; that the abolition of ritual murders and magical rites is said by some to have undermined the authority of the chiefs ; that in India, the age-old custom of suttee was put down by legislation. We must be on our guard against maintaining inhuman customs on any pretext whatever. It is a blot on European civilisation when European representatives are able to make a statement such as the following (of the diminution of polygamy) : " It undermines the authority of the native chief, as his inheritance and wealth consist largely in the number of his wives " (Cameroons).

In throwing a searchlight on certain abuses (which are sometimes only local or temporary) we doubtless leave the more favourable side of the picture in the shade. But others have shown this side. We recognise that as time goes on much good is being done and if we point out injustices we do so without ingratitude or misunderstanding of those — officials and others — who have already done so much for the oppressed.

Education.

The question of the education of the African woman is fundamental in any discussion of her status. She is universally regarded as property " comme les poules ". Under native custom she is inherited, lent, bargained for and at the best is considered a valuable asset to the tribe or family, whether the system under which she lives is patriarchal or matriarchal. Her very boasting — that her husband paid so much in cash for her — reveals the depth of her degradation. " She does not know to what she can be raised nor how she can be raised, and long tradition has made her believe that women are always subject to men — they have been created so. She never eats with her husband. She cooks his food and presents it to her lord on her knees . . . she *is* a slave " (Southern Rhodesia). " As daughter, spouse and mother, she has persuaded herself that nature in giving her her sex, has deprived her for ever of the rights and duties which are the dignity of human beings."

To make her realise her own value as a human being is the only way to elevate her, and this *can* be done if all those who are concerned in her education agree that it is worth doing — Governments, Missions and the general public, not only in the native provinces themselves, but at home.

The transition from the imposed discipline of the tribe to the self-discipline of the economic individual (an inevitable result of contact with white civilisation) can only be prevented from having disastrous consequences by an education which provides principles of respect for human personality. " I feel convinced that this state of inferiority (of the African woman) is responsible for much of the immorality we deplore " (Uganda).

The teaching must ultimately be done by Africans, and to grudge grants for education is to save now and pay later, while to allow education to boys and withhold it from girls is to deprive men of the possibility of equal partnership in the newer state of society.

Education is at present nowhere compulsory, for even where an enlightened code includes compulsion " there are exceptions ", or " the parents oppose ", and only a small percentage of the girls of school age in any district attend school. Prejudice and lack of discipline account for this to a certain extent, but the older men oppose school for the girls because they fear the emancipating effect of education ; they refuse to postpone the marriage arranged ; to pay the fees. " Here we have the greatest difficulty in educating the girls. The men do not want it. They see clearly that emancipation lies along that line and they oppose it with all their

force . . . In Matabeland, if you attempted to educate the girls in some parts, your life would be in danger from the men " (Southern Rhodesia).

On the other hand, educated natives are seeking as wives girls who are their equal in education (Northern Rhodesia) and express gratitude when helped to break with such native customs as the woman serving her husband on her knees " (Uganda). " In Buganda (province of Uganda) women are well-dressed, good mannered, increasingly educated, numerous girls' schools . . . all chiefs clamouring for equal educational facilities for boys and girls . . . nearly all midwives and women teachers in the Protectorate are *Baganda*."

Public opinion tends to regard native custom as somehow right for natives, and in many places the policy of not interfering with native custom has had a crystallising effect on the evils often inherent in it. One of the excuses for this attitude is that the natives are innocent and that it is a pity to spoil them, but the opinion of doctors and qualified observers is that the native initiation rites are at their best associated with evil, and at their worst evil and dangerous, leading the girls to hunt after sexual experience. " No native girl is a virgin ", says one correspondent, and " all the girls are tampered with from birth . . . In some parts, boys and girls exchange their lovers for periods of time, and, in others, infant fornication is practically universal " (Southern Rhodesia). The superstitious hold that the older women have over the younger, which makes them submit to the rites, can only be broken by education. Medical workers emphasise the fact that infant mortality is greatest where the girls have no trained midwives to advise them, and the maternity methods of the native older women are described as " horrible ".

The policy should be to make education for boys and girls compulsory and free wherever possible ; it should be as far as possible in the hands of Africans trained in Africa ; and it should aim at eradicating the slave mentality amongst African women. It would be disastrous to leave the women lagging behind the men in any educational policy.

African teachers (a school in Eastern Tanganyika is already under an African Committee with European supervisor) trained in Africa, and African nurses and midwives are a prime necessity. Facilities for training in these professions are extending — Mission and Government training centres for teachers exist in most parts of Africa : there is the Native University at Fort Hare at the Cape, and Achimota College on the Gold Coast, : at Buea (Cameroons) many educational facilities exist, including elementary schools and teaching of domestic science and handwork leading to a Government examination : many excellent hospitals — Mission, Government and private — give African women nursing training, and clinics teach them simple midwifery. The fact that African women *are* found capable of teaching, and nursing, should encourage Governments to expend more funds on education and training. One correspondent (Southern Rhodesia) complains that the Government wants African women only as ward-maids and domestic workers, whereas their true vocation should be that of district and hospital nurses, teachers and midwives in their own villages and amongst their own people. African midwives are in some districts " as acceptable as the Europeans ", while the opinion of some leading missionaries is that the clinics and maternity hospitals are earning the confidence of the native population more quickly than " years of ordinary mission work ", and the opportunities for native workers in these districts are unending.

Old prejudices are gradually dying down and the rising generation is giving, in many places, a steady response to such facilities as exist.

Paid Work.

The question of paid work for women is of increasing importance, as the woman's inevitable emancipation from the domination of the clan proceeds.

In the hinterlands and outlying districts, there is small opportunity for paid work. In some districts, the men regard agricultural work as beneath their dignity (Uganda) or are " unbelievably lazy " (Southern Rhodesia), or have been taken on contract to work in the mines so that the women do the field work and domestic work as a matter of course, and in some cases, where they sell their produce, they provide for children and husband (Togo). Where they are married under tribal custom, earnings from their own plots and from field work are considered to belong to the tribe (Gaboon and Bechuanaland) and girls doing domestic work for Europeans in the more urbanised districts (Transvaal) have in practice no control of their wages. The husband himself draws his wife's wages in some districts (Bechuanaland), in others, where the women work on the plantations (Kenya and Zanzibar) they have a share in their own earnings. In Senegal, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, where " all the women are ' commerçantes ' ", they are free to make use of the produce of their own field (husband and wife working separate fields) and retain the gain from their trade in pottery, small merchandise from European factories, palm oil, alcohol, beer (Madagascar, Uganda, etc.). In brick-making and carrying (Rhodesia), working as porters (Gold Coast) or as ayahs (Uganda), they keep their wages, but even so they expect to have to give freely to all their relatives. Even where by Mohammedan law the woman can dispose of property, native custom appears strong and both pagan and Mohammedan women tend in practice to give their

husbands all their gains. Those who trade in the markets are more independent, and there is even a Women's Guild of Potters in Nigeria.

In parts of West Africa, women are employed in the towns in Government offices and commercial houses (Nigeria, Togo, Dahomey), in dress-making (Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Togo), as telephone operators (Gold Coast), a few as shorthand-typists (Dahomey), and occasionally as shop-assistants (Sierra Leone). In Nigeria, women work in the mines. In all these districts, such women have control of their wages except in the more backward areas.

There are growing opportunities for teachers and hospital nurses, as a rule provided by the Missions. Midwifery, though to a lesser degree, is providing openings for a career and some medical officers of health and clinics are encouraging native women to work for their own tribes (Nigeria, Southern Rhodesia, Uganda, Gold Coast). Much more might be done, for " the work is enormous " (Southern Rhodesia) ; dispensaries have " to enlighten not only the mothers but the grandmothers who are largely responsible for bringing up the children " (Northern Rhodesia) ; in some districts there is " practically no maternity work ", in others it is left entirely to " private enterprise ".

Native women have proved over and over again that they respond to education and training, are grateful for emancipation and capable of taking advantage of it, and it remains for Governments and public opinion to encourage and support such work for "on the woman depends very largely the future of Africa ".

Marriage.

Early Pledging. — In Africa, marriage is considered more an affair of the family or tribe than of the individual. The custom of bride-price or dowry (see page 61) has its origin in the idea that the woman being lost to the tribe in which she is born, some restitution is due from the tribe into which she marries. Thus woman is looked upon as a potential source of wealth and the custom of pledging her to a future husband before she is of age to marry is widespread in Africa. Little girls are pledged to old men, to polygamists, without their own knowledge, sometimes conditionally before birth (Rhodesia, East Uganda, Dahomey, French West Africa). In other cases they are pledged to young men with full knowledge and take it for granted (British Cameroons). In Haute-Volta it is rare that a little girl under fourteen is not already the property of a stranger who, when she is of age to marry, will keep her for himself or give her to another who in his turn will either keep her or give her away. Pledging generally means that the bride-price commences to be paid directly the contract is made and payment is achieved at the time of marriage or sometimes afterwards : the fact that this contract has been made weighs heavily against the girl's free choice in marriage. The parents or relatives by whom the contract has been made will (1) bring moral pressure upon the girl to fulfil their pledge, (2) be bound by the dowry which they will be unwilling or unable to repay. In some places, however, the custom of early pledging is happily dying out. In others, such as the Transvaal, Natal and Zululand, it no longer exists. In Southern Rhodesia there is a definite law against it but the practice is carried on despite this law. In East Uganda, the custom began to die out through the action of the authorities, who, however, reversed their policy to that of " interfering as little as possible with native custom ", with the result that marriage contracts are now made before the birth of the child, often to old men, and moral and sometimes physical force is used for their conclusion. Similar contracts made in North West Rhodesia cannot be eluded, but in South Togo girls can regain their liberty where a contract made in childhood is concerned.

Child Marriages. — In Gabon, children are sold at 8 or 10 years of age to old polygamists and taken immediately to their husband's " harem ". A child may be promised in payment of a debt. There is a decree forbidding child marriage, but it remains without effect (age of marriage fixed at 14). Often little girls will fly from their husband to the Mission, but the native courts apply native custom alone and the missionaries are unable to defend the children. The Administration closes its eyes. Further, if a wife dies a man may claim either the dowry or a young sister from the family. By decree of 1934 in the French Cameroons men who have had sexual connection with girls before puberty are to be brought before the court and punished severely. The Governor complains (1934) : " The marriage of little girls who have not attained puberty is a practice much too widespread". Child marriage is still practised here, but is dying out owing to law, except in the bush, where it is general. Elsewhere, apart from Mohammedan districts, child marriage is very rare. In some cases (Sierra Leone) the pledged bride goes to live in the house of her mother-in-law at the age of 10 or 12 but consummation of the marriage never takes place before puberty, sometimes considerably later. Under Christian or civil ordinance, there is of course a legal age of marriage, and for customary unions there may be a law applying throughout the territory to the effect that a girl is not to marry until she has reached the age of puberty (Belgian Congo, French Cameroons) though often this simply does not exist. The customary age of marriage seems to be definitely rising however, and in some cases it is higher than that allowed by ordinance,

(in South Togo it has risen to 20 and over). In any case the girl rarely marries before puberty, though we may note the exceptions above and rare exceptions in Tanganyika, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia.

Consent. — It may be said in general that up till very recent years free consent on the woman's part has been a negligible factor in African marriage. The woman's opinion is simply ignored or over-ridden, while invariably the marriage is arranged by parent or guardian (male head of the family). Guided by tradition in these matters the girl often seems willing to undertake the marriage, but one must always take into account an unwillingness on her part to make herself conspicuous by protest or appeal when an unacceptable husband is imposed on her by tribal or family pressure. Her formation is chiefly of the passive kind — a slave mentality incapable of resisting the wishes of parent or guardian — so that consent has no practical value. Even with Christians where consent is asked and taken as *de facto* it is apparently sometimes difficult to ascertain whether the consent is real. " Most girls are married without being asked to consent " (North West Rhodesia). " Girls are expected by custom to conform to their parents' wishes in the choice of a husband " (Tanganyika). " The girl is sometimes forced to marry a husband under threat of physical punishment and curtailment of liberty " (South Nigeria). " The girl is always a minor under native law; she is always under full control of her parents and must obtain their consent to her marriage" (Natal and Zululand). " A good many girls betrothed very early probably accept such marriages when they would rather not " (Northern Rhodesia). " The status of women is very much below that of men " (Ruanda-Urundi). " In such a case (*i.e.*, objection of one of the parties to marriage arranged by the two families), he or she is left to their fate" (Sierra Leone). " Lack of consent provokes endless feuds and dissensions " (Gabon).

There are, of course, exceptions. In some tribes, if the girl objects to her future husband another one is sought for her (Uganda). There are districts where with the growth of individuality the girl is beginning to assert her right to choose her own mate (French Equatorial Africa, Senegal, Dahomey, Northern Rhodesia, South Togo, British Cameroons, Sudan). On the Gold Coast, escape is found from pressure in cohabitation with another man and in any case separation is easy after marriage. In Madagascar, " young people have a great deal of liberty — there is no question of forced marriage ". Flight everywhere has become easier.

Coercion. — In cases of coercion, there is often a theoretical right of appeal to the local chief or native authority. If appeal through the native court fails, it may be taken to the European Administration. In some districts right of appeal is directly to the European Administration (Belgian Congo, Ruanda-Urundi, and North West Rhodesia). It follows that if appeal is made its success depends on the character of the native authority or local district officer, native or European. One informant writes : " Women may appeal to the chief of the village and do do so." But very often the young bride is tied by the bride-price (she may have been pledged as a child) and those appealed to (native or European) either will or can do nothing to help because her parents are unable or unwilling to repay this. This is universally the case where native courts uphold native custom and European authorities back their decisions or are indifferent. " Coercion cannot really be tackled by the district commissioner and the coerced girl generally runs away, with her lover, to some other part of the country " (Northern Rhodesia). Sometimes even the suitor has a right to choose between the money or the bride, if the case is brought to court, and he chooses the bride. (A case of this kind occurred not long ago in the Belgian Congo.) In Haute-Volta, 80% of the wives run away from forced marriages, and in Gabon older wives, victims of coercion, tire their husbands out by running away and complaining to the native courts; if they prostitute themselves they win their case more easily.

" Though they *could* appeal to the chief they are often compelled by their guardians to give unwilling consent " (Tanganyika). " Owing to native servitude the girl has great difficulty in applying to the courts." In the majority of cases the girl would feel an outcast were she to make use of her right of appeal. It requires in her " great strength of mind and courage " but more often than not she is the passive agent of her parents' wishes so that though a right of appeal may exist, in practice it is seldom exercised. However, in one district appeal to the missionary is upheld, and very often appeal is made through the missionary with or without success. In cases of coercion, the latter sometimes manages to assert his personal authority but this is extra-legal and not always upheld. On the Ivory Coast there is right of appeal to the Administration and thanks to the support of the missions the girl often wins her case. In two districts — Dahomey and Togo — Christian girls are beginning to make use of the right of appeal.

Cost is a further factor which militates against the exercise of the right of appeal. An appeal in a native court and perhaps a further appeal in a European court would be prohibitive to the majority of African women. In two districts where there is " no right of appeal under tribal law " (Kenya, South Nigeria), the British Government has recently intervened and

made appeal to the British authorities possible, but distance, cost and tribal cruelty still stand in the way. In almost every case the dowry is the root cause of the girl's coercion.

It should always be remembered that (1) the girl may not know that the right of appeal exists, especially in out-districts; (2) the girl is generally of comparatively tender years; (3) she will naturally feel reluctant to indict her own people quite apart from tribal terrorism (awe of the spirit world, magical rites, etc.); (4) the girl is liable to be seized by her pursuers on the road, sometimes in a trek of seventy miles or more; (5) she may not be upheld even after appeal.

Recommendations.

In a case of obvious coercion from whatever reason, it would seem useless to fly to native custom. Native women should be regarded as human beings, and European officials should treat them as such and in each case brought before them come to the humane decision regardless of dowry or bride-price. Such an attitude on the part of the European authorities would do much to alter the attitude of the native men towards their womenfolk and to eradicate the slave mentality, leading to coercion, in the women themselves. Appeal should be made as easily accessible as possible.[1] Marriage contracts should be forbidden by law under the age of 14 and the native parent or guardian should be heavily punished when any case of early pledging or coercion is discovered, as also the man who has paid for the girl. Enforcement of a law obliging the consent of both parties in marriage would do much to help.

A correspondent of Southern Rhodesia writes: "We must all urge that the black girl may be given the chance of a free, unmarried life with a profession if she so elects for herself. That alone would do much to damp the mercenary ardour of many a father. If the daughter could say to her father: 'If you bother me much more I shall never marry at all.' She cannot do that now, for an unmarried woman is unheard of."

Bride-price or Dowry (Lobola).

The custom of bride-price, dowry or lobola is almost universal in African society and very few natives, except those de-tribalised or in towns, consider themselves married unless cattle, goats, etc., or a sum of money, or both, has been given by the suitor or his father to the bride's father or guardian. "Until Christianity obtains a further hold it seems the only way of making a marriage legal." "The only legal pledge of marriage" (Northern Rhodesia). On the other hand, "A Christian does not marry without a bride-price . . . no native father however Christian will ever allow his daughter to marry without bride-price" (Uganda). (There are exceptions among the Christians of Togo, and also Barotseland, where one of the Protestant missions forbids bride-price — and no doubt elsewhere.)

In the old days the idea was "inter-group exchange", the giving of property by one group in exchange for a woman from another group. This superseded the still older practice (yet in existence in parts of Togo and Oubangui) of exchanging women between tribes for the purposes of marriage. "In modern days the arrival of currency is degrading (the bride-price) into a kind of sale of the daughter" (North Nyasaland). It is "rapidly degenerating into mere selling" (Northern Rhodesia). In some districts the price is rising as currency spreads, leading to all kinds of difficulties. "Many cannot marry for some years as they cannot obtain sufficient riches; hence a good deal of immorality" (Southern Rhodesia, Togo, Sudan). Non-completion of payment sometimes means that the girl has to be contracted back to her own family, hence child betrothals and payments over a long period (Southern Rhodesia). In Swaziland "there is constant litigation as to non-completed lobola", and a correspondent (Cameroons) writes: "This system leads to endless quarrels and litigation in the native courts." In Gabon, sometimes two or three suitors will pay for a girl and the suitor who can pay his own bride-price and pay off the others wins the girl; sometimes girls sold and re-sold at a profit, by their father or guardian or even by their "husbands", no longer remember who have been their successive "husbands". In various territories attempts have been made to limit the sum paid, but in Uganda at least the law is powerless for if threatened with proceedings the father or guardian will simply refuse his daughter in marriage: in the French Cameroons an imposed limit of five hundred francs has proved absolutely useless.

Those who favour the bride-price use as their arguments: (1) that it makes for stability in marriage since it must be paid back in case of divorce ("The breakdown of the dowry is always accompanied by moral degeneration, etc."): (2) It enhances the value of the girl: (3) it is an incentive to young men to go out to work. Against these arguments it may be said: (1) that despite the dowry, divorce seems to be of very frequent occurrence: (2) we do not really want African girls to continue to think of themselves as valuable in a monetary sense, as though they were beasts of burden. We would prefer them to make a true valuation of themselves as human beings and dowry will hinder rather than help them to this conception: (3) the disadvantages of this incentive to work seem far to out-weigh its advantages. As often as not it is an incentive to immorality. In parentheses, it may be said

---

[1] In one part of Uganda where coercion is uncommon there is an easily accessible right of appeal for women, who can go to the Gombola or European District Commissioner and do of themselves go direct to an Administrative Officer either at his headquarters or when he is on safari. More frequently it is to the missionary that any complaint is made.

of point (2) that in most districts the transaction of bride-price is regarded simply as buying and selling and " women are proud of the fact if their husband has given a great deal for them ". That is to say, human personality is really valued in terms of money. Women are ashamed if their bride-price is low, as though it were a stigma definitely marking them down as an inferior human person.

The disadvantage to the woman of the dowry system is not only confined to the world of ideas. Apart from the question of anticipated marriage and illicit unions owing to high dowry, the father, often humanly greedy, will accept the money without consulting his daughter and *post factum* she has no option but to agree to the proposed marriage. " This is the root cause of girls being coerced " (South Nigeria). A native Christian in the French Cameroons recently gave his Christian wife to a Christian creditor in payment of a large debt. She was not merely the pledge or loan, she was the final payment of the debt, agreed to and signed by the creditor. The woman saw nothing wrong in the transaction. Her husband had bought her from her parents and he had a right to dispose of her as he willed. " By the bride-price a woman is bought into her husband's family for ever and ever and she knows it."

In several tribes it is still the custom, instead of giving bride-price, for the bridegroom to go and live in his wife's village and work in his father-in-law's fields (Nyasaland, Togo, French West Africa, Dahomey, Sudan). This raises an interesting point, the introduction of bride-price. In one part of Tanganyika, it was the custom for the bridegroom to settle down near his mother-in-law and work for her unless salaried occupation took him away. But in this district, Islam favours bride-price, and where Islam is strong, the bride-price is beginning to be introduced. In Northern Rhodesia, the custom of building for the bride's parents still exists, but it is dying out. Fifteen or twenty years ago the British Native Commissioner, encouraged by the British Government, introduced bride-price here in order to stabilise native marriage undermined by the European contact — acting on missionary representation it was provided that Christian marriages need not be ratified by lobola. Sometimes the giving of money and presents is superimposed upon the older system of working in the mother- or father-in-law's fields, so that both systems exist together (Senegal).

" If the dowry system goes it necessitates some sort of alternative to replace it, if irreparable harm is to be avoided." Let us hope " some sort of alternative " will very soon replace it, for it is " a great evil. Ideologically, it is degrading to women since it savours too much of the market ; economically, it is a hardship to young men ; morally, it is a menace to the country " (Uganda).

A correspondent in Southern Rhodesia writes of the African woman : " She still *wants* to be bought and sold in marriage ; she is proud of it ; she boasts of it. *And the husband having paid the price, treats her as his property.* According to our law-givers, a black woman is for ever a minor. They will not allow that a girl may freely leave her home and become a nun.[1] They tell me to buy out the girl ; but even if I had the funds, I would never do that as it is admitting her minority, her serfdom." The girls have often been sold as youngsters and the fathers want the money to pay back the purchaser. *The bride-price is binding under native law and under European law as upholding native custom.* " A foul thing and a shame on any society where it is practised ! " comments our correspondent.

How foul it is, is brought out in a pathetic letter written by a native postulant to her Mother Superior. This girl was ransomed by the convent for £30 but she felt the money to be a bond, a slave price, debarring her from the *free* giving of herself to God. " Once I had a quarrel with a girl and she said I was nothing but the convent's slave . . . 'Just as I am, young, strong and free, to be the best that I can be.' When I came to the word ' free ' again the temptation came that I was not perfectly free. If I had no religious vocation, could I to-day go back home without a difficulty as to whether I am ready to pay back first what I owe the convent ? " How, after reading this, can anyone doubt that the dowry constitutes a binding chain round the African woman's neck debarring her from any kind of freedom and degrading her to the status of a beast ? That she approves of it herself is no argument. The only argument is Christian education and the treatment of women by such Europeans as come in contact with them as on an equality with men (for instance in cases which come before the Europeans for judgment). Slowly the different ideas and ideals will filter through and the young men will have views very different from the old ones. A law of practical use would be to give the girl her majority at, say, 21.

It is fatal to make any laws limiting the amount of the bride-price paid in districts where it has risen. Not only is this useless in practice, but it writes dowry firmly into the law, thus crystallising the custom and making it impossible for it to die out. It is equally undesirable to introduce or reintroduce bride-price. One of our correspondents (Union of South Africa) writes : " The women are increasingly opposing the payment of lobola even in less advanced areas, since a " lobolaed " woman if she becomes a widow may not re-marry . . . For

[1] Amongst the pagans before Christianity came, there were a few " nuns ", *i.e.*, virgins entirely devoted to a life of prayer and intercession. These virgins were chosen in a sort of spiritistic *séance* and *no* recompense was ever paid to the girl's people. It was death to any man who spoke to such a girl. Her family were so proud to have a daughter chosen for this office that that was their sole reward (Southern-Rhodesia).

myself I do not believe that a community can be saved . . . along the path of return to the past. Old institutions have been too badly shattered by earlier attacks made on them ; in any case they are unsuited to new conditions and cannot stand against the impact of new demands."

All legislation, all European authorities should discourage the practice of bride-price with the view of *ultimately abolishing it* and substituting Christian marriage in its place. The woman should not be inhumanly bound by the dowry in cases of polygamy, coercion, etc., under the pretext of upholding native custom. A loop-hole should be left for marriage without dowry, and European authorities should use all their influence and do all in their power to change the attitude of both native men and women on the question of marriage, so that the woman does not retain the slave mentality nor the man regard her as his property to be bought and sold.

Polygamy.

Polygamy is still more or less universal throughout Africa, and in districts where it is practised on a large scale is a veritable scourge. In the Cameroons, both British and French, " it is still a powerful factor in favour of immorality " writes an informant. Rich polygamous chiefs who buy up all the available wives in one district cause 40% of the younger men to become forced bachelors. The polygamist offers his " wives " at a monetary consideration to soldiers or other employees *de passage* ; he offers them to his numerous friends or relations who are visiting him ; he puts them at the disposal of the very bachelors he has deprived of wives, who in return will work on his land and give him children. For example, a polygamist possessing two hundred wives, leaves them at liberty to go and come provided they bring him regularly a fixed sum. Finally, the women give themselves without scruple to any stranger. In short, polygamy is prostitution dignified into a social system (Gabon, French Cameroons).

The chief will make his wives work for him on his own plantations, he will hire them out to the administration and for special enterprises, he will pay his debts with them. What is all this but forced labour ?

It goes without saying that polygamy causes the women to lose all human dignity. What is being done by the various Governments to discourage polygamy and encourage monogamous marriages ? In the British and French Cameroons the attitude of the administration has been more obstructive than constructive (" Polygamy is the only state for natives "), and no effort has been made to stop the obvious exploitation of women. In justice, it must be said that the women themselves sometimes think that to marry a rich man, though polygamous, has its advantages. But those women who are Christian converts and wish for monogamous marriages very often find themselves in great difficulties. It is true that since 1934 the Governor of the French Cameroons has made efforts to improve the situation. Thus the consent of the woman is required *by law* to every marriage, and one regulation attempts to make the abandonment of polygamy possible. But there are obvious shortcomings in the latter regulation. If the husband wishes for monogamous marriage he may still demand repayment of dowry from those of his " wives " who re-marry. If the demand for release comes from the wives, the whole of the dowry has always to be repaid to the husband before release can take place. But considering the woman has *no* money of her own and also considering that she may wish to marry a man far less rich than her former polygamous husband this may not always be possible. Though the letter of the law allows the woman freedom, in practice it is unattainable. The cost of applying to the court for judgment is beyond her ; the judges of the tribunal are for the most part polygamous chiefs ; in theory, marriage can only take place where there is consent — in practice, the administration says that when money has been for the woman it must be paid back if she wishes for her freedom. It is a perfect form of slavery.

So much for the Cameroons, where " tolerance of polygamy sometimes resembles encouragement " and where laws providing for the liberation of women are very little known, inoperative and badly interpreted. In parts of Togo and Gabon, the position is much the same.

The Belgian Congo has made determined efforts to uproot this scourge of polygamy. Monogamous marriage is systematically encouraged — polygamy is forbidden to all native officials and to a native who has contracted a civil marriage — on each extra " wife " there is a supplementary double tax. Every material and moral help is assured to the Missions, particularly in the formation of the monogamous family. Nevertheless, here, as in the French Cameroons, the woman has to buy back her freedom from the polygamous husband unless he has acquired her illegally, after a civil marriage. In districts where there are Christian and/or civil marriage ordinances, marriage under these ordinances is *de facto* monogamous (see under Registration of Marriage).

In many districts, the Government imposes a definite tax on plural wives (hut tax or head tax) and this together with cost of bride-price and upkeep makes for decrease of polygamy. Also the fact that most administrations oblige the men to work themselves instead of allowing them to delegate work to their wives, makes for decrease.[1] Only too

[1] In Tanganyika, polygamy exists (in Moslem areas it is very common), but the majority of the people are monogamous and the taking of a second wife seems hardly to enter their heads. The necessity it would involve of clothing a second woman, building a second house, paying a second hut and poll tax, makes the game not worth the candle. In Oubangui, there are only exceptional cases of polygamy ; in Madagascar, polygamy once existed, especially in the case of chiefs — it is now *forbidden*.

often, however, " Tribal custom exalts it and Government upholds tribal custom ", maintaining that it " could not fight tribal opinions on such a matter ". Polygamy is always discouraged by the Missions except in one or two cases where the Protestants are timid in asserting the principle of monogamy and in Nigeria where the African Protestant Communion admits polygamy. Education and European influence are other factors making for definite though slow decrease, and the example of monogamous Christian families should have a good effect in time. Educated girls dislike polygamous marriage ; all Christian teaching and Christian social ideas tend to discourage it generally and in Buganda (Uganda), at any rate, it is a shameful thing to remain pagan. Monogamy is definitely gaining ground.

Recommendations.

It would seem that the Belgian Congo is the only district where really determined efforts have been made to abolish the scourge of polygamy, and their example in the encouragement of monogamous marriage might well be followed in other territories. Even here, however, the bride-price remains an inhuman bond backed by European administration. It would seem better not to tax extra wives as this tends to write polygamy into legislation, giving the appearance of toleration. Government preference for monogamous native officials and employees would be very valuable. So also would be the universal existence of a Christian Marriage Ordinance under which Christian rights and obligations were always recognised.

Registration of Marriages.

In many territories, there are Marriage Ordinances existing which provide for civil and Christian marriages and such marriages are registered ; natives contracting them are obliged to keep to ordinary observance under European marriage laws. In native eyes, this has its disadvantages and in one territory great unwillingness was expressed to marrying under civil or Christian ordinance since this would involve strict monogamy and no facilities for easy divorce, etc. " It makes marriage too binding for their tastes " (Cameroons). Customary marriages are not generally subject to registration, but in a few territories (*e.g.*, Natal and Zululand, Southern Rhodesia) all marriages are subject to Government registration. In Northern Rhodesia there is no registration of native marriages at all, no legal enactments, and the position is chaotic. " Native sanctions are rapidly dying and marriage is becoming a temporary union between two people." In Dahomey, also, no registration exists (except for natives who are naturalised subjects), and European legislation more or less upholds native custom — as everywhere.

In a few territories, customary marriages, according to diverse customs, may be registered voluntarily (Kenya, Gabon, Tanganyika, Sudan), that is to say registration is extra-legal. This does not always bear with it recognition of Christian custom in the case of native Christians choosing to register their marriages when a Christian marriage ordinance is non-existent (Sudan, Gabon, Togo). On the Ivory Coast, Christian or Mohammedan marriages may be registered but in judging disputes arising after marriage there are no established laws, everything depends on the local administration. Even with a woman married under Christian marriage ordinance, in any dispute or when she is widowed her position is only too often not as clearly defined as it should be.

In general, as far as customary marriages are concerned, the dowry question has to come before the native court before a marriage can be arranged, and in some districts a kind of native marriage registrar is kept at the courts. Alternatively, the chiefs or native district commissioners keep note of such marriages. In Northern Rhodesia and Dahomey, where no native marriage ordinance exists, the missionary makes note of the marriages of his flock, as also in certain districts where the decrees of the marriage ordinance are too difficult of fulfilment (age of marriage too high) or where religious marriage is not *de facto* registered. In some territories, notably the Belgian Congo and the French Cameroons, there exists a complicated marriage ordinance or circular applicable to native customary marriages but not bearing with it the obligation of registration. Natives of the Belgian Congo who make a civil marriage according to European law are registered under the Congolese Code and are exempt from tribal custom (dealt with under the circular). But customary marriages are not registered. The French Cameroons have a similar circular with the interesting proviso that customary marriages may, at choice, be made without dowry. In the British Cameroons, " marriages may be registered before the civil authority or in a licensed church or they may not. In the vast majority of cases they are not."

In the French Cameroons, natives may register a marriage made according to native, custom and at the same time may have registered conditions contrary to native custom, *e.g.*, that they agree that there shall be only one wife and that if this condition is broken the marriage can be dissolved at the sole demand of the wife with or without repayment of dowry. In the Kenya Colony, tribal marriage can be converted into legal monogamous marriage under ordinance of 1931. And so on.

There are those who advocate the registration of *all* marriages in order to safeguard the woman, to a certain extent, from exploitation or ill-treatment. But apart from the intrinsic difficulty this would involve, in many inaccessible districts there are patent objections to the

registration of marriages made according to native custom. Unless polygamy is to be abolished in one fell swoop, polygamous marriages would have to be registered, thus putting a more or less official stamp on polygamy, which would be highly undesirable from the point of view of the status of women. In Natal and Zululand, marriage according to native custom is registered and *polygamy allowed*. Again, universal registration would write the bride-price firmly into legislation. In Southern Rhodesia, where *all* marriages have to be registered, a statement as to the amount of the bride-price *must* be made by the male party.

In Senegal, there is talk of organising registration of marriage in order to avoid complications *in the case of divorce or repayment of the dowry*. This gives a side-light on what the universal registration of native customary marriage would mean — merely in fact the legalising and crystallising of undesirable native custom.

To sum up, native custom is more or less universally upheld by European authorities where customary marriages are concerned (exceptions may be found in certain clauses of Belgian Congo and French Cameroons circulars). This would make universal registration, however convenient in dealing with subsequent difficulties, very dangerous as tending to legalise and crystallise customs even when such customs had to be upheld by the use of physical force. (" If necessary force is used to oblige the girl to cohabit " (case of upholding native custom)). No loophole would be left for the more human and humane developments.

Position of Widows.

A factor which adds to the difficulty of renouncing polygamy is the almost universal custom of the inheritance of widows. On the death of her husband, the widow goes with her children, the cattle and other of his belongings to his heir — who is generally a brother, sometimes the son of another wife. Either she becomes the wife of the heir, or he may dispose of her as he thinks fit — keep her himself or marry her to another from whom he accepts the dowry. A man may leave several widows and they will go to various members of his family ; in some cases the widow may choose her inheritor from the males of her husband's family (French West Africa, Sudan). The children belong to the husband's family, unless the line is matrilineal, in which case they belong to the mother's family (Gold Coast, Northern Rhodesia, Gabon). It is true to say that care and maintenance of the woman and her children has in the past been an obligation on the male members of the family and this obligation has been part of the close-knit family system of the African native (see under Inheritance).

In many districts, the widow has nominal freedom to go back to her own family or to re-marry at her choice but this freedom is almost always accompanied by enforced restitution of the dowry to the heir, together with abandonment of her children to him (after infancy). Her family is, of course, unwilling to pay this restitution, and in the case of a young suitor, he cannot always meet the demands of a rich polygamist. Unless either the family or the new suitor can meet the heir's demands, the widow's plea for freedom is not generally upheld in the courts, either native or European. In the French Cameroons, a widow is supposed to be free and independent but no woman is really free to remarry without the consent of her pagan inheritor. Applying under the Decree of 1928 for relief from pecuniary obligations to her husband's family, a young widow found she was required to prove her marriage. She was then told she had left the matter too long and was considered to have accepted cohabitation with the heir, so she was obliged to apply for a divorce (which meant restitution of the dowry). In Northern Rhodesia, the custom of automatic inheritance of the widow is slowly beginning to die out. She may now go back to her father's family or remarry, but in both cases the heir tries to get back some of the dowry, *though this is against the correct reading of the law.* Sometimes coercion is used to hold her back from freedom. In some few districts, those who have married under Christian or civil ordinances are exempt from tribal law (North Nyasaland, Natal and Zululand). A widow in Madagascar where women have a far better status than in the greater part of Africa, can dispose of herself as she likes and keep her children as long as she likes.

In other parts custom is beginning to evolve, *e.g.*, on the Gold Coast, where many widows remain alone with their children (though where this occurs the widow is required to pay the heir a fee) ; and in some districts the widow can remain alone with her children if she is able to support them (South Nigeria, Sierra Leone). In one tribe, on gaining her freedom, she may keep her children as long as the eldest child is given to the mother-in-law, this being a remnant of old custom (frontier between Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia). In parts of Tanganyika, Uganda, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, the widow who does not remain with her husband's family generally retains custody of her children. In some cases this is due to the family line having been matrilineal, in others to evolution of custom. Sometimes if the woman is strongminded and independent she is free, especially where old customs are held loosely and European authorities are discouraging them. Thus, a widow of South Togo is generally her own mistress, especially if educated and having a good social standing. In the Union of South Africa, the younger widows object increasingly to the customary transfer to the house of a deceased husband's mother.

But many are frightened to break away from tribal customs and would have to be heroines of a very high order to attempt to dispose of themselves as they wished. For instance, in Southern Rhodesia, in order to regain her freedom, a widow (having no money of her own) must get her father to repay a third of the dowry (a proceeding upheld by European courts), while her children over the age of 6 are given to the husband's family (also native law supported by European courts). The same occurs in East Uganda. If, for example, a Catholic widow obstinately refuses to cohabit with a polygamous heir, the latter threatens the relatives with prison unless they repay the bride-price. Naturally, they are unwilling to do this. The unfortunate widow is generally forced to give in to moral pressure and cohabit with the heir. Her only alternative is prostitution (Southern Rhodesia). Sometimes she is able to go with all her children to live at the mission, but if she chooses this course she is not backed by law or custom, only by the power of the missioner to instil respect in her owners. Recently, in the French Cameroons, a Christian widow was by judgment allotted to a pagan. Again one correspondent writes : " Generally, a black Dahomey woman stays all her life under tutelage ; it would cost her dear to emancipate herself."

Recommendations.

It is obvious that a widow should be allowed to do what she likes both with herself and with her children. Native custom should not be upheld by European authorities so that even a missionary's action in rescuing a Christian widow from a polygamous marriage is not upheld. The widow should not be bound by the bride-price. It is also most important that the African woman be given facilities to earn her own living, so that, if she so desires a widow can be really independent.

Inheritance.

As will have been seen from the foregoing paragraph on widows, " Women themselves are property to be owned and inherited by male relatives or relatives by marriage " (Kenya).

African women are in perpetual tutelage either single or married, which means in effect that a woman is always supposed to be looked after by her husband or his heirs and for this very reason is not considered to be in need of heritage. " Women are regarded as minors and cannot own property " (Transkenian Territory).

Land and very often cattle belong to the tribe — the tribe of the woman has this ownership as well as that of the man. But to leave land to a widow or to a girl child would transfer it from one tribe to another. This difficulty has been encountered on the Gold Coast, where the Christian Marriage Ordinance transferred land in a way not known before (to the widow instead of to the sister's children) so that natives refused to be married under the Ordinance, at the same time stiffening up their tribal law to such a degree that whereas in the past it had been usual to make some slight provision for the widow, she is now very often left destitute. Daughters here, however, have had and still do have presents of land from their fathers on marriage. In Southern Rhodesia, the Christian Marriage Ordinance again upsets tribal heritage and the young men object to it very strongly. But everywhere the customary heritage laws are most unfavourable to women and generally speaking they inherit nothing, apart from a little personal property and a hoe. It is as well to remember in this connection the attitude of the native men of the Cameroons : " The day we allow woman the least freedom will witness the beginning of the decline of our power over them." Exceptions to the general principles of inheritance may be found in tribes where individual property is becoming more general. Thus in Dahomey, girls always inherit the household effects, sometimes land is given to them, which they pass on to their own daughters. Also, if there are no sons and no brothers, the woman here is allowed to inherit. In Basutoland, the woman can inherit personal property, even cattle. In Zanzibar, all money and property goes to the widow if she has children. In Uganda, " isolated cases have occurred where the husband has bought land and on his death has left it to his wife".

Household utensils, clothes, even plantations can be inherited by the women of Gabon and the Cameroons, though the men have all the money. A recent legal Ordinance (Section 28 of the Natal Code of Native Law) enables a native woman of Natal to be declared " Kraal-Head " if she has the consent of her guardian ; if she has no guardian, she may herself apply to the native commissioner. By the fact that she is declared Kraal-Head she is emancipated and freed from the control and guardianship of her guardian and vested with full rights and ownership in respect of property and power to contract in her name. On the other hand, in French West Africa, in one tribe the girl used to be able to inherit from the parents, but nowadays the older brother takes it all.

On the whole, though " superficially certain aspects are favourable to some women, the real position is terribly unfavourable to the development of the personality of women " (Kenya). " Though capable of possessing property in their own right the older a woman becomes the more needy she is. The old women are nearly destitute though cared for by the younger members of the tribe " (Northern Rhodesia). This care however depends on " how much unity there is in the family." It is not now a sure and certain thing. The move towards individuality tends to take away the protection afforded to woman in the past, giving her no defined rights in return. Thus in Nyasaland, a widow has no share in her husband's estates and on one occasion an appeal was brought to the Government because the

husband's family wished to take even her clothing from her. Fortunately, she won the appeal.

In many parts of Africa the woman has still " no being apart from her family " (Swaziland). But she upon whom the communal system has fallen more heavily than her brothers is beginning to need rights more than ever before. Much will no doubt depend " on the energy and courage of the woman and her family in defending her rights " (Northern Rhodesia) and biased interference is not always successful (witness the Christian Marriage Ordinance of the Gold Coast). But the European administrations can at least see that the African woman is treated as a human person with human rights, not regarded merely as property herself, not left in destitution or in a slave state as her reward for a life of devotion given to her family. By word, example and opportunity given the authorities can and *must* lead African society to favour the development of the personality of woman. Europeans must neither be indifferent nor yet left deploring the obligation of applying native custom and powerless to do otherwise.

Prostitution.

Prostitution in the European sense is not customary amongst the native tribes except where it is copied from the white people. " Girls often prostitute themselves before marriage, and this is a source of small gains to their parents " says one correspondent. Prostitution is not legalised in British colonies, but the recent Natives Registration Act of Southern Rhodesia legalises concubinage. Also one correspondent of Nigeria N.P. (a Mohammedan district) tells of a " house " near the market where traders travelling can obtain a woman for the night. " The houses are in charge of an offical, I was told." In the French colonies, State regulation of prostitution exists exactly as in France and the system applies both to natives and to Europeans. " Seventy per cent of the prostitutes in the town of Algiers are native and the percentage is still greater in certain centres in the interior."

One writer (Gabon) remarks that while an old man may have many wives, including girls of 7 and 8 years old, the sons, men of 25 to 30 years of age, will have to wait till he dies to share out his women. A corollary to this is the freedom often given, owing to age or illness, by men to their wives to go to other men, provided that they bring back money or children to the legitimate husband — this where children are still an asset and not merely a liability (Togo).

There are some tribes (South Nigeria) in which the custom is for a rich woman to pay dowry for a young girl and then hire her out ; and others where it is customary to gain the good will of a chief by giving him a girl (Uganda). In one district, a " village woman " is obliged to " receive all and sundry " (Gold Coast).

Direct loan of wives is still the custom in some parts, as where the wife is lent to an honoured guest (Gabon, Southern Rhodesia), or where by pact (Nyasaland) or blood-alliance (Northern Rhodesia) friends agree to lend wives to each other. It is said, however, that the " rising generation in certain parts have never heard of this custom ". Another form of loan is where a man away for some time will lend or entrust his wife to a brother or friend during his absence. This is one of the evils increased by the system of contract labour.

There are many districts where lending of wives is unknown, but there are others where collusion is practised in order to get an " adultery price ", and this evil has grown so that some courts order the fine for adultery to be paid into court and not to the husband (Ashanti, Cameroons).

In some districts, temporary unions are frequent and increasing, and sometimes the temporary wives or their parents are paid by day, month or year, and a loan system is practically in existence (Cameroons, South Nigeria). Trial marriages are universal in certain districts and the marriage need not hold if there are no children (South Nigeria) ; some tribes practise " successive polygamy " or " easy divorce " ; concubinage is rife in Mohammedan districts and a concubine if of slave origin may be given to a poor friend as a legal but dowerless wife (City of Fez).

Men on temporary work take temporary wives and women complain that they " cannot get the men to marry them " (Transvaal). It is, however, in the locations in the urban areas, that this practice is seen at its worst. " The artificial dependence of the women and the instability of the urban male population " make the growth of temporary unions inevitable, and the result in crime, immorality and disease is witnessed to by the hospital workers, missionaries and the laws of governments, alike. In the Belgian Congo, family needs are catered for, but the British have done little in this direction except for a tentative experiment near Bulawayo, where the rents of the houses are too high for the average native. White governments still foster the evils inherent in a short-sighted system of labour recruitment, which destroys family life.

Women under Koranic Law.

The position of the woman among the Mohammedan population may be said to differ in some respects from her tribal sister. If Mohammedan law is referred to, it will be seen that the Mohammedan woman has a right to her own earnings (she is sometimes taught a trade, such as embroidery or carpet making, and she sometimes trades in the market) and

to a certain amount of personal property; that part of the dowry is paid in such a manner that it is spent on household furnishings, clothes, jewels, etc., which are henceforth the personal property of the girl, even if she is repudiated; and that a definite sum is reserved to be paid to her in the case of repudiation. Moreover, widows are not automatically inherited (though much stress is laid on their male children who will ultimately inherit). Wives and daughters receive a determined portion of the husband's property, with which they can do as they please, but not as much as a son, and if there are no sons, part of the property goes to distant male relatives (this by the way is a definite encouragement to polygamy). As far as property and fortune are concerned, by Koranic law the woman is in a good position — able to enjoy these and her earnings herself, even when married. Early betrothals are the rule though not always child-marriage, and in any case consummation does not usually take place till puberty. Nevertheless, " a father has the legal right to marry his daughter to anyone he pleases and at any age he pleases " (City of Fez), and " the Kadi closes his eyes to marriages concluded under the age of 12 " (Sahara). Marriage being a family affair, consent is more or less out of the question, as also is the right of appeal, and Moslem law allows polygamy to the extent of four wives plus concubines. The husband has the right of repudiation; the woman has not, so that even if a man cannot afford many wives he can practice successive polygamy. But a " wife who can support herself and contribute to the housekeeping is an advantage " (Nigeria N.P.).

In most districts where there are Mohammedans there is a Mohammedan Marriage Ordinance based on Koranic law and usually bearing with it obligation of marriage registration.

Needless to say Mohammedanism is not at its purest in Africa; it is affected by tribal law and in its turn affects tribal law. This inter-diffusion tends to the deterioration of both customs. Thus, polygamy amongst Mohammedans cannot be tackled by the administrations because it would be " interference with the Moslem religion to do so". Frequent divorce is also a Mohammedan right, and among the Kabyles, if a woman does not bear a son, that is a valid reason for divorcing her. Again tribal law will creep in so that dowry is paid to the parents of the girl (Kabyle, Sahara, Nigeria N.P.) and has to be paid back if she re-marries after her husband has divorced her (Kabyle); so that the widow has to remain with her husband's family if there are male children (Kabyle): and so that married women must give all their earnings to their husbands, keeping back nothing (Sahara, Kabyle). The Kabyle women inherit nothing. If there is no son, all the inheritance goes to a male relative of the husband.

It will be seen that though Mohammedan women have definite advantages, the Mohammedan attitude which implies that men are superior to women tends to find its counterpart in the African tribal attitude, so that what is worst in both combines to the further degredation of women. The following description of the Kabyle woman will bear this out: " The birth of a girl child is a calamity. The wife is her husband's servant. She may not pronounce his name, nor eat with him, and her food is of an inferior quality. She does all the hardest work, carries the building-stone on her back, helps the ox or ass to plough. Her husband has the right to beat her, or to repudiate her without reason."

In different districts, conditions of course vary, Mohammedanism naturally being purer and less affected by tribal custom in the towns, but on the whole the Mohammedans " do not wish to change the *status quo* of their women ". Conservatives wish to keep the women back, so that evolution is very slow and " native courts limit themselves to applying Koranic law without modification ". That is to say, no real attempt is made to interpret Koranic law in the sense most favourable to women, and favourable decrees and circulars are found in practice very difficult of application.

Union of South Africa.

In the territories which compose the Union of South Africa, the process of social disintegration, evident wherever an alien civilisation based on competitive commercialism has been imposed on a primitive society based on agriculture, is seen in its most aggravated form.

South African policy refuses to the native the right to become a town-dweller (Urban Areas Act) or to engage in skilled employment (" Colour Bar " Act, amendment to Mines and Works Act). To further the first object of this policy, the Government has preserved for the five million natives a bare 9% of the land, thus reserving for the two million white men 91%. Of the five million natives, two million live in native reserves or on the land they own. Normally, their lives would be the least disturbed by the development of South Africa as a white man's country, but, as the amount of reserved land is already insufficient, the pressure of population is increasingly drawing men to the mines and sugar estates, and, in addition, the needs of the white population for unskilled work in the mines demand a constant supply of natives, and by a deliberate policy of Native Recruitment the able-bodied males of all tribes are brought up to the mines on contract labour, housed in special compounds for periods at a time, and in such numbers that the officials of the Native Recruiting Corporation reckon that " half the able-bodied men are away from the reserves at any given moment, and most men spend eleven months out of twenty-four absent from ' home ' ". The effect of this violent upheaval in tribal life — the indiscriminate herding of men from different tribes in the compounds, without any provision for normal social needs — is disastrous for the men

and, through them, for the women. The division of labour of the primitive kraal is destroyed and the woman is left to bear the whole burden, the bonds of tribal discipline are loosened with nothing to take their place, and the women as well as the men are deprived of normal sexual intercourse, while they bear alone the anxiety as to the fate of their men-folk, and the fear lest they should not return.

Of the remaining three million natives, two million do not own — they only rent — land outside the reserves. Under the Labour Service Contract (in Natal and the Transvaal at least), the usual rent is paid in kind by work done for the farmer for three months, in exchange for a hut, and possibly grazing rights. The farmer has the right to the service of the man, his wife or wives, and his children under 18 years of age. This practice is itself a relic of the slavery of the eighteenth century, and is aggravated by the fact that the farmer may take the labour at his own time or times, and may reckon three months as a minimum, and demand more. In addition, the man must earn cash for his hut-tax and other expenditure, and is therefore driven to search for paid work outside the farm. The effect of this state of affairs is to drive the natives into the urban areas for periods at a time, leaving the women to bear the whole burden of the farm work. The more enterprising younger natives escape from farm bondage, permanently to swell the urban proletariat. One million natives are, in spite of laws and policies, town-dwellers, but since their rights are not recognised they are obliged to live in locations. These locations are primarily reservoirs of labour and if a native loses his job he may be moved on, though he may have lived in the location all his life — the women connected with him are left to do the best they can. In any case he finds it difficult to make a living, and the women have to balance the family budget. Many men in town for casual work do not bring their wives, and temporary unions are the result. Women coming to the towns to escape from the farms, to find their men or to avoid tribal pressure under the marriage customs, are expected to " have a man to speak for them as husband " if they live in the location, and these apparent marriages increase the evil, while if women take work as domestic servants, the isolation of their position and the presence of a great number of sex-starved natives in the compounds, leads inevitably to promiscuous intercourse, seduction and rape with all their attendant evils.

Free adult and child education are badly needed, but what exists is mostly beyond the natives' means and is not, as it should be, compulsory for the children. Children sent to school have no better chance of employment than others, so mothers and fathers will not send them. Child employment being forbidden, the children remain at a loose end while their mothers are at work. Much of the infantile mortality is directly due to the ignorance of the mothers.

Thus South African policy, which is dictated by a determination to preserve the rights of a dominant white minority, creates a situation which is destroying the very thing on which it depends, a stable and contented population. The hope for the future is to give the natives an opportunity for developing inside the new society in which they should have a recognised and honourable position, a new state " built on the recognition of the humanity of Africans, their need of healthy normal family life and their inability to maintain it in any circumstances other than those we regard as necessary for Europeans."

Recommendations.

We recommend that :

Education. — (1) Grants be supplied by Governments so that free education for boys and girls, equally, may exist wherever possible ;

(2) Education be made compulsory for both sexes wherever possible ;

(3) Adult education be subsidised and native women encouraged to make use of it.

Paid Work. — (1) Girls be given the opportunity of training for, and exercising, a profession ;

(2) Native teachers, nurses and midwives be trained and employed in the greatest possible numbers ; be well-paid, surrounded by marks of approval (uniform, certificates, appreciation of European officials).

Age of Majority. — The woman be given her majority at the age of 21 or before.

Marriage. — (1) No marriage contract be made for a girl under 14 ;

(2) Consent of the two parties be a condition of valid marriage ;

(3) Appeal against coercion be made generally known and as easily accessible as possible ;

(4) There be a Christian marriage ordinance in each territory, under which Christian rites and obligations be always recognised.

Bride-Price be discouraged and registered monogamous marriage be encouraged.

Polygamy. — (1) Monogamous marriage have Government approval and encouragement ;

(2) There be Government preference for native officials and employees who are monogamous.

Widows. — A widow be free to dispose of herself and her children as she thinks fit (remain with her husband's family, go back to her own, be independent, re-marry).

Traffic in Women. — (1) All State regulation of prostitution be abolished ;

(2) Third party exploitation of prostitution be severely punished ;

(3) Adultery price (fine for committing adultery) be abolished.

Family Life. — Facilities for decent family life be provided in connection with labour recruitment and in urban areas.

Native and Half-Caste Women in Australia.

Introduction.

While the status of the male Australian native is a pitiable one, that of the woman is much worse ; not only has she no rights in the community in which she lives, but she suffers a double bondage ; her father, having probably betrothed her, at or before birth, to one of his own contemporaries, delivers the child over, as possibly, a second wife, at the age of 10 or 12, and she must at all times bend her will to him, whose lawful property she has now become, to use or to lend ; and should he die first, she automatically becomes the property of his nearest male relative. Nor have the adult native women any more command over their own persons, not only in relation to their own men-folk, but also in relation to white men. Father Gsell (who for over a quarter of a century has acted as Superintendent of the Catholic Mission Station at Bathurst Island, Federal Territory) has for some years protested publicly that some measures should be taken by the Government to help him protect the native women on a Government native reserve from being prostituted by their men-folk to the Japanese pearling crews on Australian boats.[1]

The only effective way of giving a better life to the detribalised native women of Australia, most oppressed of all women, is the gradual raising of the status of the coloured woman to that of the white woman amongst whom she lives. Coloured women living amongst whites should be allowed to appeal against conformity to native marriage customs, repugnant to civilised life ; they should also have rights of guardianship over their children.

Education.

None, except in Mission schools and schools connected with Government settlement. At E.S. Lake Tyers Aboriginal Settlement in Victoria, the State Government provides the teachers for a one-roomed school for sixty children. This was visited recently by representatives of the Victorian Aboriginal Group and it was reported on as very unsatisfactory from an educational standpoint. Similar conditions prevail in South Australia and the other States.

Marriage.

The marriage law of the land is not applied to natives, half-caste or quarter-castes, whose marriage is wholly controlled by one man — the Commissioner, formerly known as Chief Protector. He has the only say as to who may or may not marry. Under the Federal Government's aboriginal policy, marriage may be celebrated only with another aboriginal, except where special permission is given by the Protectors in writing.

Contracts. — Under native law, girls are married at 11 or 12, they are betrothed at birth, or even before ; then, as early as 7 years old, they are sent to their native husbands and are passed back and forth between the mother and the native husband from time to time before marriage, so that the child may realise from the earliest times to whom she belongs.

Initiation Rites. — A matter which needs dealing with is that girls are made to suffer introcision at puberty at the hands of one of the old men.

Coercion. — If coerced, the girl under native law has no right of appeal and white law does not provide any. In 1932, a girl was killed by her husband for running away but no inquest was held.

Polygamy.

Polygamy prevails, and is not discouraged except by missionaries. It is considered fortunate for a man to own a number of wives. On the other hand, this is set off by the economic necessity of providing for extra wives and families.

---

[1] Father Gsell says : "Thank God things are improving here this year (1937). The Government is patrolling the coast with a special patrol boat and this has had a good effect".

Widows.

Under native law, a woman, no matter what her age, has no right to dispose of herself. On the death of her husband, she becomes the property of her husband's brother or nearest male relative. She is allowed to keep her children, the boys until they grow up, the girls until their husbands claim them.

Prostitution.

All dark women and girls are regarded as prostitutes and subject to police and medical control and inspection. "The aboriginals declare it is their fashion and their right to traffic with their women and nothing in the world will stop them. The radical cure must come . . . through the education of the children."

Sexual Offences.

Under the Federal Government, any person other than an aboriginal or half-caste who not being lawfully married to the aboriginal or half-caste (*a*) habitually consorts with such; (*b*) keeps such as his mistress, or (*c*) has carnal knowledge of such is guilty of an offence. Penalty, £100 or three months' imprisonment, or both.

Lending of Wives.

Under native law, lending wives is a social obligation. During certain religious ceremonies, a wife may be at the disposal of other men who are of the same matrimonial division; these are her tribal husbands. Under certain tribal conditions, two tribesmen may exchange wives.

Inheritance.

Women have equal rights with men on aboriginal reserves. Generally, the aborigines possess no property.

Paid Work.

Apart from natives brought up in settlements, women are not paid for their work except by gifts in kind. On stations, native girls are employed as domestics, but they are generally not paid. The coloured people brought up on settlements demand some payment and are usually employed as domestics, the managers of the settlements agreeing with the employers about the wages paid. The girls sent out to service from the Government settlement have their wages stipulated by the Department and to the Department their wages must be paid, for it takes and controls their earnings beyond a small weekly sum for pocket money. They have no bank books showing what moneys the Department holds for them, so they do not know what is owing. When they want new clothes, the Department does not give them their money, but an order on a firm. Under the Federal Government, ships or boats are not permitted to employ aboriginal women.

Missions.

The position in the Catholic and Protestant Mission settlements is very different. In some missions, girls are given ordinary primary education from 5 years to 14 years. The best education possible in the circumstances is attempted by all the missions, sometimes against great odds. Native teachers and nurses are trained as far as possible. Consent is required from both parties for all marriages, and polygamy does not exist. In some settlements, domestic and nursing duties are paid for and where possible the fullest provision is made for maternal and infant welfare with trained medical and nursing staffs. Divided control of the States has always been a great difficulty. Great improvement is hoped from the recent action of the Federal Government in calling a Conference of Protectors of Aborigines and other Commonwealth and State authorities. Women officers are an urgent necessity. It is to be hoped that the aboriginals will shortly be given full civil status and services throughout the Commonwealth of Australia.

British Guiana (South America).

Paid Work.

So far, nothing has been done in the way of training native women as teachers, nurses or midwives. East Indian women immigrants do a great deal of field work. Some natives women are employed by British settlers in the Hinterland in domestic service, others in carrying rubber, etc. These are paid, usually in goods.

Marriage.

There exists (*a*) a local Marriage Ordinance based on the English Marriage Act (Civil Marriages); (*b*) registration of marriages when Christian, Mohammedan or Hindu. Every minister of religion is his own registrar.

Aboriginals out of touch with the missions have native customary marriages, recognised officially but not registered. Among the East Indians (immigrants and 40% of the population), the Hindu system of child-marriage lingers — owing to customs connected

therewith it is known as " bamboo marriage ". Children are married from 10 upwards but the Government only recognises registered (Hindu) marriage. Many women are deserted even after ten or twelve years of cohabitation and there is no redress if marriages are not registered (legal age of marriage fourteen), though fathers have to maintain illegitimate children.

Among the Red Indians, marriages are allowed by unwritten native custom so soon as they are physically capable. According to native custom, little or no liberty is allowed in choice of a partner to either boy or girl ; they have to marry the person chosen by the parents ; but now Christianity has taught them differently. The Red Indians are left to themselves with regard to marriage; anything like appeal is out of the question. Reservation law regards as married any two aboriginals living together ; if any third party interfere, there will be trouble.

Polygamy.

Among Red Indians of the Hinterland out of touch with the Missions and missionaries, polygamy is universal — *e.g.*, there is much polygamy among the Carils.

Dowry.

Nothing is paid, but the man works for his father-in-law.

Widows.

According to custom (Red Indian), if a man dies, his younger brother (if unmarried) is supposed to marry his elder brother's widow, even though she is older than him. The women are dependent on the men.

Laos (French Indo-China).

Education.

Free education is provided but is non-compulsory and girls will not attend schools. Assistants and head-teachers in small schools need only have a certificate issued at the end of the preliminary-school course, but for more advanced teaching it is necessary to have been at Hanoï or Pnom-Penh. Nurses and midwives are trained in the hospitals. The woman is the " manager " of her house : she commands and keeps the purse.

Marriage Customs.

Marriages are conducted under native custom — girls are not generally married under the age of fourteen (boys fifteen). Consent is required from both parties, and in the case of coercion, appeal may be made to the village tribunal. Polygamy exists in well-to-do families, but owing to the example of Europeans and lack of money it is disappearing.

Bride-Price, Widows, Prostitution.

Money or cattle are given to the parents of the girl if she is taken to the house of her husband. If he goes to the house of his bride, the work he does is counted as dowry. A widow can do what she likes and has entire custody of the children. Prostitution is legally controlled where there are barracks.

Maternal and Child Welfare.

Mothers are treated at the hospitals, with their children. Visiting medical officers have consultations for these in the remoter villages.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN.

May 25th, 1937.

The Political and Civil Status of Women.

Introductory.

The International Council of Women, together with the component National Councils of Women, desires to express its deep interest in the forthcoming discussion to be held in the Assembly of the League of Nations on the important subject of the political and civil status of women. The International Council of Women has passed resolutions at several congresses in support of equal status and equal opportunities for men and women, and welcomes cordially the proposal of an international convention based on the principle of equality of rights for both sexes.

In response to the invitation extended to women's international organisations to send to the League any views or useful matter concerning the subject, the International Council of Women circulated to the National Councils of Women a questionnaire on certain leading aspects. It was designed in such a way as to bring out to what extent equality had been achieved in each country or inequalities between the rights of men and women still existed. Replies have been received from twenty-five of the National Councils, representing countries in which women have arrived at various stages of progress in their efforts to obtain rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and they provide to that extent useful comparative material. The replies include many details and statistics, but, in editing them for the particular purpose of the League, attention has been devoted to a few main points, the same for each country :

I. *The political and civil status* of women in the legislature, in local government and in the judicature.

II. *The legal status* of women compared with that of men in respect of rights of property, testament and inheritance ; the right to make contracts and to bring an action before the courts ; the rights of nationality and domicile.

III. The status of women in the *professions and public services.*

IV. The general attitude of public opinion in the country with regard to the removal of all barriers of tradition, law and custom from the path of women's progress.

The replies have come from the Argentine, Austria*, Belgium*, Bulgaria*, Brazil*, United Kingdom*, Chile, Czechoslovakia*, Denmark*, Finland*, France, Greece, Hungary*, India*, Italy, Latvia*, Lithuania*, Netherlands*, Norway*, Poland*, Roumania, South Africa*, Sweden*, Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

Of these countries, *Finland* has enjoyed the longest record of women suffrage. The others that are starred in the list, with the exception of *Belgium*, *Hungary* and *India*, have given to women equal suffrage rights with men and eligibility for elected bodies. These three countries have given women parliamentary suffrage and eligibility with restrictions.

In *Italy*, a limited measure of municipal suffrage was given in 1923, but conditions were changed under the present system of a " National Council of Corporations ". Women may vote in the individual Corporations and one woman sits in the National Council.

In *Yugoslavia*, there is no law that gives women rights of suffrage and eligibility in respect of the senate or parliamentary or local authorities, but the theoretical possibility of their nomination to the senate and provincial councils is not precluded. In *Greece*, women have a limited measure of municipal and communal suffrage without eligibility for election. *Roumania* has granted to women some measure of municipal suffrage and eligibility, while *Bulgaria* gives only restricted rights of voting without eligibility to mothers, in the local, provincial and municipal councils.

In *Chile*, a law of 1935 granted municipal suffrage and eligibility to women.

In the *Argentine* and *Switzerland*, women have neither federal nor municipal franchise.

Experience in the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries has demonstrated how rapidly the new women voters claimed, and were in large measure granted the removal of sex disabilities, and freedom and opportunity for the development of their particular bent and capacities. On the other hand, the electorates in these and other countries with women

* In order to avoid duplication of information supplied from other sources, the replies in question have been filed and can be consulted in the Secretariat.

suffrage and eligibility have been extremely slow in electing women to sit in Parliament. The actual number of women members of Parliament is a very small percentage of the total number of members; for example, in the United Kingdom, at present it is between one and two per cent. Even in the provincial, municipal and other local councils, the replies sent from the various countries remark on the relatively small number of women members who secure election.

Naturally, women, as recent comers to Parliament and the local authorities, have still to win their way to full party-political confidence and support, and to break down the ties of tradition in the minds of the people. Time is on their side, but there is unfortunately little prospect of weakening the influence of ancient custom and tradition among the people as long as women are treated in the economic sphere as the inferior worker and inferior earner. This creates the impression in the popular mind of a woman in public life as a standardised " second-best ", quite properly given a secondary place in administrative functions and in public bodies throughout the country, corresponding to that which has been assigned to women in the industrial system.

This question of progress in the political and civil status of women is indissolubly bound up with the actual economic factors of daily existence. These are now under investigation by the International Labour Organisation, and outside the scope of the Assembly's resolution. They have therefore been omitted from this report except in so far as it includes some general indication of women's status in the professions and public services.

One of the most important results of giving equal suffrage rights and responsibilities of citizenship to women is that, in democratically governed countries, their vote weighs overwhelmingly in support of peace doctrines and policy. The majority of women recognise only too keenly the infinite importance and necessity of preventing war and bloodshed.

It is, therefore, particularly fitting that the States Members of the League of Nations should consider the urgent appeal of women for their support in extending the number of countries in which women have equal status with men. The right of political suffrage and eligibility enables women to become a much more potent influence in the building up of security in the home country and maintaining friendly relations with other countries.

The new women voters quickly realise the benefit of visiting some of these countries where women have already had experience of suffrage, and of seeing for themselves some of its practical results. The constructive work done by women's international organisations in bringing women of many nationalities together at meetings and congresses, and keeping up contacts by letter, must be reckoned as a considerable factor in the peace propaganda of our time.

The International Council of Women, both in its individual capacity and as a member-organisation of the Liaison Committee of Women's International Organisations, expresses its conviction that the Assembly of the League of Nations, in supporting an international convention granting equality of rights and responsibilities to women would not only help to raise the status of women, but would thereby be serving the highest interests of peace and humanity.

EQUAL RIGHTS INTERNATIONAL.[1]

May 15th, 1937.

Preliminary Statement.

The Equal Rights International is an international body, whose main object is to work for the conclusion of an Equal Rights Treaty, of which the following is adopted as the model of the major clause :

> " The contracting states agree that upon the ratification of this Treaty, men and women shall have equal rights throughout the territories subject to their respective jurisdictions."

The Equal Rights International, having as its aim the equality of the sexes before the law throughout the world, works for international agreements which embody the principle of equality.

The Equal Rights International has branches, affiliations and correspondents in twenty countries.

* * *

In connection with the notification from the Secretary-General that statements relating to the Status of Women could be submitted for consideration to the eighteenth Assembly, by international associations, the Equal Rights International submits as its contribution a study of the status of woman as wife, mother and home-maker.

To secure reliable information, a questionnaire was addressed to representatives of practically every country in Europe, Asia and the Americas, as well as to Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and the information thus acquired is incorporated in this report.

The Position of Woman as Wife, Mother and Home-maker.

Woman as wife, mother and home-maker is a category of worker invariably overlooked in legislation. Her economic position in many countries is unstable to an alarming degree. She is entitled neither to salary nor wages, but has definite duties to perform ; in some countries, she can be deprived of her earnings, of her savings and of her income ; in others, it is possible for her husband, no matter how wealthy, to leave her destitute at his death and she has no legal redress.

In considering the replies received from Governments and others, one point stands out most clearly, and that is that in practically every country a married woman's financial position, as regards cash payments from her husband, is better if living apart from him. Surely it is a disastrous state of affairs to make a broken marriage more satisfactory financially than a united one. We quote the French reply, because it is typical of the position in many countries : " Under French law, the wife is not entitled to a share of her husband's income, unless she has obtained an order for maintenance or alimony following desertion, separation or divorce ".

Another outstanding example of the appalling insecurity of woman as wife, mother and home-maker is that, in England and Wales, a man can bequeath everything he has away from his family and leave his wife and children entirely unprovided for, and thus even the wives and children of wealthy men can become a charge upon the State.

In the majority of marriages, the woman before marriage has been a wage-earner ; she has been accustomed to the handling and spending of her own money. To-day Governmental pressure, with the mistaken idea of reducing unemployment amongst men, the wishes of the husbands, maternity and other circumstances combine to remove the majority of women from the labour market on marriage. These women give up their power of earning in order to become wives, mothers and home-makers.

Let us consider the case of the woman who devotes the whole of her time to home-management and child-rearing, a work which is arduous and constant and which carries with it no right to any remuneration at all.

What are the tasks required of a housewife ?

A housewife is expected to have a knowledge of :

Dietary and food purchase ;
Cooking ;
Hygiene and household cleaning ;
Dressmaking and mending ;
Laundry work ;
Sick nursing ;
Infant rearing ;
Education of infants up to five years ;
Household accounts ;
Minor household repairs and decorating ;
In agricultural districts — poultry-keeping, dairying and gardening.

To be an expert in each and all of these requires a very wide technical knowledge and

[1] A supplement to the Equal Rights International's memorandum, containing extracts from information obtained from a number of countries, has been filed and can be consulted in the Secretariat.

skill and versatile talents. It is realised that all wives are not experts in all these branches, but a few years' experience is usually sufficient to enable them to reach as high a standard as the conditions of their homes make possible.

If we compare the working conditions of the individual workers in those spheres, we shall find that the general level enjoyed by the specialist is infinitely higher than that enjoyed by the housewife.

For example, in countries priding themselves on their standard of living, it is not customary for domestic servants to be employed for more than ten hours a day. They can claim one half-day a week, and in the majority of cases are free on two half-days. One full day a month and a week's holiday are the minimum recognised as due. Two weeks' holiday is generally given. Workers in other spheres have rather more leisure time. In what country does the mother of a working-class family enjoy so much ? In many countries, housewives work eighteen hours a day.

Night-work.

Except in the case of nurses, women are not, as a rule, employed at night and they may not be employed in shops and factories in England and other countries which have ratified the night-work convention of the International Labour Organisation between the hours of 10 p.m. and 5 a.m. or 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.

When persons are employed at night, the hours are generally subject to limitation, and with reasonable safeguards, and for limited periods, night-work need not be injurious though it is desirable it should be abolished for men and women workers wherever possible. Night-work, however, without equivalent time of rest and recreation in the following day, as is the lot of many wives and mothers when sickness strikes the home or there are young babies to rear, cannot be defended and would not be tolerated by paid employees. Night-work usually commands higher rates of pay.

The worker in the commercial world has many safeguards not possessed by the housewife, such as restrictions against being overburdened with heavy weights, the right to claim compensation for injury, etc. The former, while hampering the woman in her search for work because they are applied to women only, would be of benefit if applied more widely to men and women workers equally. The housewife is in need of such protection no less than are commercial workers.

There are millions of women the world over, doing a hard day's work in the home ; yet these housewives are not regarded as workers, but in the census of most countries are described as " dependants " of some male worker. They are really employees, but have no rights as such, no regulations as to hours, no provisions for holidays and no guarantee of remuneration. *In no country have we been able to discover the provision of a state health insurance for housewives, as such*, even when there is a health service for the majority of classes of workers.

The questionnaire sent to many countries revealed the fact that *in no country at all (except Norway and Sweden) was a woman entitled by law to a share of her husband's income* in return for her services to the family as mother, nurse, cook, cleaner, laundress, dressmaker, etc.

When we compare the legislation of diverse countries, we note that many laws state that the husband and wife are joint owners of certain properties, but in practically every case the management of the property is entirely in the hands of the husband who can act without his wife's consent. Further, property acquired by the wife's thrift and often by her own hard work, together with that of her husband, is absolutely in the husband's control.

Such laws, while assuring the wife a share of the family income — on paper — have little value, for a woman cannot be considered economically independent if she cannot handle or spend her money. The man who controls a woman's purse, controls her actions.

The need for a stable family life is one recognised by all and if the wife and mother in industrial communities is no longer responsible for producing all the goods required by the family, yet her work is vital to the life of the nation ; and, to-day, women, aware of their financial insecurity in marriage, ask how they can do this vital work in conditions so uncertain and with the prospect of a living so precarious.

Rewards of a Housewife's Labour.

It is a common belief that " a man has to keep his wife " and in marrying, many women believe that they have secured a certainty of maintenance for life. This is a fallacy.

At present, in all countries (except Scandinavia), all that the law demands that a man shall provide for his wife is food, clothing and shelter — the necessaries of life ; and the standard of each is left entirely to the goodwill of the husband. A husband need not give a wife coin

of any kind with the result that a wife can be placed in the unenviable position of having no spending money at all, of being unable to pay for recreation, medical attendance, for a holiday or for domestic help to do her work while on holiday. Her contribution to national life is considered as valueless from a monetary point of view, indeed, so little value is placed upon her work, that, in many countries, parents are bound to give their daughters a dowry which then becomes the property of her husband.

It has already been mentioned that, if a wife leaves her husband and seeks divorce or legal separation, the court may grant alimony or maintenance. But it is common knowledge that this is often very difficult for the wife to collect. It invariably depends upon the husband's willingness to pay. Legislation is vitally necessary to protect the interests of the divorced or separated wife and also the interests of children of a first marriage.

We recommend that some form of international co-operation be devised whereby assistance would be rendered in the collection of alimony or maintenance dues.

Poor as is the financial security of most of the workers, it is at least more secure than this, and when the day's work has been done, the worker knows and can count on what is due. The fact that the majority of wives are cared for to the best of a husband's capacity must not blind one to this absolute lack of specific claim which could protect the minority who find themselves victims and who suffer exploitation. The case of the wife of a bad husband is a dire one even if such cases are in a small minority.

Maternity Bonus.

Australia is the only country in which *the State* provides a bonus for maternity. There, £5 is payable to the mother in respect of each confinement at which a living or viable child is born, provided the total income of the claimant and her husband for the period of twelve months preceding the date of birth did not exceed £299. In many instances, Scandinavian countries provide a bonus and the whole question is, at present, a vital one there.[1]

Child Endowment.

New South Wales (Australia) is the only *State*, as far as can be ascertained, that provides a child endowment, although certain private industries in Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France and England do so.

New South Wales pays a parent on the basic wage 5/- per week for each child under the age of 14, except for the first child.

Russia provides cash payments for mothers nursing their infants and also an allowance for mothers of large families.

Proposals to improve the Status of the Housewife.

We do not intend here to discuss the pros and cons of all the proposals advanced for the purpose of improving the status of the housewife, but merely list a number, in the hope that Governments, organisations and societies and the housewives themselves will give to each due consideration so that eventually a satisfactory solution may be found for this urgent problem.

Some of the proposals which have been put forward are :

1. Wages for wives.
2. Legal claim to proportion of husband's earnings.
3. Joint liability for family expenses.
4. Community of goods.
5. Family allowances.
6. State endowment of motherhood.
7. Extended widows' pensions.
8. State medical service for married women.
9. Improved maternity services.
10. Special grants for pregnant and nursing mothers for food, etc.
11. Inheritance reform.
12. Removal of many discriminations in the law as between married women and other citizens.

A Wife's Claim on Her Husband.

A woman's contribution in labour to the maintenance of the house and the rearing and care of the family logically implies that wives are partners of husbands in the home. They marry for mutual benefit ; they have a common home, common responsibilities but no common right to the spending of the family income or the handling of the family property. Since marriage is a partnership, an idea worthy of consideration is that the wife be entitled while she is living with her husband to an equal share of the family joint income with an equivalent joint liability for family expenses. If at the time of marriage mutual agreements were arrived at by financial arrangements being made on this basis, many of the confusions and anomalies that now exist would be avoided. In certain parts of the world, a wife may pledge her husband's credit, but credit is useless for purposes of transport, amusement, miscellaneous

[1] A maternity bonus of 75 kronor is now to be given in Sweden to all families with a taxable income of less than 3,000 kronor. This will probably amount to 92 % of all childbirths.

shopping — for these, a wife must have cash and, under the law as it stands to-day in most countries, she cannot enforce any claim to cash.

A practical recognition of the money value of the work done by wives must be accorded. No widower or single man expects to get these services by offering board and lodging only in return. Such recognition will make for more stable and happier marriage, a wife will feel that her immense contribution has some monetary value if, amongst other things, she receives payment through a recognised share of the family joint income ; thus she will find her status considerably improved, her happiness increased, her security strengthened and the relationship of husband and wife the equal partnership it should be.

Pension Rights.

In the best classes of employment, it is nowadays assumed that a worker will have a right to some pension when his days of service are over. Provision for a housewife's old age ought to be no less generous than that made for other workers.

When a wife survives her husband, she should be able to claim a proportion of his estate. No spouse should be able to bequeath the whole of the estate away from the surviving spouse.

A Mother's Claim on the State.

In the first place, the States ought to recognise that the housewives, the most numerous class of workers, are by no means the least important to the nation's life and should make provision for the preservation of the health of wives and mothers to at least as great an extent as is made for various other classes of workers. In countries where a National Health Service exists, we find that the housewife is excluded from its benefits in most cases.

Pregnancy is viewed from a wrong angle. For the employed woman, it is looked upon as detrimental and is hedged around with restrictions ; consequently, it is generally accompanied by hardships. In the interests of the race, the mother should be in at least as good a financial position at the time of the birth of her child as she is at other times.

As the nutrition and health of the young children are primarily her concern, we advocate that she should in her own right have a claim upon the State for the means of rearing the children where it is not forthcoming through the family income and that her rights in this respect should include a right to her own means of subsistence while she is performing the public service of child-rearing, where other sources of income are non-existent or are below a reasonable standard. With the father, she should be the recognised co-guardian of the children.

We recommend also to the attention of Members of the Assembly the handicaps suffered by the married woman because of the discrimination against her in the laws of almost all countries in the matter of her right to independent nationality, to separate taxation of her income, to her own legal domicile, to her right to enter into contracts. This lack of freedom to take independent action prevents a wife, whose conditions of service to her husband are unsatisfactory, from providing an income for herself by her own efforts.

We urge Members of the Assembly to examine and grant the claim of women for equality of the sexes under the laws of the Member States and in doing so not to overlook the great majority of the working women of the world — the women whose life-work is that of housewives and mothers.

We are of the opinion that the status of women would be raised by the adoption of an international convention granting equality to women ; therefore, we urge the representatives of the Member States of the League of Nations, when considering what action in their view the League of Nations ought to take in the matter of the Status of Women to accept and give effect to the Equal Rights Treaty.

"UNION INTERNATIONALE DES LIGUES FEMININES CATHOLIQUES."

[*Translation.*]

June 16th, 1937.

The Bureau of the International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues (l'Union internationale des Ligues feminines catholiques) submits the present memorandum as a contribution towards the work of the League of Nations concerning the legal status of women.

The memorandum does not deal with the problem as a whole, but is intended to indicate the attitude of the International Union towards certain essential points.

Legislation on the subject is undoubtedly necessary in many countries. Whereas, in some countries, even adult women do not enjoy the right of individual liberty or are in the shameful position of slaves, in others, their legal status, even in the case of marriage, gives them an unlimited personal freedom and absolute economic independence which may tend to endanger the stability of family life, while, in others again, the law maintains a situation of unjustifiable inequality between men and women, placing the married woman in particular in a state of inferiority incompatible with her personal dignity and assimilating her to a minor in regard to all civil acts.

The Bureau of the International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues considers that legislation designed to secure for women their proper place in the world might usefully be based on the following considerations :

A woman is a human being, created for a personal end which she has the right and duty to pursue freely.

The physiological and psychological differences between men and women do not involve any inferiority but mean rather that they possess different aptitudes for different functions of equal value.

The happiness of men and women and that of mankind demands, on the part of both sexes, consideration for the common good and a contribution commensurate with the gifts conferred on them by the Creator.

Their contribution will never be real or adequate unless they are prepared to give society the benefit of their specific endowments in the various spheres of human endeavour.

As regards family life, which is the basis of society : the welfare of society, the welfare of men and women who have contracted marriage and the welfare of their children call for (1) the *unity*, *stability* and *indissolubility* of the marriage bond, (2) *co-operation* between husband and wife in the guidance of the family and education of the children, and (3) a *further contribution* by husband and wife towards the well-being of society in general.

Accordingly the law should :

(1) Ensure to every woman *freedom* in keeping with her nature and her *dignity* ; a *voluntary choice* as regards her mode of life and, if she chooses marriage, the free choice or acceptance of her husband ; *respect for her right to earn her living* in exchange for fair wages ;

(2) Recognise in fact the principle of *equal morals* for both sexes ;

(3) Contain provisions such as the following : a woman *shall never be deprived of nationality* ; in case of marriage, her *nationality shall not be affected* without her free consent ; and, in the case of a future husband and wife of different nationalities, *each shall have the option* of *adopting* the *other*'s nationality, since it is natural that the family should have the same nationality and that this should be determined by the convenience of the family as a whole ;

(4) Adopt the principle of "*collaboration*" rather than "subordination" as a basis for the legal provisions governing the respective rights and duties of husband and wife ; provide, however, for *the delegation of authority* to the husband and father should disagreement between husband and wife seriously endanger the unity of the family, but make provision for the wife to appeal ;

(5) Organise the property system in such a way that the administration of the *property of the family* shall be in the hands of husband and wife jointly ;

(6) Recognise *equal rights* for husband and wife in the matter of *guardianship and inheritance* ;

(7) Intervene, so far as may be necessary and possible, to create economic conditions such that the father's work shall suffice to keep the family and thus help *to abolish the inequality* which too frequently occurs *in the allocation* of the burdens in wage-earning families, in which the mother is at present obliged to carry on an outside occupation in conjunction with domestic duties ;

(8) Ensure to women *political rights*, more particularly the *right of voting* but with due reference to circumstances of place and time.

WOMEN'S CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON NATIONALITY.

May 1937.

The Women's Consultative Committee notes with satisfaction that the eighteenth Assembly of the League of Nations has before it, in accordance with the request of the delegates of fifteen countries, the subject of the communication from the Women's Consultative Committee relative to the revision of the Covenant, together with the question of the whole status of women.

The Committee has already presented to the League of Nations a considerable amount of data upon the subject of sex discrimination in the laws of various countries.

This year, the Committee therefore wishes merely to reaffirm its desire to have the equality of sexes in all spheres of law and practice guaranteed, on the one hand, by the States Members of the League through the inclusion, in the Covenant of the League, of the four points proposed in the Committee's Communication of September 1936,[1] and more widely guaranteed throughout the world by the acceptance of the Montevideo Equal Rights Treaty by every nation.

The question of nationality has been the close concern of the Committee. It confidently anticipates that the Montevideo Convention on the Nationality of Women, already in force in eight States, will be ratified by others of the signatories and that new States will adhere thereto.

* * *

" The Women's Consultative Committee,

" Considering that the Hague Nationality Convention of 1930, having received the required ten ratifications, is now in force and has become susceptible of amendment :

" Calling to mind that, at the Hague Codification Conference of 1930, a recommendation was passed as follows :

" ' The Conference recommends to States the study of the question whether it would not be possible to introduce into their law the principle of the equality of the sexes in matters of nationality' ;

" Recalling also that the same Conference laid down a general recommendation reading :

" ' The Conference, considering it desirable that there be as wide as possible a co-ordination of all efforts for the codification of international law, recommends that the work undertaken with this object under the auspices of the League of Nations and that undertaken by the Conference of American States be carried on in the most complete harmony with one another ' ;

" Therefore requests the eighteenth Assembly to take the necessary steps to bring the Hague Nationality Convention into harmony with the Montevideo Convention on the Nationality of Women."

Signed on behalf of :

International Council of Women ;
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom ;
Inter-American Commission of Women ;
Equal Rights International ;
All-Asian Conference of Women.

---

[1] See document A.8.1937.V.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council, and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 14.** 1937.

Corrigenda.

Geneva, November 29th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

Page

Part I. — Communicaitons from Governments :

Australia. — Rider to " Guardianship of Infants " Section of the Statement for Western Australia (Page 13 of document A.14.1937.V) 1

Part II. — Communications from Women's International Organisations :

International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship. — Correction to the Statement (Page 54 of document A.14.1937.V) under the Heading " Switzerland " 2

PART I. — COMMUNICATIONS FROM GOVERNMENTS.

Commonwealth of Australia.

Canberra, October 21st, 1937.

With further reference to your Circular Letter No. 160, dated October 24th, 1935, relative to the status of women, and in continuation of the Australian statement on the subject and the Acting Secretary's letter of June 30th last, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that advice has been received that there have been inconsistent decisions as to the meanings of Sections 2 and 3 of the Western Australian Guardianship of Infants Act, 1926, and it has been submitted that, until these sections have been judicially considered by the Full Court, the effect thereof must largely remain a matter of conjecture.

The Western Australian authorities have consequently forwarded the enclosed rider to the original statement on the subject, which is transmitted herewith for your information.

* * *

RIDER TO " GUARDIANSHIP OF INFANTS " SECTION OF THE STATEMENT SUPPLIED IN CONNECTION WITH THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Guardianship of Infants (Document A.14.1937.V, page 13).

With respect to the custody of children, Sections 2 and 3 of the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1926, provide that, where any question as to the custody or upbringing of a child arises in proceedings before a court, the court shall regard the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration irrespective of the rights of either parent.

3416 — S. d. N. 1.130 (F.) 1.275 (A.). 12/37. Imp. Granchamp.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 3. Corrigenda.

It is submitted, firstly, that these sections relate to custody only and not to guardianship; secondly, that the sections do not provide that the father shall be deprived of his common law rights but only put on the statute book the principle hitherto observed by the courts that the welfare of the child is of paramount importance, and, thirdly, that a strong case would still have to be made out to deprive a father of his rights.

From a working knowledge of the principles followed by the courts dealing with applications under the Married Women's Protection Act (where these questions most frequently arise), one may say that, where no moral slur has been cast upon either parent, the court most generally gives the custody of very young or female children to the mother. Until the question of custody comes before a court, it is again submitted that the common law rights of the father still hold.

PART II. — COMMUNICATIONS FROM WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.

International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship.

The following correction is made at the request of the above-mentioned organisation :

Page 54, paargraph 7, of the statement under the heading " Switzerland " :

Instead of : " A woman has the right to her own earnings and to exercise a profession or industry *without* her husband's consent"

Read: " A woman has the right to her own earnings and to exercise a profession or industry *with* the consent of the husband."

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]
[Also distributed as Special Supplement No. 167 to the *Official Journal.*]

Official No.: **A. 6 (a).1937. Annex I. V.**

Geneva, August 31st, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Annex to the Report[1] on the Work of the League for the Year 1936/37

to the Eighteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS AND CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

EIGHTEENTH LIST

Note by the Secretary-General.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the report adopted by the Council of the League of Nations during its forty-third session on December 6th, 1926, the Secretary-General has the honour to submit herewith to the Members of the Council a list, in chronological order, of the international agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League. The list shows the States which have become parties to these agreements by ratification or accession or definitive signature, the States which have signed but have not yet ratified them, and, finally, the States which have neither signed nor acceded, although they took part in the conferences at which the agreements were drawn up or have been invited to become parties thereto.

According to the decision taken by the Council at its forty-ninth session on March 6th, 1928, the present list contains in addition the reservations affixed or declarations formulated either in signing or in ratifying or in acceding to the agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The International Labour Conventions have been grouped at the end of this document.

---

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Austria, of September 10th, 1919.
2. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Bulgaria, of November 27th, 1919.
3. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Hungary, of June 4th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 187).
4. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey, of July 24th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 11).
5. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Poland, of June 28th, 1919.
6. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Czechoslovakia, of September 10th, 1919.
7. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, of September 10th, 1919.
8. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Roumania, of December 9th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 335).
9. Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, of May 15th, 1922.
10. Declaration by Albania, of October 2nd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 173).
11. Declaration by Finland as to the Aaland Islands, of June 27th, 1921.
12. Declaration by Latvia, of July 7th, 1923.
13. Convention between Bulgaria and Greece respecting Reciprocal Emigration, Neuilly-sur-Seine, November 27th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. I, p. 67).
14. Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, of January 30th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXII, p. 75).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN LIQUOR: Convention relating to the Liquor Traffic in Africa, St.-Germain-en-Laye, September 10th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 11).

(*c*) AERIAL NAVIGATION: Convention relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation, Paris, October 13th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XI, p. 173).

3148 — S.d.N. 1.710 (F.) 1.440 (A.) 9/37. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 4.

N.B. — States which have signed, ratified or acceded to particular agreements or conventions since the date of the last list submitted to the Council and Assembly (document A.6(*a*).1936. Annex I. V, of September 10th, 1936) are indicated in italics.

The letter "*a*" placed immediately after a date signifies an accession.

The letter "*s*" placed immediately after a date signifies a definitive signature.

(*d*) HEALTH:

1. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Roumania, Warsaw, December 20th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XVIII, p. 103).
2. Sanitary Convention between Poland and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Warsaw, February 17th, 1923.
3. Sanitary Convention between Germany and Poland, Dresden, December 18th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 301).
4. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Czechoslovakia, Warsaw, 1922.
5. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Latvia, Warsaw, July 7th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 317).
6. Sanitary Convention between Estonia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 25th, 1922.
7. Sanitary Convention between Latvia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 24th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 9).
8. Sanitary Convention between Bulgaria and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, April 1923.

(*e*) AALAND ISLANDS: Convention relating to the Non-Fortification and Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands, Geneva, October 20th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 211).

(*f*) UPPER SILESIA: Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, Geneva, May 15th, 1922.

(*g*) FINANCIAL RESTORATION OF AUSTRIA:

1. Protocol No. I (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
2. Protocol No. II and Annexes and Explanatory Note, Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
3. Protocol No. III (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.

(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XII, pp. 385, 391 and 405.)

(*h*) SAAR: Protocol between the German Government and the Governing Commission of the Territory of the Saar Basin, Berlin, June 3rd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 189).

(*i*) DANZIG:

1. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).
2. Treaty between Germany and Poland concerning the Regulation of Option Questions, Danzig, November 8th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 323).
3. Treaty between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Warsaw, October 24th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXVI).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1924 (A.8(*a*).1924, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) MINORITIES:

1. Declaration concerning the Protection of Minorities in Lithuania, Geneva, May 12th, 1923.
2. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, signed at Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN ARMS: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva, September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*c*) REVISION OF BERLIN AND BRUSSELS ACTS RELATING TO AFRICAN TERRITORIES: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva on September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*d*) REFUGEES:

1. Arrangement with regard to the Issue of Certificates of Identity to Russian Refugees, Geneva, July 5th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XIII, p. 237).
2. Protocol relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 29).
3. Declaration relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 41).

(*e*) FINANCIAL RECONSTRUCTION OF HUNGARY: Protocols on the Financial Reconstruction of Hungary, March 14th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, pp. 423 and 427).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1925 (A.7(*a*).1925, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Proposal relating to the Protection of Greek Minorities in Bulgaria.
2. Proposal relating to the Protection of Bulgarian Minorities in Greece

(Geneva, September 29th, 1924) (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 117 and 123).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) CURRENCY AND BANKING REFORM:

1. Protocol regarding Currency and Banking Reform in Estonia, signed at Geneva, December 10th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXII, p. 277).
2. Protocol regarding the Bulgarian Stabilisation Loan, signed at Geneva, March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 165).
3. Additional Act to the Protocol of March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 210).
4. Protocol for the stabilisation of the currency and liquidating the budget arrears of the Hellenic State and for further settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 15th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 9).
5. Declaration concerning the above Protocol on behalf of France, Great Britain and Italy, signed at Geneva, December 8th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 73).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

(*c*) REFUGEES:

1. Additional Act to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, relating to the Settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 19th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 413).
2. Declaration relating to the modifications made to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, with regard to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece, by the Additional Act of September 19th, 1924, Geneva, September 25th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 421).
3. Protocol concerning the Settlement of Refugees in Bulgaria, signed at Geneva, September 8th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 245).
4. Arrangement relating to the issue of identity certificates to Russian and Armenian Refugees, supplementing and amending the previous Arrangements dated July 5th, 1922, and May 31st, 1924, signed at Geneva, May 12th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 47).
5. Arrangement concerning the legal status of Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 53).
6. Arrangement concerning the extension to other categories of Refugees of certain measures taken to assist Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 63).
7. Agreement concerning the functions of the representatives of the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 377).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1931 (A.6(*a*).1931, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) REFUGEES:

Convention between the Hellenic Government and the Refugee Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, January 24th, 1930 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CVIII, p. 349).

(*b*) CONCERTED ECONOMIC ACTION:

1. Commercial Convention and Protocol, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.
2. Protocol regarding the Programme of Future Negotiations, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1933 (A.6(*a*).1933, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) ROUMANIA:

Agreement establishing technical advisory co-operation in Roumania, signed at Geneva, January 28th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 271).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Agreement between Colombia and Peru relating to the procedure for putting into effect the recommendations proposed by the Council of the League of Nations in the report which it adopted on March 18th, 1933, in order to avoid any incident that might aggravate the relations between the two countries, with Annexes, signed at Geneva, May 25th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 251, and Vol. CLII, p. 314).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1934 (A.6(*a*).1934, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) AUSTRIA:

Austrian Protocol, signed at Geneva, July 15th, 1932 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 285; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 469; and Vol. CXLII, p. 392).

(*b*) ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS:

International Convention for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927.
Protocol of the above Convention, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927.
Supplementary Agreement to the Convention of November 8th, 1927, for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.
Protocol of the Supplementary Agreement, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCVII, p. 391; Vol. C, p. 264; Vol. CVII, p. 538; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 411; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 447; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 336.)

The Annex to the Report on the Work of the League for the year 1935/1936 (A.6(*a*).1936. Annex I. (V)), contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

Final Act of the Conference of Wheat Exporting and Importing Countries, with Appendices and Minutes of Final Meeting, open for signature at Geneva on August 25th, 1933.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLI, p. 91.)

Protocol concerning the Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva, September 14th, 1929.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXV, p. 353.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT.
Chapter XXXI.
Creation of an International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Company (Convention for the), with Charter and Statutes. Geneva, May 21st, 1931 92

ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.
Chapters VI and XVI.
Awards (Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral). Geneva, September 26th, 1927 53
Clauses (Protocol on Arbitration). Geneva, September 24th, 1923 28

ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR (SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN).
Chapter XI.
Gases (asphyxiating, poisonous and other), and Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 46
Ifni (Declaration regarding the Territory of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925. 46
Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War (Convention for the). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 45

ASSISTANCE (FINANCIAL).
Chapter XXV.
Assistance (Convention on Financial). Geneva, October 2nd, 1930 79

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES (UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON).
Chapters XXIV and XXIX.
Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930. 76
Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931. 87
Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 77
Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 88
Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 75
Uniform Law for Cheques (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 85

BROADCASTING.
Chapter XLIV.
Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace (International Convention concerning the Use of). Geneva, September 23rd, 1936 113

COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY (SUPPRESSION OF).
Chapter XX.
Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency (International Convention for the). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 . 68
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, April 20th, 1929 69
Protocol (Optional). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 69

COURT (PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE).
Chapters I and XXII.
Accession of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Protocol relating to the). Geneva, September 14th, 1929 70
Court (Protocol of Signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 9
Clause (Optional). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 10

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (AMENDMENTS TO THE).
Chapters IV, IX and XII.
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Third paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 23
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). First paragraph amended. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 . . 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). Third and fourth paragraphs of Article 26 amended, replacing the original second paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. 25
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, September 27th, 1924 39
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph of the original text. Geneva, September 21st, 1925 49

CUSTOMS.
Chapter VII.
Simplification of Customs Formalities (International Convention relating to the), and Protocol. Geneva, November 3rd, 1923. 31

DANUBE (DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE).
Chapter XXVII.
Declaration by the Governments of the Powers which are Parties to the Convention instituting the Definitive Statute of the Danube. Geneva, December 5th, 1930 83

DISPUTES (PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XVIII.
General Act. Geneva, September 26th, 1928 58

Page

ELECTRIC (QUESTIONS).
Chapter VIII.
Electric Power (Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 36
Hydraulic Power affecting more than One State (Convention relating to the Development of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 37

EMIGRANTS (TRANSIT CARD FOR).
Chapter XXI.
Preparation of a Transit Card for Emigrants (Agreement concerning the). Geneva, June 14th, 1929 . . 70

EXPORTATION.
Chapter XVII.
Bones (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 56
Protocol to the International Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928. 57
Hides and Skins (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 . 54
Protocol to the International Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928 55

FILMS (OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER).
Chapter XXXVI.
International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character (Convention for facilitating the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 101

LAW (PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XXIII.
Conflict of Nationality Laws (Convention on Certain Questions relating to the). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 71
Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality (Protocol relating to). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 72
Statelessness (Protocol relating to a Certain Case of). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 73
Statelessness (Special Protocol concerning). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 74

NAVIGATION (INLAND).
Chapters II, XIII and XXVIII.
Collisions in Inland Navigation (Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules concerning), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 83
Flag (Convention on Administrative Measures for attesting the Right of Inland Navigation Vessels to a), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930. 84
Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation (Convention regarding the), and Protocol of Signature. Paris, November 27th, 1925 49
Registration of Inland Navigation Vessels, Rights *in rem* over such Vessels and Other Cognate Questions (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 84
Waterways of International Concern (Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 16
Waterways of International Concern (Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 17

NAVIGATION (MARITIME).
Chapters II, VIII, XXVI and XL.
Buoyage (Agreement for a Uniform System of Maritime), and Rules annexed thereto. Geneva, May 13th, 1936. 108
Flag (Declaration recognising the right to a) of States having no Sea-coast. Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 19
Lightships (Manned) not on their Stations (Agreement concerning). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 81
Maritime Ports (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 34
Signals (Agreement concerning Maritime). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 80

OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS (TRAFFIC IN).
Chapters X, XXXII, XXXV, XLI and XLII.
Drugs (Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous). Geneva, June 26th, 1936. 109
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, June 26th, 1936 110
Narcotic Drugs (Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, July 13th, 1931 93
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, July 13th, 1931 96
Narcotic Drugs (Procès-verbal to alter the latest date of issue of the annual statement of the estimated world requirements of dangerous drugs, drawn up by the Supervisory Body, as provided for by the International Convention of July 13th, 1931, for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, June 26th, 1936 111
Opium Convention (International). The Hague, January 23rd, 1912. 40
Opium (Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of Prepared), Protocol and Final Act. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 11th, 1925 42
Opium Convention (International). Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 42
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 44
Smoking (Agreement for the Suppression of Opium). Bangkok, November 27th, 1931. 100

PUBLICATIONS (OBSCENE).
Chapter V.
Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications (International Convention for the). Geneva, September 12th, 1923 26

RAILWAYS.
Chapter VIII.
Railways (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 32

RELIEF UNION (INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XV.
Relief Union (Convention and Statute establishing an International). Geneva, July 12th, 1927 52

Page

REFUGEES.
Chapter XXXVIII and XLIII.
International Status of Refugees (Convention relating to the). Geneva, October 28th, 1933 103
Status of Refugees coming from Germany (Provisional Arrangement concerning the). Geneva, July 4th, 1936. 112

ROAD TRAFFIC.
Chapter XXX.
Signals (Convention concerning the Unification of Road). Geneva, March 30th, 1931 89
Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, March 30th, 1931 90
Triptychs (Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost). Geneva, March 28th, 1931. 91

SLAVERY.
Chapter XIV.
Slavery Convention. Geneva, September 25th, 1926 50

STATISTICS (ECONOMIC).
Chapter XIX.
Statistics (International Convention relating to Economic). Geneva, December 14th, 1928 65
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, December 14th, 1928 67

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.
Chapters III and XXXVII.
Traffic in Women and Children (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, September 30th, 1921 19
Traffic in Women of Full Age (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 102

TRANSIT.
Chapter II.
Freedom of Transit (Convention and Statute on). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 15

VETERINARY (QUESTIONS).
Chapter XXXIX
Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals (International Convention for the), with Declaration attached. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 105
Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products) (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 107
Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 106

WAR (MEANS OF PREVENTING).
Chapter XXXIV.
Means of preventing War (General Convention to improve the). Geneva, September 26th, 1931 100

WHALING.
Chapter XXXIII.
Regulation of Whaling (Convention for the). Geneva, September 24th, 1931 98

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) adopted as Draft Conventions by the International Labour Conference at its various Sessions.
Chapter XLV.

(*a*) First Session (Washington, October 29th-November 29th, 1919):
Age for admission of children to industrial employment (Convention fixing the minimum) 116
Employment of Women before and after childbirth (Convention concerning the) 115
Hours of work in industrial undertakings (Convention limiting the) to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week 114
Night (Convention concerning the employment of women during the) 115
Night Work of young persons employed in Industry (Convention concerning the) 116
Unemployment (Convention concerning) 114

(*b*) Second Session (Genoa, June 15th-July 10th, 1920):
Age for admission of children to employment at sea (Convention fixing the minimum) 117
Employment for seamen (Convention for establishing facilities for finding) 118
Unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship (Convention concerning) 117

(*c*) Third Session (Geneva, October 25th-November 19th, 1921):
Age for admission of children to employment in agriculture (Convention concerning the) 118
Age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers and stokers (Convention fixing the minimum) 121
Association and combination of agricultural workers (Convention concerning the rights of) 119
Compensation in agriculture (Convention concerning workmen's) 119
Medical Examination of children and young persons employed at sea (Convention concerning the compulsory) 121
Weekly rest in Industrial Undertakings (Convention concerning the application of the) 120
White Lead in painting (Convention concerning the use of) 120

(*d*) Seventh Session (Geneva, May 19th-June 10th, 1925):
Accidents (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for) 122
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational) 122
Equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents (Convention concerning) 123
Night work in Bakeries (Convention concerning) 123

Page

LABQUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) *(continued)*.

(*e*) Eighth Session (Geneva, May 26th-June 5th, 1926):
Simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship (Convention concerning the) 123

(*f*) Ninth Session (Geneva, June 7th-24th, 1926):
Articles of Agreement (Convention concerning Seamen's) 124
Repatriation of seamen (Convention concerning the) 124

(*g*) Tenth Session (Geneva, May 25th-June 16th, 1927):
Sickness insurance for agricultural workers (Convention concerning) 125
Sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants (Convention concerning) 125

(*h*) Eleventh Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 16th, 1928):
Minimum-wage-fixing machinery (Convention concerning the creation of) 125

(*i*) Twelfth Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 21st, 1929):
Heavy Packages transported by vessels (Convention concerning the marking of the weight on) . . 126
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the) 126

(*j*) Fourteenth Session (Geneva, June 10th-28th, 1930):
Forced or compulsory labour (Convention concerning). 127
Hours of work in commerce and offices (Convention concerning the regulation of) 128

(*k*) Fifteenth Session (Geneva, May 28th-June 18th, 1931):
Hours of work in coal-mines (Convention limiting) 128

(*l*) Sixteenth Session (Geneva, April 12th-30th, 1932):
Age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (Convention concerning the) 129
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the). Revised 1932 128

(*m*) Seventeenth Session (Geneva, June 8th-30th, 1933):
Agencies (Convention concerning fee-charging employment) 129
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity). 129
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity) 129
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 129
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 130
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans'). 130
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans') 130

(*n*) Eighteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-23rd, 1934):
Automatic sheet-glass works (Convention for the regulation of hours of work in) 131
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational). Revised 1934 . . . 130
Night (Convention concerning employment of women during the). Revised 1934 130
Unemployed (Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily) 131

(*o*) Nineteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-25th, 1935):
Hours of work (Convention concerning the reduction of) to forty a week 131
Hours of work in coal mines (Convention limiting). Revised 1935 131
Hours of work in glass-bottle works (Convention concerning the reduction of) 132
Employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (Convention concerning the) . . 131
Scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance (Convention concerning the establishment of an international) 132

(*p*) Twentieth Session (Geneva, June 4th-24th, 1936):
Holidays with pay (Convention concerning annual) 132
Reduction of hours of work on public works (Convention concerning the) 132
Regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers (Convention concerning the) 132

(*q*) Twenty-first Session (Geneva, October 6th-24th, 1936):
Professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant ships (Convention concerning the minimum requirement of). 132
Holidays with pay for seamen (Convention concerning annual). 132
Liability of the shipowner in case of sickness, injury or death of seamen (Convention concerning the) 133
Sickness insurance for seamen (Convention concerning) 133
Hours of work on board ship and manning (Convention concerning) 133

(*r*) Twenty-second Session (Geneva, October 22nd-24th, 1936):
Age for admission of children to employment at sea (Convention fixing the minimum). Revised 1936 133

(*s*) Twenty-third Session (Geneva, June 3rd-23rd, 1937):
Age for admission of children to industrial employment (Convention fixing the minimum). Revised 1937 133
Age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (Convention concerning the). Revised 1937 133
Hours of work in the textile industry (Convention concerning the reduction of) 133
Safety provisions in the building industry (Convention concerning). 133

I. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

1. PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[1]

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members or States which may sign the Protocol.*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 4th, 1921)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA (July 13th, 1921)	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	SA'UDI ARABIA
AUSTRALIA (August 4th, 1921)	COSTA RICA	EGYPT
AUSTRIA (July 23rd, 1921)	GUATEMALA	ECUADOR
BELGIUM (August 29th, 1921)	LIBERIA	HONDURAS
BOLIVIA (July 7th, 1936)	NICARAGUA	IRAQ
BRAZIL (November 1st, 1921)	TURKEY	MEXICO
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 4th, 1921)		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
BULGARIA (August 12th, 1921)		
CANADA (August 4th, 1921)		
CHILE (July 20th, 1928)		
CHINA (May 13th, 1922)		
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)		
CUBA (January 12th, 1922)		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 2nd, 1921)		
DENMARK (June 13th, 1921)		
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)		
ESTONIA (May 2nd, 1923)		
ETHIOPIA (July 16th, 1926)		
FINLAND (April 6th, 1922)		
FRANCE (August 7th, 1921)		
GERMANY (March 11th, 1927)		
GREECE (October 3rd, 1921)		
HAITI (September 7th, 1921)		
HUNGARY (November 20th, 1925)		
INDIA (August 4th, 1921)		
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)		
IRISH FREE STATE		
ITALY (June 20th, 1921)		
JAPAN (November 16th, 1921)		
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)		
LITHUANIA (May 16th, 1922)		
LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)		
THE NETHERLANDS (August 6th, 1921)		
NEW ZEALAND (August 4th, 1921)		
NORWAY (August 20th, 1921)		
PANAMA (June 14th, 1929)		
PARAGUAY (May 11th, 1933)		
PERU (March 29th, 1932)		
POLAND (August 26th, 1921)		
PORTUGAL (October 8th, 1921)		
ROUMANIA (August 8th, 1921)		
SALVADOR (August 29th, 1930)		
SIAM (February 27th, 1922)		
SPAIN (August 30th, 1921)		
SWEDEN (February 21st, 1921)		
SWITZERLAND (July 25th, 1921)		
URUGUAY (September 27th, 1921)		
VENEZUELA (December 2nd, 1921)		
YUGOSLAVIA (August 12th, 1921)		

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VI, p. 379; Vol. XI, p. 404; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XXIV, p. 152; Vol. XXVII, p. 416; Vol. XXXIX, p. 165; Vol. XLV, p. 96; Vol. L, p. 159; Vol. LIV, p. 387; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 435; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 272; Vol. XCII, p. 362; Vol. XCVI, p. 180; Vol. C, p. 153; Vol. CIV, p. 492; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXI, p. 402; Vol. CXVII, p. 46; Vol. CXXVI, p. 430; Vol. CXXX, p. 440; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 392; Vol. CXLVII, p. 318; Vol. CLII, p. 282; Vol. CLVI, p. 176; Vol. CLX, p. 325; Vol. CLXIV, p. 352; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 228; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 388.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Final Act of the Conference of States signatories of the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Geneva, September 23rd, 1926.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (April 7th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

***Albania (November 7th, 1935)**

Reciprocity, 5 years as from September 17th, 1935, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 of the Statute arising after September 17th, 1930 (the date of the previous acceptance of Albania which is being renewed by the present declaration), with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, other than:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Albania;

(*b*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Albania;

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Argentine Republic

Reciprocity, 10 years, from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration does not apply:

(1) To questions already settled;

(2) To questions which, by international law, fall within the local jurisdiction or the constitutional regime of each State.

Costa Rica

Reciprocity.

Czechoslovakia

Reciprocity, 10 years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement, and subject to the right, for either of the parties to the dispute, to submit the dispute, before any recourse to the Court, to the Council of the League of Nations.

Guatemala

Reciprocity.

Liberia

Reciprocity.

Nicaragua

Unconditional.

Poland

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any future disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to such ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of peaceful settlement.

The present declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) With regard to matters which, by international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; or,

(2) Arising between Poland and States which refuse to establish or maintain normal diplomatic relations with Poland; or,

(3) Connected directly or indirectly with the world war or with the Polono-Sovietic war; or,

Other Members or States which may sign the Clause.

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Chile
China
Cuba
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Honduras
Iraq
Italy
Japan
Mexico
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

(c) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by the Kingdom of Albania and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

AUSTRALIA (August 18th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

Austria (June 30th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 5 years, as from March 13th, 1937.

BELGIUM (March 10th, 1926)

Reciprocity, 15 years, in any disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

BOLIVIA (July 7th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 10 years.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

(4) Resulting directly or indirectly from the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed at Riga, on March 18th, 1921; or,

(5) Relating to provisions of internal law connected with points (3) and (4).

TURKEY

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 arising after the signature of the present declaration, with the exception of disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions concluded by Turkey and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Brazil (January 26th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 10 years, with the exception of questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Brazilian courts of law or which belong to the constitutional regime of each State.

United Kingdom (February 5th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Bulgaria (August 12th, 1921)

Reciprocity.

Canada (July 28th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to said ratification, other than:

Disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in Canada reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Colombia (January 6th, 1932)

Reciprocity.

Denmark (May 24th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from June 13th, 1936.

Dominican Republic (February 4th, 1933)

Reciprocity.

*Estonia (May 2nd, 1928)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any future dispute in respect of which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

**Finland* (April 9th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from April 6th, 1937.

*France (April 11th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 5 years, as from April 25th, 1936, in any disputes arising with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the engagement assumed by France, and which could not have been settled by a procedure of conciliation or by the Council according to the terms of Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant, with reservation as to the case where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

GERMANY (July 5th, 1933)

Reciprocity, 5 years, from March 1st, 1933, as regards disputes which might have arisen after February 29th, 1928, date of the ratification of the declaration made on this subject at Geneva on September 23rd, 1927, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification. Cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement are excepted.

*GREECE (July 19th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years, as from September 12th, 1934.

For the classes of disputes mentioned in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication;

(*b*) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Greece and providing for another procedure.

This acceptance is effective as from the date of signature of the present declaration.

*HAITI (September 7th, 1921)

Unconditional.

HUNGARY (August 9th, 1934)

Reciprocity, 5 years, with effect as from August 13th, 1934.

INDIA (February 5th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of India,

And subject to the condition that the Government of India reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

IRAN (September 19th, 1932)

Reciprocity in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Iran and subsequent to the ratification of this declaration, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Iran, including those concerning the rights of sovereignty of Iran over its islands and ports;

(*b*) Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*c*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Persia.

However, the Imperial Government of Iran reserves the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

The present declaration is made for a period of six years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effects until notification is given of its abrogation.

IRISH FREE STATE (July 11th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 20 years.

LATVIA (February 26th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years, over all disputes which might have arisen after February 26th, 1930, date of deposit of the ratification of the declaration made at Geneva on September 10th, 1929, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration is made for a period of five years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effect until notification is given of its abrogation.

*LITHUANIA (January 14th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)
Reciprocity, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

*The Netherlands (August 5th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 10 years, as from August 6th, 1936, in any future disputes, excepting those in regard to which the parties would have agreed after the coming into force of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

New Zealand (March 29th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of New Zealand,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in New Zealand reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Norway (May 29th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 10 years, as from October 3rd, 1936.

*Panama (June 14th, 1929)
Reciprocity.

*Paraguay (May 11th, 1933)
Unconditional.

Peru (March 29th, 1932)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in any dispute arising with regard to situations and facts subsequent to ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed either to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration, or to submit the dispute previously to the Council of the League of Nations.

*Portugal (October 8th, 1921)
Reciprocity.

*Roumania (June 4th, 1936)
Renewal for 5 years, as from June 9th, 1936, of the declaration of October 8th, 1930, within the limits and subject to the conditions and reservations laid down in the said declaration.

The declaration of October 8th, 1930, read as follows:

" Reciprocity, 5 years, in respect of the Governments recognised by Roumania and on condition of reciprocity in regard to legal disputes arising out of situations or facts subsequent to the ratification by the Roumanian Parliament of this accession and with the exception of matters for which a special procedure has been or may be established and subject to the right of Roumania to submit the dispute to the Council of the League of Nations before having recourse to the Court.

" The following are, however, excepted:

"(*a*) Any question of substance or of procedure which might directly or indirectly cause the existing territorial integrity of Roumania and her sovereign rights, including her rights over her ports and communications, to be brought into question;

"(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which, according to international law, fall under the domestic jurisdiction of Roumania."

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2: Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Salvador (August 29th, 1930)
The provisions of this Statute do not apply to any disputes or differences concerning points or questions which cannot be submitted to arbitration in accordance with the political Constitution of this Republic.
The provisions of this Statute also do not apply to disputes which arose before that date or to pecuniary claims made against the Nation, it being further understood that Article 36 binds Salvador only in regard to States which accept the arbitration in that form.

Siam (May 7th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in all disputes as to which no other means of pacific settlement is agreed upon between the parties.

*Spain (September 21st, 1928)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*Sweden (April 18th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 10 years, as from August 16th, 1936.

Switzerland (April 17th, 1937)
Reciprocity, 10 years.

*Uruguay (September 27th, 1921)
Reciprocity.

State having accepted the Optional Clause in virtue of the Council Resolution of May 17th, 1922.

Monaco (April 22nd, 1937)
Acceptance for a period of 5 years in any disputes arising after April 22nd, 1937, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this declaration, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.
(This declaration was transmitted to the Secretariat by the Registrar of the Permanent Court of International Justice.)

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

1. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (November 15th, 1923)	China	Union of South Africa
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	Ethiopia (*a*)	Argentine Republic
British Empire, including Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922) Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.	Guatemala	Australia
	Lithuania	Brazil
	Panama	Canada
	Peru (*a*)	Colombia
	Portugal	Costa Rica
	Uruguay	Cuba
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)		Dominican Republic
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)		Ecuador
		Egypt
Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)		Haiti
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)		Honduras
India (August 2nd, 1922)		Irish Free State
		Liberia
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Paraguay
		Salvador
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

[1] This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 11; Vol. XI, p. 407; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XIX, p. 279; Vol. XXIV, p. 155; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 166; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 181; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393; and Vol. CXLII, p. 340.

1. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia (October 29th, 1923)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 3rd, 1925 *a*)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Estonia (June 6th, 1925)
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (September 19th, 1924)
Syria and Lebanon (French Mandate) (February 7th, 1929 *a*)
Germany (April 9th, 1924 *a*)
Greece (February 18th, 1924)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Iran (January 29th, 1931)
Iraq (March 1st, 1930 *a*)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (February 20th, 1924)
Latvia (September 29th, 1923)
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (April 17th, 1924)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Poland (October 8th, 1924)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
Spain (December 17th, 1929)
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)
Switzerland (July 14th, 1924)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
Austria (November 15th, 1923)
British Empire, including Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
India (August 2nd, 1922)
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
Bolivia
China
Colombia *(a)*
Estonia
Guatemala
Lithuania
Panama
Peru *(a)*
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Argentine Republic
Australia
Brazil
Canada
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Germany
Haiti
Honduras
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Mexico
The Netherlands
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Salvador

[1] This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 35; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 306; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. XCVI, p. 182; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393.

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (December 31st, 1926)
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
In so far as its provisions are not in conflict with the principles of the new Danube Statute drawn up by the International Commission which was appointed in accordance with Articles 349 of the Treaty of Versailles, 304 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, 232 of the Treaty of Neuilly and 288 of the Treaty of Trianon.
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
Austria (November 15th, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.
British Empire (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of the United Kingdom only accepting paragraph (*a*).
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).
Nyasaland Protectorate and Tanganyika Territory (August 2nd, 1922)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*b*).
Bahamas
Barbados
British Guiana
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Leeward Islands
Trinidad and Tobago
Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent)
Gibraltar
Malta
(August 2nd, 1922 *a*.) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
Accepting paragraph (*a*).
Peru *(a)*
Portugal
Spain
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Bulgaria
Canada
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
France
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Italy
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania

[1] The Convention being in force, this Protocol became operative after it had been ratified by two Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 65; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 437; Vol. XCVI, p. 182; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394.

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Cyprus
Gambia Colony and Protectorate
Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate
Nigeria Colony and Protectorate
Gold Coast: Ashanti and northern territories of the Gold Coast
Kenya Colony and Protectorate
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar
St. Helena
Ceylon
Mauritius
Seychelles
Hong-Kong
Straits Settlements
Fiji
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
British Solomon Islands
Tonga Islands

(August 2nd, 1922 *a*.) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Federated Malay States:

Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Non-Federated Malay States:

Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Palestine (British Mandate) (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.

Bermuda (December 27th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

India (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of India only accepting paragraph (*a*).

Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Finland (January 29th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Greece (January 3rd, 1928)

Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
Is unable to accept any restriction of her liberty in administrative matters on the waterways which are not of international concern, that is to say, on purely national rivers, while at the same time accepting the principles of liberty in accordance with the laws of the country.

Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Sweden (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Mexico
The Netherlands
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Poland
Salvador
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

4. Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Declaration is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (July 10th, 1924)	China	Argentine Republic
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	Guatemala	Brazil
British Empire, including Newfoundland (October 9th, 1922)	Iran	Colombia
Canada (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Lithuania	Costa Rica
Australia (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Panama	Cuba
New Zealand (October 9th, 1922)	Peru (*a*)	Dominican Republic
Union of South Africa (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Portugal	Ecuador
India (October 9th, 1922)	Uruguay	Egypt
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)		Ethiopia
Chile (March 19th, 1928)		Haiti
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)		Honduras
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (January 10th, 1933 *a*)		Irish Free State
Denmark (Nov. 13th, 1922)		Liberia
*Estonia		Luxemburg
Finland (September 22nd, 1922 *a*)		Nicaragua
*France		Paraguay
Germany (Nov. 10th, 1931 *a*)		Salvador
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)		Venezuela
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)		
Iraq (April 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*Italy		
Japan (February 20th, 1924)		
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)		
Mexico (October 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (November 28th, 1921)		
Norway (September 4th, 1923)		
Poland (December 20th, 1924)		
Roumania (Feb. 22nd, 1923 *a*)		
Siam (November 29th, 1922)		
Spain (July 1st, 1929)		
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)		
*Switzerland		
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)		
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (May 16th, 1935 *a*)		
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)		

III. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.[2]

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children.[3]

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935 *a*)	*Argentine Republic* a)	United States of America
Albania (October 13th, 1924)	Costa Rica	Sa'udi Arabia
Austria (August 9th, 1922)	Panama *(a)*	Bolivia
	Peru *(a)*	Dominican Republic

* Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 73; Vol. XI, p. 411; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 281; Vol. XXIV, p. 159; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 72; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 283; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 183; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; Vol. CXXX, p. 441; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394; Vol. CLVI, p. 177; and Vol. CLX, p. 327.

[2] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, details concerning:

1. The Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 18th, 1904.
2. The Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 4th, 1910.

[3] " The present Convention shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date of the deposit of its ratification or act of accession " (Article 11). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXVII, p. 419; Vol. XXXV, p. 301; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol. XLV, p. 99; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIV, p. 388; Vol. LXIII, p. 378; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p 367; Vol. C, p. 156; Vol. CVII, p. 462; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 49; Vol. CXXII, p. 322; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 399; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 417; Vol. CXLVII, p. 319; Vol. CLVI, p. 182; Vol. CLX, p. 330; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 391.

I. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (June 15th, 1922)

Brazil (August 18th, 1933)

British Empire (June 28th, 1922)

Does not include the Island of Newfoundland, the British Colonies and Protectorates, the Island of Nauru, or any territories administered under mandates by Great Britain.

Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Nyasaland, Ceylon, Hong-Kong, Straits Settlements, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Southern Rhodesia, Barbados, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Northern Rhodesia, British Honduras (September 18th, 1922 *a*)

British Guiana and Fiji (October 24th, 1922 *a*)

Leeward Islands (March 7th, 1924 *a*)

Jamaica and Mauritius (March 7th, 1924 *a*)

Falkland Islands and Dependencies (May 8th, 1924 *a*)

Gold Coast Colony (July 3rd, 1924 *a*)

Iraq (May 15th, 1925 *a*)

The Government of Iraq desire to reserve to themselves the right to fix an age-limit lower than that specified in Article 5 of the Convention.

Colony of Sierra Leone (November 16th, 1927 *a*)

Colony and Protectorate of Gambia, Protectorate of Uganda, Territory of Tanganyika (April 10th, 1931 *a*)

Palestine (including Trans-Jordan), Protected State of Sarawak, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Zanzibar Protectorate (January 14th, 1932 *a*) (November 2nd, 1931 *a*)

Canada (June 28th, 1922)

Australia (June 28th, 1922)

Does not include Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territory of New Guinea.

Papua, Norfolk Island, New Guinea, Nauru (September 2nd, 1936)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Ecuador
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Paraguay
San Marino
Salvador
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

New Zealand (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

Union of South Africa (June 28th, 1922)

Irish Free State (May 18th, 1934 *a*)

India (June 28th, 1922)
Reserves the right at its discretion to substitute the age of sixteen years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limits prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and in Article 5 of the present Convention.

Bulgaria (April 29th, 1925 *a*)

Chile (January 15th, 1929)

China (February 24th, 1926)

Colombia (November 8th, 1934)

Cuba (May 7th, 1923)

Czechoslovakia (September 29th, 1923)

Denmark (April 23rd, 1931 *a*) [1]
This ratification does not include Greenland, the Convention, in view of the special circumstances, being of no interest for that possession.

Egypt (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Estonia (February 28th, 1930)

Finland (August 16th, 1926 *a*)

France (March 1st, 1926 *a*)
Does not include the French Colonies, the countries in the French Protectorate or the territories under French mandate.

Syria and Lebanon (June 2nd, 1930 *a*)

Germany (July 8th, 1924)

Greece (April 9th, 1923)

Hungary (April 25th, 1925)

Iran (March 28th, 1933)

Italy (June 30th, 1924)
Italian Colonies (July 27th, 1922 *a*)
Subject to the age-limit for native women and children, referred to in Article 5, being reduced from twenty-one to sixteen years.

Japan (December 15th, 1925)
Does not include Chosen, Taiwan, the leased Territory of Kwantung, the Japanese portion of Saghalien Island and Japan's mandated territory in the South Seas.

Latvia (February 12th, 1924)

Lithuania (September 14th, 1931)

Luxemburg (December 31st, 1929 *a*)

Mexico (May 10th, 1932 *a*)

Monaco (July 18th, 1931 *a*)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 19th, 1923)

Nicaragua (December 12th, 1935 *a*)

Norway (August 16th, 1922)

Poland and Free City of Danzig (October 8th, 1924)

Portugal (December 1st, 1923)

Roumania (September 5th, 1923)

Siam (July 13th, 1922)
With reservation as to the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of 1910 and Article 5 of this Convention, in so far as concerns the nationals of Siam.

Spain (May 12th, 1924 *a*)
Does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

Sudan (June 1st, 1932 *a*)

Sweden (June 9th, 1925)

Switzerland (January 20th, 1926)

Turkey (April 15th, 1937 *a*)

Uruguay (October 21st, 1924 *a*)

Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929 *a*)

---

[1] According to a reservation made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE.[1]

(Geneva, October 5th, 1921.)

9. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.[2]

(First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th,1924)	COSTA RICA	ALBANIA
AUSTRIA (August 29th, 1927)	CUBA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	HAITI	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (August 13th, 1924)	LIBERIA	ECUADOR
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	PANAMA	EGYPT
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	PARAGUAY	ETHIOPIA
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PERU	FRANCE
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	VENEZUELA	GERMANY
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)		GUATEMALA
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		HONDURAS
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)		IRAN
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)		IRAQ
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)		IRISH FREE STATE
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)		LUXEMBURG
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)		MEXICO
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)		NICARAGUA
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)		POLAND
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)		SALVADOR
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923)		SPAIN
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)		TURKEY
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th,1923)		YUGOSLAVIA
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)		
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)		
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)		
ROUMANIA (September 5th, 1923)		
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)		
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)		
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)		
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)		

10. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th, 1924)	COSTA RICA	ALBANIA
AUSTRIA (August 29th, 1927)	CUBA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	HAITI	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (August 13th, 1924)	LIBERIA	ECUADOR
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	PANAMA	EGYPT
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	PARAGUAY	ETHIOPIA
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PERU	FRANCE
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	VENEZUELA	GERMANY
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)		GUATEMALA
		HONDURAS
		IRAN

[1] Article 26 of the Covenant provides: " Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Assembly ".

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (document A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the amendments to Articles 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 of the Covenant. These amendments being now in force, no reference is made to them in the present document.

[2] The Assembly adopted at its fifth ordinary session (1924) a resolution according to which it is no longer opportune to ratify the first amendment to Article 16 of the Covenant adopted in 1921. As a consequence of this resolution, the first amendment to Article 16 adopted by the Assembly at its second ordinary session does not appear in the present report. See under No. IX the new amendment adopted in 1924.

10. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16 *(continued)*.

(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
Greece (January 20th, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (August 12th, 1924)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (August 12th, 1924)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Poland
Salvador
Spain
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

11. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Third paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (August 12th, 1924)
Australia (August 12th, 1924)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (July 7th, 1923)
British Empire (August 12th, 1924)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (August 12th, 1924)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
Greece (January 20th, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (August 12th, 1924)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (August 12th, 1924)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Bolivia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Haiti
Latvia
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Venezuela

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
France
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Poland
Salvador
Spain
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

12. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(First paragraph amended.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (Sept. 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (Febr. 3rd, 1923)
Austria (August 29th, 1927)
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras
Iraq
Irish Free State
Luxemburg
Mexico
Nicaragua
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26 *(continued)*.

(New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

14. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(Third and fourth paragraphs of Article 26 amended, replacing the original second paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)	Costa Rica	Albania
Austria (August 29th, 1927)	Iran	Argentine Republic
Belgium (September 28th, 1923)	Liberia	Dominican Republic
Brazil (July 7th, 1923)	Panama	Ecuador
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)	Paraguay	Egypt
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Peru	Ethiopia
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)		Germany
Chile (August 1st, 1928)		Guatemala
China (July 4th, 1923)		Honduras
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)		Iraq
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)		Irish Free State
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)		Luxemburg
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)		Mexico
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)		Nicaragua
Finland (June 25th, 1923)		Salvador
France (August 2nd, 1923)		Turkey
Greece (August 20th, 1923)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)		Yugoslavia
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)		
India (February 3rd, 1923)		
Italy (August 5th, 1922)		
Japan (June 13th, 1923)		
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)		
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)		
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)		
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)		
Norway (March 29th, 1922)		
Poland (December 15th, 1922)		
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)		
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)		
Siam (September 12th, 1922)		
Spain (January 15th, 1930)		
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)		
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)		
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)		
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)		

V. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.[1]

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (May 10th, 1937 *a*)	*Argentine Republic* (*a*)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ALBANIA (October 13th, 1924)	COSTA RICA	SA'UDI ARABIA
AUSTRIA (January 12th, 1925)	FRANCE	BOLIVIA
BELGIUM (July 31st, 1926)	HAITI	CHILE
Includes also the Belgian Congo and the mandated territory of Ruanda-Urundi.	HONDURAS	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931)	LITHUANIA	ECUADOR
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (December 11th, 1925)	PANAMA	ETHIOPIA
Does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions, Protectorates or Territories under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority.	PERU (*a*)	ICELAND
NEWFOUNDLAND (December 31st, 1925 *a*)	URUGUAY	LIBERIA
Southern Rhodesia (December 31st, 1935 *a*)		LIECHTENSTEIN
Nigeria:		MEXICO
(*a*) Colony		NICARAGUA
(*b*) Protectorate		SWEDEN
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate.		VENEZUELA
Seychelles		
British Honduras		
Ceylon		
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		
Mauritius		
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		
Gilbert and Ellice Islands		
Fiji		
Uganda		
Trinidad and Tobago		
Zanzibar		
Tanganyika Territory		
Leeward Islands		
Windward Islands		
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		
Nyasaland		
Straits Settlements		
Federated Malay States		
Non-Federated Malay States:		
Brunei		
Johore		
Kedah		
Kelantan		
Trengganu		

(November 3rd, 1926 *a*)

[1] The present Convention came into force on August 7th, 1924, viz., on the thirtieth day following that on which the deposit of the second ratification took place (Article 11). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVII, p. 213; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 122; Vol. LIV, p. 391; Vol. LIX, p. 357; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 313; Vol. XCII, p. 368; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXXVI, p. 433; Vol. CXLII, p. 341; Vol. CLII, p. 294; Vol. CLVI, p. 186; Vol. CLX, p. 335; Vol. CLXIV, p. 361; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 398.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Northern Rhodesia, Barbados, Gold Coast, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Malta, Somaliland, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Hong-Kong (November 3rd, 1926 *a*)

Bermuda, Bahamas, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, St. Helena, Palestine, Trans-Jordan (May 23rd, 1927 *a*)

Jamaica (August 22nd, 1927 *a*)

British Guiana (September 23rd, 1929 *a*)

CANADA (May 23rd, 1924 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (June 29th, 1935 *a*)

Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

NEW ZEALAND, including the Mandated Territory of Western Samoa (December 11th, 1925)

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, including the Mandated Territory of South West Africa (December 11th, 1925)

IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)

INDIA (December 11th, 1925)

BULGARIA (July 1st, 1924)

CHINA (February 24th, 1926)

COLOMBIA (November 8th, 1934)

CUBA (September 20th, 1934)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 11th, 1927)

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 31st, 1926)

DENMARK (May 6th, 1930)

With regard to Article IV, see also Article I. The acts mentioned in Article I are punishable under the rules of Danish law only if they fall within the provisions of Article 184 of the Danish Penal Code, which inflicts penalties upon any person publishing obscene writings, or placing on sale, distributing, or otherwise circulating or publicly exposing obscene images. Further, it is to be observed that the Danish legislation relating to the Press contains special provisions on the subject of the persons who may be prosecuted for Press offences. The latter provisions apply to the acts covered by Article 184 in so far as these acts can be considered as Press offences. The modification of Danish legislation on these points must await the revision of the Danish Penal Code, which is likely to be effected in the near future.

EGYPT (October 29th, 1924 *a*)

ESTONIA (March 10th, 1936 *a*)

FINLAND (June 29th, 1925)

GERMANY (May 11th, 1925)

GREECE (October 9th, 1929)

GUATEMALA (October 25th, 1933 *a*)

HUNGARY (February 12th, 1929)

IRAN (September 28th, 1932)

IRAQ (April 26th, 1929 *a*)

ITALY (July 8th, 1924)

JAPAN (May 13th, 1936)

The provisions of Article 15 of the Convention are in no way derogatory to the acts of the Japanese judicial authorities in the application of Japanese laws and decrees.[1]

LATVIA (October 7th, 1925)

---

[1] By a communication dated February 14th, 1936, the Japanese Government withdrew the declaration regarding Taiwan, Chosen, the leased territory of Kwantung, Karafuto and the territories under Japanese mandate, expressed at the time of signing the Convention.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*Luxemburg (August 10th, 1927)
Subject to reservation " that, in the application of the penal clauses of the Convention, the Luxemburg authorities will observe the closing paragraph of Article 24 of the Constitution of the Grand-Duchy, which provides that proceedings may not be taken against the publisher, printer or distributor if the author is known and if he is a Luxemburg subject residing in the Grand-Duchy ".
San Marino (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
Monaco (May 11th, 1925)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 13th, 1927)
Norway (May 8th, 1929 *a*)
Paraguay (October 21st, 1933 *a*)
Poland (March 8th, 1927)
Portugal (October 4th, 1927)
Roumania (June 7th, 1926)
Salvador (July 2nd, 1937)
Siam (July 28th, 1924)
The Siamese Government reserve full right to enforce the provisions of the present Convention against foreigners in Siam in accordance with the principles prevailing for applying Siamese legislation to such foreigners.
Spain (December 19th, 1924)
Switzerland (January 20th, 1926)
Turkey (September 12th, 1929)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929)

VI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

1. Protocol on Arbitration Clauses.[1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by:*
Albania (August 29th, 1924)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Austria (January 25th, 1928)	Chile	Union of South Africa
Belgium (September 23rd, 1924) Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.	Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	United States of America
	India This signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Protocol upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty. India reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.	Argentine Republic
		Australia
		Bulgaria
		Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
Brazil (February 5th, 1932) Subject to the condition that the arbitral agreement or the arbitration clause mentioned in Article 1 of this Protocol should be limited to contracts which are considered as commercial by the Brazilian legislation.		

---

* This ratification, given subject to reservation, has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

[1] The present Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1924, date of the second deposit of ratification (Article 6). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVII, p. 157; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 116; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 355; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 393; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 312; Vol. XCVI, p. 190; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CIV, p. 499; Vol. CVII, p. 470; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 55; and Vol. CLVI, p. 185.

I. Protocol on Arbitration Clauses *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

British Empire (September 27th, 1924)

Applies only to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and consequently does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority or any territory in respect of which His Majesty's Government exercises a mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (December 18th, 1924 *a*)

Newfoundland (June 22nd, 1925 *a*)

British Guiana
British Honduras
Jamaica:
Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands
Leeward Islands
Windward Islands:
Granada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gold Coast (including Ashanti and the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast and Togoland)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Zanzibar
Northern Rhodesia
Ceylon
Mauritius
Gibraltar
Malta
Falkland Islands and Dependencies

(March 12th, 1926 *a*)

Iraq

Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Trans-Jordan

Tanganyika (June 17th, 1926 *a*)

St. Helena (July 29th, 1926 *a*)

Uganda (June 28th, 1929 *a*)

Bahamas (January 23rd, 1931 *a*)

New Zealand (June 9th, 1926)

Czechoslovakia (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic will regard itself as being bound only in relation to States which will have ratified the Convention of September 26th, 1927, on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, and the Czechoslovak Republic does not intend by this signature to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it which regulate the questions referred to in the present Protocol by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Protocol.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Latvia

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Liechtenstein

Subject to the following reservation:

Agreements which are the subject of a special contract, or of clauses embodied in other contracts, attributing competence to a foreign tribunal, if they are concluded between nationals and foreigners or between nationals in the country, shall henceforth be valid only when they have been drawn up in due legal form.

This provision shall apply also to stipulations in articles of association, deeds of partnership and similar instruments and also to agreements for the submission of a dispute to an arbitral tribunal sitting in a foreign country.

Any agreement which submits to a foreign tribunal or to an arbitral tribunal a dispute relating to insurance contracts shall be null and void if the person insured is domiciled in the country or if the interest insured is situated in the country.

It shall be the duty of the tribunal to ensure as a matter of routine that this provision is observed even during procedure for distraint or during bankruptcy proceedings.[1]

Lithuania
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
Uruguay

The Protocol is open to Signature by:

Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iran
Irish Free State
Liberia
Mexico
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

[1] This reservation has been submitted to the States parties to the Protocol for acceptance.

I. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES *(continued.)*

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

DENMARK (April 6th, 1925)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary courts of law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.

ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)
Limits, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of this Protocol, the obligation mentioned in paragraph 1 of the said article to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

FINLAND (July 10th, 1924)

FRANCE (June 7th, 1928)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its own national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates or Territories in respect of which France exercises a mandate.

GERMANY (November 5th, 1924)

GREECE (May 26th, 1926)

ITALY (July 28th, 1924)

JAPAN (June 4th, 1928)
Excluding Colonies.
Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the leased territory of Kwantung, and the territories in respect of which Japan exercises a mandate (February 26th, 1929 *a*).

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MONACO (February 8th, 1927)
Reserves the right to limit its obligation to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 6th, 1925)
The Government of the Netherlands reserves its right to restrict the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under Netherlands law.
Further, it declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.

NORWAY (September 2nd, 1927)

POLAND (June 26th, 1931)
Under reservation that in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 1, the undertaking contemplated in the said Article will apply only to contracts which are declared as commercial in accordance with national Polish law.

PORTUGAL (December, 10th, 1929)
(1) In accordance with the second paragraph of Article 1, the Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
(2) According to the terms of the first paragraph of Article 8, the Portuguese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include its colonies.

ROUMANIA (March 12th, 1925)
Subject to the reservation that the Royal Government may in all circumstances limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

SIAM (September 3rd, 1930)

SPAIN (July 29th, 1926)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa, or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

SWEDEN (August 8th, 1929)

SWITZERLAND (May 14th, 1928)

VII. CUSTOMS.

International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities, and Protocol. [1]

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (September 11th, 1924)
BELGIUM (October 4th, 1924)
BRAZIL (July 10th, 1929)
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)
It is stated in the instrument of ratification that this ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia (or any territory under its authority) or the Irish Free State or in the case of India, and that in pursuance of the power reserved in Article XXIX of the Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Island of Newfoundland or of the territories of Iraq and Nauru, in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate. It does not apply to the Sudan.
AUSTRALIA (March 13th, 1925)
Excluding Papua, Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea.
NEW ZEALAND (August 29th, 1924)
Includes the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 29th, 1924)
INDIA (March 13th, 1925)
BULGARIA (December 10th, 1926)
CHINA (February 23rd, 1926)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 10th, 1927)
DENMARK (May 17th, 1924)
EGYPT (March 23rd, 1925)
ESTONIA (February 28th, 1930 *a*)
FINLAND (May 23rd, 1928)
FRANCE (September 13th, 1926)
Does not apply to the Colonies under its sovereignty.
SYRIA AND LEBANON (March 9th, 1933 *a*)
GERMANY (August 1st, 1925)
GREECE (July 6th, 1927)
HUNGARY (February 23rd, 1926)
IRAN (May 8th, 1925 *a*)
IRAQ (May 3rd, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (June 13th, 1924)
LATVIA (September 28th, 1931 *a*)
LUXEMBURG (June 10th, 1927)
FRENCH PROTECTORATE OF MOROCCO (November 8th, 1926)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

CHILE
JAPAN
LITHUANIA
PARAGUAY
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CANADA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRISH FREE STATE
LIBERIA
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PERU
SALVADOR
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The present Convention came into force on November 27th, 1924, ninety days after the deposit of the fifth ratification (Article 26). The Protocol came into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 371; Vol. XXXV, p. 324; Vol. XXXIX, p. 208; Vol. XLV, p. 140; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 398; Vol. LIX, p. 365; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 319; Vol. XCII, p. 370; Vol. CXI, p. 404; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 401; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 322.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1925)
NORWAY (September 7th, 1926)
POLAND (September 4th, 1931)
ROUMANIA (December 23rd, 1925)
Under the same reservations as those formulated by the other Governments and inserted in Article 6 of the Protocol, the Royal Government understands that Article 22 of the Convention confers the right to have recourse to the procedure provided for in this Article for questions of a general nature solely on the High Contracting Parties, private persons being only entitled to appeal to their own judicial authorities in case any dispute arises with the authorities of the Kingdom.
SIAM (May 19th, 1925)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1926)
SWITZERLAND (January 3rd, 1927)
REGENCY OF TUNIS (French Protectorate)(November 8th, 1926)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929)

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

5. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927)
BELGIUM (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate ; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or territories.
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CHILE
CHINA *(a)*
The Chinese Government, subject to the declarations made in its name by the delegates whom it instructed to take part in the discussions on this Convention, confirms the said declarations regarding:
(1) The whole of Part III: " Relations between the railway and its users ", Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17;
(2) In Part VI: " General Regulations ", Article 37, relating to the conclusion of special agreements for the purpose of putting the provisions of the Statute into force in cases where existing agreements are not adequate for this purpose.
COLOMBIA *(a)*
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
LITHUANIA
PANAMA *(a)*
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
LIBERIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force (Article 6) on March 23rd, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XLVII, page 55; Vol. L, p. 180; Vol. LIX, p. 383; Vol. LXIII, p. 417; Vol. LXIX, p. 92; Vol. LXXVIII. p. 472; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 403; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 336; Vol. XCII. p. 381; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. CLVI, p. 192; and Vol. CLX, p. 338.

5. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Railways, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
British Guiana
British Honduras
Brunei
Federated Malay States:
Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Non-Federated Malay States:
Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu
Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)
Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Estonia (September 21st, 1929)
Ethiopia (September 20th, 1928 *a*)
Finland (February 11th, 1937)
France (August 28th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation contained in Article 9 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany (December 5th, 1927)
Greece (March 6th, 1929)
Hungary (March 21st, 1929)
Italy (December 10th, 1934)
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.

Japan (September 30th, 1926)
Latvia (October 8th, 1934)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (February 22nd, 1928)
Norway (February 24th, 1926)
Poland and Free City of Danzig (January 7th, 1928)
Roumania (December 23rd, 1925)
Siam (January 9th, 1925)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Switzerland (October 23rd, 1926)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (January 20th, 1927 *a*)

Belgium (May 16th, 1927)

Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.

With regard to Article 12 of the Statute, the Belgian Government declares that legislation exists in Belgium on the transport of emigrants, and that this legislation, whilst it does not distinguish between flags and consequently does not affect the principle of equality of treatment of flags, imposes special obligations on all vessels engaged in the transport of emigrants.

British Empire (August 29th, 1924)

This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and that, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Brunei, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Brazil
Bulgaria
Chile
Lithuania

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Panama *(a)*
Salvador
Spain

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Canada
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Free City of Danzig
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Finland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iran
Irish Free State
Latvia
Liberia
Luxemburg
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Roumania
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 285; Vol. LXIX, p. 102; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXVII, p. 184; Vol. CXXII, p. 349; Vol. CXLII, p. 342; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 332.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Grenada
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (excluding Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
  Antigua
  Dominica
  Montserrat
  St. Christopher-Nevis
  Virgin Islands
Non-Federated Malay States:
  Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu
Mauritius
Nigeria:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Protectorate
  (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
St. Helena
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Somaliland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Zanzibar

(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Malta (November 7th, 1925 *a*)

Australia (June 29th, 1925 *a*)
Does not apply in the case of Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Czechoslovakia (July 10th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Excluding Greenland, the maritime ports of which are subject to a separate regime.

Estonia (November 4th, 1931)
The Estonian Government reserves the right regarding emigration provided for in Article 12 of the Statute.

France (August 2nd, 1932)
Shall have the power, in conformity with Article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.
Does not include any of the Protectorates, Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany (May 1st, 1928)
In conformity with Article 12 of the Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, the German Government declares that it reserves the right of limiting the transport of emigrants, in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, to vessels which have been granted special authorisation as fulfilling the requirements of the said legislation.
In exercising this right, the German Government will continue to be guided as far as possible by the principles of this Statute.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREECE (January 24th, 1927)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

HUNGARY (March 21st, 1929)
With reservation as to the right regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

IRAQ (May 1st, 1929 *a*)
With reservation as to all the rights regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

ITALY (October 16th, 1933)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
This ratification cannot be interpreted as implying the admission or the recognition of any reservation or declaration made with a view to limiting in any way the rights granted by Article 12 of the Statute to the High Contracting Parties.

JAPAN (September 30th, 1926)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

MEXICO (March 5th, 1934 *a*)

THE NETHERLANDS (February 22nd, 1928)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (February 22nd, 1928 *a*)
The Netherlands Government reserves the right mentioned in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Statute annexed to the Convention, it being understood that no discrimination shall be made against the flag of any contracting State which in regard to the transport of emigrants does not discriminate against the Netherlands flag.

NORWAY (June 21st, 1928)

SIAM (January 9th, 1925)

SWEDEN (September 15th, 1927)

SWITZERLAND (October 23rd, 1926)

YUGOSLAVIA (November 20th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

7. Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of Electric Power, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927)

BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1st, 1925)
This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. It shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions, or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates, or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.

NEWFOUNDLAND (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

BULGARIA

CHILE

FRANCE
Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

HUNGARY

ITALY

LITHUANIA

POLAND

URUGUAY

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

ALBANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

AUSTRALIA

BOLIVIA

BRAZIL

CANADA

CHINA

COLOMBIA

COSTA RICA

CUBA

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

ECUADOR

EGYPT

ESTONIA

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND

GERMANY

GUATEMALA

HAITI

HONDURAS

INDIA

IRAN

IRISH FREE STATE

JAPAN

LATVIA

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 315; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. XCII, p. 399; Vol. CXLVII, p. 333; and Vol. CLX, p. 342.

7. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE TRANSMISSION IN TRANSIT OF ELECTRIC POWER, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.		*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
British Guiana British Honduras Brunei Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate Hong-Kong Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Palestine Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*)	(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)	LIBERIA LUXEMBURG MEXICO THE NETHERLANDS NICARAGUA NORWAY PARAGUAY PERU PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SALVADOR SIAM SWEDEN SWITZERLAND TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS VENEZUELA
NEW ZEALAND (April 1st, 1925) Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. CZECHOSLOVAKIA (November 30th, 1926) DENMARK (April 27th, 1926) FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934) GREECE (February 15th, 1929) IRAQ (August 2nd, 1935 *a*) PANAMA (July 7th, 1934 *a*) SPAIN (January 15th, 1930)		

8. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE STATE, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (January 20th, 1927)	BELGIUM	AFGHANISTAN
BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1st, 1925) This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any terri-	BULGARIA CHILE FRANCE Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA ALBANIA UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA BOLIVIA BRAZIL CANADA CHINA COLOMBIA

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on June 30th, 1925. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 75; Vol. XLV, p. 170; Vol. L, p. 166; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 395; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 405; Vol. CXLVII, p. 322; Vol. CLII, p. 295; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 367.

8. Convention relating to the Development of Hydraulic Power affecting more than One State, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
tories under their authority) or in the case of India, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.	Italy	Costa Rica
Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Lithuania	Cuba
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Poland	Czechoslovakia
British Guiana	Uruguay	Dominican Republic
British Honduras	Yugoslavia	Ecuador
Brunei		Egypt
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang		Estonia
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		Ethiopia
Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate		Finland
Hong-Kong		Germany
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		Guatemala
Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu		Haiti
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British mandate		Honduras
Northern Rhodesia		India
Nyasaland		Iran
Palestine		Irish Free State
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)		Japan
Straits Settlements		Latvia
Tanganyika Territory		Liberia
Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*)		Luxemburg
New Zealand (April 1st, 1925) Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.		Mexico
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934)		The Netherlands
Denmark (April 27th, 1926)		Nicaragua
Hungary (March 20th, 1933)		Norway
Greece (March 14th, 1929)		Paraguay
Iraq (January 28th, 1936 *a*)		Peru
Panama (July 7th, 1934 *a*)		Portugal
Siam (January 9th, 1925)		Roumania
(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)		Salvador
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

15. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16.)

(Geneva, September 27th, 1924.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Estonia (September 18th, 1926)	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
The Netherlands (February 8th, 1926)	Albania	Argentine Republic
Roumania (March 12th, 1925)	Bolivia	Australia
Salvador (June 4th, 1925)	Brazil	Austria
Siam (September 30th, 1925)	Bulgaria	Belgium
	Canada	British Empire
	Chile	China
	Cuba	Colombia
	Greece	Czechoslovakia
	New Zealand	Denmark
	Peru	Dominican Republic
	Poland	Ecuador
	Uruguay	Egypt
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		France
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Italy
		Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Portugal
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

X. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

1. International Opium Convention. The Hague, January 23rd, 1912. [1]

Schedule [2] containing the signatures of the Convention, the signatures of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the First Opium Conference, provided for in the penultimate paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention, the ratifications of the Convention, and the signatures of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention provided under "B" of the Final Protocol of the Third International Opium Conference.

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
Albania	—	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925
United States of America	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	Feb. 11, 1915
Argentine Republic	—	Oct. 17, 1912	—	—
Austria	—	—	July 16, 1920*	July 16, 1920*
Belgium [3]	—	June 18, 1912	June 16, 1914	May 14, 1919
Bolivia	—	June 4, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Brazil	—	Oct. 16, 1912	Dec. 23, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Great Britain [4]	Jan. 23, 1912	April 24, 1922	July 15, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Bulgaria	—	March 2, 1914	Aug. 9, 1920*	Aug. 9, 1920*
Chile	—	July 2, 1913	Jan. 16, 1923	May 18, 1923
China	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Feb. 9, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
Colombia [5]	—	Jan. 15, 1913	June 26, 1924	June 30, 1924
Costa Rica	—	April 25, 1912	August 1, 1924	July 29, 1925
Cuba	—	May 8, 1913	March 8, 1920*	March 8, 1920*
Czechoslovakia	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	—	Nov. 8, 1921	April 18, 1922	March 5, 1931
Denmark [6]	—	Dec. 17, 1912	July 10, 1913	Oct. 21, 1921
Dominican Republic	—	Nov. 12, 1912	June 7, 1923	April 14, 1931
Ecuador	—	July 2, 1912	Feb. 25, 1915	August 23, 1923
Estonia	—	Jan. 9, 1923	April 20, 1923	January 21, 1931
Finland	—	April 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec. 1, 1922
France [7]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Germany	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Greece	—	—	March 30, 1920*	March 30, 1920*

---

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 187; Vol. XI, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol.. LIX, p. 346; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 416; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 390.

[2] This Schedule which appeared in the Annexes to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League is reproduced here for purposes of information.

[3] Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards the Belgian Congo.

[4] In accordance with the following reservation:

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Wei-hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said Convention in the name of any Dominion, Colony, Dependency, or Protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

In virtue of the above-mentioned reservation, Great Britain signed the Convention for the following Dominions, Colonies, Dependencies, and Protectorates:

On December 17th, 1912, for Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Brunei, Cyprus, the East Africa Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Malay Protectorates, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, Malta, Northern Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Somaliland, Southern Nigeria, Trinidad, Uganda; on February 27th, 1913, for the Colony of Fiji; on April 22nd, 1913, for the Colony of Sierra Leone, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate and the Solomon Islands Protectorate; on June 25th, 1913, for the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Bahamas Islands and for the three Colonies of the Windward Islands, that is to say, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent; on January 30th, 1914, for the Leeward Islands; on February 11th, 1914, for British Guiana as well as for British Honduras; on March 11th, 1914, for the Government of the Union of South Africa; on March 28th, 1914, for Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland; on April 4th, 1914, for the Colony of Barbados; on April 8th, 1914, for Mauritius and its dependencies; on July 11th, 1914, for the Bermuda Islands; on August 21st, 1924, for Palestine and together with France for the New Hebrides; on October 20th, 1924, for Iraq.

[5] Subject to the approval of the Colombian Parliament.

[6] The signature of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the Conference as well as its ratification were given by Denmark for Iceland and the Danish Antilles; the signature of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention was given separately by Denmark and Iceland.

[7] With the reservation that a separate and special ratification or denunciation may subsequently be obtained for the French Protectorates. France and Great Britain signed the Convention for the New Hebrides, August 21st, 1924.

1. International Opium Convention. The Hague, January 23rd, 1912 *(continued)*.

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
Guatemala	—	June 17, 1912	Aug. 27, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
Haiti	—	Aug. 21, 1912	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
Honduras	—	July 5, 1912	Aug. 29, 1913	April 3, 1915
Hungary	—	—	July 26, 1921*	July 26, 1921*
Iran [1]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	—	—
Italy	Jan. 23, 1912	—	June 28, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
Japan	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Latvia	—	Feb. 6, 1922	March 25, 1924	Jan. 18, 1932.
Liberia	—	—	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
Liechtenstein [2]	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	—	April 7, 1922	—	—
Luxemburg	—	June 18, 1912	Aug. 21, 1922	Aug. 21, 1922
Mexico	—	May 15, 1912	April 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
Monaco	—	May 1, 1923	Feb. 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
The Netherlands	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 28, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
Nicaragua	—	July 18, 1913	Nov. 10, 1914	Nov. 3, 1920
Norway	—	Sept. 2, 1913	Nov. 12, 1914	Sept. 20, 1915
Panama	—	June 19, 1912	Nov. 25, 1920*	Nov. 25, 1920*
Paraguay	—	Dec. 14, 1912	—	—
Peru	—	July 24, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Poland	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
Portugal	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	April 8, 1920*
Roumania	—	Dec. 27, 1913	Sept. 14, 1920*	Sept. 14, 1920*
Russia	Jan. 23,1912	—	—	—
Salvador	—	July 30, 1912	Sept. 19, 1922	May 29, 1931
Siam [3]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 10, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
Spain	—	Oct. 23, 1912	Jan. 25, 1919	Feb. 11, 1921
Sweden [4]	—	Aug. 27, 1913	April 17, 1914	Jan. 13, 1921
Switzerland [5]	—	Dec. 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1925	Jan. 15, 1925
Turkey	Sept. 15, 1933	—	Sept. 15, 1933	Sept. 15, 1933
Uruguay	—	March 9, 1914	April 3, 1916	Jan. 10, 1920*
Venezuela	—	Sept. 10, 1912	Oct. 28, 1913	July 12, 1927
Yugoslavia	—	—	Feb. 10, 1920*	Feb. 10, 1920*

---

[1] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Iran having no treaty with China) and paragraph (*a*) of Article 3.

[2] The Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs, by a letter dated October 14th, 1936, transmitted to the Secretariat, at the request of the Swiss Legation at The Hague, the following declaration:

> " Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[3] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Siam having no treaty with China).

[4] Subject to the following declaration: " Opium not being manufactured in Sweden, the Swedish Government will for the moment confine themselves to prohibiting the importation of prepared opium, but they declare at the same time that they are ready to take the measures indicated in Article 8 of the Convention if experience proves their expediency."

[5] Subject to ratification and with the declaration that the Swiss Government will be unable to issue the necessary legal enactments within the terms fixed by the Convention.

2. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, Protocol and Final Act.[1]

(Signed at Geneva, February 11th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
The signature of this Protocol is subject, in respect of British Protectorates, to the conditions contained in Article XIII of the Agreement.

India (February 17th, 1926)

France (April 29th, 1926)

Japan (October 10th, 1928)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (March 1st, 1927)

Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
While accepting the principle of a monopoly as formulated in Article I, does so, as regards the moment at which the measures provided for in the first paragraph thereof shall come into force, subject to the limitation contained in the second paragraph of the article.
The Portuguese Government, being bound by a contract consistent with the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912, will not be able to put into operation the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article VI of the present Agreement so long as its obligations under this contract are in force.

Siam (May 6th, 1927)
Under reservation of Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), with regard to the time when this provision shall come into force, and of Article V. The reason for these reservations had been stated by the First Delegate of Siam on November 14th, 1924. The Siamese Government is hoping to put into force the system of registration and rationing within the period of three years. After that date, the reservation in regard to Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), will fall to the ground.

Other State to whose Signature the Agreement is open:

China

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

International Opium Convention.[2]

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Austria (November 25th, 1927)

Belgium (August 24th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*)
1. Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population.
2. The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the Bolivian Government, by means of export certificates.
3. The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported: Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.

Brazil (June 10th, 1932)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania

Argentine Republic (*a*)

Iran
Ad referendum and subject to the League of Nations complying with the request made by Iran in the Memorandum O.D.C.24.

Nicaragua

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
China
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Iceland
Liberia
Mexico
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

---

[1] The Agreement and the Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LI, p. 337; Vol. LIX, p. 401; and Vol. LXXVIII, p. 489.

[2] The Convention and the Protocol came into force September 25th, 1928 (Article 36). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXI, p. 317; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 390; Vol. XCII, p. 409; Vol. XCVI, p. 204; Vol. C, p. 249; Vol. CIV, p. 516; Vol. CVII, p. 525; Vol. CXI, p. 411; Vol. CXVII, p. 290; Vol. CXXII, p. 355; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 407; Vol. CLVI, p. 205; Vol. CLX, p. 348; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 233.

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations.
International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
His Britannic Majesty's ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada or the Irish Free State and, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 39 of the Convention, the instrument shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Colony of the Bahamas or the State of Sarawak under His Britannic Majesty's protection.

State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Canada (June 27th, 1928)
Australia (February 17th, 1926)
New Zealand, (February 17th, 1926)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
Union of South Africa (February 17th, 1926)
Irish Free State (September 1st, 1931)
India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 16th, 1927 *a*)
Denmark (April 23rd, 1930)
Dominican Republic (July 19th, 1928 *a*)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
France (July 2nd, 1927)
The French Government is compelled to make all reservation, as regards the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing, within the strictly prescribed time-limit, the quarterly statistics provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 22.

Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Subject to the reservation annexed to the Procès-verbal of the plenary meeting of February 16th, 1925. (The validity of the signature and ratification of this Convention are subject to the condition that a German expert will be appointed as a member of the Central Board.)

Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Hungary (August 27th, 1930)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Italy (for the Kingdom and Colonies) (December 11th, 1929 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Liechtenstein [1]
Lithuania (February 13th, 1931 *a*)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
Monaco (February 9th, 1927 *a*)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
New Hebrides (December 27th, 1927 *a*)
Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)
Poland (June 16th, 1927)
Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)

---

[1] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
San Marino (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (June 22nd, 1928)
Includes also the Spanish Colonies and the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Sweden (December 6th, 1930 *a*)
Switzerland (April 3rd, 1929)
With reference to the declaration made by the Swiss delegation at the 36th plenary meeting of the Conference concerning the forwarding of the quarterly statistics provided for in Article 22, paragraph 2.
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (Sept. 11th, 1930)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (September 4th, 1929)

Protocol.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
(Same reservation as for the Convention.)
Canada (June 27th, 1928)
Australia (Febr. 17th, 1926)
New Zealand (February 17th, 1926)
Union of South Africa (February 17th, 1926)
India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
Portugal (Sept. 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (April 19th, 1930 *a*)
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (Sept. 4th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Argentine Republic (*a*)
Iran
Nicaragua

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Austria
Belgium
Brazil
China
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ethiopia
France
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
Iceland
Irish Free State
Italy
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Mexico
Monaco
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
San Marino
Sweden
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay

XI. SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

1. CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.[1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
This ratification is subject to the reservation that the Convention shall only enter into force, as far as the United States of America are concerned, when it has entered into force as regards Belgium, the British Empire, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

BRITISH EMPIRE
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Convention.
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the said Convention by all the following Powers — *i.e.*, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and United States of America — have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

CANADA

AUSTRALIA (*a*)
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

BULGARIA

CHINA

DENMARK
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Convention, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

EGYPT

FRANCE
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the Convention by Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the United States of America have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

IRAQ (*a*)
In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 28 of the Convention, Iraq assume with regard to its territory the undertakings set forth in paragraph I of Article 28 and the obligations of Articles 19 to 26 inclusive of that Convention, in so far as they are applicable.

LATVIA
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Latvia in Article 29.

LIBERIA (*a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA

BELGIUM
To the same extent as does the effect of the Convention apply in the States named hereafter: the United States of America, Austria, France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

BRAZIL
Reserves, during the whole period of application of the present Convention, the right of fulfilling it, as regards the part that concerns Brazil, according to the spirit of the provisions having for their object the generalisation of control both as concerns the commerce as well as concerns the manufacture of armaments.

CHILE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ESTONIA
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Estonia in Article 29.

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Finland in Article 29.

GERMANY

HUNGARY

INDIA

ITALY

JAPAN

LUXEMBURG

NORWAY

ROUMANIA
Ad referendum with the reservation provided in Article 29 of the Convention, in virtue of which the application of Articles 6 and 9, as far as they concern exports consigned to Roumania by the High Contracting Parties and as far as they concern imports manufactured in Roumania, will be suspended until the date of the accession of Russia to the present Convention, as also to the Annex.

SALVADOR

SIAM

SWITZERLAND

URUGUAY

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

GREECE

IRAN

IRISH FREE STATE

LITHUANIA

MEXICO

NICARAGUA

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

PORTUGAL

TURKEY

And all other States invited to adhere in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

---

[1] " A first *procès-verbal* of the deposit of ratifications will be drawn up by the Government of the French Republic as soon as the present Convention shall have been ratified by fourteen Powers.
" The Convention shall come into force four months after the date of the notification of this *procès-verbal* by the Government of the French Republic to all signatory Powers " (Article 41).

1. Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Poland in Article 29.

SPAIN

SWEDEN
Subject to the condition that this ratification will only take effect when the other producing States shall have ratified the convention.

VENEZUELA

2. Declaration regarding the Territory of Ifni.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRALIA *(a)*
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

CHINA *(a)*

DENMARK
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Declaration, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

EGYPT

FRANCE

LIBERIA *(a)*

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND

SPAIN

VENEZUELA

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA

BELGIUM

BRAZIL

BRITISH EMPIRE:
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Declaration.

CANADA

INDIA

BULGARIA

CHILE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ESTONIA

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND

ITALY

JAPAN

LATVIA

LUXEMBURG

ROUMANIA

SALVADOR

SWITZERLAND

YUGOSLAVIA

The Declaration is open to Accession by:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

GERMANY

GREECE

HUNGARY

IRAN

IRISH FREE STATE

LITHUANIA

MEXICO

NICARAGUA

NORWAY

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

PORTUGAL

SIAM

SWEDEN

TURKEY

URUGUAY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. [1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (May 9th, 1928)

BELGIUM (December 4th, 1928)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Belgian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Belgian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BRAZIL

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

JAPAN

NICARAGUA

SALVADOR

URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

HUNGARY

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

---

[1] This Protocol came into force February 8th, 1928. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIV, p. 65; Vol. C, p. 262; Vol. CIV, p. 528; Vol. CVII, p. 537; Vol. CXI, p. 416; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXVI, p. 451; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 446; Vol. CXLVII, p. 336; Vol. CLX, p. 355; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 411.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (April 9th, 1930)

Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Protocol.

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Canada (May 6th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any State at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or whose allies *de jure* or in fact fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Australia (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

New Zealand (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Union of South Africa (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Irish Free State (August 18th, 1930 *a*)

The Government of the Irish Free State does not intend to assume, by this accession, any obligation except towards the States having signed and ratified this Protocol or which shall have finally acceded thereto, and

Should the armed forces of an enemy State or of the allies of such State fail to respect the said Protocol, the Government of the Irish Free State would cease to be bound by the said Protocol in regard to such State.

India (April 9th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Iraq (September 8th, 1931 *a*)

On condition that the Iraq Government shall be bound by the provisions of the Protocol only towards those States which have both signed and ratified it or have acceded thereto; and that they shall not be bound by the Protocol towards any State at enmity with them whose armed forces, or the forces of whose allies, do not respect the dispositions of the Protocol.

Bulgaria (March 7th, 1934)

The said Protocol is only binding on the Bulgarian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.

The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Bulgarian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Chile (July 2nd, 1935)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Chilian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may definitely accede to it.

(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Chilian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

China (August 7th, 1929 *a*)

Denmark (May 5th, 1930)

Egypt (December 6th, 1928)

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Estonia (August 28th, 1931)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Estonian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Estonian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Ethiopia (September 18th, 1935 *a*)

Finland (June 26th, 1929)

France (May 9th, 1926)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the French. Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the French Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Germany (April 25th, 1929)

Greece (May 30th, 1931)

Iran (July 4th, 1929 *a*)

Italy (April 3rd, 1928)

Latvia (June 3rd, 1931)

Liberia (April 2nd, 1927 *a*)

Lithuania (June 15th, 1933)

Luxemburg (September 1st, 1936)

Mexico (March 15th, 1932 *a*)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (October 31st, 1930)
Subject to the reservation that, as regards the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, this Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Royal Netherlands Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Norway (July 27th, 1932)

Poland (February 4th, 1929)

Portugal (July 1st, 1930)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Roumania (August 23rd, 1929)
Subject to the reservation:
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Roumanian Government in relation to States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol;
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Roumanian Government in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect the restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.

Siam (June 6th, 1931)

Spain (August 22nd, 1929)
Declares this Protocol as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting and executing the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity.

Sweden (April 25th, 1930)

Switzerland (July 12th, 1932)

Turkey (October 5th, 1929)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (April 5th, 1928 *a*)
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Government of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to the States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol.
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.

Venezuela (February 8th, 1928)

Yugoslavia (April 12th, 1929)

XII. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

16. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Second paragraph of the original text.)

(Geneva, September 21st, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
Denmark (March 28th, 1926)	Albania	Argentine Republic
Estonia (September 18th, 1926)	Bolivia	Australia
The Netherlands (August 20th, 1926)	Brazil	Austria
	Bulgaria	Belgium
	Canada	British Empire
	Dominican Republic	China
	Japan	Colombia
	New Zealand	Cuba
	Norway	Czechoslovakia
	Peru	Ecuador
	Portugal	Egypt
	Salvador	Ethiopia
	Siam	Finland
	Uruguay	France
		Germany
		Greece
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Italy
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Poland
		Roumania
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

XIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

9. Convention regarding the Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (July 4th, 1927)	Finland	Albania
Belgium (July 2nd, 1927)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Denmark
British Empire (for Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (June 14th, 1927)		Estonia
		Iran
		Irish Free State

[1] The Convention came into force on October 1st, 1927, in conformity with Article 12. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXVII, p. 63; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 443; Vol. XCVI, p. 201; Vol. C. p. 228; Vol. CIV. p. 511; and Vol. CXXVI, p. 448.

9. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BULGARIA (July 2nd, 1927)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (January 17th, 1929)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (July 23rd, 1930 *a*)
FRANCE (July 2nd, 1927)
It being understood on behalf of the French Government, and as provided for in Article 6 of the Protocol of Signature, that in the event of a re-measurement of a vessel originally measured by its own officials the original indelible marks, when they are not intended solely to indicate that the vessel has been measured, shall have added to them an indelible cross having arms of equal length, and that this addition shall be regarded as equivalent to the removal described in Article 10 of the Annex to the Convention; that the old measurement plates shall be marked with a cross instead of being withdrawn; and that, if new plates are affixed, the old plates shall be placed at the same level and near to the new ones. In the case provided for above, the notification provided for in the third paragraph of Article 5 and in Article 6 of the Convention shall also be addressed to the original office of inscription.
GERMANY (July 2nd, 1927)
GREECE (February 6th, 1931)
HUNGARY (January 3rd, 1928)
ITALY (September 27th, 1932)
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 2nd, 1927)
POLAND (June 16th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (May 18th, 1928)
SPAIN (July 11th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (July 2nd, 1927)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)
Under Clause IV of the Protocol of Signature.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

LATVIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
NORWAY
PORTUGAL
SWEDEN
TURKEY

XIV. SLAVERY.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.[1]

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (November 9th, 1935 *a*)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (March 21st, 1929 *a*)
Subject to the reservation that the Government of the United States, adhering to its policy of opposition to forced or compulsory labour except as punishment for crime of which the person concerned has been duly convicted, adheres to the Convention except as to the first sub-division of the second paragraph of Article five, which reads as follows:
"(1) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes."[2]

AUSTRIA (August 19th, 1927)
BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1927)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (*a*)
ETHIOPIA
IRAN
Ad referendum and interpreting Article 3 as without power to compel Iran to bind herself by any arrangement or convention which would place her ships of whatever tonnage in the category of native vessels provided for by the Convention on the Trade in Arms.
LITHUANIA
PANAMA
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CHILE
COSTA RICA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
GUATEMALA
HONDURAS
ICELAND
JAPAN
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBURG
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

---

[1] This Convention came into force March 9th, 1927, according to its Article 12. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LX, p. 253; Vol. LXIX, p. 114; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 440; Vol. CLII, p. 296; Vol. CLX, p. 342; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 410.

[2] This accession, given subject to reservation, has been communicated to the signatory States for acceptance.

SLAVERY CONVENTION *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 18th, 1927)
CANADA (August 6th, 1928)
AUSTRALIA (June 18th, 1927)
NEW ZEALAND (June 18th, 1927)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including South West Africa) (June 18th, 1927)
IRISH FREE STATE (July 18th, 1930 *a*)
INDIA (June 18th, 1927)

Under the terms of Article 9 of this Convention, the signature of the Convention is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of Article 2, sub-section (*b*), Articles 5, 6 and 7 of this Convention upon the following territories, namely: in Assam, the unadministered portions of the Sadiya and Balipara frontier tracts, or on the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

Further, the signature of the Convention is not binding in respect of Article 3 in so far as that article may require India to enter into any convention whereby vessels, by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Indians, or of the fact that one-half of the crew is Indian, are classified as native vessels, or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of such other States are not subject.

BULGARIA (March 9th, 1927)
China (April 22nd, 1937)
CUBA (July 6th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 10th, 1930)
DENMARK (May 17th, 1927)
ECUADOR (March 26th, 1928 *a*)
EGYPT (January 25th, 1928 *a*)
ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)
FINLAND (September 29th, 1927)
FRANCE (March 28th, 1931)
SYRIA and LEBANON (June 25th, 1931 *a*)
GERMANY (March 12th, 1929)
GREECE (July 4th, 1930)
HAITI (September 3rd, 1927 *a*)
HUNGARY [1] (February 17th, 1933 *a*)
IRAQ (January 18th, 1929 *a*)
ITALY (August 25th, 1928)
LATVIA (July 9th, 1927)
LIBERIA (May 17th, 1930)
MEXICO (September 8th, 1934 *a*)
MONACO (January 17th, 1928 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 7th, 1928)
NICARAGUA (October 3rd, 1927 *a*)
NORWAY (September 10th, 1927)
POLAND (September 17th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)
SPAIN (September 12th, 1927)

For Spain and the Spanish Colonies, with the exception of the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.

SUDAN (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
SWEDEN (December 17th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (November 1st, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (July 24th, 1933 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (September 28th, 1929)

---

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXX, p. 444.

XV. INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.[1]

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

ALBANIA (August 31st, 1929)
BELGIUM (May 9th, 1929)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (January 9th, 1929 *a*)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
NEW ZEALAND (December 22nd, 1928 *a*)
On the understanding that no contribution to the initial fund of the Union will fall due by New Zealand before the commencement of the next financial year in that country, viz., April 1st, 1929.
INDIA (April 2nd, 1929)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1931)
CHINA (May 29th, 1935 *a*)
CUBA (June 18th, 1934)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (August 20th, 1931)
ECUADOR (July 30th, 1928)
EGYPT (August 7th, 1928)
Subject to later acceptance by the Egyptian Government of the decisions of the Executive Committee fixing its contribution.
FINLAND (April 10th, 1929)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1932)
GERMANY (July 22nd, 1929)
GREECE (January 16th, 1931)
HUNGARY (April 17th, 1929)
It being understood that "the most extensive immunities, facilities and exemptions" mentioned in Article 10 of the present Convention shall not include exterritoriality or the other rights and immunities enjoyed in Hungary by duly accredited diplomatic agents.
IRAN (September 28th, 1932 *a*)
IRAQ (June 12th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (August 2nd, 1928)
Applies also to the Italian Colonies.
LUXEMBURG (June 27th, 1929 *a*)
MONACO (May 21st, 1929)
POLAND AND FREE CITY OF DANZIG (July 11th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (September 11th, 1928)
SAN MARINO (August 12th, 1929)
SUDAN (May 11th, 1928 *a*)
SWITZERLAND (January 2nd, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (March 10th, 1932)
VENEZUELA (June 19th, 1929)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 28th, 1931 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
GUATEMALA
LATVIA
NICARAGUA
PERU
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] The present Convention entered into force on December 27th, 1932, in accordance with its Article 18. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 247; Vol. CXLVII, p. 353; and Vol. CLVI, p. 256.

XVI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

2. CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

AUSTRIA (July 18th, 1930)

BELGIUM (April 27th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Belgian Congo, Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (June 5th, 1930 *a*)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (July 2nd, 1930)

Bahamas
British Guiana
British Honduras
Falkland Islands
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Tanganyika Territory
Uganda Protectorate
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar

(May 26th, 1931 *a*)

Mauritius
Northern Rhodesia

(July 13th, 1931 *a*)

Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher-Nevis
Virgin Islands

(March 9th, 1932*a*)

Malta (October 11th, 1934 *a*)

NEW ZEALAND (Western Samoa included) (April 9th, 1929)

NEWFOUNDLAND (January 7th, 1931 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic does not intend to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it with various States, which regulate the questions referred to in the present Convention by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Convention.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

INDIA

This signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

NICARAGUA

PERU

The Convention is open to Signature by:

ALBANIA
BRAZIL
CHILE
IRAQ
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MONACO
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
POLAND
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

And all the other States which may sign the Protocol of September 24th, 1923.

---

[1] The Convention came into force July 25th, 1929 (Article 8). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCII, p. 301; Vol. XCVI, p. 205; Vol. C, p. 259; Vol. CIV, p. 526; Vol. CVII, p. 528; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 303; Vol. CXXX, p. 457; and Vol. CLVI, p. 210.

2. Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Denmark (April 25th, 1929)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary Courts of Law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such Courts without further examination as a basis for the final judgment in the affair.

Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Finland (July 30th, 1931)

France (May 13th, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Germany (September 1st, 1930)

Greece (January 15th, 1932)
The Hellenic Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Italy (November 12th, 1930)

Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Netherlands (August 12th, 1931) (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (January 28th, 1933 *a*)

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)
(1) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.
(2) The Portuguese Government declares, according to the terms of Article 10, that the present Convention does not apply to its colonies.

Roumania (June 22nd, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

Siam (July 7th, 1931)

Spain (January 15th, 1930)

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (September 25th, 1930)

XVII. EXPORTATION.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.

Turkey [2]
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 357; Vol. C, p. 264; and Vol. CVII, p. 537.

[2] The reservation to which this signature is subject has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins *(cont.)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement as regards Hungary is subject to its ratification by Austria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

2. Protocol to the International Agreement.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.
Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures, as from October 1st, 1929.

2. Protocol to the International Agreement *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
Same reservations as for the Agreement.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)
Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.
Turkey
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

Denunciation.

Finland (March 4th, 1936)

The Agreement in open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series* of the *League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 373; Vol. C, p. 264; Vol. CVII, p. 537; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 384.

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones *(continued)*.
(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

Germany (June 30th, 1929)

Hungary (July 26th, 1929)

Italy (June 29th, 1929)

Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)

The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.

Norway (September 26th, 1930)

Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)

Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Sweden (June 27th, 1929)

Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)

Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)
The obligations resulting from this Agreement shall be binding for Yugoslavia only as regards signatory States which do not render exportation impossible, either by formal prohibitions or by prohibitive duties (duties considered as prohibitive are duties imposing a tax of 5 Swiss francs or more per hundred kilogrammes).

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

4. Protocol to the International Agreement.
(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Austria (June 26th, 1929)

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)

Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.

Finland (June 27th, 1929)

France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.

Germany (June 30th, 1929)

Hungary (July 26th, 1929)

Italy (June 29th, 1929)

Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)

The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

Denunciation:

Finland (March 4th, 1936).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures as from October 1st, 1929.

4. PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
NORWAY (September 26th, 1930) POLAND (August 8th, 1931) ROUMANIA (June 30th, 1929) Same reservation as for the Agreement. SWEDEN (June 27th, 1929) SWITZERLAND (June 27th, 1929) YUGOSLAVIA (September 30th, 1929)	LITHUANIA MEXICO NEW ZEALAND NICARAGUA PANAMA PARAGUAY PERU PORTUGAL SALVADOR SIAM SPAIN UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS URUGUAY VENEZUELA

XVIII. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.[1]

GENERAL ACT.[2]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions			*This Act is open to Accession by:*
A	B	C	All the Members of the League of Nations, with the exception of those mentioned in the preceding columns, and: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BRAZIL COSTA RICA GERMANY JAPAN
All the provisions of the Act. BELGIUM (May 18th, 1929) Subject to the reservation provided in Article 39 (2) (*a*), with the effect of excluding from the procedures described in this Act disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession of Belgium or prior to the accession of any other Party with whom Belgium may have a dispute. UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (May 21st, 1931) Subject to the following conditions: 1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation: (*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV). THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 8th, 1930) NORWAY[3] (June 11th, 1929) SWEDEN (May 13th, 1929)	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).	

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Protocol for the pacific settlement of international disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

[2] The General Act came into force August 16th, 1929 (Article 44). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 343; Vol. C, p. 260; Vol. CVII, p. 529; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CLII, p. 297; Vol. CLVI, p. 211; and Vol. CLX, p. 354.

[3] Norway having acceded on June 11th, 1929, to Chapters I, II and IV, and thereafter having extended its accession to Chapter III, on June 11th, 1930, has therefore accepted all the provisions of the Act. However, it has been deemed necessary to make it appear also under " B " in the present list, so as to make it clear that Norway had already accepted the provisions provided under that heading as from June 11th, 1929.

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

CANADA (July 1st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession in respect of Canada to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in Canada and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty in respect of Canada reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

AUSTRALIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

NEW ZEALAND (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in New Zealand and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

IRISH FREE STATE (September 26th, 1931)

INDIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between the Government of India and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

DENMARK (April 14th, 1930)

ESTONIA (September 3rd, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Estonia or to the accession of another Party with whom Estonia might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

ETHIOPIA (March 15th, 1935)

FINLAND (September 6th, 1930)

FRANCE (May 21st, 1931)

The said accession concerning all disputes that may arise after the said accession with regard to situations or facts subsequent thereto, other than those which the Permanent Court of International Justice may recognise as bearing on a question left by international law to the exclusive competence of the State, it being understood that in application of Article 39 of the said Act the disputes which the parties or one of them may have referred to the Council of the League of

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

Nations will not be submitted to the procedures described in this Act unless the Council has been unable to pronounce a decision under the conditions laid down in Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant.

Furthermore, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations " on the submission and recommendation of the General Act ", Article 28 of this Act is interpreted by the French Government as meaning in particular that " respect for rights established by treaty or resulting from international law " is obligatory upon arbitral tribunals constituted in application of Chapter III of the said General Act.

GREECE (September 14th, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation referred to in Chapter I:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Greece or to the accession of another Party with whom Greece might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States and in particular disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication.

ITALY (September 7th, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. The following disputes shall be excluded from the procedure described in the said Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which international law leaves to the sole jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Italy and any third Power.

II. It is understood that, in conformity with Article 29 of the said Act, disputes for the solution of which a special procedure is provided by other conventions shall be settled in accordance with the provisions of those conventions; and that, in particular, disputes which may be submitted to the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations in virtue of one of the provisions of the Covenant shall be settled in accordance with those provisions.

III. It is further understood that the present accession in no way affects Italy's accession to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and to the clause in that Statute concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

LATVIA (September 17th, 1935)

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)

NORWAY (June 11th, 1930)

PERU (November 21st, 1931)

Subject to reservation (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SPAIN (September 16th, 1930)

Subject to reservations (*a*) and (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SWITZERLAND (December 7th, 1934)

TURKEY (June 26th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession:

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Turkey and any third Power.

XIX. ECONOMIC STATISTICS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS.[1]

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (March 27th, 1931)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)

Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)

[2] Returns provided for in Article 2, III (B), will not contain information with regard to areas under crops on native farms, and in native reserves, locations and mission stations.

CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Does not apply to the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island, New Guinea and Nauru.

(1)[2] The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I (*b*), for separate returns for direct transit trade shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

(2) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I, Paragraph IV, that when the quantity of goods of any kind is expressed in any unit or units of measure other than weight, an estimate of the average weight of each unit, or multiple of units, shall be shown in the annual returns, shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)

IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

In pursuance of Article 11 of the Convention, the Belgian Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that it cannot accept, in regard to the Colony of the Belgian Congo, the obligations arising out of the clauses of the present Convention.

BRAZIL

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

ESTONIA

FINLAND

GERMANY

HUNGARY

JAPAN

In virtue of Article 11 of the present Convention, the Japanese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Convention does not extend to its Territories mentioned below: Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung, the Territories under Japanese mandate.

LUXEMBURG

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force December 14th, 1930, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CX, p. 171; Vol. CXVII, p. 330; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXVI, p. 454; Vol. CXXX, p. 463; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; and Vol. CLVI, p. 222.

[2] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)

A. Under the terms of Article 11, the obligations of the Convention shall not extend to the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty the King Emperor.

B[1] (1) Article 2. I (*a*). — The provisions for returns of "transit trade" made in Annex I, Part I, 1 (*b*) shall not apply to India nor shall returns of the "land frontier trade" of India be acquired.

(2) Article 2. II (*a*). — The question whether a general census of agriculture can be held in India and, if so, on what lines and at what intervals still remains to be settled. For the present, India can assume no obligations under this article.

(3) Article 2. III (*b*). (1). — For farms in the "permanently settled" tracts in India, estimates of the cultivated areas may be used in compiling the returns.

(4) Article 2. III (*b*). (2). — The returns of quantities of crops harvested may be based on estimates of yield each year per unit area in each locality.

(5) Article 2. III (*d*). — Complete returns cannot be guaranteed from Burma, and in respect of the rest of India the returns shall refer to Government forests only.

The Government of India further declared that, with regard to the second paragraph of Article 3 of the Convention, they cannot, with the means of investigation at their disposal, usefully undertake to prepare experimentally the specified tables, and that for similar reasons they are not in a position to accept the proposal contained in Recommendation II of the Convention.

BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)

CHILE (November 20th, 1934 *a*)

CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)

DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)

In pursuance of Article 11, Greenland is excepted from the provisions of this Convention. Furthermore, the Danish Government, in accepting the Convention, does not assume any obligation in respect of statistics concerning the Faroe Islands.

EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)

FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)

By its acceptance, France does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

GREECE (September 18th, 1930)

ITALY (June 11th, 1931)

In accepting the present Convention, Italy does not assume any obligation in respect of her Colonies, Protectorates and other Territories referred to in the first paragraph of Article 11.

Latvia (July 5th, 1937)

THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932)

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)

1. The following shall not be applicable:
   (*a*) The provisions of Article 2, III, E) and V;
   (*b*) The provisions concerning the system of valuations known as "declared values" mentioned in Annex I, Part I, § II (See Article 3);
   (*c*) Article 3, paragraph 2.
2. The returns mentioned in Article 2, IV, shall only apply to coal, petroleum, natural gas, tin, manganese, gold and silver.
3. The statistics of foreign trade mentioned in Article 3 shall not comprise tables concerning transit.[1]

NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)

In accordance with Article 11, the Bouvet Island is excepted from the provisions of the present Convention. Furthermore, in ratifying the Convention, Norway does not assume any obligation as regards statistics relating to the Svalbard.

POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)

PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)

In accordance with Article 11, the Portuguese Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that the present Convention does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)

SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)

SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)

---

[1] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (March 27th, 1931)	BELGIUM	AFGHANISTAN
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ALBANIA
Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)	ESTONIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)	FINLAND	BOLIVIA
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)	GERMANY	CHINA
IRISH FREE STATE (September 15th, 1930)	HUNGARY	COLOMBIA
INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)	JAPAN	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)	LUXEMBURG	ECUADOR
CHILE (November 20th, 1934 *a*)	YUGOSLAVIA	ETHIOPIA
CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)		GUATEMALA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)		HAITI
DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)		HONDURAS
EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)		IRAN
FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)		IRAQ
GREECE (Sept. 18th, 1930)		LIBERIA
ITALY (June 11th, 1931)		LITHUANIA
Latvia (July 5th, 1937)		MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932)		NICARAGUA
This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.		NEW ZEALAND
Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)		PANAMA
NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)		PARAGUAY
POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)		PERU
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)		SALVADOR
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)		SIAM
SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)		SPAIN
SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)		TURKEY
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

XX. SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.[1]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935)
The procedure provided by Article 19 of the Convention, for the settlement of any disputes which might arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or the application of the said Convention, shall not be applied in the case of a dispute between Poland and the Free City of Danzig.
DENMARK (February 19th, 1931)[2]
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (September 25th, 1936 *a*)
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)
IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (December 27th, 1935)
MEXICO (March 30th, 1936 *a*)
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)
In view of the provisions of Article 176, paragraph 2, of the Norwegian Ordinary Criminal Code and Article 2 of the Norwegian Law on the Extradition of Criminals, the extradition provided for in Article 10 of the present Convention may not be granted for the offence referred to in Article 3, No. 2, where the person uttering the counterfeit currency himself accepted it *bona fide* as genuine.[3]
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)
Turkey (January 21st, 1937 *a*)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[4] (July 13th, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.
INDIA
As provided in Article 24 of the Convention, this signature does not include the territories of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
CHINA
FRANCE
JAPAN
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA
ROUMANIA
SWITZERLAND

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SAN MARINO
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on February 22nd, 1931, in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 371; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 450; Vol. CXLVII, p. 351; Vol. CLII, p. 301; Vol. CLVI, p. 227; Vol. CLX, p. 380; Vol. CLXIV, p. 388; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 412.

[2] According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[3] As this reservation has not given rise to any objection on the part of the States to which it was communicated in accordance with Article 22, it may be considered as accepted.

[4] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)	GREAT BRITAIN and NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)	INDIA	AUSTRALIA
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)	CHINA	BOLIVIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)	FRANCE	BRAZIL
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935).	JAPAN	CANADA
DENMARK[1] (February 19th, 1931)	LUXEMBURG	CHILE
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)	PANAMA	COSTA RICA
Finland (September 25th, 1936 *a*)	ROUMANIA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)	SWITZERLAND	ECUADOR
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)		EGYPT
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)		ETHIOPIA
IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)		GUATEMALA
ITALY (December 27th, 1935)		HAITI
MEXICO (March 30th, 1936 *a*)		HONDURAS
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)		ICELAND
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)		IRAN
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)		IRAQ
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		LATVIA
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		LIBERIA
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		LIECHTENSTEIN
Turkey (January 21st, 1937 *a*)		LITHUANIA
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[2] (July 13th, 1931)		NICARAGUA
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		NEW ZEALAND
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SAN MARINO
		SALVADOR
		SIAM
		SWEDEN
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

OPTIONAL PROTOCOL.[3]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (June 25th, 1931)	PANAMA	The Members of the League of Nations who did not sign it and the non-member States having signed or who have been invited to accede to the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency.
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)		
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)		
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)		
Finland (September 25th, 1936 *a*)		
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)		
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		
ROUMANIA (November 10th, 1930)		
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		

[1] Same note as for the Convention.
[2] Instrument deposited in Berlin.
[3] This Protocol came into force on August 30th, 1930. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 395; Vol. CXXII, p. 367; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 428; Vol. CXLVII, p. 351; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 412.

XXI. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.[1]

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

In Force.

Definitive signatures.	*Signatures* ad referendum.	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
AUSTRIA (February 3rd, 1930)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	ALBANIA
BELGIUM (June 14th, 1929)	HUNGARY	BULGARIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 14th, 1929)	SWITZERLAND	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FINLAND (October 9th, 1929)		DENMARK
FRANCE (June 14th, 1929)		ESTONIA
GERMANY (May 12th, 1930)		IRISH FREE STATE
GREECE (June 22nd, 1931)		LATVIA
ITALY (June 14th, 1929)		LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 3rd, 1930)		LUXEMBURG
POLAND (December 23rd, 1929)		NORWAY
ROUMANIA (November 26th, 1929)		PORTUGAL
SAAR TERRITORY GOVERNING COMMISSION (June 14th, 1929)		SWEDEN
SPAIN (December 17th, 1929)		YUGOSLAVIA

XXII. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

3. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[2]

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by:*
ALBANIA (Sept. 12th, 1930)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRIA (February 26th, 1930)	BOLIVIA	COSTA RICA
BELGIUM (October 5th, 1931)	BRAZIL	ECUADOR
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (February 12th, 1930)	CHILE	EGYPT
	GUATEMALA	IRAQ
	HAITI	MEXICO
	LIBERIA	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
CANADA (August 28th, 1930)	NICARAGUA	
AUSTRALIA (August 28th, 1930)	PARAGUAY	
NEW ZEALAND (June 4th, 1930)	PERU	
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1930)	SALVADOR	
IRISH FREE STATE (August 2nd, 1930)	TURKEY	
INDIA (February 26th, 1930)		

---

[1] This Agreement is not subject to ratification. It came into force September 12th, 1929, in accordance with its Article 11. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIV, p. 277; Vol. C, p. 263; and Vol. CXI, p. 416.

[2] The present Protocol shall come into force as soon as all States which have ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, and also the United States, have deposited their ratifications (Article 7).

3. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

BULGARIA (April 27th, 1931)
CHINA (October 14th, 1930)
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA (November 26th, 1930)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 30th, 1930)
DENMARK (March 11th, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (September 8th, 1930)
ETHIOPIA (March 30th, 1935)
FINLAND (August 28th, 1930)
FRANCE (May 8th, 1931)
GERMANY (August 13th, 1930)
GREECE (August 29th, 1930)
HUNGARY (August 13th, 1930)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
ITALY (April 2nd, 1931)
JAPAN (November 14th, 1930)
LATVIA (August 29th, 1930)
LITHUANIA (January 23rd, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (November 3rd, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 8th, 1930)
NORWAY (April 10th, 1930)
PANAMA (May 2nd, 1935)
POLAND (May 13th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (June 12th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (August 4th, 1930)
SIAM (June 2nd, 1930)
SPAIN (July 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (March 20th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 5th, 1930)
URUGUAY (September 19th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 14th, 1932)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 27th, 1930)

XXIII. PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

1. CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
With reservations as regards Articles 5, 6, 7, 16 and 17, which Brazil will not adopt owing to difficulties with which it has to contend in connection with principles forming the basis of its internal legislation.
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations (April 6th, 1934)
CANADA (April 6th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
CHILE
COLOMBIA
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
CUBA
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 9, 10 and 11.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

The Convention is open to Accession by :

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN

[1] This Convention came into force on July 1st, 1937.

1. Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws *(continued).*

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

India (October 7th, 1935)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China (February 14th, 1935)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.

Monaco (April 27th, 1931 *a*)

The Netherlands (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
Excluding the provisions of Articles 8, 9 and 10 of the Convention.

Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)

Poland (June 15th, 1934)

Sweden (July 6th, 1933)
The Swedish Government declares that it does not accept to be bound by the provisions of the second sentence of Article 11, in the case where the wife referred to in the article, after recovering the nationality of her country of origin, fails to establish her ordinary residence in that country.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Denmark
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 5 and 11.

Egypt

Estonia

France

Germany

Greece

Hungary

Iceland

Irish Free State

Italy

Japan
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 4 and 10 and as regards the words "according to its law" of Article 13.

Latvia

Luxemburg

Mexico
Subject to reservation as regards paragraph 2 of Article 1.

Peru
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.

Portugal

Salvador

Spain

Switzerland
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.

Uruguay

Yugoslavia

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Iraq

Liberia

Lithuania

New Zealand

Nicaragua

Panama

Paraguay

Roumania

San Marino

Siam

Turkey

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Venezuela

2. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

United States of America (August 3rd, 1932)

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)

Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
(Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru).

Union of South Africa (October 9th, 1935 *a*)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 2.

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 15, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Austria

Belgium
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.

Canada

Chile

Denmark

Egypt

France

Germany

Greece

Irish Free State

Luxemburg

Mexico

Peru

Portugal

Spain

Uruguay

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan

Albania

Argentine Republic

Bolivia

Bulgaria

China

Costa Rica

Czechoslovakia

Free City of Danzig

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Estonia

Ethiopia

Finland

Guatemala

Haiti

Honduras

Hungary

Iceland

Iran

Iraq

Italy

Japan

Latvia

Liberia

[1] This Protocol came into force on May 25th, 1937.

2. PROTOCOL RELATING TO MILITARY OBLIGATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES OF DOUBLE NATIONALITY *(continued)*.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Colombia (February 24th,1937)
Cuba (October 22nd, 1936)
The Government of Cuba declares that it does not accept the obligation imposed by Article 2 of the Protocol when the minor referred to in that Article, although he has the right, on attaining his majority, to renounce or decline Cuban nationality, habitually resides in the territory of the State and is in fact more closely connected with the latter than with any other State whose nationality he may also possess.
The Netherlands (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
SALVADOR (October 14th, 1935)
SWEDEN (July 6th, 1933)

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

LITHUANIA
MONACO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

3. PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)
AUSTRALIA (July 8th, 1935)
(Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (April 9th, 1936)
INDIA (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.
CHILE (March 20th, 1935)
CHINA (February 14th, 1935)
The Netherlands (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)
SALVADOR (October 14th, 1935 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
CANADA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
DENMARK
EGYPT
ESTONIA
FRANCE
GREECE
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LATVIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
PERU
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
ITALY
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MONACO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
ROUMANIA
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] This Protocol came into force on July 1st, 1937.

4. SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931 *a*)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)

AUSTRALIA (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (April 9th, 1936)

INDIA (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

CHINA (February 14th, 1935)

SALVADOR (October 14th, 1935)
The Republic of Salvador does not assume the obligation laid down by the Protocol where the Salvadorian nationality possessed by the person and ultimately lost by him was acquired by naturalisation.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA

BELGIUM
With the reservation that the application of this Protocol will not be extended to the Colony of the Belgian Congo or to the Territories under mandate.

CANADA

COLOMBIA

CUBA

EGYPT

GREECE

IRISH FREE STATE

LUXEMBURG

MEXICO

PERU

PORTUGAL

SPAIN

URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MONACO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 9, § 1).
The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 9 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 10, § 1).

XXIV. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

I. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles, 6, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the utilisation of the rights provided in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention. As regards the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government intends to reserve all the rights provided in the Annex in question, with the exception of the right mentioned in Article 21 of that Annex.

* FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The undertaking by the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 of Annex II to the said Convention.
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Declares that Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
Subject to the following reservations with regard to Annex II:
Article 8: Paragraphs 1 and 3.
Article 9: As regards bills payable at a fixed date, or at a fixed period after date or after sight.
Article 13.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ECUADOR
HUNGARY
LUXEMBURG
PERU
SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article VI of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 257; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; Vol. CLX, p. 428; Vol. CLXIV, p. 412; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 236.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, with Annexes and Protocol *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Article 15: (*a*) Proceedings against a drawer or endorser who has made an inequitable gain;

(*b*) Same proceedings against an acceptor who has made an inequitable gain.

" These proceedings shall be taken within a period of five years counting from the date of the bill of exchange. "

Article 17: The provisions of Greek law relating to short-term limitations shall apply.

Article 20: The above-mentioned reservations apply equally to promissory notes.

ITALY (August 31st, 1932)

The Italian Government reserves the right to avail itself of the right granted in Articles 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the right referred to in the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention, in virtue of Article 1, paragraph 2.

MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)

NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, paragraph 2, and 22 of Annex II to the Convention.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15 and 17 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Annex II.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservation mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol. [2]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
AUSTRIA (August 31st, 1932)	BRAZIL	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)	COLOMBIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland (June 24th, 1935)	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ALBANIA
	ECUADOR	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
	HUNGARY	SA'UDI ARABIA
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)	LUXEMBURG	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	PERU	AUSTRALIA
	SPAIN	BOLIVIA
	TURKEY	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
	YUGOSLAVIA	

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 15 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 317; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; Vol. CLX, p. 428; Vol. CLXIV, p. 412; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 237.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Finland (August 31st, 1932)	Bulgaria
France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)	Canada
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)	Chile
Greece (August 31st, 1931)	China
Italy (August 31st, 1932)	Costa Rica
Japan (August 31st, 1932)	Cuba
Monaco (January 25th, 1934 *a*)	Dominican Republic
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)	Egypt
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)	Estonia
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)	Ethiopia
Norway (July 27th, 1932)	Guatemala
Poland (December 19th, 1936*a*)	Haiti
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934)	Honduras
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.	Iceland
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)	India
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932)[1]	Iran
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 *a*)	Iraq
	Irish Free State
	Latvia
	Liberia
	Liechtenstein
	Lithuania
	Mexico
	New Zealand
	Nicaragua
	Panama
	Paraguay
	Roumania
	Salvador
	San Marino
	Siam
	Sudan
	Uruguay
	Venezuela

3. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol.[2]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Austria (August 31st, 1932)	Brazil	Afghanistan
Belgium (August 31st, 1932)	Colombia	Union of South Africa
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 18th, 1934 *a*)	Czechoslovakia	Albania
His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His Colonies or Protectorates or any territories under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.	Ecuador	United States of America
	Hungary	Sa'udi Arabia
	Luxemburg	Argentine Republic
	Peru	Australia
	Spain	Bolivia
	Turkey	Bulgaria
Newfoundland (May 7th, 1934 *a*)	Yugoslavia	Canada
Subject to the provision D. I. in the Protocol of the Convention.		Chile
		China
		Costa Rica

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 337; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; Vol. CLX, p. 429; Vol. CLXIV, p. 413; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 237.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Barbados (* with limitation) Basutoland Bechuanaland Protectorate Bermuda (with limitation) British Guiana (with limitation) British Honduras Ceylon (with limitation) Cyprus (with limitation) Fiji (with limitation) Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gibraltar (with limitation) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation) Malay States: (*a*) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor (with limitation) (*b*) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, Brunei (with limitation) Malta Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Protectorate Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) Seychelles Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation) Straits Settlements (with limitation) Swaziland Trinidad and Tobago (with limitation) Uganda Protectorate (with limitation) Windward Islands: Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent (with limitation) **IRISH FREE STATE (July 10th, 1936 *a*) ***FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935) DENMARK (July 27th, 1932) The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland. FINLAND (August 31st, 1932) FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*) ***GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933) ITALY (August 31st, 1932) JAPAN (August 31st, 1932) MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)	(July 18th, 1936 *a*) CUBA DOMINICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT ESTONIA ETHIOPIA GREECE GUATEMALA HAITI HONDURAS ICELAND INDIA IRAN IRAQ LATVIA LIBERIA LIECHTENSTEIN LITHUANIA MEXICO NEW ZEALAND NICARAGUA PANAMA PARAGUAY ROUMANIA SALVADOR SAN MARINO SIAM SUDAN URUGUAY VENEZUELA

* The words "with limitation" placed after the names of certain territories indicate that the limitation contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention applies to these territories.

** The Government of the Irish Free State having informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its desire to be allowed the limitation specified in paragraph I of Section D of the Protocol to this Convention, the Secretary-General has transmitted this desire to the interested States in application of paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned Section. No objection having been raised on the part of the said States, this limitation should be considered as accepted.

*** All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)[1]
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 *a*)

XXV. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.[2]

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
DENMARK (May 15th, 1931)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
FINLAND (July 30th, 1931)	AUSTRIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)	Subject to the reservation that this signature shall only take effect when an agreement with the States concerned has removed the obstacles which still stand in the way of the application of the Convention as regards Austria —*i.e.*, the supervision of credit exercised by the Committee of Control and the general lien belonging to the States which have granted reconstruction credits.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	BELGIUM	CANADA
	BOLIVIA	CHILE
	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations	CHINA
		COLOMBIA
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		ECUADOR
		GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		HUNGARY
		INDIA
		IRAQ
		JAPAN
		LIBERIA
		LUXEMBURG
		MEXICO

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above-referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The present Convention shall not come into force until it has received ratifications or accessions resulting in causing a sum of not less than 50 million gold francs, for the annual service of loans, to be covered by ordinary guarantees and also by the special guarantees of not less than three Governments. It shall enter into force ninety days after the date on which the conditions provided above are satisfied and subject to the provisions of Article 35.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE *(continued)*.[1]

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRALIA
IRISH FREE STATE
BULGARIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FRANCE
GERMANY
GREECE
ITALY
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
NORWAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
SWEDEN

In virtue of the constitutional laws of Sweden, loan operations are entrusted to a special authority (Riksgäldskontoret) appointed direct by Parliament.

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

XXVI. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.

BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932)

Belgium cannot undertake, for the present, to apply the provisions relating to "Warning of gale expected to affect the locality" which form the first chapter of the Regulations of this Agreement.

Further, the ratification by Belgium of the provisions which are the object of Chapter II (Tide and depth signals), and Chapter III (Signals concerning the movement of vessels at the entrances of harbours or important channels), will only take effect when Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Norway shall have themselves notified their effective ratifications of the provisions contained in these two chapters.

This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.

Signatures subject to Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
CUBA
ESTONIA
GERMANY
SWEDEN
YUGOSLAVIA

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA

---

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on November 22nd, 1931, the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by five Governments. (Article 5.) See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXV, p. 95; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 453; Vol. CXLII, p. 379; Vol. CLVI, p. 241; Vol. CLX, p. 393; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 390.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS *(continued)*.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.		*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)		IRISH FREE STATE
CHINA (May 29th, 1935)		ICELAND
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)		IRAN
		IRAQ
		ITALY
FINLAND (June 12th, 1936)		JAPAN
FRANCE (July 13th, 1931)		LIBERIA
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:		LITHUANIA
French West Africa		MEXICO
French Equatorial Africa		NEW ZEALAND
Togoland		NICARAGUA
Cameroons		NORWAY
Madagascar		PANAMA
French Settlements in India		PERU
Indo-China		SALVADOR
Reunion		SIAM
French Coast of Somaliland		TANGIER
New Caledonia		URUGUAY
Oceania		VENEZUELA
Martinique		
Guadeloupe		
Guiana		
St. Pierre and Miquelon		
(October 28th, 1933 *a*)		
GREECE (September 14th, 1932)		
LATVIA (September 17th, 1935 *a*)		
MONACO (November 3rd, 1933)		
MOROCCO (September 3rd, 1931)		
THE NETHERLANDS (August 24th, 1931 *s*). Including the Netherlands Indies.		
POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)		
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		
ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)		
SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)		
TUNIS (October 27th, 1931)		
TURKEY (June 27th, 1936 *a*)		
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)		

2. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.	*Signatures subject to Ratification.*	*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932) This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.	CUBA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)	GERMANY	ALBANIA
		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on January 21st, 1931, the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by five Governments. (Article 4.) See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 21; Vol. CXVII, p. 331; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 449; Vol. CXLII, p. 371; Vol. CXLVII, p. 350; Vol. CLVI, p. 226; Vol. CLX, p. 380; Vol. CLXIV, p. 387; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 412.

2. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS *(continued)*.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Does not include any Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate of His Britannic Majesty.

INDIA (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Does not include any of the Indian States under British suzerainty.

CHINA (May 29th, 1935)

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)

DENMARK (April 29th, 1931 *s*)

Estonia (September 16th, 1936)

FINLAND (May 23rd, 1934)

FRANCE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)

French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows: (October 28th, 1933 *a*)
- French West Africa
- French Equatorial Africa
- Togoland
- Cameroons
- Madagascar
- French Settlements in India
- Indo-China
- Reunion
- French Coast of Somaliland
- New Caledonia
- Oceania
- Martinique
- Guadeloupe
- Guiana
- St. Pierre and Miquelon

MOROCCO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)

TUNIS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)

GREECE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)

IRAQ (October 15th, 1935 *a*)

LATVIA (September 17th, 1935 *a*)

MONACO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)

THE NETHERLANDS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Including the Netherlands Indies.

POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)

PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)

ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)

SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)

SWEDEN (February 3rd, 1933)

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)

TURKEY (June 27th, 1936 *a*)

YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

AUSTRALIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
TANGIER
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

XXVII. DECLARATION BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE POWERS WHICH ARE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION INSTITUTING THE DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE DANUBE.

(Geneva, December 5th, 1930.)

Signatures.

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
FRANCE
ITALY
ROUMANIA
YUGOSLAVIA

Signatures ad referendum.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
GERMANY
GREECE
HUNGARY

XXVIII. UNIFICATION OF RIVER LAW.

1. CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Accession.

PORTUGAL (March 1st, 1932 *a*)
Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14, of the Protocol-Annex.
BELGIUM
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland).
Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex.
FRANCE
GERMANY
Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex.
HUNGARY
Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex.
ITALY
LUXEMBURG
THE NETHERLANDS
Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex.
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SWITZERLAND
Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex.
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
DENMARK
ESTONIA
FINLAND
GREECE
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
NORWAY
SPAIN
SWEDEN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 17).

2. CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *in rem* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex.
BELGIUM
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex.
FRANCE
GERMANY
Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex.
HUNGARY
Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex.
ITALY
LUXEMBURG
THE NETHERLANDS
Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex.
POLAND
SWITZERLAND
Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex.
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
DENMARK
ESTONIA
FINLAND
GREECE
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
NORWAY
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
SWEDEN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

3. CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [2]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FRANCE
HUNGARY
Subject to the reservation provided under IV, *ad* Article 8, of the Protocol-Annex.
ITALY
LUXEMBURG
POLAND
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
AUSTRIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
DENMARK
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
ESTONIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GREECE
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS
NORWAY
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[1] This Convention shall enter into force six months after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 53).
[2] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 11).

XXIX. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

1. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, para. 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to this Convention.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)

The undertaking of the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, par. 1, 16 (*a*), 18, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of Annex II to the said Convention.

The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*), 18 and 27 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)

Declares that Articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to the Convention.

*GREECE (June 1st, 1934)

Subject to the following conditions:

A. The Hellenic Government does not avail itself of the reservations provided in Articles 1, 2, 5-8, 10-14, 16, paragraph 1 (*a*) and (*b*), 18, paragraph 1, 19-22, 24 and 26, paragraph 2, of Annex II.

B. The Hellenic Government avails itself of the following reservations provided in Annex II:

(1) The reservation in Article 3; paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the Uniform Law being replaced by the words: "A cheque which does not specify the place of payment shall be regarded as payable at the place where it was drawn".

(2) The reservation in Article 4, the following paragraph being added to Article 3: "A cheque issued and payable in Greece shall not be valid as a cheque unless it is drawn on a banking Company or Greek legal person having the status of an institution of public law, engaging in banking business".

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ECUADOR
HUNGARY
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article VI of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 355; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; Vol. CLXIV, p. 413; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 239.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, with Annexes and Protocol *(cont)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

(3) The reservation in Article 9, the following provision being added to paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Uniform Law: "But in such exceptional case the issue of the cheque to bearer is prohibited."

(4) The reservation in Article 15, the following paragraph being added to Article 31 of the Uniform Law: "By presidential decree, promulgated at the instance of the Ministers of Justice and National Economy, it may be decided what institutions in Greece are to be regarded as clearing-houses."

(5) The reservation in the second paragraph of Article 16, it being laid down that "provisions with regard to the loss or theft of cheques shall be embodied in Greek law."

(6) The reservation in Article 17, the following paragraph being added at the end of Article 35: "In exceptional circumstances connected with the rate of exchange of Greek currency, the effects of the stipulation contained in paragraph 3 of the present Article may be abrogated in each case by special legislation as regards cheques payable in Greece. The above provision may also be applied as regards cheques issued in Greece."

(7) The reservation in Article 23, the following being added to No. 2 in Article 45 of the Uniform Law: "which, however, in the case of cheques issued and payable in Greece, shall be calculated in each case at the legal rate of interest in force in Greece." Similarly, the following is added to No. 2 of Article 46 of the Uniform Law: "except in the special case dealt with in No. 2 of the preceding Article."

(8) The reservation in Article 25, the following Article being added to the National Law: "In the event of forfeiture of the bearer's rights or limitation of the right of action, proceedings may be taken against the drawer or endorser on the ground of his having made an inequitable gain. The right to take such proceedings lapses after three years from the date of the issue of the cheque."

(9) The reservation in the first paragraph of Article 26, a provision being enacted to the following effect: "The causes of interruption or suspension of limitation of actions enacted in the present law shall be governed by the rules regarding limitation and short-term limitation of actions."

(10) The reservation in Article 27, a separate Article being appended in the following terms: "Legal holidays within the meaning of the present law shall be all Sundays and all full days of rest observed by public offices."

(11) The reservation in Article 28 and the reservation in Article 29.

(12) The reservation in Article 30.

ITALY (August 31st, 1933)

In accordance with Article 1 of this Convention, the Royal Italian Government intends to avail itself of the rights provided in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, para. 2, 19, 20, 21, para. 2, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

In connection with Article 15 of Annex II to this Convention, the institutions referred to in the said article are, in Italy, solely the "Stanze di compensazione".

JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)

By application of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, this ratification is subject to the benefit of the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention.

MONACO (February 9th, 1933)

*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 15, 16, paragraph 1 (*a*), 16, paragraph 2, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

1. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL *(cont.)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 4, 8, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

2. CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.[2]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
*GREECE (June 1st, 1934)
ITALY (August 31st, 1933)
JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)
MONACO (February 9th, 1933)
*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935*a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936*a*)
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ECUADOR
HUNGARY
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 407; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; Vol. CLXIV, p. 413; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 239.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (January 13th, 1932) This ratification does not include any British Colony or Protectorate or any mandated territory in respect of which the mandate is exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.	Austria	Afghanistan
Barbados	Belgium	Union of South Africa
Basutoland	Czechoslovakia	Albania
Bechuanaland Protectorate	Ecuador	United States of America
Bermuda	Hungary	Sa'udi Arabia
British Guiana	Luxemburg	Argentine Republic
British Honduras	Mexico	Australia
Ceylon	Roumania	Bolivia
Cyprus	Spain	Brazil
Fiji	Turkey	Bulgaria
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)	Yugoslavia	Canada
Gibraltar		Chile
Gold Coast:		China
(*a*) Colony		Colombia
(*b*) Ashanti		Costa Rica
(*c*) Northern Territories		Cuba
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate		Dominican Republic
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		Egypt
Malay States:		Estonia
(*a*) Federated Malay States:		Ethiopia
Negri Sembilan		Guatemala
Pahang		Haiti
Perak		Honduras
Selangor		Iceland
(*b*) Unfederated Malay States:		India
Johore		Iran
Kedah		Iraq
Kelantan		Latvia
Perlis		Liberia
Trengganu		Liechtenstein
Brunei		Lithuania
Malta		New Zealand
Northern Rhodesia		Panama
Nyasaland Protectorate		Paraguay
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)		Peru
Seychelles		Salvador
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)		San Marino
Straits Settlements		Siam
Swaziland		Sudan
Trinidad and Tobago		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uganda Protectorate		Uruguay
Windward Islands:		Venezuela
Grenada		
St. Lucia		
St. Vincent		
Irish Free State (July 10th, 1936 *a*)		

July 18th, 1936 *a*)

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on November 29th, 1933, in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 7; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; Vol. CLXIV, p. 412; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 235.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
*GREECE (June 1st, 1934)
ITALY (August 31st, 1933)
JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)
MONACO (February 9th, 1933)
*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
NICARAGUA (March 16, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936*a*)
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]

XXX. ROAD TRAFFIC.

1. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS. [2]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (August 21st, 1936 *a*)
FRANCE (October 11th, 1934)
Does not assume any obligation in regard to Algeria, colonies, protectorates and territories under its mandate.
Algeria (July 22nd, 1935 *a*)
Hungary (January 8th, 1937)
ITALY (September 25th, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (April 9th, 1936)
MONACO (January 19th, 1932*a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
DENMARK
GERMANY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] This Convention came into force on July 16th, 1934, in accordance with its Article 11. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CL, p. 247; Vol. CLX, p. 439; Vol. CLXIV, p. 421; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 426.

1. Convention concerning the Unification of Road Signals (*continued*).

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Poland (April 5th, 1934)
Portugal (April 18th, 1932 *a*)
Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
Spain (July 18th, 1933)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Turkey (October 15th, 1936)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
Siam
Sweden
Uruguay
Venezuela

2. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles, with Protocol-Annex.[1]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (November 9th, 1932)
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 20th, 1932)
Does not include any colonies, protectorates or overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Southern Rhodesia (August 6th, 1932 *a*)
Newfoundland (January 9th, 1933 *a*)
Ceylon, Cyprus, Gold Coast: Colony, Ashanti, Northern Territories, Togoland under British mandate (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Czechoslovakia
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
Argentine Republic
Australia
Austria
Bolivia
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
France
Germany
Greece
Guatemala

[1] This Convention entered into force on May 9th, 1933, in accordance with its Article 14. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 149; Vol. CXLII, p. 393; Vol. CXLVII, p. 356; Vol. CLVI, p. 260; Vol. CLX, p. 418; Vol. CLXIV, p. 403; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 426.

2. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles, with Protocol-Annex *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

- Hong-Kong
- Jamaica
- Malta
- Windward Islands:
  - Grenada
  - St. Lucia
  - St. Vincent

(January 3rd, 1935 *a*)

- Nigeria:
  - Colony
  - Protectorate
  - Cameroons under British Mandate
- Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)

(March 11th, 1936 *a*)

- Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (April 29th, 1936 *a*)
- Irish Free State (November 27th, 1933 *a*)
- Bulgaria (March 5th, 1932 *a*)
- Denmark (December 4th, 1931)
- Finland (May 23rd, 1934 *a*)
- Italy (September 25th, 1933)
- Luxemburg (March 31st, 1933)
- The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)
- Poland (June 15th, 1934)
- Portugal (January 23rd, 1932)
  Does not assume any obligation as regards its Colonies.
- Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
- Spain (June 3rd, 1933)
- Sweden (November 9th, 1933)
- Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
- *Turkey* (September 25th, 1936)
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)
- Yugoslavia (May 9th, 1933 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

- Haiti
- Honduras
- Hungary
- India
- Iran
- Iraq
- Japan
- Latvia
- Liberia
- Lithuania
- Mexico
- Monaco
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Norway
- Panama
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Salvador
- Siam
- Uruguay
- Venezuela

3. Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost Triptychs.[1]

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.	*Signature* ad referendum.	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
Austria (August 4th, 1931)	Yugoslavia	Albania
Belgium (March 28th, 1931)		Free City of Danzig
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (March 28th, 1931)		Estonia
Irish Free State (May 6th, 1931)		Finland
Bulgaria (February 27th, 1932)		Iceland
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1933)		Latvia
Denmark (March 28th, 1931)		Liechtenstein
France (April 15th, 1931)		Lithuania
Germany (March 28th, 1931)		Monaco
Greece (August 18th, 1931)		San Marino

[1] This Agreement entered into force on June 26th, 1931, on the ninetieth day after its signature on behalf of three Customs administrations (Article III). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXIX, p. 47; Vol. CXXVI, p. 460; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 432; Vol. CLVI, p. 230; and Vol. CLX, p. 384.

3. AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

HUNGARY (August 14th, 1931)
ITALY (May 27th, 1931)
LUXEMBURG (March 28th, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (June 11th, 1931)
NORWAY (September 27th, 1932)
POLAND (September 9th, 1932)
PORTUGAL (August 26th, 1931)
ROUMANIA (June 19th, 1935)
SPAIN (July 8th, 1931)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (March 28th, 1931)
TURKEY (May 15th, 1932)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (September 6th, 1935)

XXXI. INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY.

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY,[1] WITH CHARTER AND STATUTES.

(Geneva, May 21st, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
LATVIA (September 28th, 1931)
POLAND (April 22nd, 1932)
ROUMANIA (February 4th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (December 31st, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

AUSTRIA
BELGIUM
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DENMARK

The Danish Government reserves the right to make the entry into force of this Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being ratified and also put into force by Norway and Sweden.

ESTONIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
HUNGARY
ITALY
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe only)
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
SWEDEN [2]

The Convention is open to Accession by:

1. The European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *a*.
2. The non-European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *b*.

---

[1] The present Convention shall come into force as soon as the amount of the contributions, whether obligatory or voluntary, to the Special Reserve due from the Governments which have ratified the Convention attains the sum of twenty-five million francs. If this condition is not realised before December 31st, 1931, a Conference of the Governments which have ratified the Convention shall be called by the Council of the League of Nations. This Conference will determine new conditions for the coming into force of the Convention (Article 16).

[2] On signing this Convention, the Swedish Plenipotentiary made the following declaration:

"The Swedish Government reserves the right to make its ratification of this Convention depend on the attitude which the Governments of Denmark and Norway shall adopt towards it."

XXXII. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS. [1]

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (June 21st, 1935 *a*)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (April 28th, 1932)

1. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purpose of internal control and control of import into, and export from, territory under its jurisdiction, of opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures stricter than the provisions of the Convention.
2. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purposes of controlling transit through its territories of raw opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures by which the production of an import permit issued by the country of destination may be made a condition precedent to the granting of permission for transit through its territory.
3. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to send statistics of import and export to the Permanent Central Opium Board short of 60 days after the close of the three months' period to which such statistics refer.
4. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to state separately amounts of drugs purchased or imported for Government purposes.
5. Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs by them on the part of the United States of America on this date is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognises a regime or entity which signs or accedes to the Convention as the Government of a country when that regime or entity is not recognised by the Government of the United States of America as the Government of that country.
6. The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed on this date, does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country represented by a regime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognise as the Government of that country until such country has a Government recognised by the Government of the United States of America.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
ETHIOPIA
LIBERIA
PARAGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ICELAND
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Convention entered into force on July 9th, 1933, in accordance with its Article 30. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXIX, p. 301; Vol. CXLVII, p. 361; Vol. CLII, p. 344; Vol. CLVI, p. 268; Vol. CLX, p. 419; Vol. CLXIV, p. 407; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 234; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 426.

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

SA'UDI ARABIA (August 15th, 1936)
AUSTRIA (July 3rd, 1934)
BELGIUM (April 10th, 1933)
This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo, nor the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.
BRAZIL (April 5th, 1933)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 1st, 1933)
His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates and overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.

British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher and Nevis
Virgin Islands
Mauritius
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar Protectorate

(May 18th, 1936 *a*)

Newfoundland (June 28th, 1937 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia (July 14th, 1937 *a*)
CANADA (October 17th, 1932)
AUSTRALIA (January 24th, 1934)
This accession applies to Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.
NEW ZEALAND (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
IRISH FREE STATE (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
INDIA (November 14th, 1932)
BULGARIA (March 20th, 1933 *a*)
CHILE (March 31st, 1933)
CHINA (January 10th, 1934 *a*)
COLOMBIA (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
COSTA RICA (April 5th, 1933)
CUBA (April 4th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 12th, 1933)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)
DENMARK (June 5th, 1936)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (April 8th, 1933)
EGYPT (April 10th, 1933)
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
ESTONIA (July 5th, 1935 *a*)

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Finland (September 25th, 1936 *a*)

France (April 10th, 1933)

The French Government makes every reservation, with regard to the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated Territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Germany (April 10th, 1933)

Greece (December 27th, 1934)

Guatemala (May 1st, 1933)

Haiti (May 4th, 1933 *a*)

Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)

Hungary (April 10th, 1933 *a*)

Iran (September 28th, 1932)

Iraq (May 30th, 1934 *a*)

Italy (March 21st, 1933)

Japan (June 3rd, 1935)

The Japanese Government declare that, in view of the necessity of close co-operation between the High Contracting Parties in order to carry out most effectively the provisions of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931, they understand that the present position of Japan, regardless of whether she be a Member of the League of Nations or not, is to be maintained in the matter of the composition of the organs and the appointment of the members thereof mentioned in the said Convention.[1]

Latvia (August 3rd, 1937 *a*)

Liechtenstein [2]

Lithuania (April 10th, 1933)

Luxemburg (May 30th, 1936)

Mexico (March 13th, 1933)

The Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory—as it has already done—measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the preparation, use, possession, importation, exportation and consumption of the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Monaco (February 16th, 1933)

The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)

Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

Norway (September 12th, 1934 *a*)

Panama (April 15th, 1935)

Peru (May 20th, 1932 *a*)

Poland (April 11th, 1933)

Portugal (June 17th, 1932)

The Portuguese Government makes every reservation with regard to its colonies as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Roumania (April 11th, 1933)

Salvador (April 7th, 1933 *a*)

(*a*) The Republic of Salvador does not agree to the provisions of Article 26, on the ground that there is no reason why the High Contracting Parties should be given the option of not applying the Convention to their colonies, protectorates, and overseas mandated territories.

(*b*) The Republic of Salvador states that it disagrees with the reservations embodied in Nos. 5 and 6 of the declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America regarding Governments not recognised by the Government of that country; in its opinion, those reservations constitute an infringement of the national sovereignty of Salvador, whose present Government, though not as yet recognised by the United States Government, has been recognised by the majority of the civilised

---

[1] Before ratifying the Convention with the declaration here set out, the Japanese Government consulted the Contracting Parties, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General. A summary of the correspondence which took place was published in the League of Nations *Official Journal* for September 1935 (16th Year, No 9).

[2] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

" Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

countries of the world. Their recognition is due to their conviction that that Government is a perfectly constitutional one and affords a full and complete guarantee of the performance of its international duties, inasmuch as it enjoys the unanimous, decided and effective support of all the inhabitants of the Republic, whether citizens of the country or foreigners resident therein.

As it respects the internal regimes of other nations, the Republic of Salvador considers that the Convention in question, being of a strictly hygienic and humanitarian character, does not offer a suitable occasion to formulate such political reservations as have called forth this comment.

San Marino (June 12th, 1933)

Siam (February 22nd, 1934)

As its harmful-habit-forming drugs law goes beyond the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the present Convention on certain points, the Siamese Government reserves the right to apply its existing law.

Spain (April 7th, 1933)
Sudan (August 25th, 1932 *a*)
Sweden (August 12th, 1932)
Switzerland (April 10th, 1933)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (April 7th, 1933)
Venezuela (November 15th, 1933)

Protocol of Signature.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
United States of America (April 28th, 1932)	Argentine Republic	Afghanistan
Sa'udi Arabia (August 15th, 1936 *a*)	Bolivia	Union of South Africa
Austria (July 3rd, 1934)	Ethiopia	Albania
Belgium (April 10th, 1933)	Guatemala	Bulgaria
Brazil (April 5th, 1933)	Panama	China
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 1st, 1933) Same reservation as for the Convention.	Paraguay	Haiti
British Honduras		Iceland
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		Iraq
Ceylon		Latvia
Cyprus		Liberia
Falkland Islands and Dependencies		Salvador
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Gibraltar		Yugoslavia
Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate		
Hong-Kong		
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		
Leeward Islands: Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands		
Mauritius		

(May 18th, 1936 *a*)

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar Protectorate
(May 18th, 1936 *a*)

Newfoundland (June 28th, 1937 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia (July 14th, 1937 *a*)
CANADA (October 17th, 1932)
AUSTRALIA (January 24th, 1934 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
IRISH FREE STATE (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
INDIA (November 14th, 1932)
CHILE (November 20th, 1933)
COLOMBIA (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
COSTA RICA (April 5th, 1933)
CUBA (April 4th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 12th, 1933 *a*)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)
DENMARK (June 5th, 1936)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (April 8th, 1933)
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
EGYPT (April 10th, 1933)
ESTONIA (July 5th, 1935 *a*)
FRANCE (April 10th, 1933)
GERMANY (April 10th, 1933)
GREECE (December 27th, 1934)
HONDURAS (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
HUNGARY (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)
ITALY (March 21st, 1933)
JAPAN (June 3rd, 1935)
LIECHTENSTEIN [1]
LITHUANIA (April 10th, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (May 30th, 1936)
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
MONACO (March 20th, 1933)
THE NETHERLANDS [2] (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)
NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
PERU (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
POLAND (April 11th, 1933)
PORTUGAL (June 17th, 1932)
ROUMANIA (April 11th, 1933)
SAN MARINO (June 12th, 1933)
SIAM (February 22nd, 1934)
SPAIN (April 7th, 1933)
SUDAN (January 18th, 1933 *a*)
SWEDEN (August 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (April 10th, 1933)
TURKEY (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
URUGUAY (April 7th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 11th, 1934)

---

[1] Same note as for the Convention.

[2] The instrument of ratification specifies that the reservation relating to paragraph 2 of Article 22, as formulated by the Netherlands representative at the time of signature of the Protocol, should be considered as withdrawn.

XXXIII. WHALING.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING. [1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (July 7th, 1932)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRIA (January 2nd, 1936 *a*)	BELGIUM	SA'UDI ARABIA
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)	AUSTRALIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 18th, 1934)	INDIA	BOLIVIA
His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.	COLOMBIA	BULGARIA
Bahamas	GERMANY	CHILE
Barbados	GREECE	CHINA
Bermuda	ROUMANIA	COSTA RICA
British Guiana		CUBA
British Honduras		FREE CITY OF DANZIG
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Ceylon		ESTONIA
Cyprus		ETHIOPIA
Falkland Islands and Dependencies		GUATEMALA
Fiji		HAITI
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		HONDURAS
Gibraltar		HUNGARY
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony		ICELAND
Gold Coast Colony		IRAN
Hong-Kong		IRAQ
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)		IRISH FREE STATE
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		JAPAN
Leeward Island:		LIBERIA
Antigua		LIECHTENSTEIN
Dominica		LITHUANIA
Montserrat		LUXEMBURG
St. Christopher and Nevis		PANAMA
Virgin Islands		PARAGUAY
Malay States:		PERU
(a) *Federated Malay States:*		PORTUGAL
Negri Sembilan		SALVADOR
Pahang		SAN MARINO
Perak		SIAM
Selangor		SWEDEN
(b) *Unfederated Malay States:*		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
Johore		URUGUAY
Kedah		VENEZUELA
Kelantan		
Perlis		
Trengganu, and Brunei		

(February 17th, 1937 *a*)

[1] This Convention came into force on January 16th, 1935, in accordance with its Article 17. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLV, p. 349; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 440.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Malta
Mauritius
Nigeria:
(a) *Colony*
(b) *Protectorate*
(c) *Cameroons under British Mandate*
North Borneo, State of
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
St. Helena and Ascension
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar Protectorate
Newfoundland (February 17th, 1937 *a*)

} (February 17th, 1937 *a*)

CANADA (December 12th, 1935)
NEW ZEALAND (October 16th, 1935)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (January 11th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 20th, 1933)
DENMARK (including Greenland) (June 26th, 1934)
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
EGYPT (January 25th, 1933 *a*)
FINLAND (March 21st, 1936)
FRANCE (May 16th, 1935)
ITALY (June 12th, 1933)

The accession of the Italian Government to this Convention can in no way constitute a precedent for future agreements providing for the limitation of fishing in extra-territorial sea.

LATVIA (September 17th, 1935 *a*)
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
MONACO (June 7th, 1932 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)
NICARAGUA (April 30th, 1932*a*)
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)
POLAND (September 27th, 1933)
SUDAN (April 13th, 1932 *a*)
SPAIN (August 2nd, 1933)
SWITZERLAND (February 16th, 1933)
TURKEY (May 28th, 1934)
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

XXXIV. MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

General Convention to improve the Means of preventing War.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)
Nicaragua (April 1st, 1935 *a*)
Norway (July 18th, 1932)
Peru (March 29th, 1932)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Colombia
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
France

Ratification cannot take place until it has been possible for the Government of the Republic to ascertain that the regulations provided for in Article 4, and which must be elaborated in order to enter into force at the same time as the Convention, ensure the guarantees of control which are deemed necessary by the French Government.

Germany
Greece
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Panama

This signature does not affect in any way the provisions of the treaties of conciliation and arbitration concluded up to this date by the Republic of Panama with other Powers.

Portugal
Siam
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Canada
Chile
China
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Italy
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Mexico
New Zealand
Paraguay
Poland
Roumania
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

XXXV. — SUPPRESSION OF OPIUM-SMOKING.

Agreement.[2]

(Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 3rd, 1933)
India (December 4th, 1935)

Subject to the understanding that this Agreement does not apply at present to the territory known as the Shan States and that it applies, so far as India is concerned, only to the Province of Burma, excluding the Shan States.

France (May 10th, 1933)
Japan (January 22nd, 1937)
The Netherlands (May 22nd, 1933)
Portugal (January 27th, 1934)
Siam (November 19th, 1934)

With a reservation to Article I.

---

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States have been deposited (Article 13, § 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will then enter into force as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 14, § 1).

[2] The Agreement came into force on April 22nd, 1937, in accordance with its Article VI.

XXXVI. FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRIA (August 26th, 1935)
With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

BELGIUM (June 8th, 1936)
The Belgian Government reserve the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending their market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

The Belgian Government declare that they do not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (February 26th, 1936)
His Majesty is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or the territories under his suzerainty, or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him and is being exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

NEWFOUNDLAND (June 29th, 1936 *a*)

Australia (December 23rd, 1936 *a*)
Including the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

IRISH FREE STATE (July 24th, 1934 *a*)

INDIA (October 17th, 1934)
Under the terms of Article XX of the Convention, this signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of the Convention in the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

BULGARIA (July 10th, 1934 *a*)

CHILE (March 20th, 1935)
With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

CUBA (June 25th, 1936 *a*)

DENMARK (July 10th, 1935)
In conformity with paragraph 1 of Article XX of the Convention, Denmark does not assume any obligation as regards Greenland.

EGYPT (February 8th, 1936)

Greece (January 27th, 1937)

HUNGARY (May 9th, 1936)
With reservation, for the Hungarian Government, of the right provided in Article IX to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Under the terms of Article XX of this Convention, the Government of the United States of America assume no obligation in respect of the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Island of Guam.

FINLAND

FRANCE
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX, and declaring that the signature of the Convention shall be effective only as regards the home territory of France.

PANAMA

POLAND
Subject to the reservation, provided for in Article IX, of the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

1 This Convention came into force on January 15th, 1935, in accordance with its Article XVIII. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLV, p. 331; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 440.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

IRAN (April 12th, 1935 *a*)
IRAQ (February 18th, 1936 *a*)
ITALY (November 21st, 1934)
LATVIA (October 21st, 1935)
MONACO (September 11th, 1934)
NICARAGUA (September 7th, 1935)
NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)
ROUMANIA (June 19th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX.
Sweden (December 27th, 1936)
SWITZERLAND (April 20th, 1934)

XXXVII. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN.

2. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (April 10th, 1935 *a*)
AUSTRALIA (September 2nd, 1936)
(Including Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (November 20th, 1935)
AUSTRIA (August 7th, 1936)
BELGIUM (June 11th, 1936)
With reservation as regards Article 10.
BULGARIA (December 19th, 1934)
CHILE (March 20th, 1935)
CUBA (June 25th, 1936 *a*)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (July 27th, 1935)
Finland (December 21st, 1936 *a*)
Greece (August 20th, 1937)
HUNGARY (August 12th, 1935)
IRAN (April 12th, 1935 *a*)
LATVIA (September 17th, 1935)
THE NETHERLANDS (September 20th, 1935)
(Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.)
NICARAGUA (December 12th, 1935 *a*)
NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)
Portugal (January 7th, 1937)
ROUMANIA (June 6th, 1935)
SUDAN (June 13th, 1934 *a*)
SWEDEN (June 25th, 1934)
SWITZERLAND (July 17th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.
CHINA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
FRANCE
GERMANY
LITHUANIA
MONACO
PANAMA
POLAND
SPAIN
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by :

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ICELAND
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

[1] The Convention came into force on August 24th, 1934, in accordance with its Article 8. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CL, p. 431; Vol. CLX, p. 439; Vol. CLXIV, p. 421; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 239; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 427.

XXXVIII. REFUGEES.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES. [1]

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (August 4th, 1937)

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 2, paragraph 3, relating to the right conferred on consuls to extend Nansen certificates, cannot be accepted by the Belgian Government;

(2) Article 9, in so far as it concerns the application of the provisions of the domestic legislation relating to "unemployment insurance", cannot be accepted;

(3) Article 10, concerning social insurance laws, cannot be favourably received;

(4) Article 14, which concerns the enjoyment of the rights and favours accorded to foreigners, subject to reciprocity, cannot be admitted:

(5) The Belgian Government in accepting the present Convention is not assuming any obligation as regards the colony of the Congo or the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (October 28th, 1936*a*)

Subject to the following reservations:

1. *Article 1.* His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom regard the Convention as applicable only to Russian, Armenian and assimilated refugees who at the date of the present accession no longer enjoy the protection of their country of origin.

2. *Article 3.* The first paragraph will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose. The term "public order" is deemed to include matters relating to crime and morals.

Paragraph 2 of Article 3 is not accepted.

3. *Article 7* will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose.

4. *Article 12.* Owing to the special position of schools and universities in the United Kingdom, this Article is not accepted.

5. *Article 14* is not accepted.

His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories under His suzerainty, or territories administered under mandate by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

EGYPT

Article 1:

Apart from such modifications or amplifications as each Contracting Party may introduce in this definition, my Government reserves the right to extend or limit the said definition in any way.

Article 2:

Bearers of Nansen certificates may not be admitted into Egypt unless the said certificates contain a visa for return to the countries by which they were issued. If these refugees are authorised to sojourn in Egypt, the competent local authorities reserve the right to issue to them Egyptian travel papers.

Article 3:

These authorities reserve the right to expel such refugees at any moment for reasons of public security.

Article 4:

Moreover, as regards the acquired rights referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the draft Convention, it should be stipulated that in order to ensure respect for such rights due account must be taken of international public order and of internal public order as the latter is conceived and applied in Egyptian law. Further, in order to dispel any misunderstanding, it should be stipulated that the rights in question are only those relating to personal status.

Article 13:

This article must not in any case invalidate or impair our reservation relating to Egyptian travel papers together with the consequences involved in the application of that reservation.

Article 14:

Our signature does not apply to this Article.

Article 15:

The Egyptian Government wishes it to be understood that the committees referred to in Article 15 will not be invested with the powers laid down in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said Article in the event of its desiring to reserve the said powers for the representatives of the local authority.

* * *

The Egyptian Government reserves the right to substitute, should the case arise, and whenever it may think fit, assimilation to nationals, for the most favourable treatment granted to nationals of a foreign country, in all the provisions of the Convention in which such treatment is stipulated.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
MONACO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] This Convention came into force on June 13th, 1935, in accordance with its Article 20. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLIX, p. 199; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 432.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BULGARIA (December 19th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. Article 1. — The Bulgarian Government maintains the reservations made by the Bulgarian delegate on signing the Arrangement of June 30th, 1928,[1] concerning the extension to other categories of refugees of certain measures taken in favour of Russian and Armenian refugees.

II. Article 2. — The departure from the country of refugees in possession of Nansen certificates (passports) shall be governed by the general regulations in force in this respect. Bulgarian consuls will be empowered in cases of *force majeure* to extend Nansen certificates issued in Bulgaria for a period of three months. The cost of visas for Nansen certificates shall be fixed in accordance with the tariff applicable to the nationals of the country by which the certificate was issued.

III. Article 6. — Exemption from *cautio judicatum solvi* shall be at the discretion of the courts in each individual case.

IV. Article 7. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept points (*a*) and (*d*).

V. Articles 8 and 10 (formerly 7 and 9). — Disability and old-age pensions shall be paid (regard being had to the possibilities of the fund concerned) to the persons entitled, their heirs and assigns, provided always that such persons are resident in the country.

VI. Article 13. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept the first paragraph, as refugees resident in Bulgaria are subject to the same treatment in fiscal matters as other foreign nationals resident in the country.

VII. Article 15. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept paragraphs 2 and 3.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (May 14th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the following reservations:

" A. The Czechoslovak Government will regard as refugees within the meaning of Article 1 only such persons as formerly actually possessed Russian or Turkish nationality, lost it before January 1st, 1923, and have not acquired any other nationality.

" B. The accession of the Czechoslovak Republic does not apply to:

" (*a*) Paragraph 3 of Article 2, whereby consuls are qualified to extend Nansen certificates;

" (*b*) Paragraph 3 of Article 3, so far as it limits the power of the national authorities to expel persons who constitute a danger to the safety of the State and public order; nor, of course, do the provisions of Article 3 in any way affect expulsions by order of the courts, or obligations deriving from extradition treaties or from the Czechoslovak laws regarding the extradition of aliens;

" (*c*) The whole of Article 7, which exempts refugees from the application of the provisions of laws and decrees for the protection of the national labour market;

" (*d*) The whole of Article 14, which waives the condition of reciprocity;

" (*e*) The whole of Article 15, which deals with the creation of local committees.

" C. Articles 4 and 5, dealing with the juridical condition of refugees, and Articles 8, 9, 10 and 11, dealing with industrial accidents and welfare and relief, will be applied in Czechoslovakia only so far as the laws of the country permit."

DENMARK (December 21st, 1935 *a*)

With reservation as regards Articles 7 and 14 of the Convention.

This accession does not include Greenland.

France (November 3rd, 1936)

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 7 shall not preclude the application of the laws and regulations fixing the proportion of wage-earning foreigners that employers are authorised to employ in France;

(2) The organisation, in France, of committees such as are provided for in Article 15 shall not, if it takes place, confer on them powers incompatible with the existing laws in the matter of finding employment;

(3) The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Convention, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

ITALY (January 16th, 1936 *a*)

1. Article 3 of the Convention cannot limit the right of the Italian authorities to apply measures of expulsion to refugees for reasons of national security and public order.
2. In acceding to the Convention, the Italian Government assumes no obligations in regard to its colonies and possessions.

NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)

With reservation as regards the provisions of Article 2, para.3, and Article 14.

---

[1] This reservation was worded as follows:

"On the understanding that the present Arrangement applies only to such refugees as are at the present date on Bulgarian territory."

XXXIX. VETERINARY QUESTIONS.

1. International Convention for the Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals, with Declaration attached.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications

Belgium (July 21st, 1937)

The Belgian Government does not regard the mere fact that in Belgium the inspection of meat, while carried out by Government veterinary surgeons or by veterinary surgeons approved by the Government, is placed under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior (Inspection of Foodstuffs), as being contrary to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 5, of the present Convention; particularly since all the requirements of the said Article are observed in Belgium.

Bulgaria (August 28th, 1936)

Latvia (May 4th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Austria
Chile a)
Czechoslovakia
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands
(for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Roumania
Spain
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Canada
China
Colombia
Cuba
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Liberia
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Sweden
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

---

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions have been received (Article 13, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will come into force on that date (Article 14, paragraph 1).

2. International Convention concerning the Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin, with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications

Belgium (July 21st, 1937)
Latvia (May 4th, 1937)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Austria
Bulgaria
Chile a)
Czechoslovakia
The Czechoslovak Government does not consider that it can waive the right to make the transit of animals across its territory subject to a previous authorisation. It intends, in practice, to exercise the right so reserved in as liberal a spirit as possible, in conformity with the principles which are at the basis of the present Convention, the object of which is to facilitate the transit of animals and of animal products.
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Roumania
Spain
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Canada
China
Colombia
Cuba
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Irish Free State
Japan
Liberia
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Sweden
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

---

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the conditions laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 18 and in paragraph 3 of Article 19 have been received (Article 20, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 20. It will come into force on that date (Article 21, paragraph 1).

3. International Convention concerning the Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products), with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (July 21st, 1937)	Austria	Afghanistan
Latvia (May 4th, 1937)	Bulgaria	Union of South Africa
	Chile a)	Albania
	Czechoslovakia	United States of America
	France	Argentine Republic
	Greece	Australia
	Italy	Bolivia
	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Brazil
	Poland	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Roumania	Canada
	Spain	China
	Switzerland	Colombia
	Turkey	Cuba
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Irish Free State
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the condition laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 12 and in paragraph 3 of Article 13 have been received (Article 14, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 14. It will come into force on that date (Article 15, paragraph 1).

XL. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

3. AGREEMENT FOR A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF MARITIME BUOYAGE, AND RULES ANNEXED THERETO.[1]

(Geneva, May 13th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures and Ratifications.

Belgium (May 12th, 1937)

The Belgian Government declares that its acceptance of the present Agreement and the application thereof to the Belgian Congo are conditional on the acceptance or the application of the said Agreement by Germany, Great Britain, France and the Netherlands.

Finland (May 11th, 1937)

The Finnish Government reserves the right to make the putting into force of this Agreement in respect of Finland conditional on its entry into force or simultaneous application by all the other countries bordering upon the Baltic Sea and Norway.

Latvia (May 8th, 1937)

Signatures subject to Ratification.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of the United Kingdom will be conditional on its acceptance or on its application by Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.

India

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of India will be conditional on its acceptance by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and its application to Burma.

This signature is not binding in respect of the territories in India of any prince or chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

China

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Chinese Government is conditional on the acceptance or on the application of this Agreement by Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Denmark, France, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden to the said Agreement.

Estonia

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of Estonia will be conditional on its acceptance or on its application by Finland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Latvia.

France

Valid for France and her overseas possessions, except Indo-China, in regard to which the present accession shall take effect only in so far as China shall herself have acquiesced in the Agreement.

Morocco (French Protectorate)

Monaco

Sweden[2]

Tunis (Regency of)

Turkey

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be conditional on its acceptance or on its application by Germany, Estonia, Finland, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Japan, Norway and Turkey.

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DENMARK
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
GERMANY
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TANGIER
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The Agreement shall enter into force the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by ten Governments (Article 5).

[2] By a letter dated May 11th, 1937, the Permanent Delegate of Sweden to the League of Nations informed the Secretariat that the ratification of this Agreement by the Swedish Government is subject to the acceptance or application thereof by the Governments of Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Latvia, Norway, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

XLI. SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.

5. CONVENTION OF 1936 FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.[1]

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to accession by:*
India (August 4th, 1937)[2]	AUSTRIA	AFGHANISTAN
	Belgium	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	Belgium does not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territories of Ruanda-Urundi in respect of which a mandate is being exercised by her on behalf of the League of Nations.	ALBANIA
		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
		SA'UDI ARABIA
	BRAZIL	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	AUSTRALIA
		BOLIVIA
	CANADA	CHILE
	BULGARIA	COSTA RICA
	CHINA	FREE CITY OF DANZIG
	Colombia	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	CUBA	ETHIOPIA
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	FINLAND
	DENMARK	GERMANY
	ECUADOR	GUATEMALA
	EGYPT	HAITI
	Estonia	ICELAND
	FRANCE	IRAN
	GREECE	IRAQ
	HONDURAS	IRISH FREE STATE
	Hungary	ITALY
	JAPAN	LATVIA
	MEXICO	LIBERIA
	Monaco	LIECHTENSTEIN
	THE NETHERLANDS	LITHUANIA
	PANAMA	LUXEMBURG
	POLAND	NEW ZEALAND
	PORTUGAL	NICARAGUA
	ROUMANIA	NORWAY
	SPAIN	PARAGUAY
	SWITZERLAND	PERU
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
	URUGUAY	SUDAN
	VENEZUELA	SWEDEN
		TURKEY
		YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Convention shall come into force ninety days after the Secretary-General of the League of Nations has received the ratifications or accessions of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States. It shall be registered on that date by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations (Article 22).

[2] Burma having ceased to be part of India, as from April 1st, 1937, to become an overseas territory of His Majesty, it is not bound by the Convention as a result of ratification by India, although Burma was part of India at the time of the signature of the Convention.

Protocol of Signature.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to accession by:*
India (August 4th, 1937)	Austria	Afghanistan
	Belgium	Union of South Africa
	Brazil	Albania
	Great Britain and Northern Ireland	United States of America
	Canada	Sa'udi Arabia
	Bulgaria	Argentine Republic
	China	Australia
	Colombia	Bolivia
	Cuba	Chile
	Czechoslovakia	Costa Rica
	Denmark	Free City of Danzig
	Ecuador	Dominican Republic
	Egypt	Ethiopia
	Estonia	Finland
	France	Germany
	Greece	Guatemala
	Honduras	Haiti
	Hungary	Iceland
	Japan	Iran
	Mexico	Iraq
	Monaco	Irish Free State
	The Netherlands	Italy
	Panama	Latvia
	Poland	Liberia
	Portugal	Liechtenstein
	Roumania	Lithuania
	Spain	Luxemburg
	Switzerland	New Zealand
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Nicaragua
	Uruguay	Norway
	Venezuela	Paraguay
		Peru
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Sweden
		Turkey
		Yugoslavia

XLII. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

6. Procès-Verbal [1]

TO ALTER THE LATEST DATE OF ISSUE OF THE ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED WORLD REQUIREMENTS OF DANGEROUS DRUGS, DRAWN UP BY THE SUPERVISORY BODY, AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF JULY 13TH, 1931, FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures.

Afghanistan
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AUSTRIA
Belgium
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
Bulgaria
CANADA
CHINA
Costa Rica
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Free City of Danzig
(Through the intermediary of Poland)
DENMARK
ECUADOR
EGYPT
Estonia
Finland
FRANCE
GREECE
Haiti
Hungary
INDIA
Iraq
IRISH FREE STATE
JAPAN
LIECHTENSTEIN [2]
Mexico
Monaco
THE NETHERLANDS
New Zealand
NORWAY
Panama
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SIAM
SPAIN
Sweden
SWITZERLAND
Turkey
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
Uruguay
VENEZUELA

The Procès-verbal *is open to Signature by :*

SA'UDI ARABIA
AUSTRALIA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HONDURAS
IRAN
ITALY
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
NICARAGUA
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SUDAN

---

[1] The present *Procès-verbal* will come into force as soon as it shall have been signed in the name of all Governments parties to the Convention of July 13th, 1931 (§ 2).

[2] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

" Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

XLIII. REFUGEES.

PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENT CONCERNING THE STATUS OF REFUGEES COMING FROM GERMANY.[1]

(Geneva, July 4th, 1936.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

Belgium (October 7th, 1936)

In application of paragraph 1 of Article 12, the Belgian Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation as regards the Colony of the Congo, the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi, or any other territory provided in paragraph 1 of Article 12.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (September 25th, 1936)

Article 4. — Refugees who are the subject of extradition proceedings commenced in the United Kingdom will not be regarded as being entitled to claim the protection otherwise afforded to them under this Article.

Paragraph 2 of Article 4 will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose. The term "public order" is deemed to include matters relating to crime and morals.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom does not assume any obligations in respect of any of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories under suzerainty or territories administered under mandate.

DENMARK (July 4th, 1936)

FRANCE (July 4th, 1936)

The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

Norway (September 21st, 1936)

Spain (January 27th, 1937)

Switzerland (August 30th, 1937)

Signature ad referendum.

THE NETHERLANDS

The Arrangement is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The Arrangement came into force on August 4th, 1936, in accordance with its Article 10. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXI, p. 75.

XLIV. BROADCASTING.

International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace.[1]

(Geneva, September 23rd, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to accession by :*
Australia (June 25th, 1937 *a*) Including the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.	*Albania*	Afghanistan
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (August 18th, 1937)	*Argentine Republic*	Union of South Africa
India (August 11th, 1937)	*Austria*	United States of America
	Belgium Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.	Bolivia
	Brazil	Bulgaria
	Chile	Canada
	Colombia	China
	Czechoslovakia	Costa Rica
	Denmark	Cuba
	Dominican Republic	Free City of Danzig
	Egypt	Ecuador
	Estonia	Ethiopia
	France	Finland
	Greece	Germany
	Lithuania	Guatemala
	Luxemburg	Haiti
	Mexico	Honduras
	The Netherlands	Hungary
	New Zealand	Iceland
	Norway	Iran
	Roumania	Iraq
	Spain Under reservation of the declaration mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.	Irish Free State
	Switzerland	Italy
	Turkey	Japan
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.	Latvia
	Uruguay	Liberia
		Nicaragua
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Poland
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, in conformity with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, sixty days after the receipt by him of the sixth ratification or accession. The Convention shall enter into force on the day of such registration. (Article 11.)

XLIII. REFUGEES.

PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENT CONCERNING THE STATUS OF REFUGEES COMING FROM GERMANY.[1]

(Geneva, July 4th, 1936.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

Belgium (October 7th, 1936)

In application of paragraph 1 of Article 12, the Belgian Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation as regards the Colony of the Congo, the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi, or any other territory provided in paragraph 1 of Article 12.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (September 25th, 1936)

Article 4. — Refugees who are the subject of extradition proceedings commenced in the United Kingdom will not be regarded as being entitled to claim the protection otherwise afforded to them under this Article.

Paragraph 2 of Article 4 will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose. The term "public order" is deemed to include matters relating to crime and morals.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom does not assume any obligations in respect of any of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories under suzerainty or territories administered under mandate.

DENMARK (July 4th, 1936)

FRANCE (July 4th, 1936)

The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

Norway (September 21st, 1936)

Spain (January 27th, 1937)

Switzerland (August 30th, 1937)

Signature ad referendum.

THE NETHERLANDS

The Arrangement is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The Arrangement came into force on August 4th, 1936, in accordance with its Article 10. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXI, p. 75.

XLIV. BROADCASTING.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING THE USE OF BROADCASTING IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE.[1]

(Geneva, September 23rd, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Australia (June 25th, 1937 *a*)
Including the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (August 18th, 1937)
India (August 11th, 1937)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Argentine Republic
Austria
Belgium
Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.
Brazil
Chile
Colombia
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Egypt
Estonia
France
Greece
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Mexico
The Netherlands
New Zealand
Norway
Roumania
Spain
Under reservation of the declaration mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.
Uruguay

The Convention is open to accession by :

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
IRISH FREE STATE
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, in conformity with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, sixty days after the receipt by him of the sixth ratification or accession. The Convention shall enter into force on the day of such registration. (Article 11.)

XLV. — INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS.[1]

(*a*)

1. Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA [2]	June 12th, 1924
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM	September 6th, 1926
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CANADA	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	September 20th, 1934
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
FRANCE [3]	June 2nd, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
ITALY [4]	October 6th, 1924
LATVIA [5]	August 15th, 1925
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN [6]	February 22nd, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

2. Convention concerning unemployment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	February 20th, 1924
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BELGIUM [7]	August 25th, 1930
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
DENMARK	October 13th, 1921
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FINLAND	October 19th, 1921
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925

---

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning: The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of White Phosphorus in the Manufacture of Matches, Berne, September 26th, 1906.

The Annex to the Report on the Work of the League for the year 1935/36 (A.6(*a*).1936. Annex I. (V)) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Amendment to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles and to the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace, Geneva, November 2nd, 1922, and the Protocol relative to this Amendment, Geneva, June 14th, 1923. (See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIX, pages 35 and 39.)

[2] "As regards Austria, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified by those European Members of the International Labour Organisation which are of the chief industrial importance (Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy) and by all the States, bordering upon Austria, with whom the latter has economic relations (Yugoslavia, Poland, Switzerland, the Czechoslovak Republic and Hungary) . . .".

[3] This ratification is subject to the condition that the obligations it entails for France shall not take effect until the Convention has been ratified by Germany and Great Britain.

[4] Subject to the condition that it shall only come into force when the ratifications, without reservations or other conditions, of the following Members of the International Labour Organisation have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations: Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Switzerland.

[5] "The Convention shall come into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Draft Convention, after the ratifications of three of the Powers which are of the chief industrial importance, as laid down in Article 393, paragraphs 5 and 6, of the Treaty of Peace of Versailles, shall have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations."

[6] The reservation by which Spain made its ratification subject to the ratification of Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy was withdrawn on October 1st, 1931.

[7] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	February 6th, 1932
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

3. Convention concerning the employment of women before and after childbirth, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 29th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
GERMANY	October 31st, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

4. Convention concerning the employment of women during the night, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciation*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	November 1st, 1921	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (October 25th, 1935) This denunciation is not to take effect until the revised Convention of 1934 on the same subject shall have come into force.
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932	*Belgium* (August 4th, 1937)
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933	*Brazil* (May 12th, 1937)
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924	*Great Britain and Northern Ireland* (January 25th, 1937)
BELGIUM [1*]	July 12th, 1924	ESTONIA (January 28th, 1936)
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934	GREECE (June 30th, 1936)
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921	*Hungary* (December 18th, 1936)
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922	*Irish Free State* (March 15th, 1937)
CHILE	October 8th, 1931	*The Netherlands* (June 12th, 1937)
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	SWITZERLAND (June 4th, 1936)
CUBA	August 6th, 1928	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921	
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922	
FRANCE	May 14th, 1925	
GREECE	November 19th, 1920	
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928	
INDIA	July 14th, 1921	
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925	
ITALY	April 10th, 1923	
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931	
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928	
THE NETHERLANDS	September 4th, 1922	
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934	
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932	

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

5. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	February 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
JAPAN	August 7th, 1926
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	July 21st, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
Norway	July 7th, 1937
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

6. Convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	May 20th, 1937
THE NETHERLANDS	March 17th, 1924
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL [1]	May 10th, 1932
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

(*b*)

7. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to employment at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA [2]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [3]	February 4th, 1925
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
China	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
IRISH FREE STATE	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	July 14th, 1932
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 26th, 1925
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	May 8th, 1922
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

8. Convention concerning unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA [2]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [3]	February 4th, 1925
GREAT BRITAIN	March 12th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FRANCE	March 21st, 1929
GERMANY	March 4th, 1930
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924

[1] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

[2] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[3] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
LATVIA [1]	August 29th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	May 20th, 1937
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 21st, 1936
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	January 1st, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

9. Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 10th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA	August 3rd, 1925
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 7th, 1922
FRANCE	January 25th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

(*c*)

10. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to employment in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 16th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [2]	June 13th, 1928
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
HUNGARY	February 2nd, 1927
IRISH FREE STATE	May 26th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	December 19th, 1923
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Latvia had ratified this Convention on August 5th, 1926, subject to the following reservation: " The Convention shall enter into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of this Convention, when the States which are of chief importance in maritime commerce shall have sent their ratifications for registration by the Secretariat of the League of Nations." By an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on August 29th, 1930, this reservation was withdrawn.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

11. Convention concerning the rights of association and combination of agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6th, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA	April 27th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DENMARK [2]	June 20th, 1930
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	March 23rd, 1929
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRISH FREE STATE	June 17th, 1924
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	May 20th, 1937
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
THE NETHERLANDS	August 20th, 1926
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

12. Convention concerning workmen's compensation in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1*]	October 26th, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6th, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
DENMARK	February 26th, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
ITALY [3]	September 1st, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	June 17th, 1924
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	August 20th, 1926
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
SPAIN	October 1st, 1931
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Italian colonies and possessions.

13. Convention concerning the use of white lead in painting, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 19th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRIA	June 12th, 1924
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND [2]	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE	February 19th, 1929
GREECE	December 22nd, 1926
HUNGARY [3]	January 4th, 1928
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	December 4th, 1925
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	April 28th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

14. Convention concerning the application of the weekly rest in industrial undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 17th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA [4]	May 17th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DENMARK [5]	August 30th, 1935
ESTONIA	November 29th, 1923
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	September 3rd, 1926
GREECE	May 11th, 1929
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRISH FREE STATE	July 22nd, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
Norway	July 7th, 1937
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
SWITZERLAND [6]	January 16th, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] Effective as from October 1st, 1929.

[3] The Convention shall not come into force as regards Hungary until it has been ratified by France, Great Britain and Germany.

[4] Article I of the Chinese " Amended Factory Laws " promulgated on December 30th, 1932, provides that " this Act shall apply to all factories using machines driven by motor-power and regularly employing thirty workers or more."

[5] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[6] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from September 1st, 1934.

15. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers or stokers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	July 19th, 1926
GREAT BRITAIN	March 8th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
China	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
FRANCE	January 16th, 1928
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	June 14th, 1930
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	November 20th, 1922
IRISH FREE STATE	June 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN [3]	December 4th, 1930
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	June 17th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14th, 1925
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

16. Convention concerning the compulsory medical examination of children and young persons employed at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	July 19th, 1926
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN	March 8th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
China	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
FRANCE	March 22nd, 1928
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	June 28th, 1930
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	November 20th, 1922
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 9th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14th, 1925
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung or the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

(*d*)

17. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	August 21st, 1936
BELGIUM [1*]	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	May 29th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929
SPAIN	February 22nd, 1929
SWEDEN	September 8th, 1926
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

18. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciations*
AUSTRIA	September 29th, 1928	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 29th, 1936)
BELGIUM [1*]	October 3rd, 1927	
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	October 6th, 1926	*Irish Free State* (March 15th, 1937)
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929	*Sweden* (February 24th, 1937)
CHILE	May 31st, 1933	
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	
CUBA	August 6th, 1928	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	September 19th, 1932	
DENMARK	June 18th, 1934	
FINLAND	September 17th, 1927	
FRANCE	August 13th, 1931	
GERMANY	September 18th, 1928	
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928	
INDIA [3]	September 30th, 1927	
IRISH FREE STATE	November 25th, 1927	
ITALY [4]	January 22nd, 1934	
JAPAN [5]	October 8th, 1928	
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929	
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928	
THE NETHERLANDS	November 1st, 1928	
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934	
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929	
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929	
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932	
SWEDEN	October 15th, 1929	
SWITZERLAND	November 16th, 1927	
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933	
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927	

---

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[*] As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] Subject to subsequent decisions as regards the application of the Convention to the Italian Colonies and Possessions.

[5] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

19. Convention concerning equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 5th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Union of South Africa	March 30th, 1926
Austria	September 29th, 1928
Belgium [1]	October 3rd, 1927
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	October 6th, 1926
Bulgaria	September 5th, 1929
Chile	October 8th, 1931
China	April 27th, 1934
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 6th, 1928
Czechoslovakia	February 8th, 1927
Denmark [2]	March 31st, 1928
Finland	September 17th, 1927
France	April 4th, 1928
Estonia	April 14th, 1930
Germany	September 18th, 1928
Greece	May 30th, 1936
Hungary	April 19th, 1928
India [3]	September 30th, 1927
Irish Free State	July 5th, 1930
Italy	March 15th, 1928
Japan [4]	October 8th, 1928
Latvia	May 29th, 1928
Lithuania	September 28th, 1934
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	May 12th, 1934
The Netherlands	September 13th, 1927
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Norway	June 11th, 1929
Poland	February 28th, 1928
Portugal [5]	March 27th, 1929
Spain	February 22nd, 1929
Sweden	September 8th, 1926
Switzerland	February 1st, 1929
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933
Yugoslavia	April 1st, 1927

20. Convention concerning night work in bakeries, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 8th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Bulgaria	September 5th, 1929
Chile	May 31st, 1933
Colombia	June 20th, 1933
Cuba	August 6th, 1928
Estonia	December 23rd, 1929
Finland	May 26th, 1928
Irish Free State	March 15th, 1937
Luxemburg	April 16th, 1928
Nicaragua	April 12th, 1934
Spain	August 29th, 1932
Uruguay	June 6th, 1933

(*c*)

21. Convention concerning the simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighth Session on June 5th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Albania	March 17th, 1932
Australia	April 18th, 1931
Austria	December 29th, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[5] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	February 15th, 1928
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	September 16th, 1927
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	May 25th, 1928
FINLAND	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE [3]	January 13th, 1932
HUNGARY	February 3rd, 1931
INDIA	January 14th, 1928
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
JAPAN [4]	October 8th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SWEDEN [5]	October 15th, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*f*)

22. Convention concerning seamen's articles of agreement, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 24th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [6]	April 1st, 1935
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
China	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	May 10th, 1929
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	September 20th, 1930
INDIA	October 31st, 1932
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

23. Convention concerning the repatriation of seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 23rd, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
China	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	July 9th, 1928
FRANCE	March 4th, 1929
GERMANY	March 14th, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] As regards Great Britain and Northern Ireland, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by France, Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Norway and Spain.

[3] The ratification of this Convention will only take effect as regards France from the date on which the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall have registered the ratifications without reservation of Poland, Spain and Italy.

[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[5] As regards Sweden, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by Denmark, Finland and Norway.

[6] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[7] This ratification applies also to the Italian colonies.

(g)

24. Convention concerning sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 18th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 28th, 1929
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

25. Convention concerning sickness insurance for agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 18th, 1929
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(h)

26. Convention concerning the creation of minimum-wage-fixing machinery, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eleventh Session on June 16th, 1928.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	December 28th, 1932
AUSTRALIA	March 9th, 1931
Belgium [1]	August 11th, 1937
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	June 4th, 1935
CANADA	April 25th, 1935
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	May 5th, 1930
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	February 24th, 1936
FRANCE	September 18th, 1930
GERMANY	May 30th, 1929
HUNGARY	July 30th, 1932
ITALY	September 9th, 1930
IRISH FREE STATE	June 3rd, 1930
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
The Netherlands	November 10th, 1936
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 7th, 1933
SPAIN	April 8th, 1930
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Including the Belgian Congo and the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

(*i*)

27. Convention concerning the marking of the weight on heavy packages transported by vessels, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session on June 21st, 1929.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA[1]	February 21st, 1933
AUSTRALIA[2]	March 9th, 1931
AUSTRIA	August 16th, 1935
BELGIUM[3]	June 6th, 1934
BULGARIA	June 4th, 1935
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	June 24th, 1931
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	March 26th, 1934
DENMARK[4]	January 18th, 1933
ESTONIA	January 18th, 1932
FINLAND[5]	August 8th, 1932
FRANCE	July 29th, 1935
GERMANY	July 5th, 1933
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
INDIA	September 7th, 1931
ITALY	July 18th, 1933
JAPAN[6]	March 16th, 1931
LITHUANIA	September 28th, 1934
LUXEMBURG	April 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	January 4th, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
POLAND	June 18th, 1932
PORTUGAL[7]	March 1st, 1932
ROUMANIA	December 7th, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	April 11th, 1932
SWITZERLAND[8]	November 8th, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	December 17th, 1932
YUGOSLAVIA	April 22nd, 1933

28. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session on June 21st, 1929.[9]

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
IRISH FREE STATE	July 5th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 1st, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN[10]	August 29th, 1932

---

[1] The ratification by the Union of South Africa shall not take effect unless and until the ratifications of Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy have been registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in terms of Article 406 of the Treaty of Versailles.

[2] The Convention applies to the Territory Nauru.

[3] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[4] This ratification does not include Greenland.

The Danish Government makes the entry into force of the Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being also ratified by Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy and The Netherlands.

[5] This Convention shall be put into force in Finland as from January 1st, 1933.

[6] This ratification includes Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[7] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

[8] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from October 1st, 1934.

[9] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1932 involves, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirement of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 21 of the present Convention. The present Convention has ceased to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1932 (October 30th, 1934). It remains, nevertheless, in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

[10] This Convention is denounced as regards Spain as from October 30th, 1934, date of the coming into force of the revising Convention of 1932, Spain having ratified the latter Convention on July 28th, 1934.

(j)

29. Convention concerning forced or compulsory labour, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [1]	January 2nd, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	June 3rd, 1931
BULGARIA	September 22nd, 1932
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
DENMARK	February 11th, 1932
FINLAND	January 13th, 1936
France [3]	June 24th, 1937
IRISH FREE STATE	March 2nd, 1931
ITALY	June 18th, 1934
JAPAN [4]	November 21st, 1932
LIBERIA	May 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934

[1] This ratification applies also to the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and to the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland is accompanied with a Declaration, as provided for in Article 26 of the Convention, that the provisions of the Convention shall be applied without modification to the following Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under mandate:

Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (including Turks and Caïcos Islands and the Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher and Nevis
Virgin Islands
Malay States:
(*a*) Federated Malay States:
Negri Sembilan
Pahang
Perak
Selangor
(*b*) Unfederated Malay States:
Johore
Kedah
Kelantan
Perlis
Trengganu
Brunei
Malta
Mauritius
Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine
St. Helena and Ascension
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
South Africa High Commission, Territories of the:
Basutoland
Bechuanaland Protectorate
Swaziland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Trans-Jordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Western Pacific, Islands of:
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
Tonga
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar Protectorate

The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland applies also to:
Newfoundland, November 13th, 1931, and to Southern Rhodesia, March 20th, 1933.

[3] 1. France intends to apply the provisions of the Convention with certain modifications to the following territories only:

French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Indo-China, Madagascar, French Settlements in Oceania, New Caledonia, territories under B mandate.

The modifications in question apply to the following provisions of the Convention:

(a) *Article 2, second paragraph (letter a).* This provision should be applied as if it did not contain the words " for work of a purely military character ".

(b) *Article 10.* The provisions of this article shall not be applied as regards forced or compulsory labour exacted as a tax.

(c) *Article 12, first paragraph.* This clause shall not be applied where recourse is had to forced or compulsory labour for the execution of public works for the benefit of the community as a whole.

(d) *Article 19.* This clause shall not be applied in the case of cultivation for the purpose of experimental agricultural instruction.

2. France reserves her decision as regards the following territories:

Morocco, Tunisia and the States of the Levant under French mandate.

[4] This ratification applies also to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
THE NETHERLANDS [1]	March 31st, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
YUGOSLAVIA	March 4th, 1933

30. Convention concerning the regulation of hours of work in commerce and offices, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA [2]	February 16th, 1933
BULGARIA	June 22nd, 1932
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CUBA	February 24th, 1936
FINLAND	January 13th, 1936
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*k*)

31. Convention limiting hours of work in coal-mines, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fifteenth Session on June 18th, 1931 [3].

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932

(*l*)

32. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (revised 1932), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 27th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	January 10th, 1935
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CHINA	November 30th, 1935
ITALY	October 30th, 1933
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
SPAIN	July 28th, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

---

[1] I. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention integrally in the Kingdom in Europe, in Surinam and in Curaçao;

II. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention to the Netherlands Indies with the following modifications:

(*a*) Article 3 will not be applied; nevertheless, the competent central authorities will be responsible for the employment of forced or compulsory labour;

(*b*) Article 4 will not be applied to services rendered to owners by persons living in the so-called " particuliere landerijen " in the Island of Java.

[2] The ratification by Austria shall only become effective from the date on which the Secretary-General shall have registered the ratification of Germany.

[3] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1935 shall involve, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirements of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 20 of the present Convention. The present Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1935. It shall remain nevertheless in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

33. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to non-industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 30th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	June 6th, 1934
CUBA	February 24th, 1936
THE NETHERLANDS	July 12th, 1935
SPAIN	June 22nd, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(m)

34. Convention concerning fee-charging employment agencies, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
FINLAND	January 13th, 1936
SPAIN	April 27th, 1935
SWEDEN	January 1st, 1936

35. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

36. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

37. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

---

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate

38. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

39. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936

40. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936

41. Convention concerning employment of women during the night (revised 1934), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 19th, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	May 28th, 1935
Belgium	August 4th, 1937.
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	January 25th, 1937
ESTONIA	December 21st, 1935
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
Hungary	December 18th, 1936
INDIA	November 22nd, 1935
Irish Free State	March 15th, 1937
THE NETHERLANDS	December 9th, 1935
SWITZERLAND	June 4th, 1936

42. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases (revised 1934), adopted as Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRIA	February 26th, 1936
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	April 29th, 1936
Cuba	October 22nd, 1936
HUNGARY	June 17th, 1935
Irish Free State	March 15th, 1937
JAPAN[1]	June 6th, 1936
Mexico	May 20th, 1937
NORWAY	May 21st, 1935
Sweden	February 24th, 1937

[1] The Japanese Government intend to apply the above-mentioned Convention, in so far as mining industries are concerned, also to Taiwan and Karafuto.

43. Convention for the regulation of hours of work in automatic sheet-glass works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Belgium [1]	August 4th, 1937
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	January 13th, 1937
NORWAY	May 21st, 1935

44. Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily unemployed, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 23rd, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	April 29th, 1936
Irish Free State	June 10th, 1937

(o)

45. Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
Afghanistan	May 14th, 1937
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	June 25th, 1936
Austria	July 3rd, 1937
Belgium [1]	August 4th, 1937
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
China	December 2nd, 1936
CUBA	April 14th, 1936
Estonia	June 4th, 1937
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
IRISH FREE STATE	August 20th, 1936
The Netherlands	February 20th, 1937
SWEDEN	July 11th, 1936

46. Convention limiting hours of work in coal mines (revised 1935), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
CUBA	April 14th, 1936

47. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work to forty a week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

[1] Excluding the Belgian Congo and the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

48. Convention concerning the establishment of an international scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Spain	July 8th, 1937
Hungary	August 10th, 1937

49. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in glass-bottle works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 25th, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
NORWAY	July 21st, 1936
Irish Free State	June 10th, 1937

(*p*)

50. Convention concerning the regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session on June 20th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Norway	July 7th, 1937

51. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session on June 23rd, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

52. Convention concerning annual holidays with pay, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session on June 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

(*q*)

53. Convention concerning the minimum requirement of professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant ships, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Norway	July 7th, 1937

54. Convention concerning annual holidays with pay for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

55. Convention concerning the liability of the shipowner in case of sickness, injury or death of seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

56. Convention concerning sickness insurance for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

57. Convention concerning hours of work on board ship and manning, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

(r)

58. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of children to employment at sea (revised 1936), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-second Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Norway	July 7th, 1937

(s)

59. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment (revised 1937), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 22nd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

60. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (revised 1937), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 22nd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

61. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in the textile industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 22nd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

62. Convention concerning safety provisions in the building industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 23rd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: A. 20. 1937. V.

385

Geneva, September 8th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Results of the Seventh Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL.
1937. V. 5.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

Under the Assembly resolution of October 3rd, 1930, it is the duty of the Secretary-General :

(a) (Point I of the resolution) :

Annually to ask those Members of the League and non-member States which, having signed a Convention concluded under the League's auspices, have not ratified it within one year from the date at which it ceased to be open for signature, to inform him of their intentions with regard to ratification ; and

(b) (Point II of the resolution) :

At such intervals as he considers suitable, to ask those Members of the League which have neither signed nor acceded to Conventions concluded under the League's auspices within five years from the date at which they became open for signature to inform him of their views with regard to those Conventions.

In the present year, the Secretary-General has taken action under both points of the above-mentioned resolution.

* * *

The present document contains the replies received by the Secretary-General to these two enquiries.

This document is in continuation of documents A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V and A.22.1936.V.

PART I.

(Point I of the Assembly Resolution of October 3rd, 1930).

RATIFICATION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND NON-MEMBER STATES OF CONVENTIONS SIGNED BY THEM BUT NOT RATIFIED WITHIN ONE YEAR FROM THE EXPIRY OF THE TIME-LIMIT FOR SIGNING SUCH CONVENTIONS.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON FREEDOM OF TRANSIT.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, Guatemala, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Belgium, Bolivia, Estonia, Guatemala, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, Colombia.

ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1933.V :

Belgium, Peru, Portugal, Spain.

3168. — S.d.N. 990 (F). 765 (A). 9/37. — Imp. Réunies, Chambéry.

DECLARATION RECOGNISING THE RIGHT TO A FLAG OF STATES HAVING NO SEA-COAST.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, Guatemala, Iran, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V AND A.13.1934.V :

Costa Rica, Panama, Peru.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF, AND TRAFFIC IN, OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Costa Rica, France, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Haiti, Honduras.

PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

India.

The Indian Arbitration Act, 1937 embodies the legislation required to implement the Government of India's obligations under this Protocol and the Convention of 1927 on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards. The early ratification of both these instruments on behalf of India is at present under consideration. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Bolivia, Chile, Free City of Danzig, Latvia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Paraguay.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL RELATING THERETO.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Chile, Japan, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Paraguay.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

Brazil will not ratify this Convention. (Letter of May 5th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Bulgaria, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Panama, Portugal, Salvador, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China, Colombia.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF MARITIME PORTS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

Brazil will not ratify this Convention. (Letter of May 5th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Bulgaria, Chile, Lithuania, Panama, Salvador, Spain, Uruguay.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE TRANSMISSION IN TRANSIT OF ELECTRIC POWER, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, France, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE STATE, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, France, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION ADOPTED BY THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Albania, Argentine Republic, Iran, Nicaragua.

CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

With regard to this Convention, the Government of Finland sees no reason to change the attitude of strict reserve previously adopted by it. (Letter of June 26th, 1937.)
(See documents A.30.1931.V and A.17.1935.V.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria,
Belgium,
Brazil,
Chile,
Czechoslovakia,
Estonia,
Germany,
Hungary,
India,
Italy,
Japan,
Luxemburg,
Norway,
Roumania,
Salvador,
Switzerland,
Uruguay,
Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia, **Siam.**

DECLARATION REGARDING THE TERRITORY OF IFNI.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

With regard to this Declaration, the Government of Finland sees no reason to change the attitude of strict reserve previously adopted by it. (Letter of June 26th, 1937.)
(See documents A.30.1931.V and A.17.1935.V.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria,
Belgium,
Brazil,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
Bulgaria,
Canada,
Chile,
Czechoslovakia,
Estonia,
India,
Italy,
Japan,
Latvia,
Luxemburg,
Roumania,
Salvador,
Switzerland,
Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia.

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS AND OTHER GASES AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

United States of America,
Brazil,
Czechoslovakia,
Japan,
Nicaragua,
Salvador,
Uruguay.

CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

The Government of Finland does not at present see any reason to modify its attitude of reserve, already announced, regarding this Convention. (Letter of June 26th, 1937.)
(See documents A.30.1931.V and A.17.1935.V.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Albania, Colombia, Iran, Panama, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Lithuania.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Brazil.

This Convention was submitted to the Congress, which decided, at its meeting on July 17th, 1935, not to approve it. (Letter of May 5th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Guatemala, Latvia, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia.

CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

India.

The Indian Arbitration Act, 1937 embodies the legislation required to implement the Government of India's obligations under the Protocol of 1923 on arbitration clauses, and the present Convention. The early ratification of both these instruments on behalf of India is at present under consideration. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Bolivia, Free City of Danzig, Nicaragua, Peru.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF HIDES AND SKINS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Bulgaria, Turkey.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF BONES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Bulgaria, Turkey.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

The Government of Finland proposes to ratify this Convention with the assent of the Chamber of Representatives. The necessary legislative measures are at present in course of preparation. (Letter of June 26th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Belgium,
Brazil,
Free City of Danzig,
Estonia,
Germany,
Hungary,
Japan,
Luxemburg,
Yugoslavia.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.30.1931.V, A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Albania,
United States of America,
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
France,
India,
Japan,
Luxemburg,
Panama,
Roumania,
Switzerland.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

China.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.30.1931.V :

Free City of Danzig, **Hungary,** **Switzerland.**

CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Australia.

The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia has passed an Act, which came into force on April 1st, 1937, to give effect to the provisions of this Convention. Copies of this Act were transmitted to the Secretariat. The matter is now under consideration in connection with the application of the Convention to the external territories of the Commonwealth and it is anticipated that ratification will be proceeded with at an early date. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Belgium.

A Bill to approve this Convention was introduced in the Chamber of Representatives on February 9th, 1937. (Letter of April 5th, 1937.)

Irish Free State.

In view of the passing into law of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act (1935), the Government of the Irish Free State has now under consideration the ratification of this Convention. (Letter of June 25th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Union of South Africa,
Austria,
Chile,
Cuba,
Czechoslovakia,
Free City of Danzig,
Denmark,
Estonia,
France,
Germany,
Greece,
Hungary,
Iceland,
Italy,
Japan,
Latvia,
Luxemburg,
Mexico,
Peru,
Portugal,
Switzerland.
Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, **Egypt,** **Salvador,** **Spain,** **Yugoslavia.**

PROTOCOL RELATING TO MILITARY OBLIGATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES OF DOUBLE NATIONALITY.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill to approve this Protocol was introduced in the Chamber of Representatives on February 9th, 1937. (Letter of April 5th, 1937.)

Irish Free State.

In view of the passing into law of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act (1935), the Government of the Irish Free State has now under consideration the ratification of this Protocol. (Letter of June 25th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria, **Canada,** **Chile,** **Denmark,** **France,** **Germany,** **Greece,** **Luxemburg,** **Mexico,** **Peru,** **Portugal,** **Uruguay.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Egypt, **Spain.**

PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Irish Free State.

In view of the passing into law of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act (1935), the Government of the Irish Free State has now under consideration the ratification of this Protocol. (Letter of June 25th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Belgium, **Canada,** **Cuba,** **Czechoslovakia,** **Free City of Danzig,** **Denmark,** **Estonia,** **France,** **Greece,** **Japan,** **Latvia,** **Luxemburg,** **Mexico,** **Peru,** **Portugal,** **Uruguay.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, **Egypt,** **Spain.**

SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill to approve this Protocol was introduced in the Chamber of Representatives on February 9th, 1937. (Letter of April 5th, 1937.)

Irish Free State.

In view of the passing into law of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act (1935), the Government of the Irish Free State has now under consideration the ratification of this Protocol. (Letter of June 25th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Austria, Canada, Cuba, Greece, Luxemburg, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Egypt, Spain.

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.25.1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxemburg, Peru, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, Spain, Turkey.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Union of South Africa, Estonia, Germany, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Cuba.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.17.1933.V :

Germany.

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Cuba.

CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The reply of the Netherlands Government concerning the Bill to approve this Convention was submitted to the Second Chamber on February 11th, 1937. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Poland.

The ratification of this Convention is not contemplated for the moment. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936. V :

Austria, **Belgium,** **Czechoslovakia,** **Free City of Danzig,** **France,** **Germany,** **Hungary,** **Roumania,** **Switzerland.** **Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, **Luxemburg.**

CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *IN REM* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The reply of the Netherlands Government concerning the Bill to approve this Convention was submitted to the Second Chamber on February 15th, 1937. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Poland.

The ratification of this Convention is not contemplated for the moment. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria, **Belgium,** **Czechoslovakia,** **Free City of Danzig,** **France,** **Germany,** **Hungary,** **Switzerland,** **Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, **Luxemburg.**

CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Poland.

The ratification of this Convention is not contemplated for the moment. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Belgium, **Czechoslovakia,** **France,** **Hungary,** **Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Italy, **Luxemburg.**

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill to approve the three Conventions on Cheques was passed by the Chamber of Representatives at meetings held on February 6th and 7th, 1935. The Senate, to which the Bill has been submitted, has not yet announced its decision. (Letter of April 5th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria,	**Hungary,**	**Spain,**
Czechoslovakia,	**Mexico,**	**Turkey,**
Ecuador,	**Roumania,**	**Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill to approve the three Conventions on Cheques was passed by the Chamber of Representatives at meetings held on February 6th and 7th, 1935. The Senate, to which the Bill has been submitted, has not yet announced its decision. (Letter of April 5th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria,	**Hungary,**	**Spain,**
Czechoslovakia,	**Mexico,**	**Turkey,**
Ecuador,	**Roumania,**	**Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

A Bill to approve the three Conventions on Cheques was passed by the Chamber of Representatives at meetings held on February 6th and 7th, 1935. The Senate, to which the Bill has been submitted, has not yet announced its decision. (Letter of April 5th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Austria, **Hungary,** **Spain,**
Czechoslovakia, **Mexico,** **Turkey,**
Ecuador, **Roumania,** **Yugoslavia.**

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Luxemburg.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Belgium, **Free City of Danzig,** **Germany,**
Czechoslovakia, **Denmark,** **Yugoslavia.**

CONVENTION ON THE TAXATION OF FOREIGN MOTOR VEHICLES, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Czechoslovakia, **Free City of Danzig.**

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY IT TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V :

Yugoslavia.

CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V AND A.22.1936.V :

Argentine Republic, **Bolivia,** **Liberia.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ethiopia, **Paraguay.**

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Australia.

The subject matter of this Convention falls within the jurisdiction of the several States of Australia as regards their territorial waters. The Commonwealth Parliament has already enacted legislation embodying the provisions of the Convention, and the States have agreed to adopt similar legislation so far as they are concerned. As soon as this State legislation has been adopted, the Commonwealth Government proposes to proceed with ratification of the Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO PREVIOUS ENQUIRIES AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A.13.1934.V AND A.17.1935.V:

Albania, **Greece,** **Roumania.**
Belgium, **India,**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Colombia, **Germany.**

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Finland.

The Government of Finland has already submitted a proposal to the Chamber of Representatives requesting the latter's assent to the ratification of this Convention. (Letter of June 26th, 1937.)

Poland.

The deposit of the instrument of ratification of this Convention is expected to take place shortly. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO THE PREVIOUS ENQUIRY AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.22.1936.V :

France, **Uruguay.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, **United States of America,** **Panama.**

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Further consideration of the legislation necessary to enable this Convention to be ratified in respect of the United Kingdom is in suspense pending the outcome of the discussions in regard to the draft Convention for the Suppression of the Exploitation of Prostitution, which is at present under consideration by the competent organs of the League. (Letter of July 12th, 1937.)

Monaco.

The ratification of this Convention can take place as soon as the work, at present being carried out, of bringing Monegasque legislation into harmony with the provisions of this Convention is completed. (Letter of May 15th, 1937.)

Poland.

The deposit of the instrument of ratification of this Convention is expected to take place shortly. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE NOT MODIFIED THE REPLIES GIVEN BY THEM TO THE PREVIOUS ENQUIRY AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.22.1936.V :

Free City of Danzig, **France.**

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, **Germany,** **Panama,** **Yugoslavia.**
China, **Lithuania,** **Spain,**

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS NOT MODIFIED THE REPLY GIVEN BY IT TO THE PREVIOUS ENQUIRY AND CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT A.22.1936.V :

Egypt.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS, WITH DECLARATION ATTACHED.

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic regrets that it is not at present in a position to define its attitude concerning the ratification of this Convention, as the competent authorities have not yet been able to reach a final decision in this matter. (Letter of July 13th, 1937.)

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention was introduced in the Chamber of Deputies in November 1936. The Bill has not yet come up for discussion. (Letter of June 11th, 1937.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention is in preparation. As Netherlands legislation will have to be modified in order to conform with the three veterinary Conventions, the preparatory work is not yet finished. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Poland.

This Convention is still being examined by the competent authorities. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

Switzerland.

The Federal Council will ratify this Convention when the States bordering on Switzerland have definitely accepted it. (Letter of February 25th, 1937.)

Turkey.

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey ratified this Convention by a Law dated June 11th, 1937. The instrument of ratification will be deposited with the Secretariat in the near future. (Letter of August 14th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The deposit of the instrument of ratification of this Convention is expected to take place shortly. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria. **Italy,** **Spain.**
Greece, **Roumania,**

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING THE TRANSIT OF ANIMALS, MEAT AND OTHER PRODUCTS OF ANIMAL ORIGIN, WITH ANNEX.

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic regrets that it is not at present in a position to define its attitude concerning the ratification of this Convention, as the competent authorities have not yet been able to reach a final decision in this matter. (Letter of July 13th, 1937.)

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention was introduced in the Chamber of Deputies in November 1936. The Bill has not yet come up for discussion. (Letter of June 11th, 1937.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention is in preparation. As the Netherlands legislation will have to be modified in order to conform with the three veterinary Conventions, the preparatory work is not yet finished. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Poland.

This Convention is still being examined by the competent authorities. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

Switzerland.

The Federal Council will ratify this Convention when the States bordering on Switzerland have definitely accepted it. (Letter of February 25th, 1937.)

Turkey.

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey ratified this Convention by a Law dated June 11th, 1937. The instrument of ratification will be deposited with the Secretariat in the near future. (Letter of August 14th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The deposit of the instrument of ratification of this Convention is expected to take place shortly. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, **Greece,** **Roumania,**
Bulgaria, **Italy,** **Spain.**

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXPORT AND IMPORT OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS (OTHER THAN MEAT, MEAT PREPARATIONS, FRESH ANIMAL PRODUCTS, MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS), WITH ANNEX.

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Czechoslovakia.

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic regrets that it is not at present in a position to define its attitude concerning the ratification of this Convention, as the competent authorities have not yet been able to reach a final decision in this matter. (Letter of July 13th, 1937.)

France.

A Bill for the ratification of this Convention was introduced in the Chamber of Deputies in November 1936. The Bill has not yet come up for discussion. (Letter of June 11th, 1937.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention is in preparation. As the Netherlands legislation will have to be modified in order to conform with the three veterinary Conventions, the preparatory work is not yet finished. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Poland.

This Convention is still being examined by the competent authorities. (Letter of June 30th, 1937.)

Switzerland.

The Federal Council will ratify this convention when the States bordering on Switzerland have definitely accepted it. (Letter of February 25th, 1937.)

Turkey.

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey ratified this Convention by a Law dated June 11th, 1937. The instrument of ratification will be deposited with the Secretariat in the near future. (Letter of August 14th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The deposit of the instrument of ratification of this Convention is expected to take place shortly. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria, **Greece,** **Roumania,**
Bulgaria, **Italy,** **Spain.**

PART II.

(Point II of the Assembly Resolution of October 3rd, 1930).

SIGNATURE OR ACCESSION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN THE CASE OF CONVENTIONS WHICH THEY HAVE NOT SIGNED OR TO WHICH THEY HAVE NOT ACCEDED WITHIN A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE ON WHICH THE CONVENTIONS BECAME OPEN FOR SIGNATURE.

CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT ON NATIONALITY LAWS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Convention in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Convention is still being studied by the competent authorities, who are considering whether Finland can accede to it. The said authorities have not yet reached a definite decision in the matter, in view of the fact that the Convention contains certain provisions which are not in conformity with the legislation in force, or are of little importance to Finland. Their hesitation has been increased by the fact that the position with regard to the questions dealt with in the said Convention is still very vague in many other countries. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Convention has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Guatemala,**	**Liberia,**	**Roumania,**
Argentine Republic,	**Haiti,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Bolivia,	**Honduras,**	**New Zealand,**	**Turkey,**
Bulgaria,	**Iran,**	**Panama,**	**Venezuela.**
Ethiopia,	**Iraq,**	**Paraguay,**	

PROTOCOL RELATING TO MILITARY OBLIGATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES OF DOUBLE NATIONALITY.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Protocol has not been fully considered by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Czechoslovakia.

As a Bill dealing with the acquisition and loss of nationality is at present under examination, the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic can only consider the question of accession to this Protocol in conformity with the final text of the Czechoslovak law now being examined, and taking into account the attitude towards this Protocol of certain European countries, especially those which are neighbours of Czechoslovakia. (Letter of July 12th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Protocol. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Protocol in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Estonia.

The provisions of this Protocol have been practically applied by the Estonian law on nationality ; official accession would only be requisite if a large number of countries had ratified it ; up to the present there have been only ten accessions to the Protocol, enabling it to come into force on May 25th, 1937. Only two of those accessions were by European countries. Estonia prefers not to consider acceding to the Protocol until it becomes effective in the case of neighbouring countries and the most important European States. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Protocol is still being studied by the competent authorities, who are considering whether Finland can accede to it. The said authorities have not yet reached a definite decision in the matter, in view of the fact that the Protocol contains certain provisions which are not in conformity with the legislation in force, or are of little importance to Finland. Their hesitation has been increased by the fact that the position with regard to the questions dealt with in the said Protocol is still very vague in many other countries. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

Hungary.

Hungary does not at present contemplate the possibility of acceding to this Protocol. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Protocol has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government is not in a position to accede to this Protocol, in view of the modifications in Norwegian legislation which such accession would render necessary. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Poland.

The Polish Government does not intend to accede to this Protocol. (Letter of April 14th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Protocol is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
Argentine Republic,
Bolivia,
Bulgaria,
China,
Ethiopia,
Guatemala,
Haiti,
Honduras,
Iran,
Iraq,
Italy,
Latvia,
Liberia,
Lithuania,
New Zealand,
Panama,
Paraguay,
Roumania,
Siam,
Switzerland,
Turkey,
Venezuela,
Yugoslavia.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Protocol has not been fully considered by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Austria.

The Austrian Government could only consider acceding to this Protocol if the majority of neighbouring countries were to accede to it. (Letter of July 12th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Protocol. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Protocol in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Protocol is still being studied by the competent authorities, who are considering whether Finland can accede to it. The said authorities have not yet reached a definite decision in the matter, in view of the fact that the Protocol contains certain provisions which are not in conformity with the legislation in force, or are of little importance to Finland. Their hesitation has been increased by the fact that the position with regard to the questions dealt with in the said Protocol is still very vague in many other countries. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

Hungary.

Hungary does not at present contemplate the possibility of acceding to this Protocol. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Protocol has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government is not in a position to accede to this Protocol, in view of the modifications in Norwegian legislation which such accession would render necessary. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Sweden.

As the contents of this Protocol are not compatible with the principles of Swedish legislation, the Swedish Government does not at present contemplate acceding to it. (Letter of July 21st, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Protocol is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Liberia, Lithuania, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Roumania, Siam, Switzerland. Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan,

As this Protocol has not been fully considered by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Czechoslovakia.

As a Bill dealing with the acquisition and loss of nationality is at present under examination, the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic can only consider accession to this Protocol in conformity with the final text of the Czechoslovak law now being examined, and taking into account the attitude towards this Protocol of certain European countries, especially those which are neighbours of Czechoslovakia. (Letter of July 12th, 1937.)

Denmark.

Denmark does not consider that, in the circumstances, it is in a position to accede to this Protocol. (Letter of August 20th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Protocol. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Protocol in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Estonia.

The provisions of this Protocol have been practically applied by the Estonian law on nationality ; official accession would only be requisite if a large number of countries had ratified it. As there have been only seven accessions to the Protocol up to the present, it is unlikely that it will come into force in the near future. Moreover, only one European country has acceded. Estonia prefers not to consider acceding to the Protocol until it becomes effective in the case of neighbouring countries and the most important European States. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Protocol is still being studied by the competent authorities, who are considering whether Finland can accede to it. The said authorities have not yet reached a definite decision in the matter, in view of the fact that the Protocol contains certain provisions which are not in conformity with the legislation in force, or are of little importance to Finland. Their hesitation has been increased by the fact that the position with regard to the questions dealt with in the said Protocol is still very vague in many other countries. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

France.

The French Government has not changed its point of view concerning this Protocol and does not see its way to acceding to it. (Letter of June 29th, 1937.)

Hungary.

Hungary does not at present contemplate the possibility of acceding to this Protocol. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

The Netherlands.

The Netherlands Government has refrained from signing this Protocol because it regards as undesirable the partial regulation of obligatory repatriation as provided for in the Protocol. The Netherlands Government has not changed its opinion in this matter, and therefore does not intend to give its subsequent accession to the Protocol. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Protocol has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government is not in a position to accede to this Protocol in view of the modifications in Norwegian legislation which such accession would render necessary. Further, the competent Norwegian authorities consider that the provisions of this Protocol are incomplete and lacking in clarity. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Poland.

The Polish Government does not intend to accede to this Protocol. (Letter of April 14th, 1937.)

Sweden.

As the contents of this Protocol are not compatible with the principles of Swedish legislation, the Swedish Government does not at present contemplate acceding to it. (Letter of July 21st, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Protocol is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Guatemala,**	**Latvia,**	**Roumania,**
Argentine Republic,	**Haiti,**	**Liberia,**	**Siam,**
Bolivia,	**Honduras,**	**Lithuania,**	**Switzerland.**
Bulgaria,	**Iran,**	**New Zealand,**	**Turkey,**
Chile,	**Iraq,**	**Panama,**	**Venezuela,**
Ethiopia,	**Italy,**	**Paraguay,**	**Yugoslavia.**

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully considered by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have not yet completed their examination in regard to this Convention, and a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General as soon as the investigation has been completed. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The Commonwealth of Australia is not prepared at present to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

It is not possible for His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to accede to this Convention, on account of the fundamental differences between English and continental law in these matters. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Estonia.

As the competent bodies in Estonia have decided, in principle, to accede to this Convention, an official ratification will be sent to the Secretary-General as soon as the preliminary work is completed. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India has had no occasion to consider the question of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Convention has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Cuba,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Paraguay.**
Argentine Republic,	**Ethiopia,**	**Latvia,**	**Roumania**
Bolivia,	**Guatemala,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Bulgaria,	**Haiti,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Canada,	**Honduras,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay,**
Chile,	**Iran,**	**New Zealand,**	**Venezuela.**
China,	**Iraq,**	**Panama,**	

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have not yet completed their examination in regard to this Convention, and a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General as soon as the investigation has been completed. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The Commonwealth of Australia is not prepared at present to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

It is not possible for His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to accede to this Convention, on account of the fundamental differences between English and continental law in these matters. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Estonia.

As the competent bodies in Estonia have decided, in principle, to accede to this Convention, an official ratification will be sent to the Secretary-General as soon as the preliminary work is completed. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India has had no occasion to consider the question of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Convention has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Cuba,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Paraguay,**
Argentine Republic,	**Ethiopia,**	**Latvia,**	**Roumania,**
Bolivia,	**Guatemala,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Bulgaria,	**Haiti,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Canada,	**Honduras,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay,**
Chile,	**Iran,**	**New Zealand,**	**Venezuela.**
China,	**Iraq,**	**Panama,**	

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have not yet completed their examination in regard to this Convention, and a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General as soon as the investigation has been completed. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia calls attention to its letter of April 6th, 1937, in which the Commonwealth desires to be allowed the limitation specified in Section " D ", paragraph 1, of the Protocol to this Convention and, if there is no objection on the part of the other signatories, the Commonwealth Government proposes to proceed with ratification. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Estonia.

As the competent bodies in Estonia have decided, in principle, to accede to this Convention, an official ratification will be sent to the Secretary-General as soon as the work of preparation is completed. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India has had no occasion to consider the question of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Convention has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
Argentine Republic,
Bolivia,
Bulgaria,
Canada,
Chile,
China,
Cuba,
Ethiopia,
Greece,
Guatemala,
Haiti,
Honduras,
Iran,
Iraq,
Latvia,
Liberia,
Lithuania,
Mexico,
New Zealand,
Panama,
Paraguay,
Roumania,
Salvador,
Siam,
Uruguay,
Venezuela.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Australia.

With respect to this Agreement, most of the signals covered by the Agreement are the concern in Australia of the State Governments. Shortly before the Agreement was drawn up, the Interstate Conference of Australian Harbour Authorities adopted a uniform system which differed materially from that embodied in the Agreement. The local system has been working satisfactorily for some years, and it is practically certain that the State and Port Authorities would be unwilling to make any change at present.

As regards the provisions of the Agreement in relation to " Warning of Gales ", the issue of such warnings in Australia is the function of the Commonwealth Government Meteorologist, and the existing system of broadcasting warnings by wireless render unnecessary the expense of establishing a system of visual signals. It is proposed, however, to bring this matter before the Permanent Committee of Interstate Harbour Authorities with a view to having it discussed at their next Interstate Conference which is to be held in Hobart next year. (Letter of August 9th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

This Agreement consists of three chapters, namely: (1) Gale warnings, (2) Tide and depth signals, (3) Signals concerning the movements of vessels at the entrances to harbours or important channels.

As regards (1), the Gale Warning Board, at a meeting in May 1931, passed the following resolution :

> " This Board considers :
>
> " *(a)* That there are no definite advantages in the new signals from the point of view of life-saving.
>
> " *(b)* That there are two definite disadvantages in the new signals, namely : that it would be more difficult to forecast with accuracy, and that a larger number of signals would be liable to be confusing.
>
> " *(c)* That a change to the new signals would involve considerable cost.
>
> " The Board knows of no case of a wish being expressed for more information than that already given by the present signals and is therefore of the opinion that the present system of gale warning signals is satisfactory and meets the needs of fishermen and shipping generally."

Proposals (2) and (3) were considered by the Dock and Harbour Authorities' Association in January 1931, and the competent department of His Majesty's Government was subsequently

informed that, in the opinion of the Association, the tide and depth signals were too complicated to be of practical use and that the signals provided in (3) were not necessary. His Majesty's Government therefore do not propose to become a party to this Agreement. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Agreement; should it contemplate such accession it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Agreement. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Denmark.

Denmark does not consider that, in the circumstances, it is in a position to accede to this Agreement. (Letter of August 20th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Agreement. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Agreement in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India have objections to the substance of the Agreement and are therefore unable to accept it. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Agreement has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government regrets that it is obliged to maintain its previous attitude with regard to this Agreement, for the reasons indicated in its letter dated May 13th, 1932, to the Secretary-General. (See document C.465.M.238.1933.VIII—[Appendix], page 43.) (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Haiti,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Argentine Republic,	**Honduras,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Bulgaria,	**Iran,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay,**
Canada,	**Iraq,**	**New Zealand,**	**Venezuela.**
Chile,	**Irish Free State,**	**Panama,**	
Guatemala,	**Italy,**	**Peru,**	

AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

On account of the elevation of the Union's coast, lightships are not necessary and therefore not utilised. The Government of the Union of South Africa do not intend to accede to this Agreement. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

In regard to this Agreement, there are no such lightships in Australia, and consequently the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia does not propose, at present, to take any action in the way of accession to such Agreement. (Letter of August 9th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Agreement ; should it contemplate such accession, it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Agreement. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Agreement. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Agreement in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Agreement has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government regrets that it is obliged maintain to its previous attitude with regard to this Agreement, for the reasons indicated in its letter dated May 13th, 1932, to the Secretary-General. (See document C.465.M.238.1933.VIII—[Appendix], page 43.)

It should be added that Norway has only one manned lightship, and the Government does not think it should accede to this Agreement merely because of this one vessel. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Haiti,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Argentine Republic,	**Honduras,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay,**
Bulgaria,	**Iran,**	**New Zealand,**	**Venezuela.**
Canada,	**Irish Free State,**	**Panama,**	
Chile,	**Italy,**	**Peru,**	
Guatemala,	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**	

CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have nothing to add to their statement on this subject contained in their letter No. W 4296/1933/13 of April 23rd, 1931. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

The statement is in the following terms :

" Since this Convention does not affect this country, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom do not propose to take steps to ratify it on behalf of Great Britain and Northern Ireland."

Denmark.

Denmark does not consider that, in the circumstances, it is in a position to accede to this Convention. (Letter of August 20th, 1937.)

Estonia.

This Convention is of very little interest to Estonia, which possesses no navigable waterways of international importance ; Estonia therefore considers that it should refrain from acceding to it. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Convention would rarely in practice apply to inland navigation in Finland; further, accession to this Convention would necessitate considerable modification of the laws at present in force. In the circumstances, the Government of Finland hesitates, for the present at any rate, to accede to the Convention. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government does not intend to accede to this Convention, in view of the fact that inland navigation of the kind referred to in the Convention does not exist in Norway. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Sweden.

The competent authorities have examined the question of Sweden's possible accession to this Convention. In their opinion, the latter is of little practical interest to Sweden. Further, its ratification would necessitate the adoption of special legislation which would scarcely appear justifiable in the circumstances. The Royal Government does not therefore contemplate acceding to the above-mentioned Convention at the present time. (Letter of July 21st, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Irish Free State, Latvia, Lithuania, Spain. Turkey,

---

CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *IN REM* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have nothing to add to their statement on this subject contained in their letter No. W 4296/1393/13 of April 23rd, 1931. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

The statement is in the following terms :

> " Since this Convention does not affect this country, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom do not propose to take steps to ratify it on behalf of Great Britain and Northern Ireland."

Denmark.

Denmark does not consider that, in the circumstances, it is in a position to accede to this Convention. (Letter of August 20th, 1937.)

Estonia.

This Convention is of very little interest to Estonia, which possesses no navigable waterways of international importance; Estonia therefore considers that it should refrain from acceding to it. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Convention would rarely in practice apply to inland navigation in Finland; further, accession to this Convention would necessitate considerable modification of the laws at present in force. In the circumstances, the Government of Finland hesitates, for the present at any rate, to accede to the Convention. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government does not intend to accede to this Convention, in view of the fact that inland navigation of the kind referred to in the Convention does not exist in Norway. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Sweden.

The competent authorities have examined the question of Sweden's possible accession to this Convention. In their opinion, the latter is of little practical interest to Sweden. Further, its ratification would necessitate the adoption of special legislation which would scarcely appear justifiable in the circumstances. The Royal Government does not therefore contemplate acceding to the above-mentioned Convention at the present time. (Letter of July 21st, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Irish Free State, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Turkey.

CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Austria.

The Austrian Government does not propose to accede to this Convention, in view of the fact that in Austria there is only one shipping company on the Danube which is international in character, and that there is therefore no need to draw up a flag register of inland navigation vessels. (Letter of July 12th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have nothing to add to their statement on this subject contained in their letter No. W 4296/1933/13 of April 23rd, 1931. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

The statement is in the following terms :

> " Since this Convention does not affect this country, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom do not propose to take steps to ratify it on behalf of Great Britain and Northern Ireland."

Denmark.

Denmark does not consider that, in the circumstances, it is in a position to accede to this Convention. (Letter of August 20th, 1937.)

Estonia.

This Convention is of very little interest to Estonia, which possesses no navigable waterways of international importance ; Estonia therefore considers that it should refrain from acceding to it. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

This Convention would rarely in practice apply to inland navigation in Finland ; further, accession to this Convention would necessitate considerable modification of the laws at present in force. In the circumstances, the Government of Finland hesitates, for the present at any rate, to accede to the Convention. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

The Netherlands.

As this Convention is not in conformity with the system on which Netherlands legislation regarding inland navigation is based, the Netherlands Government does not consider that it is able to accede to it. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government does not intend to accede to this Convention, in view of the fact that inland navigation of the kind referred to in the Convention does not exist in Norway. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Sweden.

The competent authorities have examined the question of Sweden's possible accession to this Convention. In their opinion, the latter is of little practical interest to Sweden. Further, its ratification would necessitate the adoption of special legislation which would scarcely appear justifiable in the circumstances. The Royal Government does not therefore contemplate acceding to the above-mentioned Convention at the present time. (Letter of July 21st, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Irish Free State, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey.

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have not yet completed their examination in regard to this Convention, and a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General as soon as the investigation has been completed. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The Commonwealth of Australia is not at present prepared to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

It is not possible for His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to accede to this Convention, on account of the fundamental differences between English and continental law in these matters. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Convention ; should it contemplate such accession, it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Convention. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Estonia.

As the competent bodies in Estonia have decided, in principle, to accede to this Convention, an official ratification will be sent to the Secretary-General as soon as the preliminary work is completed. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India has had no occasion to consider the question of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
Argentine Republic,
Bolivia,
Bulgaria,
Canada,
Chile,
China,
Cuba,
Ethiopia,
Guatemala,
Haiti,
Honduras,
Iran,
Iraq,
Irish Free State,
Latvia,
Liberia,
Lithuania,
New Zealand,
Panama,
Paraguay,
Peru,
Salvador,
Siam,
Uruguay,
Venezuela.

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have not yet completed their examination in regard to this Convention, and a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General as soon as the investigation has been completed. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The Commonwealth of Australia is not at present prepared to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

It is not possible for His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to accede to this Convention, on account of the fundamental differences between English and continental law in these matters. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Convention ; should it contemplate such accession, it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Convention. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Estonia.

As the competent bodies in Estonia have decided, in principle, to accede to this Convention, an official ratification will be sent to the Secretary-General as soon as the preliminary work is completed. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India has had no occasion to consider the question of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
Argentine Republic,
Bolivia,
Bulgaria,
Canada,
Chile,
China,
Cuba,
Ethiopia,
Guatemala,
Haiti,
Honduras,
Iran,
Iraq,
Irish Free State,
Latvia,
Liberia,
Lithuania,
New Zealand,
Panama,
Paraguay,
Peru,
Salvador,
Siam,
Uruguay,
Venezuela.

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government have not yet completed their examination in regard to this Convention, and a further communication will be addressed to the Secretary-General as soon as the investigation has been completed. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The law in Australia already complies with the provisions of this Convention and ratification will be proceeded with at the same time as ratification of the Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of June 7th, 1930. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Convention ; should it contemplate such accession, it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Convention. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Estonia.

As the competent bodies in Estonia have decided, in principle, to accede to this Convention, an official ratification will be sent to the Secretary-General as soon as the work of preparation is completed. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

India.

The Government of India has had no occasion to consider the question of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to this Convention is not contemplated for the present. (Letter of March 9th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,
Argentine Republic,
Bolivia,
Bulgaria,
Canada,
Chile,
China,
Cuba,
Ethiopia,
Guatemala,
Haiti,
Honduras,
Iran,
Iraq,
Latvia,
Liberia,
Lithuania,
New Zealand,
Panama,
Paraguay,
Peru,
Salvador,
Siam,
Uruguay,
Venezuela.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

The general principles of this Convention have as far as practicable been adopted to the requirements of the Union, but the Union Government regret that it is not possible to accede to the Convention at the present stage. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

This Convention deals with a matter that falls mainly within the jurisdiction of the State Governments. The danger signals in Australia generally conform with those prescribed in the Convention, except that the nature of the danger is indicated in words instead of by symbols. There are very few cases of international traffic in Australia, and until the principles embodied in the Convention can be fully adopted in Australia, it is not proposed to take any action in the way of accession to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The United Kingdom representative who attended the Conference which drew up this Convention did not sign it since, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, the special traffic and road condition prevalent in Great Britain render it undesirable that the United Kingdom should be a party to a general convention dealing with road signs. The views of His Majesty's Government on the subject are unchanged, and they have accordingly no present intention of acceding to the Convention. At the same time, the Minister of Transport has, when approving types of road signals, had sympathetic regard to the practice adopted by countries which are parties to this Convention. (Letter of July 16th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Convention ; should it contemplate such accession, it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Convention. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Convention in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Estonia.

Hitherto it has been impossible for Estonia to accede to this Convention, as the Estonian highways code was not in conformity with it. As the requisite changes in the code have now, however, been made, the Estonian Government is proceeding with the technical work necessary for its accession to the Convention. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

The Finnish Government has just decided that during the next three years road signals throughout the country shall be in accordance with the international system laid down in the Convention. Consequently, the competent authorities will give their renewed consideration to the possibility of Finland acceding to this Convention. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

India.

Many of the recommended signs have been standardised and the principle underlying the Convention has therefore been largely implemented, but owing to conditions obtaining in India it is not possible for the Government formally to accede to this Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Convention has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

The Norwegian Government regrets that it cannot yet accede to this Convention, because of the economic consequences which would result from the introduction of the system advocated in the Convention in connection with the roads which do not come within the competence of the central authorities in Norway. However, in a circular letter of November 20th, 1933, local authorities have been requested to observe, as far as possible, the provisions contained in the Convention, especially with regard to the installation of new signs and the renewal of old ones. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Sweden.

The question of Sweden's accession to this Convention is at present being examined by the competent authorities. The matter will presumably be decided in the near future. (Letter of July 21st, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Cuba,**	**Iraq,**	**Panama,**
Argentine Republic,	**Ethiopia,**	**Irish Free State,**	**Paraguay,**
Bolivia,	**Greece,**	**Latvia,**	**Peru,**
Bulgaria,	**Guatemala,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Canada,	**Haiti,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Chile,	**Honduras,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay,**
China,	**Iran,**	**New Zealand,**	**Venezuela.**

CONVENTION ON THE TAXATION OF FOREIGN MOTOR VEHICLES, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Afghanistan.

As this Convention has not been fully examined by the competent authorities in Afghanistan, the Afghan Government cannot for the moment take a decision in the matter. (Letter of July 15th, 1937.)

Union of South Africa.

Legislation concerning the control, licensing, etc., of motor vehicles in the Union rests with the administrations of the four individual provinces of the Union. Adequate provision exists in provincial legislation for meeting the principal requirements of the Convention, but in the absence of uniformity of such legislation, the Union Government regret its inability at the present stage to accede to the Convention. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Australia.

The taxation of foreign vehicles in Australia appears in the majority of the States to be along the lines of the provisions of this Convention. No decision has yet been reached in connection with the question of accession to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Austria.

The Austrian Government does not propose to accede to this Convention, in view of the fact that under the Federal Law of May 1st, 1935, taxation of motor vehicles has been entirely abolished. (Letter of July 12th, 1937.)

Colombia.

Colombia does not, for the moment, intend to accede to this Convention; should it contemplate such accession, it would not fail to inform the Secretary-General of its attitude regarding the Convention. (Letter of April 8th, 1937.)

Dominican Republic.

The Government of the Dominican Republic does not at present propose to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 15th, 1937.)

Ecuador.

The Government of Ecuador proposes to examine this Convention in order to decide on accession or to formulate any observations which it may consider desirable. Its decision will be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as possible. (Letter of May 6th, 1937.)

Estonia.

The Estonian Government considers it necessary to regulate the matters dealt with in this Convention in agreement with Lithuania and Latvia, neither of which countries has found it possible to accede to this Convention. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

France.

A Bill authorising the French Government to accede to this Convention was introduced in the Chamber of Deputies on April 27th last. This Bill has not yet come up for discussion. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

Hungary.

Hungary does not at present contemplate the possibility of acceding to this Convention. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

India.

Vehicles entering India under a " triptyque " or " carnet de passage " are exempt from import duties and most provincial Governments exempt *bona fide* visitors from taxation up to a period of 30 days. The taxation of motor vehicles falls within the provincial sphere, while the principle underlying the Convention has been given effect to the extent stated above. The Government of India are not in a position to accede to the Convention. (Letter of August 26th, 1937.)

Nicaragua.

This Convention has been submitted to the competent authorities for examination, and as soon as they have reached a decision the Government of Nicaragua will inform the Secretary-General of the result. (Letter of April 3rd, 1937.)

Norway.

With regard to this Convention, it should be pointed out that its provisions are less advantageous than the regulations at present in force in Norway. Also, the system applied to Norwegian motor vehicles in a number of foreign countries is more advantageous than the regulations contained in the Convention. For these reasons, the Norwegian Government does not see its way to acceding to this Convention. (Letter of June 8th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania,	**Ethiopia,**	**Latvia,**	**Peru,**
Argentine Republic,	**Greece,**	**Liberia,**	**Salvador,**
Bolivia,	**Guatemala,**	**Lithuania,**	**Siam,**
Canada,	**Haiti,**	**Mexico,**	**Uruguay,**
Chile,	**Honduras,**	**New Zealand,**	**Venezuela.**
China,	**Iran,**	**Panama,**	
Cuba,	**Iraq,**	**Paraguay,**	

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Estonia.

The Estonian Government considers it necessary to regulate the matters dealt with in the above instrument in agreement with Lithuania and Latvia, neither of which countries has found it possible to accede to the Agreement. (Letter of April 29th, 1937.)

Finland.

The competent Finnish authorities find that the provisions of this Agreement are very general and vague in character and may give rise to difficulties in their interpretation and practical application. Also, the cases referred to in the said Agreement are of little importance to Finland. For these reasons, the Finnish Government has been in no haste to accede to the Agreement. (Letter of July 7th, 1937.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Albania, Latvia, Lithuania.

CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Union of South Africa.

The Union Government are at the present moment taking the necessary steps for acceding to this Convention. (Letter of June 28th, 1937.)

Albania.

This Convention has been approved by the Albanian Parliament, promulgated by the Head of the State and published in the *Official Journal* of the Kingdom. The instrument of accession relating to the Convention will be deposited with the Secretariat in the near future. (Letter of August 21st, 1937.)

GOVERNMENT WHOSE REPLY HAS NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Yugoslavia.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 20.** 1937. V.
Addendum.

Geneva, September 25th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RESULTS OF THE SEVENTH ENQUIRY ADDRESSED BY TH SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE GOVERNMENTS UNDER THE ASSEMBLY'S RESOLUTION OF OCTOBER 3RD, 1930

PART II.

(Point II of the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.)

SIGNATURE OR ACCESSION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN THE CASE OF CONVENTIONS WHICH THEY HAVE NOT SIGNED OR TO WHICH THEY HAVE NOT ACCEDED WITHIN A PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS FROM THE DATE ON WHICH THE CONVENTIONS BECAME OPEN FOR SIGNATURE.

CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

Reply from Yugoslavia *(Letter of September 25th, 1937)*

[*Translation.*]

The Government of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia applies the regime as regards narcotic drugs provided for in the above Convention; it collaborates with the competent bodies of the League of Nations on the basis of the said Convention, but, for reasons which it has stated on several occasions, and in particular at the time of the 1931 Conference, it considers that it is not in a position formally to accede to it.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 5. Addendum.

[Communiqué à l'Assemblée,
au Conseil et aux Membres
de la Société.]

N° officiel : **A. 20.** 1937. V.
Addendum.

Genève, le 25 septembre 1937.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

RATIFICATION DES CONVENTIONS INTERNATIONALES CONCLUES SOUS LES AUSPICES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

RÉSULTATS DE LA SEPTIÈME REQUÊTE ADRESSÉE AUX GOUVERNEMENTS PAR LE SECRÉTAIRE GÉNÉRAL, EN VERTU DE LA RÉSOLUTION DE L'ASSEMBLÉE DU 3 OCTOBRE 1930

DEUXIÈME PARTIE

(Point II de la résolution de l'Assemblée du 3 octobre 1930.)

SIGNATURE OU ADHÉSION PAR LES MEMBRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS RELATIVEMENT A DES CONVENTIONS QU'ILS N'ONT PAS SIGNÉES OU AUXQUELLES ILS N'ONT PAS ADHÉRÉ CINQ ANS APRÈS L'OUVERTURE DE CES CONVENTIONS A LA SIGNATURE.

CONVENTION POUR LIMITER LA FABRICATION ET RÉGLEMENTER LA DISTRIBUTION DES STUPÉFIANTS ET PROTOCOLE DE SIGNATURE.
(Genève, le 13 juillet 1931.)

Réponse de la Yougoslavie *(Lettre du 25 septembre 1937).*

Le Gouvernement du Royaume de Yougoslavie applique le régime des stupéfiants, tel qu'il est prévu par cette Convention ; il collabore avec les organes compétents de la Société des Nations à la base de ladite Convention, mais pour des raisons qu'il a exprimées à plusieurs reprises et notamment au moment de la Conférence de 1931, il considère qu'il n'est pas en mesure d'y adhérer formellement.

3260 — S. d. N. 1.655 - 9/37. — Imp. de la Tribune de Genève.

Série de Publications de la Société des Nations
V. QUESTIONS JURIDIQUES
1937. V. 5. Addendum.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council, and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 14 (a).** 1937. V.

Geneva, September 10th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

Since the publication of document A.14.1937.V, the following replies have been received :

	Page
United Kingdom	1
Hungary	9

United Kingdom.

August 9th, 1937.

1. I am directed by Viscount Halifax to transmit to you herewith a memorandum containing the observations of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom on the action which might be taken by the League of Nations in the matter of the status of women.

2. His Majesty's Government do not desire to supplement the information contained in their memorandum of September 1st, 1936 (circulated in League document A.33.1936.V, of September 29th, 1936), on the subject of the status of women in English law, but I am to transmit to you herewith the enclosed memorandum on the points on which the law of Scotland differs from English law, with references to certain paragraphs and headings in the memorandum on English law contained in document A.33.1936.V. A memorandum on the status of women in British colonies, protectorates, etc., is also transmitted to you herewith.

* * *

1. STATUS OF WOMEN.

Action which might be taken by the League of Nations.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have given very careful consideration to the question on which the observations of Governments were requested in accordance with the resolution adopted by the seventeenth Assembly — viz., the action the League might take in the matter of the status of women.

His Majesty's Government, as explained by their representative at the seventeenth Assembly, have already given effect in a large measure to the principle of equality of status as between men and women and would welcome any decisions by States to apply this principle so far as practicable under their domestic laws. In their view, however, in considering what action the League might usefully take in the matter of the status of women, it is important to bear in mind that the extent to which effect should be given in any State to the principle of the equality of the sexes is a matter for that State to determine under its

3182-S.d.N. 1130 (F.) 1025 (A.) 9/37. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL
1937. V. 6.

domestic law according to its own circumstances and requirements. Further, it does not appear to His Majesty's Government that there is in this particular field any matter of international concern, either as having a bearing on international law, as in the case of the nationality of women, or as requiring co-operation between States for effective international control, as in the case of the drug traffic and the traffic in women. Accordingly, His Majesty's Government do not think the League would be justified in attempting to induce States to enter into any general convention on this subject or to undertake binding obligations to give effect to the principle of the equality of the sexes in their own domestic law. On the other hand, it appears to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom that while the League, for the reasons explained above, should itself refrain from expressing any opinions on this matter, useful action can be taken by the League in encouraging the study of the questions involved by the collection and distribution of information relating to the status of women in different countries, or by similar methods, with special reference to the extent to which, under the law of those countries, effect has been given to the principle of equality.

2. Supplementary Memorandum as to the Status of Women under the Law of Scotland.

(The references given refer to paragraphs and headings in the memorandum on the Status of Women in English Law as printed in League document A.33.1936.V.)

II (3) Women are eligible for membership of councils of local authorities by reason of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919. Disqualification by sex or marriage for the office of county or town councillor, or parish councillor had previously been removed by the Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Act, 1907, and section 11[1] of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894.

III (2) (*a*) As a result of a series of Acts commencing in 1861 and terminating with the Married Women's Property (Scotland) Act, 1920, a married woman has the same power of disposing of her estate as if she were unmarried : she is capable of entering into contracts and incurring obligations, and may sue and be sued, and her husband is no longer liable under contracts or obligations entered into or incurred by her on her own behalf.

A married woman is liable for, and may be sued in respect of, her wrongful acts as if she were unmarried.

(c) *Divorce.* — A married woman enjoys the same rights as her husband. It is competent for either spouse to bring an action for divorce either on the ground of the other spouse's adultery, or that the other spouse has been in wilful and malicious desertion for the space of four years.

(d) *Judicial Separation and Maintenance.* — A married woman may sue for a decree of judicial separation either in the court of session or the sheriff court, on the ground of her husband's adultery, or of his cruelty. The Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903, made habitual drunkenness also a ground for such proceedings. A married woman living apart from her husband under a decree of separation is entitled to such yearly aliment as will enable her to live suitably in the station she occupies in virtue of her husband's position, unless she has adequate separate estate of her own. A married woman living apart from her husband with his consent, or on account of his adultery, cruelty or desertion, is similarly entitled to aliment.

III (3) (b) *Liability for Maintenance.* — The father and mother of an illegitimate child are jointly liable to aliment the child. The inability of either parent casts the whole liability on the other. Under the Illegitimate Children (Scotland) Act, 1930, the obligation to aliment endures till the child is sixteen years of age.

A married woman is equally liable with her husband for the aliment of their children.

3. Status of Women in British Colonies, Protectorates, etc.

For the purposes of this memorandum, it will be convenient to consider the various British dependencies in two groups : (1) those where the basic law follows the English legal system ; (2) those where it follows other systems. Under this classification group (1) will include the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, the Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Grenada, British Guiana, British Honduras, Hong-Kong, Jamaica and dependencies, Kenya, the Leeward Islands, Nigeria, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, St. Helena, St. Vincent, Sierra Leone, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Trinidad, Uganda Protectorate, the Zanzibar Protectorate and the territories administered under the Pacific Order-in-Council, 1893. Group (2) will include Ceylon, Cyprus, the Federated and Unfederated Malay States, Malta, Mauritius, St. Lucia, Seychelles and the Somaliland Protectorate. No absolute division, however, can be drawn between these two groups for the following reasons :

[1] See also Sections 19 (1) and 20 (3).

(1) In some colonies — *e.g.*, British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad — while the local legal system is based on the English model for all ordinary purposes, special legislative provision is made for the operation of customary laws in respect of the large Indian immigrant minorities in those places. This consideration also applies in the case of certain East African territories where there are large immigrant populations comprising a variety of religious beliefs.

(2) In some colonies where the local law is based, *e.g.*, on the Roman-Dutch or French systems, as in Ceylon and St. Lucia respectively, those systems have been considerably modified as regards the status of women by local statute law.

(3) While certain African territories are included in the first group, the law based on the English system extends generally only to Europeans and to those natives who have been married according to Christian rites and who are living under approximately European conditions. Natives living under tribal conditions are subject generally to the law and customs of the tribe to which they belong, and these may vary considerably, not only as between one territory and another, but also as between tribe and tribe. Particulars of the status of women under tribal law, particularly in regard to marriage, are contained in the extracts from correspondence with certain colonial Governments, which were printed as Appendix 15 to the report of the Advisory Committee of Experts on Slavery on its second session, held in April 1935 (document C.159.M.113.1935.VI).

I. *Right of Women to succeed to, acquire, hold and dispose of Property.*

In the case of those colonies, etc., comprised in group (1), the status of women, both married and single, is approximately the same as in England, *i.e.* :

(*a*) The status of single women has never been essentially different from that of a man in any branch of the law of property;

(*b*) Since the passing of the various Married Women's Property Acts and the Law Reform (Married Women and Tortfeasors) Act, 1935, the status of a married woman as regards the acquisition, holding and disposal of property is in all respects the same as if she were a single woman.

Not all the colonies, etc., included in group (1) have gone as far as the United Kingdom in placing a married woman on an equal footing with a single woman as regards the acquisition, holding and disposal of property. In the Leeward Islands and in the Turks and Caicos Islands (a dependency of Jamaica), for example, only the principles of the MarriedWomen's Property Act of 1882 have been embodied in local legislation; but even in that Act it is laid down that a married woman is capable of acquiring, holding and disposing by will or otherwise of any real or personal property as her separate property as if she were a single woman.

On the other hand, some colonies — Hong-Kong, Grenada and Trinidad, for example — have kept pace with the most recent changes in the English law on the subject, while Sierra Leone and Tanganyika Territory have passed laws which declare that so much of English law as restricts the acquisition, holding and disposal of real or personal property by a married woman shall not be in force in the territory. In Sierra Leone, however, it is provided that the property of parties to a marriage celebrated under the Christian Marriage Ordinance shall, if both be natives, be subject in all respects to the laws and customs of the tribe or tribes to which the parties respectively belong.

In the following paragraphs, particulars are given of the status of women as regards the acquisition, etc., of property in those British dependencies not included in group (1) and also in certain places included in that group where there are considerable native and immigrant non-Christian populations.

British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad.

Special provisions exist in the local law of these colonies with regard to the succession to property of Indian immigrants, and, in each case, the right of women to succeed to property is fully recognised.

Ceylon.

The law relating to the holding and disposing of property by women under Roman-Dutch law — the law that obtains in Ceylon — has been considerably modified by local statute law. Under the Married Women's Property Ordinance, 1923, a married woman is declared to be capable of acquiring, holding and disposing by will or otherwise of any movable or immovable property as her separate property in the same manner as if she were a single woman. The Ordinance,however, does not apply to Kandyans, Mohammedans or Tamils of the Northern Province who are or who may become subject to the Tesawalamai. These three classes have their own laws on the subject, which are based on custom.

The law applicable to the Mohammedans is stated in part in an Extract from the Minutes of a Council held at Colombo on August 5th, 1806. This code originally applied only to the "province of Colombo", but was extended to apply to Mohammedans in other parts of the island by section 10 of Ordinance No. 5, of 1852. Inheritance among the Tamils of the Northern Province subject to the Tesawalamai is governed by sections 16-38 of Ordinance No. 1, of 1911 (The Jaffna Matrimonial Rights and Inheritance Ordinance). Both Mohammedan and Tamil systems provide for the succession of a daughter and a widow to a male deceased's property.

Cyprus.

Succession to real estate either by operation of law or by will :

(*i*) Of the category of Mulk, or

(*ii*) Of the category of Vakouf held in Ijaretein, where there are heirs upon whom it would devolve,

is regulated, as regards non-Mohammedans, by the Wills and Succession Law, No. 20, of 1895 and, as regards Mohammedans, by the Sheri Law.

Succession to real estate, by operation of law :

(*i*) Of the category of State land (Arazi Mirie), or

(*ii*) Of the category of Mevqufe land (Arazi Mevqufe),

is regulated by the Ottoman Law of 17 Muharrem, 1284 (May 21st, 1867), and by Article 54 of the Ottoman Land Code. Under the Wills and Succession Law, 1895, husband and wife have equal rights to share in the legal portion of the property of which a deceased person dies possessed. Children also share equally without regard to sex.

Federated Malay States (Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak and Selangor) and *Unfederated Malay States* (Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis and Trengganu).

Mohammedans constitute approximately 45 % of the population of British Malaya and immigrant Chinese 40 %. Succession to real estate is in the case of Mohammedans governed by Mohammedan law. There is no restriction on the devising of land by will except in so far as Mohammedan law restrains it. In the case of all other persons, property is distributed on intestacy to the person or persons entitled thereto according to the law of distribution which applies to the deceased, which is the law of the domicile.

Gold Coast and Nigeria (Colony).

Where any person who is subject to native law or custom contracts a marriage under the Marriage Ordinance of the colony and dies intestate, leaving a widow, such person's real and personal property is distributed according to the law in England, any native law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding, provided, however, that where, by the law of England, any portion of the Estate would go to the Crown, such portion must be distributed in accordance with native law and custom, and provided also that real property the succession to which cannot by native law or custom be disposed of by will must descend in accordance with the provisions of such native law.

Kenya.

The Indian Succession Act, 1865, regulates succession, but it does not apply to natives nor to any Hindu, Mohammedan or Buddhist (*vide* section 331 of the Act). Succession to immovable property of persons married in accordance with the Mohammedan law, where such person dies after December 29th, 1920, and where the issue of such marriage dies after that date, is regulated by the principles of Mohammedan law (*vide* section 4 of the Mohammedan Marriage, Divorce and Succession Ordinance). In the case of Hindus, etc., exempted under the Indian Succession Act, succession is governed by the Indian statutes applicable in Indian which have been applied — viz., the Hindu Wills Act, 1870, and the Probate and Administration Act, 1881.

Malta.

The status of a wife as regards property is governed by the Law of Persons and Things (VII, of 1868), under which a wife or a daughter may inherit.

Mauritius.

The French Civil Code is in force in Mauritius.

Nigeria.

(See Gold Coast.)

Nyasaland Protectorate.

(*a*) British Protected Persons — *i.e.*, natives — normally succeed to property in accordance with the custom of their particular tribe, but, in the case of natives who have been married under the local Marriage Ordinance, the same provisions with regard to the devolution of property apply as in the Gold Coast and Nigeria. Natives can also contract marriage

according to Christian rites without compliance with the requirements of the Marriage Ordinance, but such a marriage has no legal consequences and does not therefore affect rights of succession.

(*b*) Non-Christian Asiatics have rights of succession in accordance with the Asiatics (Marriage, Divorce and Succession) Ordinance (Chapter 81 of the Revised Edition of the Laws, 1933), section 6 of which provides, *inter alia*, as follows : " Subject to the provisions of this or any Ordinance or applied Act for the time being in force in the Protectorate, the succession to movable property in the Protectorate of a deceased non-Christian Asiatic who at his death is domiciled in the Protectorate and to the immovable property in the Protectorate of such an Asiatic, whether domiciled in the Protectorate at his death or not, shall be (with certain provisos) regulated by the law of the religion professed by him at his death.

(*c*) All persons not included in (*a*) and (*b*) inherit in accordance with the law in force in England (*vide* under group (1) above).

St. Lucia.

The French Code Civil is in force in St. Lucia, but it has been considerably modified by the Married Women's Property Ordinance, 1930, under which marital administration of a wife's separate property is abolished. Section 4 provides that a married woman can accept, receive, administer, use, alienate and dispose of her separate property as if she were not married. The Ordinance is based on the Married Women's Property Acts of the United Kingdom.

Seychelles.

The French Code Civil is in force in Seychelles.

Somaliland Protectorate.

The Indian Succession Act, 1865, has been applied to the Protectorate. Succession to immovable property in the case of Mohammedans is regulated in accordance with the principles of Mohammedan Law. In the case of natives who have been married under the local Marriage Ordinance, however, the same provisions with regard to the devolution of property apply as in the Gold Coast and Nigeria.

Tanganyika Territory.

(1) The Indian Succession Act, 1865, regulates succession, but it does not apply to natives nor to Hindus, Mohammedans or Buddists (*vide* section 331 of the Act).

(2) In the case of persons who are " by birth or adoption members of a native African tribe " succession is governed by local ordinance — viz., the Deceased Natives Estates Ordinance (cap. 16 of the Revised Edition of the Laws, 1928). Under this Ordinance, the estate of a member of a native tribe is administered according to the law of that tribe unless the deceased at any time professed the Mohammedan religion.

(3) In the case of Hindus, Mohammedans, Buddists, etc., succession is governed by the Indian Statutes applicable to India which have been applied to the territory — viz., the Hindu Wills Act, 1870, and the Probate and Administration Act, 1881.

Uganda Protectorate.

The Indian Succession Act, 1865, regulates succession.

Zanzibar Protectorate.

Succession to real estate in Zanzibar is determined by the Zanzibar Succession Decree (Chapter 13 of the Revised Edition of the Laws, 1934), which is based on the Indian Succession Act, 1865. Under section 7 of the Succession Decree, the personal law of Hindus, Mohammedans or Buddists applies to succession to real estate whether testamentary or intestate, but the Hindu Wills Decree (Chapter 15 of the Revised Edition, 1934) applies to the wills or codicils of Hindus, Jainas, Sikhs or Buddists and makes applicable certain portions of the Succession Decree to such wills or codicils.

With the exceptions noted above, the rule is that Mohammedan Law applies to Mohammedans, Hindu Law to Hindus and, in each case, the law is that of the school to which the deceased belonged.

II. *Status under the Marriage and Divorce Laws.*

The grouping of the various British colonies, etc., which was adopted above in regard to the right of women to acquire, hold and dispose of property holds also in regard to marriage and divorce.

(a) *Marriage (Christian).*

In the case of the colonies, etc., included in group (1), the local marriage laws do not vary much from the law in force in England and in every case they follow the law of England in

requiring that the free consent of both parties to the marriage must be given, although actually such consent both in English and colonial law is presumed : no formal written consent being necessary. The only real difference between the English marriage law as it stands at present and the laws of the colonies, etc., included in group (1) is in regard to the minimum age at which a valid marriage can be contracted. In England, by the Age of Marriage Act, 1929, it is now 16 years for both parties, while, in most of the colonies, etc., in question, the English rule prior to the passing of the Act continues to apply — viz., 14 years for the male and 12 years for the female. The minimum age of Christian marriage varies slightly in the case of those colonies, etc., not included in group (1). In Ceylon, under the Marriage Registration Ordinance, it is 16 years for the male and 14 years for the female when she is the daughter of European or Burgher parents. Moreover, any question of the law of marriage not settled by local ordinance must, in Ceylon, be solved by reference to the Roman-Dutch law so far as applicable to local conditions. In Cyprus, the Greek Orthodox Church has fixed the age of 16 as the minimum for both sexes. In Mauritius and Seychelles, where the French Code Civil is in force, it is 18 and 15 for male and female respectively.

Provision is made in the legislation in most of the East African dependencies for the celebration of native Christian marriages. Such laws are generally simpler than those for European Christians and dispense with many of the formalities usually required prior to marriage. On the other hand, in Tanganyika Territory and Uganda, it is laid down that the formalities preliminary to marriage customary for the natives in the religion to which the parties belong must be observed and in the Nyasaland Protectorate it is provided that the Christian marriage ceremony has merely the sanction of the Church behind it while the civil status of the natives concerned remains as determined by native law or custom. In Kenya, under the Native Christian Marriage and Divorce Ordinance, 1931, provision is made by which native Christian widows are protected against the operation of native law. Thus she is deemed to have attained her majority on widowhood, is not bound to cohabit with or to be at the disposal of the brother or any other relative of her deceased husband, and is recognised as the guardian of any children of the marriage. At the same time, however, she is deemed to have the same right to support for herself and her children from her husband's relatives as she would have had if she had not been married under the Ordinance.

(b) *Marriage (Non-Christian).*

Marriages celebrated according to the Mohammedan religious custom are recognised in parts of East and West Africa, Ceylon, Cyprus, Fiji, the Federated and Unfederated Malay States, Mauritius, the Straits Settlements and Trinidad. The local statute law provides only for their registration. In certain colonies — viz., Fiji, British Guiana, Jamaica, Mauritius and Trinidad — into which there has been an influx of Asiatic immigrants, legislation has been passed to accord recognition to the marriages of such persons where they have been contracted according to their religion and personal law. A minimum age for such marriages has in most cases been laid down by local law — *e.g.*, in British Guiana it is 15 years for the male and 14 for the female, in Fiji it is 16 and 13, in Jamaica 15 and 13 and in Trinidad 16 and 12 respectively. All such marriages must, under the local law, be registered. In Ceylon, the marriage of Kandyans is provided for in the Kandyan Marriages Law, 1870. Under this law, the minimum age of marriage is 16 years for the male and 12 for the female. Recognition of the marriages of non-Christian Asiatics is accorded by law in the Nyasaland Protectorate and the Tanganyika Territory provided that the parties are not related to each other in any of the degrees of affinity and consanguinity prohibited by the law of the religion of either party and provided that the marriage is contracted in the manner customary in the territory among persons professing the religion of either party. Under the Hindu Widows Ordinance of the Straits Settlements, it is provided that, notwithstanding any custom or any interpretation to the contrary, no marriage between Hindus is invalid nor is the issue of any such marriage illegitimate by reason of the woman having been previously married or betrothed to another person who since such marriage or betrothal has died.

Tribal marriages in Africa and elsewhere are celebrated according to tribal custom. By the Natives Betrothal and Marriage Ordinance of Somaliland, however, it is laid down that any unmarried woman betrothed by her father or guardian shall have the right personally or by her agent to register before any magistrate her refusal of the betrothal. In that event, the woman is no longer deemed to be betrothed.

(c) *Divorce.*

In England, a man can claim a divorce from his wife if she has been guilty of adultery since the celebration of the marriage ; and a wife can claim a divorce from her husband, if he has been guilty of adultery, or of rape, or of certain " unnatural offences " during the marriage.

The mere adultery of the husband, however, was only made a ground for divorce by the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1923. Prior to that Act a wife could only obtain a divorce if the adultery was coupled with some other offence such as bigamy, cruelty or desertion for two years. Nearly all the colonies, etc., follow the present English practice in allowing divorce on the mere adultery of either party; but in a few — viz., Fiji, Grenada, the Nyasaland Protectorate. St. Vincent, the Uganda Protectorate and Zanzibar (Native Christian) — the law still remains as it was in England before the Act of 1923. No provision for divorce exists in Bermuda, Malta, St. Lucia and Zanzibar (non-native); and, in Cyprus, the courts have no divorce jurisdiction in respect of Moslems and of members of the Greek Orthodox Church.

In the East African territories of Kenya, the Nyasaland Protectorate, Tanganyika Territory and the Uganda Protectorate, the local divorce law applies also to natives and British Indians (except that British Indians are not included in the case of the Nyasaland Protectorate), provided that the marriage was celebrated in the territory and provided also that the marriage was one which meant the union of one man and one woman for life to the exclusion of others. In all the East African territories mentioned, divorce jurisdiction in the case of natives who have contracted a Christian marriage is delegated to subordinate courts of the first or second class, but, in the Tanganyika Territory, all orders for dissolution of native marriage must be confirmed by the High Court. In the Tanganyika Territory also damages, when claimed, must as far as possible be assessed in accordance with native custom and may be awarded in kind or money; and further, when a court makes a decree annulling or dissolving a native marriage, it may also order the restoration of any property acquired before, and in consideration of, or during the marriage by either party from the other party or their parents and relatives.

In most colonies, etc., the local divorce law expressly provides that the petitioner for a divorce must be domiciled in the colony. As however many persons who live in a colony or protectorate are not so domiciled and could not therefore obtain a divorce, provision has been made by an Imperial Act (the Indian and Colonial Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1926) for conferring on the courts of the colonies, etc., divorce jurisdiction in respect of persons who are domiciled in England or Scotland. Such jurisdiction is conferred by Order-in-Council made under the Act and Orders relating to Ceylon, Hong-Kong, Jamaica, Kenya and the Straits Settlements have been made. The grounds for divorce under the Act are the same as those prevailing for the time being in England.

Where a colony, etc., has a considerable Mohammedan population, the local statute law recognises the validity of all divorces granted in accordance with Mohammedan religious practice and generally provides only for their registration; but, in Kenya, the Supreme Court has jurisdiction to hear and determine all matrimonial suits in respect of Mohammedan marriages and to act and give relief upon the principles of Mohammedan law; and, in Ceylon, separate rules of procedure for husbands who wish to divorce their wives and for wives who wish to divorce their husbands are scheduled to the Moslem Marriage and Divorce Registration Ordinance, 1929. Provision for the registration only of Mohammedan divorces exists in parts of East and West Africa, Fiji, the Federated Malay States, the Unfederated Malay States, the Straits Settlements and Trinidad. Similarly provision for the registration of Kandyan divorces exists in Ceylon, for the divorces of Indian immigrants in Fiji, Jamaica and Trinidad, of Chinese and Siamese in Kelantan (one of the Unfederated Malay States) and of non-Christian Asiatics in the Nyasaland Protectorate and the Tanganyika Territory, provided in the latter case the divorce was granted on grounds which are recognised as valid for divorce by the law of the religion of the persons divorced and is effected in the manner customary among persons professing that religion.

(d) *Judicial Separation.*

The superior courts of the colonies, etc., whether they possess divorce jurisdiction or not, have authority to grant orders of judicial separation; and the grounds on which they are granted are the same for both parties. In many colonies, etc., the inferior courts — *i.e.*, courts of summary jurisdiction — have power to grant separation orders. Such orders provide (1) that one party is no longer bound to cohabit with the other; (2) for the custody of children; and (3) for the maintenance of the wife, and are usually granted in the case of women applicants on the grounds of an aggravated assault upon her by her husband, for persistent cruelty, for desertion or for habitual drunkenness. In several colonies — *e.g.*, British Guiana, British Honduras, Kenya, St. Lucia, etc. — this form of separation can only be obtained by women.

III. *Maintenance of Wives and Children (including Illegitimate Children).*

A wife who is deserted by her husband or who is separated from her husband by order of a court of summary jurisdiction or who has obtained in the high court (supreme court) an order of judicial separation is, in practically all colonies, etc., entitled to maintenance by her husband provided there is at the time no statutory impediment to the grant of maintenance. A wife in the first category applies to the courts for a maintenance order for herself and her children against her husband, while those in the other two categories are usually granted maintenance at the time the separation order or order of judicial separation was granted. The Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act, 1920 (10-11 Geo. V, c. 33), has been extended to all colonies and protectorates, and therefore maintenance orders issued in England and Ireland are enforceable in any colony or protectorate, and *vice versa*. In those colonies, etc., which have passed legislation on the lines of the Married Women's Property Acts of the United Kingdom, any wife having separate property from her husband is liable, if necessary, for the support of her children. This provision however does not relieve her husband from any liability imposed upon him by law for the maintenance of his children. In some colonies — *e.g.*, Grenada — a woman having separate property is also liable for the support of her husband should he become destitute, while, in Barbados and Bermuda, she can only be proceeded against in respect of her husband's poor law maintenance.

In most colonies, etc., which follow English law the mother of an illegitimate child is liable for the support of her illegitimate children until they attain the age of 16, or until the mother marries, when her husband becomes liable to maintain his wife's illegitimate children born prior to the marriage. The alleged father of the child, upon proof of paternity may, by means of an affiliation order, be compelled to contribute towards its support. In Ceylon, however, where the Roman-Dutch system of law obtains, the father of an illegitimate child is civilly liable to maintain it. Variations from the English rule also occur in those colonies where the French Code Civil is in force — viz., Mauritius, Seychelles and St. Lucia. The civil law of Malta follows in this respect the French Code Civil.

IV. *Right of Women to enter the Professions.*

There is no law in the colonies, etc., corresponding to the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act, 1919, of the United Kingdom (9-10 Geo. V, c. 71). This Act provides, *inter alia*, that a person shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage from entering or carrying on any civil profession. As, however, the laws in the various colonies, etc., which regulate the practice of the professions provide that persons who have obtained a qualification entitling them to practise their professions in the United Kingdom can, upon registration locally, practise that profession in the colony, and as women can now become qualified in the United Kingdom, it follows that women so qualified can practise as barristers, solicitors, doctors, etc., as the case may be, in the colonies, etc.

Two colonies have made special statutory provision to enable women to practise a particular profession. Ordinance No. 25, of 1933, of Ceylon provides that a woman shall not be disqualified by reason only of her sex from being admitted or practising as an advocate, proctor, notary or commissioner for oaths; and section 4 (2) of the Advocates and Solicitors Ordinance of the Straits Settlements (Chapter 62 of the Revised Edition of the Laws, 1936) provides that a person shall not be disqualified by sex from being admitted and enrolled as an advocate or solicitor of the Supreme Court. Women are already practising as advocates or barristers in Nigeria, British Guiana, Straits Settlements and Trinidad and as doctors in many colonies and protectorates.

V. *Eligibility of Women to serve as Jurors and Assessors.*

The Act which enabled women to enter the various civil professions in the United Kingdom also provided that they should not normally be exempted in the future from service on juries. Grenada and St. Vincent in the Windward Islands have followed with legislation providing for women jurors.

VI. *Right of Women to vote and stand for Election to Colonial Legislatures.*

In a number of colonies, etc., there are, for various reasons, either no legislative Councils or, if they exist, they do not include any members elected by popular vote. There is, *e.g.*, no legislative council in St. Helena and there are no elected members on the legislatures of the Falkland Islands, Gambia, the Nyasaland Protectorate, Tanganyika Territory, the Uganda Protectorate, etc., but, even in those colonies, etc., where the legislative council is wholly nominated, there is nothing as a rule in their constitutions to preclude the nomination of women. Some colonies, etc., however, always have had, and a considerable number now have, elected or partly elected legislatures, and, in the case of many of them, women can vote at elections and also stand as candidates for election. The colonies, etc., in which women can both vote and stand as candidates for election are Ceylon, the Gold Coast, British Honduras, Jamaica, four presidencies of the Leeward Islands (namely, Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat and St. Christopher-Nevis), Kenya, Northern Rhodesia and the Windward

Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent), while, in British Guiana and Trinidad, women can at present only vote. In some colonies, etc., the qualifications for the franchise and the qualifications for standing as candidates for election to the legislature are the same for women as for men. This rule obtains in Ceylon, the Gold Coast, the Windward Islands colonies and the various presidencies of the Leeward Islands. In other places, however — *e.g.*, British Honduras, Jamaica and Northern Rhodesia — the age qualification for men and women voters is different and is slightly higher in the case of women.

VII. *Right of Women to vote and stand for Election to Colonial Municipalities, etc.*

In an increasing number of colonies, etc., it is now possible for women to vote at local government elections and also to stand as candidates for election to local governments. Thus women can now vote at elections for and also be elected to the municipalities of Colombo (Ceylon), Kingston (Jamaica), Accra and Cape Coast (Gold Coast), Mombasa and Nairobi (Kenya), Livingstone and Ndola (Northern Rhodesia), Freetown (Sierra Leone) and Port of Spain and San Fernando (Trinidad). They can also vote at elections for and be elected to the town boards of Belize (British Honduras), Castries (St. Lucia) and Kingstown (St. Vincent) and the town councils of Blantyre, Fort Johnston, Port Herald and Limbe (Nyasaland Protectorate).

VIII. *Right of Women to enter Colonial Government Service.*

Women are not at present eligible for appointment to the Colonial Administrative Service, but many are employed in the education, medical and public health services of the colonies, etc. Women are also employed in nearly all colonies, etc., as clerks, typists and shorthand-writers.

Hungary.

August 6th, 1937.

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a memorandum containing information on the civil and political status of women in Hungary.

As to the possible action to be taken by the League in regard to the status of women, the Hungarian Government considers that this is essentially an internal problem. Since, both in the sphere of private law and in the matter of political rights, the emancipation of women depends on the ethnical, social and cultural conditions in each country, in the Hungarian Government's opinion all that can be done is to grant women such rights as the special situation of each State permits.

The Civil and Political Status of Women.

Civil Status.

Civil Capacity. — Under Article 1 of Law XX, of 1877, concerning guardianship and interdiction, and under Article 1 of Law XXIII, of 1874, concerning the majority of women, men and women alike become of full age on completing their twenty-fourth year.

In accordance with Article 2 of Law XXIII, of 1874, a female minor, whatever her age, becomes of full age on her marriage and retains the majority she has thus acquired even if her husband dies and leaves her a widow before she has completed her twenty-fourth year or if the court dissolves the marriage or declares it null and void.

Nevertheless, Article 1 of Law XXVII, of 1876, concerning bills of exchange provides that a female minor who has acquired majority only through her marriage cannot become liable upon a bill of exchange until she has completed her twenty-fourth year unless she has previously acquired majority by carrying on an industry in the capacity of employer (Article 5 of Law XX, of 1877, Article 2 of Law XII, of 1922, amending Law XVII, of 1884, relating to industry).

Capacity to contract Marriage. — Under 7 of Law XXXI, of 1894, concerning matrimonial law, a man must not be under 18 and a woman not under 16 in order to contract marriage. The Minister of Justice may waive this age limit.

Personal Relations between Husband and Wife. — In conjugal life, the decision rests with the husband. He chooses in particular the place of the conjugal domicile and the joint abode. In reaching his decisions, he must, however, take into consideration, in accordance with equity, the reasoned advice and objections of his wife.

The wife takes her husband's name, to which she may add her own surname.

On becoming a widow, the wife keeps her husband's name unless she marries again.

A husband must maintain his wife suitably in their joint home in accordance with his social position, total wealth and resources. If the wife is living apart from her husband and she is not the guilty party the husband must pay her alimony.

It is the wife's duty to manage the joint household affairs.

The wife has the right to act for and on behalf of her husband in matters affecting the household. In doubtful cases, it is presumed that legal acts performed in this connection by the wife were performed on behalf of her husband.

The wife must concern herself with household duties, assist her husband in his occupation and even contribute by her work and other resources to the upkeep of the household, within the limits of equity, if their situation so requires.

If the husband is without means and is unable to provide for his needs by his work his wife must maintain him in the joint home in accordance with their social position, so far as her means and resources permit.

Matrimonial Regime: Inheritance of the Spouse. Widow's Right of Usufruct. Legal Consequences of the Dissolution of the Marriage. — In principle, Hungarian law provides that the estates shall be separate. Marriage does not therefore create a joint estate. The estates must be administered by the husband, but both the husband and the wife may freely dispose of their property. Dotal property constitutes the only exception to this rule. The wife is not free to dispose of this property, of which the husband may make use to meet the household expenses. He may not, however, alienate nor mortgage it and if the marriage is dissolved he must return it. Consequently, even the dowry is not jointly owned by the husband and wife. A dowry paid in cash becomes the property of the husband, who must, however, return it if the marriage is dissolved.

If the wife has entrusted to her husband, in whole or in part, the administration of the property at her free disposal, she may withdraw this mandate at any time.

Nevertheless, unless his wife has made other arrangements the husband may consider that the net income from the property entrusted to him constitutes a voluntary contribution by his wife to the household expenses and that his wife has authorised him to use it for this purpose.

This system of separate estates holds good apart from the right to property acquired in common ; during the marriage, either the husband or the wife may acquire property for his or her account and dispose of it freely.

The right to property acquired in common is a right enjoyed by the husband and wife or their heirs only if the marriage is dissolved. In such a case, with the exception of the wives of nobles or persons following a profession for which high intellectual qualifications are required, the husband and wife are each entitled to one-half of the property in the possession of the other, exclusive of personal property and the debts of the spouse. By personal property is meant property possessed by the party concerned at the time of the marriage or acquired during the marriage by inheritance or gift or by some other means without payment. Property acquired in common consists of property acquired for valuable consideration during the conjugal life, which is regarded as separate from the personal property if the marriage is dissolved.

Property regarded as acquired in common is property obtained by the husband and wife not by inheritance but in accordance with matrimonial law.

As regards the right of the surviving spouse to the property of the deceased spouse, a distinction should be made between :

(*a*) The patrimony, and

(*b*) Acquired property.

The *patrimony* is the whole of the property received from one's ascendants by direct or indirect inheritance or by donation *inter vivos*.

Any other property of the deceased spouse, irrespective of the date at which it was acquired, is *acquired properly*.

The surviving spouse therefore receives out of the estate of the deceased spouse :

(1) One-half of the property acquired in common as acquirer ;[1]

(2) In the absence of descendants, the acquired property, even if it was acquired before the marriage, as the heir.

The patrimony is inherited not by the surviving spouse, but — if there is no will and there are no descendants — by the ascendant who left, or whose ascendants left, the patrimony to the deceased spouse. If that ascendant is no longer living, or for some reason no longer participates in the inheritance, his descendants inherit the patrimony which passed to the deceased spouse from a common ascendant. Should there be no heir entitled to the patrimony, it goes to the surviving spouse.

When the wife survives her husband, she is entitled — whether there are any descendants or not — to a share in the property which does not fall to her.

This right of the widow applies to all degrees of the social scale ; it consists in the enjoyment during the whole of her widowhood of all the property left by her husband. The widow thus enjoys the use of the property which does not come to her by inheritance. If she re-marries, she may claim a dowry against the estate.

---

[1] As stated above, the spouse of a noble or a person following a profession for which high intellectual qualifications are required, is not entitled to the acquired property.

The dowry consists of the property which the wife brings the husband or which a third person cedes fo the husband in respect of his wife to help him to bear the financial responsibilities of the marriage.

In the absence of any stipulation to the contrary, parents are not required to provide a dowry for their daughters.

The husband acquires the right to make use of the property constituting the dowry so long as the marriage lasts; a cash dowry should be regarded as a loan without interest which becomes the property of the husband and is at his disposal on condition that he returns it if the marriage is dissolved.

In this latter case, the former wife or her heirs are entitled to the dowry.

Husband and wife may conclude a contract between themselves defining the matrimonial regime (maintenance of the wife, separate estates, property acquired in common, dowry, joint estate, etc.), in a manner not prescribed by the law, but this contract must be concluded by a notarial act (Article 22, paragraph (*a*) of Law VII, of 1886, amending and supplementing Law XXXV, of 1874, relating to the Royal Notaries). The marriage contract may be concluded either before or after the marriage.

As regards the legal consequences of divorce, Law XXXI, of 1894 (Marriage Code), contains the following provisions :

Article 90. — If the wife is recognised as not being guilty, the husband must maintain her according to his resources and social position, in so far as the wife's income is not sufficient for the purpose.

Alimony must be paid in advance and, as a general rule, each month.
At the wife's request, the husband must furnish security for the alimony.

Article 91. — The alimony should be increased :

(*a*) If the financial situation of the husband did not enable him to make his wife a suitable allowance but has subsequently improved ;

(*b*) If, when the allowance was fixed, account was taken of certain resources of the wife, of which she has been deprived otherwise than by her own fault.

Article 92. — The allowance may be fixed by amicable agreement between the husband and wife, and the wife may even waive her right to an allowance. The obligation to pay alimony shall be transferred to the husband's heirs, who may, however, ask for the amount to be reduced to the level of the net income from the estate.

Article 93. — The husband is no longer responsible for the maintenance of his former wife if she re-marries.

A wife who has been recognised as not being guilty may continue to bear her husband's name after the divorce has been pronounced, if she expresses a desire to do so during the trial.

In such a case, the judge must mention this right in the verdict.

Under Article 105 of Law XXXI, of 1894, Articles 90 to 92 reproduced above logically apply to legal separation which, however, is very rare. As regards the property system, legal separation may be assimilated to divorce.

Guardianship and Interdiction. — Article 43, paragraph (*a*) of Law XX, of 1877, provides that women — with the exception of mothers, adoptive mothers and wives — may not be entrusted with the functions of guardian or curator.

Personal Rights and Rights in rem. As regards personal rights and rights *in rem*, there is no difference between the status of the man (husband) and that of the woman (wife).

Political Status.

I. *Elections to the Chamber of Deputies.*

In accordance with the provisions of Law XXVI, of 1925, the right to vote is granted to all women not under 30 years of age, who have been Hungarian nationals for at least ten years, have resided in the same commune for the previous two years, and possess the leaving certificate of the sixth standard of the elementary school or an equivalent standard, or prove that they have had an equivalent education.

A woman :

(1) Who has had at least three legitimate children and has at least three children living, or

(2) Who is living on the income from her capital or labour and is the head of her household ;

possesses the right to vote even if she has only passed the first four standards of the elementary school, provided she fulfils the other conditions prescribed.

In the absence of these legal conditions of electoral capacity, a woman still has the right to vote if her name appears on the electoral list for the legislative elections of 1918, provided she is living in the same commune on the electoral list of which her name was included (acquired right).

The condition of two years' residence is regarded as fulfilled if the woman concerned has only changed her domicile once during the last two years, provided she previously resided in the same commune for two years.

The law allows several exceptions to the two years' residence rule. Deputies, public officials, permanent employees of certain undertakings, retired employees of the public and private services, etc., are exempted as are also the wives of such persons. The latter, provided they fulfil the other conditions prescribed, have the right to vote irrespective of their period of residence.

Elementary education up to the sixth or fourth standard is presumed in the case of wives living with their husbands who take an active part in the management of the commercial or industrial undertaking by which the husband maintains his family, and in the case of the wives of farmers whose farms bring in a net taxable income of at least 60 gold crowns per annum.

These, then, are the conditions under which women have the right to vote in Hungary. Even when these conditions are fulfilled, the right may not be exercised in certain cases in which persons are debarred by law, and during the period of legal exclusion.

Persons are usually debarred from exercising this right for penal reasons and also on the following grounds : civil incapacity, bankruptcy, maintenance out of public assistance funds authorities, prostitution, etc.

In order to be *elected*, the person, irrespective of sex, must be an elector at the time of the election, be 30 years of age or over, and not be debarred for any other person.

The cases in which persons are debarred are enumerated in full by the law. Apart from reasons relating to incompatibility of offices or duties and to nationality, the grounds for exclusion are mainly penal. No distinction is made in this respect between men and women.

II. *Elections to the Municipal Council of the Departments and Autonomous Towns.*

Irrespective of sex, any person whose name appears on the electoral list for the legislative elections of the year of election of the council may be an elector, provided such person has had his or her residence or domicile for the previous six years at least in the territory of the department or the autonomous town (Law XXX, of 1929).

In the town of Budapest, electors of the municipal council must comply with the electoral conditions required for the Chamber of Deputies and have lived for at least six years without a break in the territory of the capital (Law XVII, of 1930).

As regards the period of residence and deprivation of the right to vote, the rules governing elections to the Chamber of Deputies laid down in Law XXVI, of 1925, are applied.

At Budapest, these conditions are verified when the list of electors for the municipal council is compiled ; this list is drawn up periodically and independently of the list relating to the legislative elections. In the other towns, the conditions are verified when this latter list, which is used for elections to the municipal council of the Department or the autonomous town as well, is drawn up.

At Budapest any person, irrespective of sex, *may be elected* to the municipal council, provided that his or her name appears on the list of electors, that such person has completed his or her thirtieth year and pays the State tax in some part of the country, no matter where, or pays the communal tax in the territory of the capital and is not debarred for any reason.

As a rule, in the other autonomous towns and in the departments, the conditions for election are the same as those laid down for the town of Budapest. In the autonomous towns (but not in the departments) women may enter the municipal council as the elected representatives of all the electors, provided they have received a secondary or equivalent education.

Generally speaking, with the exception of incompatibility of duties or offices, the grounds on which persons may not be elected to the municipal council of the autonomous towns and the departments are the same as those laid down in Law XXVI, of 1925, for the Chamber of Deputies.

III. *Elections to the Communal Council.*

Any woman whose name appears on the list for the legislative elections may be an elector for the communal council, provided she has resided in the territory of the commune for the previous six years at least and that she or her husband has paid the communal tax for at least two years.

As regards the period of residence and cases in which persons are excluded from voting, the rules laid down for the legislative elections are applied with certain modifications.

As a rule, only men are eligible for the communal council. In order to be elected, they must have completed their thirtieth year, be electors for the communal council and, in the departmental towns, know how to read and write.

In the departmental towns, women who have received a secondary or equivalent education may also enter the communal council if they fulfil the other conditions required.

Except as regards incompatibility of duties or offices, the grounds on which persons may not be elected are practically the same as those laid down for the Chamber of Deputies.

Women may be members of the communal council provided they pay a certain amount as taxes ; in such cases, they may only exercise their rights through a third person. In the departmental towns, they may sit on the council in person.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council, and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 14 (b).** 1937. V.

Geneva, September 13th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

Since the publication of documents A.14 and A.14(*a*).1937.V, the following reply has been received :

Switzerland.

September 6th, 1937.

The Federal Political Department has the honour to send to the Secretariat herewith, for the information of the Members of the League of Nations, a brief statement which it has drawn up on the status of women in Switzerland, based on the data supplied to it by the competent authorities.

As regards the measures which the League of Nations might take in this connection, the Swiss Government wishes to express once again its opinion that this is a matter in which the individual States are alone competent and in which the League of Nations has no occasion to intervene. It accordingly hopes that the Assembly's action will be confined at the most to an exchange of information on these problems of a strictly national character.

The Status of Women under Swiss Law.

General.

The unification of private law in Switzerland has been achieved to some extent by the emancipation of women. While the laws of nearly all the cantons gave women, whether married or not, a position inferior to that of men, the Swiss Civil Code in 1912 abolished the tutelage of women in general—*i.e.*, the obligation for all women to live under tutelage, particularly that of their husbands. In private law, an unmarried woman is treated in all respects in the same way as a man; she has not only the full enjoyment but also the free exercise of all civil rights. The same applies in principle to the married woman. The restrictions to which her legal capacity is subject in certain respects are due not so much to marriage as such as to the effect of the matrimonial regime. The legal regime in Switzerland is not the separation of property but the union of property. This gives the wife much greater independence than she enjoys under the system of community of property, which was the legal regime in several cantons.

The position of women in public law has not followed the same evolution. As a general rule, the Swiss woman has no vote and is not eligible. This is due to several reasons and particularly to the fact that hitherto woman's status in private law has given her full satisfaction, and that, under a system of direct democracy like that of Switzerland, there is a general tendency not to involve women in political controversy.

The following particulars illustrate the foregoing observations.

3209-S.d.N. 1130 (F.) 1025 (A.) 9/37. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 7.

The unmarried woman is treated, under Articles 11 and 13 of the Civil Code, on the same footing as a man as regards the enjoyment and the exercise of civil rights. The following differences should, however, be mentioned :

A woman is marriageable at the age of 18, whereas a man is marriageable at the age of 20 (Article 96, C.C.). Moreover, a woman is never obliged to act as guardian, whereas a man may be so obliged (Article 382, C.C.). Lastly, the sexes are equal as regards inheritance : daughters and sons, the maternal and paternal lines and the grand-maternal and grand-paternal lines have equal rights (Articles 457, paragraph 2 ; 458, paragraph 2, and 459, paragraph 2, C.C.). If, however, there is an agricultural undertaking in the succession, the sons are entitled to inherit it, provided that they compensate the daughters (Article 621, paragraph 3).

As regards matrimonial law, the Civil Code has replaced the traditional notion of marital power and its corollary, the protection of the wife by the husband, by two modern conceptions — namely, the autonomy of the two persons on the one hand and the idea of conjugal community on the other. This gives the married woman full civil capacity, tempered to some extent by the position of head of the conjugal union given to the husband.

In virtue of her autonomy, the married woman is entitled to dispose of her property, to appear before the courts as plaintiff or defendant, to prosecute and be prosecuted for debt, to act as guardian (Article 379, C.C.) and to witness a will.

Paternal authority belongs to her equally with the husband. The father's wishes prevail, however, in the absence of agreement between the parents (Article 274, C.C.). After the father's death, the mother exercises paternal authority ; the same applies in cases of divorce when the custody of the children has been given to the mother ; the latter has equal right with the father over the property of their children (Articles 290 and following, C.C.).

As regards current household requirements, the conjugal union is represented by the wife as well as by the husband. The latter is liable for his wife's acts in so far as she does not exceed her powers in a manner recognisable by third parties (Article 163, C.C.). A married woman may also exercise a profession or trade with the express or tacit consent of her husband. She may appeal to the judge if the husband refuses his consent (Article 167, C.C.).

In virtue of Article 177 of the Civil Code, the wife must obtain the approval of the guardianship authorities before entering into commitments to third parties in the interests of her husband. This is a survival of the old idea of the protection of the wife against the husband. On the other hand, the approval of the guardianship authorities for settlements between husband and wife in regard to the property brought by the wife and the property of the community is compulsory for the husband as well as for the wife.

Causes of divorce are the same for both partners (Articles 137 to 142, C.C.). A divorced woman preserves the position which she acquired by marriage, but resumes her previous name. The rules concerning the custody of children, and alimony for the latter or for the innocent party, make no distinction in principle between the sexes, although in practice the woman is usually more favoured than the man in this respect.

In case of dissolution or annulment of the marriage, the wife is subject to a special waiting period, and may not contract a new union for three hundred days in order to avoid any *confusio sanguinis*.

In accordance with the principle of community mentioned above, the husband is the head of the conjugal union and chooses the common home (Article 160, C.C.). This idea of unity of direction in conjugal affairs also appears in the matter of matrimonial regimes.

The Code provides for several matrimonial regimes. The husband and wife are subject to the regime of union of property if they have not adopted another regime by the marriage contract or if they are not subject to the special matrimonial regime (Article 178, C.C.).

Under the regime of union of property, the property which the two partners possessed at the time of marriage, and any property which they acquire subsequently, is administered by the husband, who has the usufruct of this property and receives the income there of (Articles 195, 200 and 201, C.C.). The wife administers herself her reserved property, which includes in particular that which she uses for the exercise of a profession or trade and the proceeds of her work outside her domestic activity (Article 191, C.C.).

A certain number of rules restrict the husband's right of disposal of his wife's property. If, when a marriage is dissolved, there remains a surplus after the partners, or the heirs of either of them, have recovered their original property, a third is allotted to the wife or her descendants and the other two-thirds to the husband or his heirs. If, on the other hand, there is a deficit, the latter is charged to the husband or his heirs unless it can be proved that it can be attributed to the wife (Article 214, C.C.).

The system of union of property allows the wife, in the event of her husband's bankruptcy, to claim the compensation due to her in respect of the property she has contributed and which is not covered, and hence to share in the attachment measures taken against him (Article 210, C.C.). If the wife has not recovered as much as half of the property contributed by her, or if she has not received security to that extent, she is treated as a privileged creditor in respect of the remainder of that half (Article 211, C.C.).

The other matrimonial regimes adopted in Switzerland are that of community and that of separation of property. Under the first of these regimes, the general joint property, which is administered by the husband, consists of all the property and income both of the husband and wife ; it belongs jointly to both partners (Article 215, C.C.). Reserved property can exist side by side with joint property.

The regime of separation of property leaves to the wife the disposal, administration and usufruct of her property, but gives her no privilege in her husband's bankruptcy.

As we have said, a woman has no vote in federal and cantonal matters ; she is not eligible to the Federal Parliament or to the Cantonal Parliaments, and cannot be a member of the Federal Government or of the cantonal Governments. Moreover, she cannot serve on a federal court (federal tribunal) or on a federal jury. Nor can she in principle serve on an ordinary court. These rules are, however, subject to numerous exceptions. Thus several Protestant cantons give women a vote in ecclesiastical matters. A woman may also become a member of an extraparliamentary commission or an official in a federal administration. Lastly, in several cantons, women sit on juvenile courts or trade councils and on charitable committees, and are eligible to act as guardians.

As regards the liberal professions, they are usually open to women, particularly teaching, even of the higher grade. In 1936, some twenty women, most of them with the degree of *Privat dozent*, were members of the teaching staff of the Swiss universities ; two of them even held special chairs.

The following provisions govern the nationality of women :

According to the Federal Constitution (Article 54, paragraph 4) and the Civil Code (Article 161), a woman acquires by marriage the right of citizenship of her husband. Consequently, a foreign woman who marries a Swiss becomes Swiss. The contrary principle, according to which a Swiss woman who marries a foreigner loses Swiss nationality, has been established by custom. Nevertheless, if a Swiss woman cannot acquire her husband's nationality by marriage, or if the latter has no nationality, she keeps her Swiss citizenship.

The husband's naturalisation carries that of his family with it, but the federal authorities may except the woman if she expresses such a desire. The same applies when the husband renounces Swiss nationality. Here, too, the family is treated as a whole, but the federal authorities may, in this case also, make an exception in favour of the woman.

In case of dissolution of marriage or of a judicial separation for an indefinite period, the Federal Council may under certain conditions re-admit to her original nationality a woman of Swiss origin who has married a foreigner if she is domiciled in Switzerland. Such re-admission must be applied for within ten years of the dissolution of marriage or of the separation.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 14 (c).** 1937. V

Geneva, September 16th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

Since the publication of documents A.14, A.14*(a)* and A.14*(b)*. 1937.V, the following reply has been received :

Yugoslavia.

[*Translation.*] September 15th, 1937.

Following on the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations on September 27th, 1935, inviting Governments to furnish information regarding the status of women as at present contained in their respective national laws, the Permanent Delegation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to the League of Nations has the honour to communicate herewith a part of this information.

The particulars supplied below refer to the status of women in the field of social legislation (Law for the Protection of Workers, Social Insurance Law and Shop Law) in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

The Permanent Delegation will take the necessary steps to ensure that information on the status of women in other branches of Yugoslav law (civil status, penal law, administrative law, etc.) is communicated to the Secretariat.

With regard to political rights, the Permanent Delegation has the honour to furnish provisionally certain brief particulars which form the first part of the annex appended.

Annex.

I. Political Rights.

The Constitution of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia of September 3rd, 1931, at present in force, contains (in Article 55) the following provision : " The Law shall decide the question of women's suffrage. "

The Constitution therefore enables the legislator to grant women the right to vote and the right to be elected.

II. Social Legislation.

Yugoslav social legislation applies the principle of equality of rights of men and women without restriction. It is true that special regulations exist which concern women only, as, in addition to their profession or other occupation, women have the important function of maternity to fulfil, and the status of women as workers must be determined in relation to their calling as mothers. Certain laws accordingly contain special clauses concerning women, namely :

Law for the Protection of Workers (1922) ;

Social Insurance Law (1922) ;

Shop Law (1931).

3219 — S.d.N. 1.130 (F) 1.025 (A). 9/37. — Imp. de la T. de G.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL V

1937. V. 8.

1. *Law for the Protection of Workers.*

(a) Night work for women shall be forbidden in all industrial and mechanical undertakings, as well as work of a particularly difficult nature or harmful to health.

(b) Women may not work during the two months preceding and the two months following confinement; they are entitled to allowances payable to workers under the Social Insurance Law. During this period, the employer may not dismiss any woman worker.

(c) An employer must grant a woman worker rest interval of fifteen to thirty minutes every four to five hours to feed her infant. Regular rest and wages may not be reduced as a result of this legal obligation.

(d) Every industrial undertaking employing a hundred or more workers of whom at least twenty-five have children must maintain a crèche for the children of its workers.

(e) Under the labour health regulations established by the Law for the protection of workers, undertakings must provide special rooms for women's meals, toilet, etc.

2. *Social Insurance Law.*

Any person hiring out his physical or mental labour for pay, whether temporarily or permanently, must be insured against sickness or accident. Women workers are entitled to free medical attendance and to the care of midwives during confinement, to a special allowance six weeks before and six weeks after confinement, and to allowances for the layette and for breast-feeding during a period of twelve weeks.

3. *Shop Law.*

(a) Women may not work for six weeks before and six weeks after confinement. During the whole of this period they are entitled to their wages and to the allowances payable under the Social Insurance Law.

(b) They are entitled to interrupt their work for an interval of half-an-hour twice a day in order to feed their child. Regular rest and wages may not be reduced as a result.

* * *

The whole of these regulations apply to all working women, whether married or not.

Other legislative regulations apply to all workers without distinction of sex. The new Law on Minimum Wages and the Old Age and Invalidity Insurance Law make no distinction between men and women workers.

This short report indicates that Yugoslavia is applying the principle of the protection of women workers.

[Communiqué à l'Assemblée,
au Conseil et aux Membres
de la Société.]

N° officiel : **A. 14 (d).** 1937. V.415

Genève, le 17 septembre 1937.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

STATUT DE LA FEMME

COMMUNICATIONS DES GOUVERNEMENTS ET DES ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES FÉMININES REÇUES DEPUIS SEPTEMBRE 1936

Depuis la publication des documents A.14, A.14*(a)*, A.14*(b)* et A.14*(c)*.1937.V, la réponse suivante a été reçue :

International Federation of Business and Professional Women.

Le 16 septembre 1937.

[*Traduction.*]

La Fédération internationale des femmes dans les carrières libérales et commerciales tient à exprimer son vif désir de voir l'Assemblée prendre des mesures effectives en ce qui concerne le statut de la femme.

Comme elle l'a déjà exposé dans son mémorandum d'août 1935, la Fédération — qui comprend quelque 100.000 femmes, de vingt-cinq pays du monde, qui gagnent leur vie dans le commerce et les professions libérales — est depuis longtemps sérieusement préoccupée des difficultés auxquelles ses membres ont à faire face, difficultés dont la cause fondamentale réside dans les différences entre le statut des hommes et celui des femmes. Même lorsque l'égalité existe en droit, l'habitude et les préjugés constituent souvent pour elles, dans la pratique, de sérieux handicaps.

En conséquence, la Fédération a demandé instamment que les gouvernements procèdent à une enquête sur le statut et la situation actuels de la femme, afin de déterminer les méthodes les plus propres à améliorer le statut de la femme dans chaque pays et de définir dans quelle mesure il est aujourd'hui possible de faire naître un accord, sur certains points particuliers, entre les gouvernements, en tenant compte des difficultés existantes tant en droit que dans la pratique. La Fédération estimait que les résultats d'une telle investigation constitueraient une base solide qui permettrait de poursuivre une action concertée, sur le plan international.

Cette enquête a été faite et une documentation très précieuse a été communiquée par les divers gouvernements, sans parler d'autres sources. En outre, on pourra bientôt disposer d'autres informations lorsque l'enquête à laquelle procède actuellement le Bureau international du Travail sera terminée.

La Fédération espère que l'on pourra faire étudier à fond ces données par un organisme approprié, en vue de déterminer les méthodes les meilleures et les plus pratiques pour améliorer le statut de la femme dans les nombreux pays où il existe encore des inégalités, et de préciser les points sur lesquels il serait actuellement possible de réaliser l'accord des gouvernements.

3.220 S. d. N. 1.955 9/37. — Imp. de « La Tribune de Genève ».

Série de Publications de la Société des Nations

V. QUESTIONS JURIDIQUES

1937. V. 9.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No. : **A. 14 (d).** 1937. V.

Geneva, September 17th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

Since the publication of documents A.14, A.14*(a)*, A.14*(b)* and A.14*(c)*. 1937.V, the following reply has been received :

International Federation of Business and Professional Women.

September 16th, 1937.

The International Federation of Business and Professional Women wishes to express its extreme and urgent desire that constructive action be taken by the Assembly in regard to the question of the status of women.

As previously stated in its memorandum dated August 1935, the Federation, whose membership is composed of some 100,000 women engaged in earning their living in the professional and commercial field in twenty-five countries of the world, has long been gravely concerned with the difficulties its members face, difficulties whose fundamental cause lies in the inequalities of status existing between men and women. Even where equality exists in law, in practice women are often severely handicapped by habit and prejudice.

The Federation, therefore, urged that an enquiry be made by Governments into the present status and position of women, the aim of the enquiry being to reveal the best methods of improving the status of women in each country, and to establish the measure of agreement on *definite points* now possible between Governments, taking into account existing difficulties both in law and practice. The Federation felt that the *results* of such an investigation should provide an effective basis for further concerted international action.

Such an enquiry has been made and much valuable material received from various Governments and also from other sources. Moreover, further material will shortly be available upon the completion of the investigation now being carried on by the International Labour Office.

The Federation earnestly trusts that effective machinery may be established to undertake a thorough study of such material with a view of ascertaining the best and most practical methods of improving the status of women in the many countries where inequalities still exist, and also of establishing the measure of agreement of definite points now possible between Governments.

[Communiqué au Conseil, aux Membres de la Société des Nations ainsi qu'aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 21 de la Convention.]

N° officiel : **C. 546. M. 383.** 1937. V.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

CONVENTION POUR LA PRÉVENTION ET LA RÉPRESSION DU TERRORISME

(Genève, le 16 novembre 1937)

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

(Geneva, November 16th, 1937)

Série de Publications de la Société des Nations
V. QUESTIONS JURIDIQUES
1937. V. 10.

CONVENTION POUR LA PRÉVENTION ET LA RÉPRESSION DU TERRORISME

. . . . . .

Désireux de rendre de plus en plus efficaces la prévention et la répression du terrorisme, lorsqu'il présente un caractère international,

Ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires:

. . . . . .

Lesquels, après avoir produit leurs pleins pouvoirs trouvés en bonne et due forme, ont convenu des dispositions suivantes:

Article premier.

1. Les Hautes Parties contractantes, réaffirmant le principe du droit international d'après lequel il est du devoir de tout Etat de s'abstenir lui-même de tout fait destiné à favoriser les activités terroristes dirigées contre un autre Etat et d'empêcher les actes par lesquels elles se manifestent, s'engagent, dans les termes ci-après exprimés, à prévenir et à réprimer les activités de ce genre et à se prêter mutuellement leur concours.

2. Dans la présente Convention, l'expression « actes de terrorisme » s'entend des faits criminels dirigés contre un Etat et dont le but ou la nature est de provoquer la terreur chez des personnalités déterminées, des groupes de personnes ou dans le public.

Article 2.

Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes doit prévoir dans sa législation pénale, s'ils n'y sont déjà prévus, les faits suivants commis sur son territoire s'ils sont dirigés contre une autre Haute Partie contractante et s'ils constituent des actes de terrorisme au sens de l'article premier:

(1) Les faits intentionnels dirigés contre la vie, l'intégrité corporelle, la santé ou la liberté:

a) Des chefs d'Etat, des personnes exerçant les prérogatives du chef d'Etat, de leurs successeurs héréditaires ou désignés;

b) Des conjoints des personnes ci-dessus énumérées;

c) Des personnes revêtues de fonctions ou de charges publiques lorsque ledit fait a été commis en raison des fonctions ou charges que ces personnes exercent.

(2) Le fait intentionnel consistant à détruire ou à endommager des biens publics ou destinés à un usage public qui appartiennent à une autre Haute Partie contractante ou qui relèvent d'elle.

(3) Le fait intentionnel de nature à mettre en péril des vies humaines par la création d'un danger commun.

(4) La tentative de commettre les infractions prévues par les dispositions ci-dessus du présent article.

(5) Le fait de fabriquer, de se procurer, de détenir ou de fournir des armes, munitions, produits explosifs ou substances nocives en vue de l'exécution, en quelque pays que ce soit, d'une infraction prévue par le présent article.

Article 3.

Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes doit également prévoir dans sa législation pénale les faits suivants s'ils sont commis sur son territoire en vue d'actes de terrorisme visés à

CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

. . . . . .

Being desirous of making more effective the prevention and punishment of terrorism of an international character,

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1.

1. The High Contracting Parties, reaffirming the principle of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against another State and to prevent the acts in which such activities take shape, undertake as hereinafter provided to prevent and punish activities of this nature and to collaborate for this purpose.

2. In the present Convention, the expression "acts of terrorism" means criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons, or a group of persons or the general public.

Article 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall, if this has not already been done, make the following acts committed on his own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1:

(1) Any wilful act causing death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to:

(*a*) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(*b*) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(*c*) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity.

(2) Wilful destruction of, or damage to, public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party.

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public.

(4) Any attempt to commit an offence falling within the foregoing provisions of the present article.

(5) The manufacture, obtaining, possession, or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article.

Article 3.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall make the following acts criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to an act of terrorism falling within

3386. — S.d.N. 1.325 + 100. 11/37. Imp. Kundig.

l'article 2, dirigés contre une autre Haute Partie contractante, en quelque pays que ces actes doivent être exécutés:

(1) L'association ou l'entente en vue de l'accomplissement de tels actes;

(2) L'instigation à de tels actes, lorsqu'elle a été suivie d'effet;

(3) L'instigation directe publique aux actes prévus par les numéros 1, 2 et 3 de l'article 2, qu'elle soit ou non suivie d'effet;

(4) La participation intentionnelle;

(5) Toute aide donnée sciemment en vue de l'accomplissement d'un tel acte.

Article 4.

Chacun des faits prévus à l'article 3 doit être considéré par la loi comme une infraction distincte dans tous les cas où il devra en être ainsi pour éviter l'impunité.

Article 5.

La répression par une Haute Partie contractante des faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 doit être la même, que ces faits soient dirigés contre cette Haute Partie contractante ou une autre Haute Partie contractante, sous réserve des dispositions spéciales du droit national touchant la protection particulière des personnalités visées à l'article 2, N° 1, ou des biens visés à l'article 2, N° 2.

Article 6.

1. Les pays qui admettent le principe de la récidive internationale reconnaissent, dans les conditions établies par leurs législations respectives, comme génératrices d'une telle récidive, les condamnations étrangères prononcées du chef de l'un des actes prévus aux articles 2 et 3.

2. Lesdites condamnations seront, en outre, reconnues de plein droit ou à la suite d'une procédure spéciale par les Hautes Parties contractantes dont la législation admet la reconnaissance des jugements étrangers en matière pénale, en vue de donner lieu, dans les conditions prévues par cette législation, à des incapacités, déchéances ou interdictions de droit public ou privé.

Article 7.

Dans la mesure où la constitution de parties civiles est admise par la législation interne, les parties civiles étrangères, y compris éventuellement une Haute Partie contractante, doivent jouir de l'exercice de tous les droits reconnus aux nationaux par les lois du pays où se juge l'affaire.

Article 8.

1. Sans préjudice des dispositions de l'alinéa 4 ci-dessous, les faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 sont compris comme cas d'extradition dans tout traité d'extradition conclu ou à conclure entre les Hautes Parties contractantes.

2. Les Hautes Parties contractantes qui ne subordonnent pas l'extradition à l'existence d'un traité reconnaissent, dès à présent, sans préjudice des dispositions de l'alinéa 4 ci-dessous, les faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 comme cas d'extradition entre elles, sous la condition de réciprocité.

3. Aux fins du présent article, est également considéré comme cas d'extradition, tout fait énuméré aux articles 2 et 3, qui a été commis sur le territoire de la Haute Partie contractante contre laquelle il a été dirigé.

4. L'obligation d'extrader en vertu du présent article est subordonnée à toute condition et restriction admises par le droit ou la pratique du pays auquel la demande est adressée.

Article 2 and directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the act of terrorism is to be carried out:

(1) Conspiracy to commit any such act;

(2) Any incitement to any such act, if successful;

(3) Direct public incitement to any act mentioned under heads (1), (2) or (3) of Article 2, whether the incitement be successful or not;

(4) Wilful participation in any such act;

(5) Assistance, knowingly given, towards the commission of any such act.

Article 4.

Each of the offences mentioned in Article 3 shall be treated by the law as a distinct offence in all cases where this is necessary in order to prevent an offender escaping punishment.

Article 5.

Subject to any special provisions of national law for the protection of the persons mentioned under head (1) of Article 2, or of the property mentioned under head (2) of Article 2, each High Contracting Party shall provide the same punishment for the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3, whether they be directed against that or another High Contracting Party.

Article 6.

1. In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is accepted, foreign convictions for any of the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 will, within the conditions prescribed by domestic law, be taken into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

2. Such convictions will, further, in the case of High Contracting Parties whose law recognises foreign convictions, be taken into account, with or without special proceedings, for the purpose of imposing, in the manner provided by that law, incapacities, disqualifications or interdictions whether in the sphere of public or of private law.

Article 7.

In so far as *parties civiles* are admitted under the domestic law, foreign *parties civiles*, including, in proper cases, a High Contracting Party shall be entitled to all rights allowed to nationals by the law of the country in which the case is tried.

Article 8.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below, the offences set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been, or may hereafter be, concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall henceforward, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below and subject to reciprocity, recognise the offences set out in Articles 2 and 3 as extradition crimes as between themselves.

3. For the purposes of the present article, any offence specified in Articles 2 and 3, if committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom it is directed, shall also be deemed to be an extradition crime.

4. The obligation to grant extradition under the present article shall be subject to any conditions and limitations recognised by the law or the practice of the country to which application is made.

Article 9.

1. Lorsqu'une Haute Partie contractante n'admet pas le principe de l'extradition des nationaux, ses ressortissants qui sont rentrés sur le territoire de leur pays, après avoir commis à l'étranger l'un des faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3, doivent être poursuivis et punis de la même manière que si le fait avait été commis sur son territoire, et cela même dans le cas où le coupable aurait acquis sa nationalité postérieurement à l'accomplissement de l'infraction.

2. Les dispositions du présent article ne sont pas applicables lorsque, dans un cas semblable, l'extradition d'un étranger ne peut pas être accordée.

Article 10.

Les étrangers qui ont commis à l'étranger un des faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 et qui se trouvent sur le territoire d'une des Hautes Parties contractantes doivent être poursuivis et punis de la même manière que si le fait avait été commis sur le territoire de celle-ci, lorsque les conditions suivantes sont réunies:

a) L'extradition ayant été demandée n'a pu être accordée pour une raison étrangère au fait même;

b) La législation du pays de refuge reconnaît la compétence de ses juridictions à l'égard d'infractions commises par des étrangers à l'étranger;

c) L'étranger est ressortissant d'un pays qui reconnaît la compétence de ses juridictions à l'égard des infractions commises par des étrangers à l'étranger.

Article 11.

1. Les dispositions des articles 9 et 10 s'appliquent également aux faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 qui ont été commis sur le territoire de la Haute Partie contractante contre laquelle ils ont été dirigés.

2. En ce qui concerne l'application des articles 9 et 10, les Hautes Parties contractantes n'assument pas l'obligation de prononcer une peine dépassant le maximum de celle prévue par la loi du pays où l'infraction a été commise.

Article 12.

En vue de prévenir efficacement toutes les activités contraires au but visé par la présente Convention, chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes doit prendre sur son territoire et dans le cadre de sa législation et de son organisation administrative les mesures qu'elle estimera appropriées.

Article 13.

1. Indépendamment des dispositions de l'article 2, N° 5, doivent être réglementés le port, la détention et la circulation d'armes à feu (autres que les armes de chasse à canon lisse) et des munitions. Le fait de céder, de vendre ou de distribuer ces armes ou munitions à une personne ne justifiant pas de l'autorisation ou de la déclaration lorsqu'elle est requise par la législation interne pour la détention ou le port de ces objets sera réprimé; il en sera de même pour la cession, la vente ou la distribution des explosifs.

2. Les fabricants d'armes à feu, autres que les armes de chasse à canon lisse, doivent être obligés de marquer chaque arme d'un numéro d'ordre ou signe distinctif de nature à l'identifier; les fabricants et les détaillants doivent tenir un registre des noms et adresses des acheteurs.

Article 14.

1. Doivent être punis:

a) Tous les faits frauduleux de fabrication ou d'altération de passeports ou autres documents équivalents;

b) Le fait d'introduire dans le pays, de se procurer ou de détenir de tels documents qui sont faux ou falsifiés, sachant qu'ils le sont;

c) Le fait de se faire délivrer de tels documents sur déclarations ou pièces fausses;

d) L'usage fait sciemment de tels documents faux ou falsifiés ou établis à une autre identité que celle du porteur.

Article 9.

1. When the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised by a High Contracting Party, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country after the commission abroad of an offence mentioned in Articles 2 or 3 shall be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed on that territory, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. The provisions of the present article shall not apply if, in similar circumstances, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 10.

Foreigners who are on the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the offences set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be prosecuted and punished as though the offence had been committed in the territory of that High Contracting Party, if the following conditions are fulfilled—namely, that:

(*a*) Extradition has been demanded and could not be granted for a reason not connected with the offence itself;

(*b*) The law of the country of refuge recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners;

(*c*) The foreigner is a national of a country which recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners.

Article 11.

1. The provisions of Articles 9 and 10 shall also apply to offences referred to in Articles 2 and 3 which have been committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom they were directed.

2. As regards the application of Articles 9 and 10, the High Contracting Parties do not undertake to pass a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence provided by the law of the country where the offence was committed.

Article 12.

Each High Contracting Party shall take on his own territory and within the limits of his own law and administrative organisation the measures which he considers appropriate for the effective prevention of all activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article 13

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of head (5) of Article 2, the carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition shall be subjected to regulation. It shall be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute such arms or munitions to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles; this shall apply also to the transfer, sale or distribution of explosives.

2. Manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, shall be required to mark each arm with a serial number or other distinctive mark permitting it to be identified; both manufacturers and retailers shall be obliged to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

Article 14.

1. The following acts shall be punishable:

(*a*) Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration of passports or other equivalent documents;

(*b*) Bringing into the country, obtaining or being in possession of such forged or falsified documents knowing them to be forged or falsified;

(*c*) Obtaining such documents by means of false declarations or documents;

(*d*) Wilfully using any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. Doit être réprimé le fait de la part des fonctionnaires compétents de délivrer sciemment des passeports, autres documents équivalents ou visas, en vue de favoriser une activité contraire au but visé par la présente Convention, à des personnes sachant qu'elles n'ont pas le droit, conformément aux lois ou règlements, d'obtenir lesdits documents ou visas.

3. Les dispositions du présent article s'appliquent sans égard au caractère national ou étranger du document.

Article 15.

1. Dans chaque pays et dans le cadre de sa législation nationale, les résultats des recherches en matière d'infractions prévues par les articles 2 et 3 et par l'article 14, dans la mesure où l'infraction à celui-ci peut être en rapport avec la préparation d'actes de terrorisme, seront centralisés dans un service.

2. Ce service doit être en contact étroit:

a) Avec les autorités de police à l'intérieur du pays;

b) Avec les services similaires des autres pays.

3. Il doit, en outre, réunir tous les renseignements pouvant faciliter la prévention et la répression des actes prévus par les articles 2 et 3 et des actes prévus par l'article 14, dans la mesure où ceux-ci pourraient être en rapport avec la préparation d'actes de terrorisme; il doit, dans la mesure du possible, se tenir en contact étroit avec les autorités judiciaires à l'intérieur du pays.

Article 16.

Chaque service, dans les limites où il le jugera désirable, devra notifier au service des autres pays, en leur donnant toutes informations nécessaires:

a) Tout acte prévu par les articles 2 et 3, même s'il est encore à l'état de projet; cette notification sera accompagnée de descriptions, de copies ou de photographies;

b) Les recherches, poursuites, arrestations, condamnations, expulsions de personnes s'étant rendues coupables d'actes visés par la présente Convention, ainsi que le déplacement de ces personnes et tous renseignements utiles, notamment leurs signalement, empreintes digitales et photographies;

c) La découverte des écrits, armes, engins ou autres objets se rapportant aux actes prévus par les articles 2, 3, 13 et 14.

Article 17.

1. Les Hautes Parties contractantes sont tenues d'exécuter les commissions rogatoires relatives aux infractions visées par la présente Convention selon leur législation nationale, leur pratique en cette matière et les conventions conclues ou à conclure.

2. La transmission des commissions rogatoires doit être opérée:

a) Soit par voie de communication directe entre les autorités judiciaires;

b) Soit par correspondance directe des ministres de la Justice des deux pays;

c) Soit par correspondance directe entre l'autorité du pays requérant et le ministre de la Justice du pays requis;

d) Soit par l'intermédiaire de l'agent diplomatique ou consulaire du pays requérant dans le pays requis; cet agent enverra directement ou par l'intermédiaire du ministre des Affaires étrangères la commission rogatoire à l'autorité judiciaire compétente ou à celle indiquée par le gouvernement du pays requis, et recevra directement de cette autorité ou par l'intermédiaire du ministre des Affaires étrangères les pièces constituant l'exécution de la commission rogatoire.

3. Dans les cas *a*) et *d*), copie de la commission rogatoire sera toujours adressée en même temps au ministre de la Justice du pays requis.

4. A défaut d'entente contraire, la commission rogatoire doit être rédigée dans la langue de l'autorité requérante, sauf au pays requis à en demander une traduction faite dans sa langue et certifiée conforme par l'autorité requérante.

5. Chaque Haute Partie contractante fera connaître, par une communication adressée à chacune des autres Hautes Parties contractantes, celui ou ceux des modes de transmission susvisés qu'elle admet pour les commissions rogatoires de cette Haute Partie contractante.

6. Jusqu'au moment où une Haute Partie contractante fera une telle communication, sa procédure actuelle en fait de commissions rogatoires sera maintenue.

7. L'exécution des commissions rogatoires ne pourra donner lieu au remboursement de taxes ou frais autres que les frais d'expertises.

2. The wilful issue of passports, other equivalent documents, or visas by competent officials to persons known not to have the right thereto under the laws or regulations applicable, with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention, shall also be punishable.

3. The provisions of the present article shall apply irrespective of the national or foreign character of the document.

Article 15.

1. Results of the investigation of offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 14 shall in each country, subject to the provisions of its law, be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. Such service shall be in close contact:

(*a*) With the police authorities of the country;

(*b*) With the corresponding services in other countries.

3. It shall furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 14; it shall, as far as possible, keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

Article 16.

Each service, so far as it considers it desirable to do so, shall notify to the services of the other countries, giving all necessary particulars:

(*a*) Any act mentioned in Articles 2 and 3, even if it has not been carried into effect, such notification to be accompanied by descriptions, copies and photographs;

(*b*) Any search for, any prosecution, arrest, conviction or expulsion of persons guilty of offences dealt with in the present Convention, the movements of such persons and any pertinent information with regard to them, as well as their description, finger-prints and photographs;

(*c*) Discovery of documents, arms, appliances or other objects connected with offences mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 13 and 14.

Article 17.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention in accordance with their domestic law and practice and any international conventions concluded or to be concluded by them.

2. The transmission of letters of request shall be effected:

(*a*) By direct communication between the judicial authorities;

(*b*) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries;

(*c*) By direct correspondence between the authority of the country making the request and the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made;

(*d*) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request, either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the competent judicial authority or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made and shall receive the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request from this authority either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. In cases (*a*) and (*d*), a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the Minister of Justice of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letters of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority making the request, provided always that the country to which the request is made may require a translation in its own language, certified correct by the authority making the request.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method or methods of transmission mentioned above which he will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, his existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. Execution of letters of request shall not give rise to a claim for reimbursement of charges or expenses of any nature whatever other than expenses of experts.

8. Rien, dans le présent article, ne pourra être interprété comme constituant, de la part des Hautes Parties contractantes, un engagement d'admettre, en ce qui concerne le système des preuves en matière répressive, une dérogation à leur loi.

Article 18.

La participation d'une Haute Partie contractante à la présente Convention ne doit pas être interprétée comme portant atteinte à son attitude sur la question générale de la compétence de la juridiction pénale comme question de droit international.

Article 19.

La présente Convention laisse intact le principe en vertu duquel la qualification des faits visés par elle, les peines applicables, la poursuite, le jugement, le régime des excuses, le droit de grâce et d'amnistie relèvent dans chaque pays des règles de sa législation interne, sans que jamais l'impunité puisse résulter d'une lacune dans les textes de cette législation en matière pénale.

Article 20.

1. S'il s'élève entre les Hautes Parties contractantes un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application de la présente Convention, et si ce différend n'a pu être résolu de façon satisfaisante par voie diplomatique, il sera réglé conformément aux dispositions en vigueur entre les Parties concernant le règlement des différends internationaux.

2. Au cas où de telles dispositions n'existeraient pas entre les parties au différend, elles le soumettront à une procédure arbitrale ou judiciaire. A défaut d'un accord sur le choix d'un autre tribunal, elles soumettront le différend à la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, si elles sont toutes parties au Protocole du 16 décembre 1920 relatif au Statut de ladite Cour, et, si elles n'y sont pas toutes parties, à un Tribunal d'arbitrage constitué conformément à la Convention de La Haye du 18 octobre 1907, pour le règlement pacifique des conflits internationaux.

3. Les dispositions ci-dessus du présent article ne portent pas atteinte au droit des Hautes Parties contractantes membres de la Société des Nations de porter le différend, si le Pacte les y autorise, devant le Conseil ou l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations.

Article 21.

1. La présente Convention, dont les textes français et anglais feront également foi, portera la date de ce jour; elle pourra, jusqu'au 31 mai 1938, être signée au nom de tout Membre de la Société des Nations et de tout Etat non membre représenté à la Conférence qui a élaboré la présente Convention ou auquel le Conseil de la Société des Nations aura, à cet effet, communiqué copie de la présente Convention.

2. La présente Convention sera ratifiée. Les instruments de ratification seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société ainsi qu'aux Etats non membres visés au paragraphe précédent.

Article 22.

1. A partir du 1er juin 1938, la présente Convention sera ouverte à l'adhésion de tout Membre de la Société des Nations ou de tout Etat non membre visé à l'article 21 par qui cette Convention n'aurait pas été signée.

2. Les instruments d'adhésion seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société et aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 21.

Article 23.

1. Les Membres de la Société des Nations et Etats non membres qui seraient disposés à ratifier la Convention conformément au second paragraphe de l'article 21 ou à y adhérer en vertu de l'article 22, mais qui désireraient être autorisés à apporter des réserves à l'application de la Convention, informeront de leur intention le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations. Celui-ci communiquera immédiatement ces réserves à tous les Membres de la Société et Etats non membres au nom desquels un instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion aura été déposé, en leur demandant s'ils ont des objections à présenter. Si la réserve est formulée au cours des trois ans qui suivront l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention, la même communication sera adressée aux Membres de la Société et Etats non membres dont la signature n'a pas encore été suivie de ratification. Si dans un délai de six mois à partir de la date de la communication du Secrétaire général aucune objection n'a été soulevée contre la réserve, celle-ci sera considérée comme acceptée par les Hautes Parties contractantes.

8. Nothing in the present article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws.

Article 18.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of the limits of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 19.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, provided the offender is not allowed to escape punishment owing to an omission in the criminal law, the characterisation of the various offences dealt with in the present Convention, the imposition of sentences, the methods of prosecution and trial, and the rules as to mitigating circumstances, pardon and amnesty are determined in each country by the provisions of domestic law.

Article 20.

1. If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

2. If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

3. The above provisions of the present article shall not prevent High Contracting Parties, if they are Members of the League of Nations, from bringing the dispute before the Council or the Assembly of the League if the Covenant gives them the power to do so.

Article 21.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall be both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until May 31st, 1938, it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and on behalf of any non-member State represented at the Conference which drew up the present Convention or to which a copy thereof is communicated for this purpose by the Council of the League of Nations.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Article 22.

1. After June 1st, 1938, the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations, and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 21, on whose behalf the Convention has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 21.

Article 23.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State which is prepared to ratify the Convention under the second paragraph of Article 21, or to accede to the Convention under Article 22, but desires to be allowed to make reservations with regard to the application of the Convention, may so inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall forthwith communicate such reservations to all the Members of the League and non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited and enquire whether they have any objection thereto. Should the reservation be formulated within three years from the entry into force of the Convention, the same enquiry shall be addressed to Members of the League and non-member States whose signature of the Convention has not yet been followed by ratification. If, within six months from the date of the Secretary-General's communication, no objection to the reservation has been made, it shall be treated as accepted by the High Contracting Parties.

2. Au cas où des objections seraient soulevées, le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations en informera le gouvernement qui désire formuler une réserve et l'invitera à lui faire savoir s'il est disposé à ratifier la Convention ou à y adhérer sans la réserve ou s'il préfère s'abstenir de toute ratification ou adhésion.

Article 24.

La ratification par une Haute Partie contractante ou son adhésion à la présente Convention implique l'assurance de sa part que sa législation et son organisation administrative la mettent en mesure de pourvoir à l'exécution de la Convention.

Article 25.

1. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut déclarer, au moment de la signature, de la ratification ou de l'adhésion, que, par son acceptation de la présente Convention, elle n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble ou toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la présente Convention ne sera pas applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration.

2. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes pourra ultérieurement notifier au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations qu'elle entend rendre la présente Convention applicable à l'ensemble ou à toute partie de ses territoires ayant fait l'objet de la déclaration prévue au paragraphe précédent. En adressant ladite notification, la Haute Partie contractante intéressée pourra spécifier que l'application de ladite Convention à l'un quelconque dé ces territoires sera subordonnée à toutes réserves qu'elle aura formulées et qui auront été acceptées aux termes de l'article 23. Dans ce cas, la Convention s'appliquera, avec lesdites réserves, à tous les territoires visés dans la notification quatre-vingt-dix jours après la réception de cette notification par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations. Au cas où une Haute Partie contractante désirerait formuler, en ce qui concerne l'un quelconque de ces territoires, des réserves autres que celles qu'elle a déjà apportées aux termes de l'article 23, la procédure à suivre sera celle qui est fixée audit article 23.

3. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut, à tout moment, déclarer qu'elle entend voir cesser l'application de la présente Convention pour l'ensemble ou pour toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la Convention cessera d'être applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration un an après la réception de cette déclaration par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

4. Le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations communiquera à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 21 les déclarations et notifications reçues en vertu du présent article.

Article 26.

1. La présente Convention sera enregistrée, conformément aux dispositions de l'article 18 du Pacte, par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, le quatre-vingt-dixième jour qui suivra la réception par le Secrétaire général du troisième instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion.

2. La Convention entrera en vigueur le jour de cet enregistrement.

Article 27.

Chaque ratification ou adhésion qui interviendra après le dépôt du troisième instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion sortira ses effets dès le quatre-vingt-dixième jour qui suivra la date de la réception de l'instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion respectif par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

Article 28.

Une demande de revision de la présente Convention pourra être formulée en tout temps par toute Haute Partie contractante, par voie de notification adressée au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations. Cette notification sera communiquée par le Secrétaire général à toutes les autres Hautes Parties contractantes, et, si elle est appuyée par un tiers au moins de celles-ci, les Hautes Parties contractantes s'engagent à se réunir en une conférence aux fins de révision de la Convention.

Article 29.

La présente Convention pourra être dénoncée au nom de toute Haute Partie contractante, par notification écrite adressée au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, qui en informera tous les Membres de la Société et les Etats non membres visés à l'article 21. La dénonciation sortira ses effets un an après la date à laquelle elle aura été reçue par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations; elle ne sera opérante qu'au regard de la Haute Partie contractante au nom de laquelle elle aura été effectuée.

2. In the event of any objection being received, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall inform the Government which desired to make the reservation and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to ratify or accede without the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification or accession.

Article 24.

Ratification of, or accession to, the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation enable him to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

Article 25.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. In making such notification, the High Contracting Party concerned may state that the application of the Convention to any of such territories shall be subject to any reservations which have been accepted in respect of that High Contracting Party under Article 23. The Convention shall then apply, with any such reservations, to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Should it be desired as regards any such territories to make reservations other than those already made under Article 23 by the High Contracting Party concerned, the procedure set out in that Article shall be followed.

3. Any High Contracting Party may at any time declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States referred to in Article 21 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 26.

1. The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the third instrument of ratification or accession.

2. The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration.

Article 27.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the third instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 28.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by means of a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

Article 29.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 21. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires ont signé la présente Convention.

FAIT à Genève, le seize novembre mil neuf cent trente-sept, en simple expédition, qui sera déposée dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations; copie certifiée conforme en sera transmise à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et à tous les Etats non membres visés à l'article 21.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, on the sixteenth day of November one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven, in a single copy, which will be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States referred to in Article 21.

ALBANIE

Ad referendum:

Th. LUARASSI

ALBANIA

RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE

Enrique RUIZ-GUIÑAZÚ

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

BELGIQUE

Ad referendum:

S. SASSERATH

BELGIUM

INDE

INDIA

Denys BRAY

BULGARIE

BULGARIA

N. MOMTCHILOFF

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE — DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Ch. ACKERMANN

ÉGYPTE — EGYPT

Aly SHAMSY Abdel Latif TALAAT

ÉQUATEUR — ECUADOR

Alejandro GASTELÚ

ESPAGNE — SPAIN

Cipriano DE RIVAS CHERIF.

ESTONIE — ESTONIA

J. KÔDAR.

FRANCE — FRANCE

Me référant à l'article 25 de la Convention, je déclare que le Gouvernement français n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble de ses colonies et protectorats, ainsi que des territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié [1].

BASDEVANT

GRÈCE — GREECE

S. POLYCHRONIADIS

---

[1] *Translation by the Secretariat of the League of Nations:*

With reference to Article 25 of the Convention, I declare that the French Government does not assume any obligation as regards the whole of its Colonies and Protectorates, or the territories for which a mandate has been entrusted to it.

NORVÈGE

NORWAY

Ad referendum :

H. H. BACHKE

PAYS-BAS

THE NETHERLANDS

VAN HAMEL

PÉROU

PERU

J. M. BARRETO

ROUMANIE — ROUMANIA

Vespasien V. PELLA.

TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE — CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr KOUKAL

TURQUIE — TURKEY

Vasfi MENTEŞ

VENEZUELA

C. PARRA-PEREZ
J. M. ORTEGA-MARTINEZ
Alejandro E. TRUJILLO

VENEZUELA

YOUGOSLAVIE

Thomas GIVANOVITCH.

YUGOSLAVIA

Copie certifiée conforme.

Genève, le

Pour le Secrétaire général:

Conseiller juridique du Secrétariat.

Certified true copy.

Geneva,

For the Secretary-General:

Legal Adviser of the Secretariat.

[Communiqué au Conseil, aux Membres de la Société des Nations ainsi qu'aux Etats non membres représentés à la Conférence.]

N° officiel : **C.547.M.384.** 1937. V.

SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS

CONVENTION POUR LA CREATION D'UNE COUR PENALE INTERNATIONALE

(Genève, le 16 novembre 1937)

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

(Geneva, November 16th, 1937)

Série de Publications de la Société des Nations
V. QUESTIONS JURIDIQUES
1937. V.11.

CONVENTION POUR LA CRÉATION D'UNE COUR PÉNALE INTERNATIONALE

. . . . . .

Désireux, à l'occasion de la conclusion de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme, signée à la date de ce jour, de créer une Cour pénale internationale en vue de réaliser par là un progrès dans la lutte contre les infractions présentant un caractère international,

Ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires:

. . . . . .

Lesquels, après avoir produit leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes:

Article premier.

Il est institué une Cour pénale internationale en vue de juger dans les conditions ci-après spécifiées les individus accusés d'une infraction prévue dans la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

Article 2.

1. Dans les cas visés par les articles 2, 3, 9 et 10 de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme, toute Haute Partie contractante à la présente Convention a la faculté, au lieu de faire juger par ses propres juridictions, de déférer l'accusé à la Cour.

2. Elle a en outre la faculté, dans les cas où elle peut accorder l'extradition conformément à l'article 8 de ladite Convention, de déférer l'accusé à la Cour, si l'Etat qui demande l'extradition est également partie à la présente Convention.

3. Les Hautes Parties contractantes reconnaissent qu'en faisant usage de la faculté prévue par le présent article, les autres Parties contractantes se conforment à leur égard aux prescriptions de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

Article 3.

La Cour est constituée de façon permanente. Toutefois, elle ne devra se réunir que lorsqu'elle sera saisie d'une poursuite relevant de sa compétence.

Article 4.

Le siège de la Cour est fixé à La Haye. La Cour, consultée par son Président, peut, pour une affaire déterminée, décider de se réunir ailleurs.

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

. . . . . .

Being desirous on the occasion of concluding the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, which bears to-day's date, of creating an International Criminal Court with a view to making progress in the struggle against offences of an international character,

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1.

An International Criminal Court for the trial, as hereinafter provided, of persons accused of an offence dealt with in the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is hereby established.

Article 2.

1. In the cases referred to in Articles 2, 3, 9 and 10 of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, each High Contracting Party to the present Convention shall be entitled, instead of prosecuting before his own courts, to commit the accused for trial to the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party shall further, in cases where he is able to grant extradition in accordance with Article 8 of the said Convention, be entitled to commit the accused for trial to the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a Party to the present Convention.

3. The High Contracting Parties recognise that other Parties discharge their obligations towards them under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism by making use of the right given them by the present article.

Article 3.

The Court shall be a permanent body, but shall sit only when it is seized of proceedings for an offence within its jurisdiction.

Article 4.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. For any particular case, the President may take the opinion of the Court and the Court may decide to meet elsewhere.

3387 — S.d.N. 1.325 + 100. 11/37. Imp. Kundig.

Article 5.

La Cour se compose de magistrats choisis parmi les jurisconsultes possédant une compétence reconnue en matière de droit pénal qui sont ou qui ont été membres de tribunaux siégeant en matière pénale ou qui réunissent les conditions requises pour être nommés dans leur pays.

Article 6.

La Cour se compose de cinq juges titulaires et de cinq juges suppléants appartenant chacun à une nationalité différente, sous réserve cependant que les juges titulaires et juges suppléants doivent être des ressortissants des Hautes Parties contractantes.

Article 7.

1. Tout Membre de la Société des Nations et tout Etat non membre à l'égard desquels la présente Convention est en vigueur pourra présenter deux candidats au plus aux fonctions de juge à la Cour.

2. La Cour permanente de Justice internationale sera priée de choisir les juges titulaires et suppléants parmi les personnes ainsi présentées.

Article 8.

Tout membre de la Cour doit, avant d'entrer en fonction, prendre en séance publique l'engagement solennel d'exercer ses attributions en pleine impartialité et en toute conscience.

Article 9.

Les Hautes Parties contractantes reconnaissent aux membres de la Cour, dans l'exercice de leurs fonctions, les privilèges et immunités diplomatiques.

Article 10.

1. Le mandat des juges est de dix ans.

2. La Cour se renouvelle tous les deux ans à raison d'un membre titulaire et d'un membre suppléant.

3. Pour la première période de dix ans, l'ordre suivant lequel ce renouvellement aura lieu sera déterminé au moyen d'un tirage au sort au moment de la première élection.

4. Le mandat des juges peut être renouvelé.

5. Les juges restent en fonction jusqu'à leur remplacement.

6. Toutefois, après ce remplacement, ils continuent de connaître des affaires dont ils ont déjà été saisis.

Article 11.

1. En cas de vacance d'un siège par expiration du mandat du titulaire ou pour toute autre cause, il y est pourvu conformément à l'article 7.

2. En cas de démission d'un membre de la Cour, la démission prendra effet au moment où notification en sera reçue par le Greffier.

3. En cas de vacance d'un siège se produisant plus de huit mois avant la date du renouvellement normal de ce siège, les Hautes Parties contractantes doivent, dans le délai de deux mois, procéder aux présentations prévues à l'article 7, paragraphe 1, en vue de pourvoir à cette vacance.

Article 12.

Un membre de la Cour ne peut être relevé de ses fonctions que si, au jugement unanime de tous les autres membres, titulaires et suppléants, il a cessé de répondre aux conditions requises.

Article 13.

Le juge nommé en remplacement d'un juge dont le mandat n'est pas expiré achève le terme du mandat de son prédécesseur.

Article 14.

La Cour élit pour deux ans son Président et son Vice-Président; ils sont rééligibles.

Article 5.

The Court shall be composed of judges chosen from among jurists who are acknowledged authorities on criminal law and who are or have been members of courts of criminal jurisdiction or possess the qualifications required for such appointments in their own countries.

Article 6.

The Court shall consist of five regular judges and five deputy judges, each belonging to a different nationality, but so that the regular judges and deputy judges shall be nationals of the High Contracting Parties.

Article 7.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State, in respect of which the present Convention is in force, may nominate not more than two candidates for appointment as judges of the Court.

2. The Permanent Court of International Justice shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

Article 8.

Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, give a solemn undertaking in open Court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

Article 9.

The High Contracting Parties shall grant the members of the Court diplomatic privileges and immunities when engaged on the business of the Court.

Article 10.

1. Judges shall hold office for ten years.

2. Every two years, one regular and one deputy judge shall retire.

3. The order of retirement for the first period of ten years shall be determined by lot when the first election takes place.

4. Judges may be re-appointed.

5. Judges shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled.

6. Nevertheless, judges, though replaced, shall finish any cases which they have begun.

Article 11.

1. Any vacancy, whether occurring on the expiration of a judge's term of office or for any other cause, shall be filled as provided in Article 7.

2. In the event of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall take effect on notification being received by the Registrar.

3. If a seat on the Court becomes vacant more than eight months before the date at which a new election to that seat would normally take place, the High Contracting Parties shall within two months nominate candidates for the seat in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1.

Article 12.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of all the other members, including both regular and deputy judges, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Article 13.

A judge appointed in place of a judge whose period of appointment has not expired shall hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 14.

The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for two years; they may be re-elected.

Article 15.

La Cour établira elle-même un règlement pour son fonctionnement et sa procédure.

Article 16.

Le Greffe de la Cour sera assuré par le Greffe de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, si celle-ci y consent.

Article 17.

Les archives de la Cour sont confiées au Greffier.

Article 18.

La Cour siège au nombre de cinq membres.

Article 19.

1. Les membres de la Cour ne peuvent participer au jugement d'aucune affaire dans laquelle ils sont antérieurement intervenus à un titre quelconque. En cas de doute, la Cour décide.

2. Si, pour une raison spéciale, l'un des membres de la Cour estime ne pas devoir siéger dans une affaire déterminée, il en fait part au Président dès qu'il a été informé que la Cour est saisie de cette affaire.

Article 20.

1. Si la présence de cinq juges n'est pas assurée, ce nombre est parfait par l'appel en fonction de juges suppléants dans l'ordre du tableau.

2. Le tableau est dressé par la Cour en tenant compte d'abord de la priorité de nomination et, ensuite, de l'ancienneté d'âge.

Article 21.

1. En ce qui concerne l'application de la loi pénale de fond, la Cour appliquera la loi la moins rigoureuse. A cet effet, elle prendra en considération la loi du pays sur le territoire duquel l'infraction a été commise et la loi du pays qui a saisi la Cour.

2. Pour toutes contestations sur la question de savoir quelle est la loi pénale de fond à appliquer, la Cour statuera.

Article 22.

Si la Cour est appelée, conformément à l'article 21, à appliquer la loi d'un Etat qui ne compte pas de ressortissant parmi les juges siégeant dans l'affaire, elle pourra appeler à siéger à ses côtés, avec voix consultative et à titre de juriste assesseur, un jurisconsulte ayant une compétence reconnue en la matière.

Article 23.

La Haute Partie contractante qui use de la faculté de déférer un accusé pour jugement à la Cour en informera le Président par l'intermédiaire du Greffe.

Article 24.

Le Président de la Cour, dès qu'une Haute Partie contractante lui a communiqué sa décision de déférer un accusé à la Cour, conformément à l'article 2, en informe l'Etat contre lequel l'infraction a été dirigée, celui sur le territoire duquel elle a été commise, ainsi que celui dont l'accusé est ressortissant.

Article 25.

1. La Cour est saisie par le fait qu'une Haute Partie contractante lui défère l'accusé.

2. L'acte par lequel un Etat défère un accusé à la Cour doit contenir l'énoncé des charges principales et les éléments sur lesquels elles s'appuient, ainsi que la désignation de l'agent par lequel cet Etat sera représenté.

3. L'Etat qui a déféré l'accusé à la Cour assume la charge de soutenir l'accusation, à moins que l'Etat contre lequel l'infraction a été dirigée ou, à son défaut, l'Etat sur le territoire duquel l'infraction a été commise n'exprime le désir de se substituer à lui.

Article 15.

The Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure.

Article 16.

The work of the Registry of the Court shall be performed by the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice, if that Court consents.

Article 17.

The Court's archives shall be in the charge of the Registrar.

Article 18.

The number of members who shall sit to constitute the Court shall be five.

Article 19.

1. Members of the Court may not take part in trying any case in which they have previously been engaged in any capacity whatsoever. In case of doubt, the Court shall decide.

2. If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not sit to try a particular case, he shall so notify the President as soon as he has been informed that the Court is seized of that case.

Article 20.

1. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly, to age.

Article 21.

1. The substantive criminal law to be applied by the Court shall be that which is the least severe. In determining what that law is, the Court shall take into consideration the law of the territory on which the offence was committed and the law of the country which committed the accused to it for trial.

2. Any dispute as to what substantive criminal law is applicable shall be decided by the Court.

Article 22.

If the Court has to apply, in accordance with Article 21, the law of a State of which no sitting judge is a national, the Court may invite a jurist who is an acknowledged authority on such law to sit with it in a consultative capacity as a legal assessor.

Article 23.

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to commit an accused person for trial to the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 24.

The President of the Court, on being informed by a High Contracting Party of his decision to commit an accused person for trial to the Court in accordance with Article 2, shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, the State on whose territory the offence was committed and the State of which the accused is a national.

Article 25.

1. The Court is seized so soon as a High Contracting Party has committed an accused person to it for trial.

2. The document committing an accused person to the Court for trial shall contain a statement of the principal charges against him and the allegations on which they are based, and shall name the agent by whom the State will be represented.

3. The State which committed the accused person to the Court shall conduct the prosecution unless the State against which the offence was directed or, failing that State, the State on whose territory the offence was committed expresses a wish to prosecute.

Article 26.

1. Tout Etat qualifié pour saisir la Cour pourra intervenir devant elle, prendre connaissance du dossier, présenter un mémoire à la Cour et participer aux débats.

2. Toute personne qui a été lésée directement par l'infraction pourra, si la Cour l'y autorise et dans les conditions fixées par celle-ci, se constituer partie civile; elle ne pourra prendre part au débat que lorsqu'il s'agira pour la Cour de se prononcer sur les dommages-intérêts.

Article 27.

La Cour ne peut juger d'autres accusés que ceux qui lui ont été déférés, ni juger les accusés pour d'autres faits que ceux en raison desquels ils lui ont été déférés.

Article 28.

La Cour abandonnera la poursuite et ordonnera la mise en liberté de l'accusé, si, l'accusation étant retirée, elle n'est pas immédiatement reprise par un Etat ayant qualité pour la présenter.

Article 29.

1. Les accusés pourront se faire défendre par des avocats faisant partie d'un barreau et agréés par la Cour.

2. Dans le cas où la défense ne serait pas assurée par un avocat choisi par l'accusé, la Cour désignera pour chaque accusé un défenseur d'office choisi parmi les avocats faisant partie d'un barreau.

Article 30.

L'individu déféré pour jugement à la Cour devra recevoir communication du dossier de l'affaire ainsi que du mémoire de la partie civile.

Article 31.

1. La Cour décide si l'individu qui lui est déféré doit être mis ou maintenu en état d'arrestation. Elle fixe, le cas échéant, les conditions de sa mise en liberté provisoire.

2. Pour l'exécution de la prise de corps, l'Etat sur le territoire duquel siège la Cour mettra à la disposition de celle-ci un lieu d'internement approprié ainsi que le personnel de gardiens nécessaire.

Article 32.

Les parties pourront proposer des témoins et experts à la Cour, sous réserve pour celle-ci de décider s'il y a lieu de les citer et de les entendre. La Cour pourra toujours, même d'office, procéder à l'audition d'autres témoins et experts. Il en sera de même pour tous autres éléments de preuve.

Article 33.

Les commissions rogatoires dont l'envoi serait jugé utile par la Cour seront transmises, selon la méthode fixée par son règlement, à l'Etat compétent pour leur donner suite.

Article 34.

Il ne pourra être procédé devant la Cour à aucun interrogatoire, à aucune audition de témoins ou d'experts, ni à aucune confrontation qu'en présence des conseils de l'accusé, des représentants des Etats prenant part à la procédure ou ces représentants dûment appelés.

Article 35.

1. Les audiences de la Cour sont publiques.

2. Toutefois, la Cour pourra, par un jugement motivé, décider qu'il sera procédé à huis clos. Le jugement sera toujours prononcé en audience publique.

Article 36.

Les délibérations de la Cour sont secrètes.

Article 37.

Les décisions de la Cour sont prises à la majorité des juges.

Article 26.

1. Any State entitled to seize the Court may intervene, inspect the file, submit a statement of its case to the Court and take part in the oral proceedings.

2. Any person directly injured by the offence may, if authorised by the Court, and subject to any conditions which it may impose, constitute himself *partie civile* before the Court; such person shall not take part in the oral proceeding except when the Court is dealing with the damages.

Article 27.

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person committed to it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been committed.

Article 28.

The Court shall not proceed further with the case and shall order the accused to be discharged if the prosecution is abandoned and not at once recommenced by a State entitled to prosecute.

Article 29.

1. Accused persons may be defended by advocates belonging to a Bar and approved by the Court.

2. If provision is not made for the conduct of the defence by a barrister chosen by the accused, the Court shall assign to each accused person a counsel selected from advocates belonging to a Bar.

Article 30.

The file of the case and the statement of the *partie civile* shall be communicated to the person who is before the Court for trial.

Article 31.

1. The Court shall decide whether a person who has been committed to it for trial shall be placed or remain under arrest. Where necessary, it shall determine on what conditions he may be provisionally set at liberty.

2. The State on the territory of which the Court is sitting shall place at the Court's disposal a suitable place of internment and the necessary staff of warders for the custody of the accused.

Article 32.

The parties may submit to the Court the names of witnesses and experts, but the Court shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts. The same rules shall apply as regards any other kind of evidence.

Article 33.

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall be transmitted to the State competent to give effect thereto by the method prescribed by the regulations of the Court.

Article 34.

No examination, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for the accused and of the representatives of the States which are taking part in the proceedings or after these representatives have been duly summoned.

Article 35.

1. The hearings before the Court shall be public.

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place *in camera*. Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

Article 36.

The Court shall sit in private to consider its judgment.

Article 37.

The decisions of the Court shall be by majority of the judges.

Article 38.

Tout arrêt de la Cour est motivé et lu en audience publique par le Président.

Article 39.

1. La Cour statuera sur les confiscations éventuelles et restitutions.

2. La Cour pourra prononcer contre les individus qui lui ont été déférés des condamnations aux dommages-intérêts.

3. Les Hautes Parties contractantes sur le territoire desquelles se trouvent les objets à restituer ou des biens appartenant aux condamnés sont tenues de prendre toutes mesures prévues par leurs propres lois afin d'assurer l'exécution de ces condamnations.

4. Les dispositions de l'alinéa précédent s'appliquent aussi lorsqu'il s'agit du recouvrement des peines pécuniaires prononcées par la Cour ou des frais de procédure.

Article 40.

1. Les peines privatives de liberté seront exécutées par la Haute Partie contractante que la Cour désignera après avoir pris son assentiment. L'Etat qui aura déféré le condamné à la Cour ne pourra refuser son assentiment. Toutefois, cette exécution sera assurée par l'Etat qui a déféré le condamné à la Cour, si cet Etat en a exprimé le désir.

2. La Cour déterminera l'affectation des amendes.

Article 41.

Si la peine de mort a été prononcée, l'Etat désigné par la Cour pour exécuter la peine aura la faculté de lui substituer la peine privative de liberté la plus grave dans sa législation nationale.

Article 42.

Le droit de grâce sera exercé par l'Etat chargé de l'exécution de la peine. Il prendra au préalable l'avis du Président de la Cour.

Article 43.

1. Contre les arrêts de condamnation rendus par la Cour, il n'y aura d'autre voie de recours que la revision.

2. La Cour déterminera par son règlement les cas dans lesquels la revision pourra lui être demandée.

3. Auront le droit de demander la revision les Etats mentionnés à l'article 25 et les personnes mentionnées à l'article 29.

Article 44.

1. Les indemnités des juges sont à la charge des Etats dont ils sont ressortissants, sur la base d'un barème établi par les Hautes Parties contractantes.

2. Il sera institué un fonds commun alimenté par les Hautes Parties contractantes et sur lequel seront prélevés les frais de procédure et autres frais imposés par le jugement de l'affaire, y compris éventuellement les honoraires et frais de l'avocat d'office, sauf recouvrement à charge du condamné. L'indemnité spéciale du Greffier et les frais du Greffe seront supportés par ledit fonds.

Article 45.

1. La Cour statue sur les questions qui pourraient surgir au sujet de sa propre compétence au cours d'une affaire dont elle est saisie; elle applique à cet effet les dispositions de la présente Convention ainsi que de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme et les principes généraux du droit.

2. Si une Haute Partie contractante, autre que celle qui aura saisi la Cour, conteste l'étendue de la compétence de celle-ci par rapport à ses propres juridictions nationales et si cette Haute Partie contractante ne croit pas devoir se borner à faire trancher cette question par la Cour pénale internationale en intervenant à cette fin dans la procédure, cette contestation sera considérée comme s'élevant entre cette Haute Partie contractante et la Haute Partie contractante qui aura saisi la Cour, et elle sera réglée comme il est dit à l'article 48.

Article 38.

Every judgment or order of the Court shall state the reasons therefor and be read at a public hearing by the President.

Article 39.

1. The Court shall decide whether any object is to be confiscated or be restored to its owner.

2. The Court may sentence the persons committed to it to pay damages.

3. High Contracting Parties in whose territory objects to be restored or property belonging to convicted persons is situated shall be bound to take all the measures provided by their own laws to ensure the execution of the sentences of the Court.

4. The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply to cases in which pecuniary penalties imposed by the Court or costs of proceedings have to be recovered.

Article 40.

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by a High Contracting Party chosen with his consent by the Court. Such consent may not be refused by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court for trial. The sentence shall always be executed by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court if this State expresses the wish to do so.

2. The Court shall determine the way in which any fines shall be dealt with.

Article 41.

If sentence of death has been pronounced, the State designated by the Court to execute the sentence shall be entitled to substitute therefor the most severe penalty provided by its national law which involves loss of liberty.

Article 42.

The right of pardon shall be exercised by the State which has to enforce the penalty. It shall first consult the President of the Court.

Article 43.

1. Against convictions pronounced by the Court, no proceedings other than an application for revision shall be allowable.

2. The Court shall determine in its rules the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

3. The States mentioned in Article 25, and the persons mentioned in Article 29, shall have the right to ask for a revision.

Article 44.

1. The salaries of the judges shall be payable by the States of which they are nationals on a scale fixed by the High Contracting Parties.

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases, including any fees and expenses of counsel assigned to the accused by the Court, shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

Article 45.

1. The Court shall decide any questions as to its own jurisdiction arising during the hearing of a case; it shall for this purpose apply the provisions of the present Convention and of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the general principles of law.

2. If a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, disputes the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts and does not see his way to appear in the proceedings in order that the question may be decided by the International Criminal Court, the question shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 48.

Article 46.

1. Les représentants des Hautes Parties contractantes se réuniront en vue de prendre toutes décisions nécessaires concernant:

a) La constitution et la gestion du fonds commun, la répartition entre les Hautes Parties contractantes des sommes jugées nécessaires pour créer et maintenir ce fonds et, d'une manière générale, toutes questions ayant trait à l'établissement et au fonctionnement de la Cour;

b) L'organisation des réunions prévues au paragraphe 3 ci-dessous.

2. Les représentants des Hautes Parties contractantes décideront également à leur première réunion les adaptations qui seraient nécessaires en vue de réaliser le but de la présente Convention.

3. Le Greffier de la Cour convoquera les réunions ultérieures conformément aux règles qui auront été établies à cet effet.

4. Toutes les questions qui pourront se poser lors des réunions visées au présent article feront l'objet de décisions prises à la majorité des deux tiers des Hautes Parties contractantes représentées à la réunion.

Article 47.

1. Tant que la présente Convention ne sera pas en vigueur entre douze Hautes Parties contractantes, il sera possible qu'un juge et un juge suppléant soient ressortissants de la même Haute Partie contractante.

2. L'application de l'article 18 et de l'article 20, paragraphe 1, ne peut avoir pour conséquence de faire siéger simultanément un juge et un juge suppléant ressortissants du même Etat.

Article 48.

1. S'il s'élève entre les Hautes Parties contractantes un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application de la présente Convention et si ce différend n'a pu être résolu de façon satisfaisante par voie diplomatique, il sera réglé conformément aux dispositions en vigueur entre les Parties concernant le règlement des différends internationaux.

2. Au cas où de telles dispositions n'existeraient pas entre les parties au différend, elles le soumettront à une procédure arbitrale ou judiciaire. A défaut d'un accord sur le choix d'un autre tribunal, elles soumettront le différend à la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, si elles sont toutes parties au Protocole du 16 décembre 1920 relatif au Statut de ladite Cour, et si elles n'y sont pas toutes parties, à un Tribunal d'arbitrage constitué conformément à la Convention de la Haye du 18 octobre 1907, pour le règlement pacifique des conflits internationaux.

Article 49.

1. La présente Convention, dont les textes français et anglais feront également foi, portera la date de ce jour; elle pourra, jusqu'au 31 mai 1938, être signée au nom de tout Membre de la Société des Nations et de tout Etat non membre au nom desquels la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme a été signée.

2. La présente Convention sera ratifiée. Les instruments de ratification seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société ainsi qu'aux Etats non membres visés au paragraphe précédent. Toutefois, le dépôt d'un instrument de ratification sur la présente Convention est subordonné au dépôt, par la même Haute Partie contractante, de l'instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion à la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

Article 50.

1. A partir du 1er juin 1938, la présente Convention sera ouverte à l'adhésion de tout Membre de la Société des Nations et de tout Etat non membre par qui cette Convention n'aurait pas été signée. Le dépôt d'un instrument d'adhésion est subordonné au dépôt, par la même Haute Partie contractante, de l'instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion à la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

2. Les instruments d'adhésion seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société et aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 49.

Article 46.

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning:

(*a*) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;

(*b*) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

2. At their first meeting, the representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall also decide what modifications are necessary in order to attain the objects of the present Convention.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. All questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in the present article shall be decided by a majority of two-thirds of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

Article 47.

1. Until the present Convention is in force between twelve High Contracting Parties, it shall be possible for a judge and a deputy judge to be both nationals of the same High Contracting Party.

2. Article 18 and Article 20, paragraph 1, shall not be applied in such a manner as to cause a judge and a deputy judge of the same nationality to sit simultaneously on the Court.

Article 48.

1. If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the Parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

2. If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

Article 49.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until May 31st, 1938, it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State on whose behalf the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism has been signed.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League. The Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The deposit of an instrument of ratification of the present Convention shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of, or accession to, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 50.

1. After June 1st, 1938, the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State which has not signed this Convention. Nevertheless, the deposit of an instrument of accession shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of, or accession to, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 49.

Article 51.

Il ne pourra être fait de réserve à la signature, à la ratification de la présente Convention ou en adhérant à elle, que sur l'article 26, paragraphe 2.

Article 52.

1. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut déclarer, au moment de la signature, de la ratification ou de l'adhésion, que, par son acceptation de la présente Convention, elle n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble ou toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la présente Convention ne sera pas applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration.

2. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes pourra ultérieurement notifier au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations qu'elle entend rendre la présente Convention applicable à l'ensemble ou à toute partie de ses territoires ayant fait l'objet de la déclaration prévue au paragraphe précédent. Dans ce cas, la Convention s'appliquera à tous les territoires visés dans la notification quatre-vingt-dix jours après la réception de cette notification par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

3. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut, à tout moment, déclarer qu'elle entend voir cesser l'application de la présente Convention pour l'ensemble ou pour toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la Convention cessera d'être applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration un an après la réception de cette déclaration par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

4. Le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations communiquera à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et aux Etats non membres visés aux articles 49 et 50, les déclarations et notifications reçues en vertu du présent article.

Article 53.

1. Le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas est prié de convoquer une réunion des Etats ayant ratifié la présente convention ou y ayant adhéré, réunion qui se tiendra dans le délai d'un an à compter de la réception par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations du septième instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion. Cette réunion aura à fixer la date de la mise en vigueur de la présente Convention. La décision sera prise à la majorité des deux tiers sans que ce chiffre puisse être inférieur à six voix. Cette réunion prendra également les décisions nécessaires pour l'application de l'article 46.

2. La mise en vigueur de la présente Convention est, toutefois, subordonnée à la mise en vigueur de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

3. La présente Convention sera enregistrée conformément à l'article 18 du Pacte par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations au jour qui sera fixé par la réunion ci-dessus visée.

Article 54.

Chaque ratification ou adhésion émanant d'un Etat qui n'a pas été appelé à prendre part à la réunion visée à l'article 53 produira effet quatre-vingt-dix jours après sa réception par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, sans que cet effet puisse se produire moins de quatre-vingt-dix jours après l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention.

Article 55.

La présente Convention pourra être dénoncée au nom de toute Haute Partie contractante par notification écrite adressée au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, qui en informera tous les Membres de la Société et les Etats non membres visés aux articles 49 et 50. La dénonciation sortira ses effets un an après la date à laquelle elle aura été reçue par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations; elle ne sera opérante qu'au regard de la Haute Partie contractante au nom de laquelle elle aura été effectuée.

Article 56.

1. Lorsque la Cour aura été saisie d'une affaire avant la dénonciation de la présente Convention ou l'avis prévu à l'article 52, paragraphe 3, elle en achèvera néanmoins l'examen et le jugement.

2. La Haute Partie contractante appelée à donner effet à une condamnation conformément à la présente Convention restera tenue de ses obligations à l'égard de toute condamnation intervenue antérieurement à sa dénonciation.

Article 51.

Signature, ratification or accession to the present Convention may not be accompanied by any reservations except in regard to Article 26, paragraph 2.

Article 52.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates or oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may, at any time, declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in Articles 49 and 50 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present article.

Article 53.

1. The Government of the Netherlands is requested to convene a meeting of representatives of the States which ratify or accede to the present Convention. The meeting is to take place within one year after the receipt of the seventh instrument of ratification or accession by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and has for object to fix the date at which the present Convention shall be put into force. The decision shall be taken by a majority which must be a two-thirds majority and include not less than six votes. The meeting shall also take any decisions necessary for carrying out the provisions of Article 46.

2. The entry into force of the present Convention shall, however, be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

3. The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in accordance with Article 18 of the Covenant on the day fixed by the above-mentioned meeting.

Article 54.

A ratification or accession by a State which has not taken part in the meeting mentioned in Article 53 shall take effect ninety days after its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, provided that the date at which it takes effect shall not be earlier than ninety days after the entry into force of the Convention.

Article 55.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 49 and 50. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

Article 56.

1. A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 52, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party who before denouncing the present Convention has under the provisions thereof incurred the obligation of carrying out a sentence shall continue to be bound by such obligation.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires ont signé la présente Convention.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

FAIT à Genève, le seize novembre mil neuf cent trente-sept, en simple expédition, qui sera déposée dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations; copie certifiée conforme en sera transmise à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et à tous les Etats non membres représentés à la Conférence.

DONE at Geneva, the sixteenth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven, in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States represented at the Conference.

BELGIQUE

BELGIUM

Ad referendum:

S. SASSERATH

BULGARIE

BULGARIA

N. MOMTCHILOFF

ESPAGNE

SPAIN

Cipriano DE RIVAS CHERIF.

FRANCE

FRANCE

Me référant à l'article 52 de la Convention, je déclare que le Gouvernement français n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble de ses colonies et protectorats, ainsi que des territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié [1].

BASDEVANT

GRÈCE

GREECE

S. POLYCHRONIADIS

---

[1] *Translation by the Secretariat of the League of Nations:*

With reference to Article 52 of the Convention, I declare that the French Government does not assume any obligation as regards the whole of its Colonies and Protectorates, or the territories for which a mandate has been entrusted to it.

PAYS-BAS THE NETHERLANDS

VAN HAMEL

ROUMANIE ROUMANIA

Vespasien V. PELLA.

TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE — CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr KOUKAL

TURQUIE — TURKEY

Vasfi MENTEŞ

YOUGOSLAVIE — YUGOSLAVIA

Thomas GIVANOVITCH.

Copie certifiée conforme.

Genève, le

Pour le Secrétaire général:

Conseiller juridique du Secrétariat.

Certified true copy.

Geneva,

For the Secretary-General:

Legal Adviser of the Secretariat.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **A. 14 (e). 1937. V.**

436

Geneva, September 29th, 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SINCE SEPTEMBER 1936

Since the publication of document A.14(*d*).1937.V, the following reply has been received:

United States of America.

August 24th, 1937.

There is transmitted herewith a preliminary report on the existing legal status of women in the United States of America, prepared at the request of the Secretary of Labour by the Women's Bureau for transmission by the Secretary of State to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations prior to the session of the Assembly in September 1937.

The request of the Secretary-General also called for the observations of Governments on the subject of the legal status of women. This, too, was referred to the Women's Bureau, which is the official agency in this country having to do with the conservation and advancement of the welfare of women and therefore is in constant touch with representatives of the national women's organisations and familiar with their policies.

These observations are of particular importance at this time, because a resolution on the status of women is before the Assembly of the League of Nations. Under this resolution, the Governments would undertake to assure to women equality with men in the following:

(1) The right to vote;
(2) The law and practice of nationality;
(3) All other fields;
(4) Membership in official bodies of the League of Nations.

In connection with this resolution, attention may be called to two statements made by official representatives of the United States of America to international bodies.

Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, Buenos Aires, December 1936.

At this Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, a similar resolution was proposed but was not adopted. The woman member of the delegation from the United States, who was officially charged with this part of the Conference business for this country, issued the following statement:

> "The resolution in question has two subject matters. The first of these is votes for women and the second is equal rights for men and women.
>
> "With the first subject, my life's work demonstrates without further words my complete endorsement. But both subjects belong obviously within the domestic concerns of each of the republics, and I feel personally that I have no right to recommend or suggest to any other republic what course of action it should follow.
>
> "The achievements thus far have been hardly won and I cannot give my consent to take part in any effort to throw overboard these safeguards, for such would be the logical end-result of such a course.

3369—S.d.N.1.130(F.)1.125(A.)12/37. Imp. Granchamp, Annemasse.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1937. V. 12.

" Not only is this my personal stand, but I have reason to believe that it is shared by a majority of the women's organisations in the United States.

" Since my arrival in Buenos Aires it has become known in the United States that an effort is being made to weaken the guards to which I have referred. Telegrams from the most important organisations, both in numbers, public activity and influence, among women in the United States have been sent to me here.

" These expressions clearly demonstrate that this proposal for an equal rights resolution in no sense represents the voice of American women."

International Labour Conference, Geneva, June 1937.

At the International Labour Conference in June of the present year, a resolution introduced by the official representatives of the United States of America and passed by the Conference contains the following paragraphs :

" . . . it is for the best interests of society that, in addition to full political and civil rights and full opportunity for education, women should have full opportunity to work and should receive remuneration without discrimination because of sex, and be protected by legislative safeguards against physically harmful conditions of employment and economic exploitation, including the safeguarding of motherhood ; and

" . . . it is necessary that women as well as men should be guaranteed freedom of association by Governments and should be protected by social and labour legislation which world experience has shown to be effective in abolishing special exploitation of women workers ; . . . "

The third point in the resolution now before the Assembly of the League of Nations is in direct contradiction to these principles sponsored by the International Labour Conference, since it would operate in practice to undermine important labour legislation built up after long effort. For example, it would nullify the effectiveness of the international labour Conventions, such as the prohibition of the employment of women in mines, the night-work Convention, and the protection of women before and after childbirth. As was stated by the Government representative of the United States of America, who addressed the Conference in support of the resolution partially quoted in the foregoing :

" . . . because social and political rights have come to them a century later than to working men, working women are in a disadvantageous position in the labour market."

Therefore, women are still in need of the type of legislation that would be nullified by point 3 of the resolution now being considered by the League.

The first and second points in the resolution before the League correspond to aims long sought and worked for by many large bodies of organised women in the United States of America, but as was stated by the woman delegate of this country to the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, these are within the domestic concerns of the various countries.

In regard to the fourth point : Article 7, Section 3, of the League Covenant contains the following guarantee of the equal standing of women as League officials : " All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women ". Since this covers all positions, point 4 of the new resolution is unnecessary as a legal guarantee. The need existing at present is not that of changing the legal basis but is in reality that of putting this guarantee more fully into practice. Hence, point 4 of the resolution is not required.

Certain of the women's organisations in the United States of America are transmitting their statements on this resolution through their own international bodies, but in order that others of the large national organisations may have full opportunity to place their attitude in this matter before the Secretary-General, the Women's Bureau is attaching hereto such statements as have been submitted to it[1] for transmission with this letter to the Secretary-General by the Department of State.

* * *

PART I. — CHARACTER OF STUDY AND GENERAL BACKGROUND.

General Character of this Study.

This summary of legislation affecting generally the property rights, domestic relations and the political responsibilities of women in the United States, with its forty-eight separate jurisdictions (forty-nine, including the District of Columbia), is somewhat in the nature of an advanced progress report on a research project that has been growing throughout a period of practically fifteen years and has incorporated the combined knowledge of very many able lawyers in all parts of the country.

[1] The statements here referred to, emanating from the National League of Women Voters and the National Women's Trade Union League of America, are, for the reason explained in paragraph 3 of the introductory note to the first document of the present series (A.14.1937.V), not included in the present document but have been filed for reference in the Secretariat.

In its first form, it was planned in 1922 and issued in 1924 by the National League of Women Voters, which prepared a supplement in 1926, and published in 1930 a revised edition with more elaborate treatment of subject matter.

When the Women's Bureau undertook a revision of this work to July 1st, 1936, still further subjects were added and the judicial interpretations also were more fully investigated. In the first issue, and in each revision, including the present one, competent legal authorities within each State were consulted — persons who may or may not have been State officials, but who were in a position to know and to evaluate, with sympathy for this project, the law and the practice within the State. The co-operation and advice of these persons in all the States at several different periods has been of inestimable value and their assistance has been an important factor in assuring the completeness and accuracy of the work.

As presented at this time, it has not been possible to finish the study of judicial decisions for all States. Under each topic, therefore, findings are shown separately for those States whose court decisions have been examined — twenty-four in all, including the District of Columbia — and for the remaining twenty-five States where the statutes have been reviewed, but the check with interpretations has not yet been completed and the authorities within the State itself have not as yet given advice on the material.

As soon as the full process has been followed for all the States as well as for the Federal Government, this summary will be revised and issued in final form to the date of July 1st, 1936. Besides the more comprehensive summary, the separate information for each State will be made available.

Variety of Sources necessary to consult.

The determination of women's legal status in the United States is made the more intricate by the fact that this is a federated Government, and there are separate jurisdictions for the forty-eight States in addition to the fields covered by the national laws. Even when limited to its civil and political phases, the consideration of women's position presents a complexity apparent only from a consideration of the steps precedent to such an end.

First : It is necessary to articulate broadly the unwritten law that may be applicable to the rights of a woman citizen, either of the United States or of any one of the forty-eight States to be considered.

Secondly : It is necessary to define the relative authorities of the Federal Government and of the forty-eight member States of the Union, together with the means employed to implement such authorities, whether by treaties, constitutions, statutes, unwritten law, judicial decisions or combinations of some or all of these instruments.

Thirdly : The numerous current written laws of each jurisdiction, as they pertain to a woman's rights and responsibilities, must be segregated from the mass of legislation and so compiled as to retain all that properly bears upon this subject.

Fourthly : The most recent action of the Federal and State courts must be determined, as they have applied unwritten law or construed constitutional and statute law, or as they have overruled previous judicial action on an issue, or established judicial rule in the absence of legislation.

Fifthly : It remains to form a composite picture by classifying and summarising the findings adduced from the preceding steps, as of a given time, while legislatures and courts proceed with their ceaseless contributions of new colours for the picture.

Imperfect though results may be in this preliminary summary, the methods described have been pursued in gathering the material submitted. It is presented for the light it may throw on the general temper of these United States with regard to the rights and responsibilities of women compared to those of men.

Scope and Method.

The field of research of the earlier report has been enlarged in the present study to include a number of additional branches of the subject, and to the jurisdictions of the forty-eight States have been added those of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

The relation at law between the Federal Government and women citizens of the United States is considered under Part II of this summary. Sources examined include treaties, the Federal Constitution and its amendments, statutes of the Congress of the United States, and leading decisions of Federal courts, wherever these are pertinent to the investigation.

Part III outlines the major phases of woman's legal status under the Governments of the member States of the Federal Union. For the purposes of this summary, the District of Columbia is treated as a State, though its laws are made by the Federal Congress and its affairs are administered by a Commission appointed by the President with the approval of the United States Senate.

Within Part III, the material is subdivided into two sections, in order that the reader may distinguish easily between the findings for the States in which the revision of the earlier report is complete as to both statutes and court decisions (as of July 1st, 1936), and the findings for the States in which, thus far, only the statutes have been examined in the present

study. The incomplete revision is included for its worth as an indicator of the general trend in spirit among the States it covers.

The primary sources of data for the States completed, designated as Section 1 of Part III, are the respective constitutions, current statutes and controlling cases from the highest appellate courts of these States.

Source material for the group of twenty-five States on which incomplete data are presented under Section 2 of Part III is *statutory only*, as of July 1st, 1936.

Lists of the States composing Sections 1 and 2 are given at the end of Part III (page 19).

For uniformity in comparisons, the study assumes, unless otherwise specifically noted, that in all references to married women the marital relation continues and the spouses are living together.

Subjects not included in this Summary.

Something should now be said as to what the summary does not cover. For example, this survey does not include a *résumé* of the labour legislation adopted in many of the States in behalf of women who work for wages. This information has been covered specifically in a Women's Bureau report on these State laws, and something of the effects of such legislation is shown in other reports of this Bureau.[1]

Through lack of time, no detailed enquiry has been made as to the status of women under the criminal law and its administration. However, it is safe to assert that for the most part, so far as the statute law of State or nation is concerned, the woman unfortunate who runs athwart society is not especially discriminated against. Nowhere is there tolerated any flavour of the ancient English common law by whose provisions :[2]

> " . . . if the baron kills his feme it is the same as if he had killed a stranger, or any other person; but if the feme kills her baron, it is regarded by the laws as a much more atrocious crime; as she not only breaks through the restraints of humanity and conjugal affection, but throws off all subjection to the authority of her husband. And therefore the law denominates her crime a species of treason, and condemns her to the same punishment as if she had killed the king . . .
>
> " By the common law, all women were denied the benefit of clergy; and till the 3 & 4 W. and M., c. 9, they received sentence of death, and might have been executed, for the first offense in simple larceny, bigamy, manslaughter, etc., however learned they were, merely because their sex precluded the possibility of their taking holy orders; though a man who could read was for the same crime subject only to burning in the hand and a few months' imprisonment."

Nor does the old common-law rule apply that the husband is responsible for the torts, and crimes other than murder and treason, committed by his wife. Each individual is responsible under the law for his or her own wrongs to society.

The admission of women, either married or unmarried, to positions of trust and fiduciary capacities, as executors, administrators, trustees or guardians, has not been covered in detail. Generally, they are eligible for such appointments, without discrimination. In a few jurisdictions, a married woman serving in such a fiduciary capacity is required to give additional bond.

In the field of property division and disposition of children where a legal separation or an absolute divorce occurs, much is left to the court's discretion, after full presentation of evidence, in the determination of these issues. This is especially true when designating the person who shall have custody of small children. The rule guiding the court's action in such cases is that the welfare of the child is to be held paramount, and not the rights of the parents. Accordingly, no detailed research in this field has been attempted for the present summary.

Lastly, there will be found in these pages no reference to women and ecclesiastical privileges, since it must be remembered that in the United States of America there is no official connection between Church and State and the administration of ecclesiastical affairs is entirely within the control of the various religious bodies, each according to its own standards.

Historical Background.

The material considered in this report centres largely around the woman in the marriage relation. This must be so, because in the United States of America at the present time, with the exception of discrimination in certain political privileges, such as jury service, election or appointment to public office, or variances in the statutory ages of majority or ages of consent to marriage as between men and women, occurring in some States, the legal status

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor. Women's Bureau, *Bul. 144* : " State Labor Laws for Women ", and its 1937 supplement. For effects of such laws see *Buls. 65 and 68* : " The Effects of Labour Legislation on the Employment Opportunities of Women ", and a more recent *Bulletin* : " Women in the Economy of the United States of America ", Part II.

[2] BLACKSTONE'S " Commentaries ", book 1, page 445 (Note, Christian's edition).

of the unmarried woman is practically identical with that of the unmarried man. Hence, such a compilation would be beside the point in this enquiry.

It is the legal fortunes of the married woman that led the investigator into the maze of ancient common law, and later along the more open path of her progress, made possible by legislative and judicial action.

The far-reaching scope of the rights of persons in the marital relation was pointed out more than a century ago in the following observation by a great American jurist,[1] Chancellor James Kent, in whom the common-law system, as adapted to American ideals and conditions, found a staunch defender for all its merits :

> " The law concerning husband and wife has always made a very prominent and extensive article in the codes of civilised nations. . . . There are no regulations on any other branch of the law, which affect so many minute interests, and interfere so deeply with the prosperity, the honour and happiness of private life."

Any conclusion bearing upon woman's status under the laws of the United States of America must take into account the common or unwritten law, usually thought of as based on English tradition, upon which the fabric of the nation's jurisprudence is woven. Concerning its source, and importance in the affairs of the people, this same authority made this statement :[2]

> " It [the common law] is the common jurisprudence of the people of the United States, and was brought with them as colonists from England, and established here, so far as it was adapted to our institutions and circumstances. It was claimed by the Congress of the United Colonies, in 1774, as a branch of those ' indubitable rights and liberties to which the respective colonies are entitled'. It fills up every interstice, and occupies every wide space which the statute law cannot occupy."

He says of it further that it :

> " Includes those principles, usages and rules of action, applicable to the government and security of person and property, which do not rest for their authority upon any express and positive declaration of the will of the legislature."

And again :

> " A great proportion of the rules and maxims which constitute the immense code of the common law grew into use by gradual adoption, and received, from time to time, the sanction of the courts of justice, without any legislative act or interference."

Wrought in this fashion from the lives of a people, the common law must perforce reflect the spirit and temper of that people, and change with its own horizons. As an old maxim states it : " When the reason of the law ceases, so does the law itself ". On these grounds of practicality and flexibility, the exponents of the common-law system have their strong entrenchment. Their evaluation of the statute law is fairly declared in such a statement as this by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Munn *v.* Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 134 (1876) :

> " . . . the great office of statutes is to remedy defects in the common law as they are developed, and to adapt it to the changes of time and circumstances."

A thoughtful scanning of legislative history in the common-law jurisdictions of the United States of America easily demonstrates that in no area of the common law is this conclusion more firmly supported than in the development of legislation to improve the legal status of women, particularly married women.

Much ground has been covered in the century just past. The largest remaining area to be reformed to the present-day trend lies in the matter of ownership and control of property acquired by the efforts of husband and wife after marriage. Under the common-law system, strictly applied, the husband owns all such property and has absolute control of it. Under the community system, the legal ownership is divided equally as to the spouses upon the death of one, but on the whole, during the marriage, control of all the property is lodged with the husband.

The common-law rules of property sprang from various causes, notably tradition, military or economic exigency, natural male dominance, and the social status of women. The present concern with these causes is only to observe that character shifts in these same bases have effected an almost complete overturn in laws governing the property owned by a woman prior to her marriage and that coming into her individual ownership after her marriage, by gift, inheritance, will or accumulation from her premarital possessions, as this summary will presently show. Will this ferment, by natural process, reach the largely intact common-law area of marital property just described ?

An able contemporary advocate[3] of the community system of French civil law thus notes the ferment and reflects on its implications :

---

[1] KENT, James : " Commentaries on American Law ", vol. 2, page 182.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pages 343 and 471.
[3] DAGGETT, Harriet Spiller : " General Principles of Succession on Death in Civil Law ", in *Tulane (La.) Law Review*, 1937, vol. XI, page 408.

" A proper adjustment of individual rights with those of society seems to be an age-long and ever-unsatisfactory struggle. Intolerance and injustice to a submerged group is the ever-present topic for contemporary writers and speakers. The rise and fall of these units in the history of civilisation is attended with, perhaps, more bloodshed and mental anguish than the rise and fall of nations. Women have never considered themselves a dispossessed group. They have not seriously compared their problems of emergence with those of political, economic or racial units. The analogy is indeed imperfect in all but its most superficial aspects. However, the discontent of the industrial and professional married woman is regarded by informed commentators upon family law as a danger signal to the State, whose welfare rests upon the emotional as well as the economic security of the family unit."

Understanding of the present situation will be aided by including at this point a brief summary of the major provisions of the ancient common law as they related to the women whose legal destinies they governed. It then may be observed how these provisions have been woven, with modifications, into current laws, or else changed by legislation or judicial action to reflect the changing thought-trends of the people.

Ancient English Common-law Status of Women.

According to Blackstone's " Commentaries " on the English laws of his time — about the middle of the eighteenth century — together with editorial notes on that work, the following rules were among those invoked for purposes of the law in dealing with women on the subjects indicated :

The age of majority was fixed at 21 years for both sexes.

Contracts with a minor, for other than necessaries under certain conditions, were voidable at his or her majority.

Upon marriage, the very being or legal existence of the woman merged into that of the husband. This state of the wife created a disability at law called her coverture.

The effect of this legal assumption went to both her personal and her property rights. For example, the husband could not grant property to, nor contract with, his wife, for that would imply her separate existence.

If the wife had incurred debt before marriage, the husband was bound afterward to pay the debt, for he had adopted her and her circumstances together.

All deeds executed and acts done by the wife during marriage were void, as she was for such matters considered the inferior of her husband and acting under his compulsion. She might execute certain conveyances to cure defects in land titles, or like matters of record, but she was then " solely and secretly examined, to learn if her act be voluntary ".

The wife could not by will devise lands to her husband, for she was deemed under his coercion at the time of making it.

The husband was bound to provide his wife with necessaries as much as himself. If she contracted debts for them, he was obliged to pay them, but he was not chargeable for anything besides necessaries. He was relieved of this obligation if the wife deserted him.

The husband was entitled to the wife's services, in return for the support which the law required of him. Hence, he was entitled also to any earnings which she might receive for her labour.

" By the custom of London, where a feme covert of a husband meddleth nothing, such a woman shall be charged as a feme sole concerning everything which toucheth the craft; and if the husband and wife be impleaded in such case, the wife shall plead as a feme sole, and if she be condemned, she shall be committed to prison till she hath made satisfaction, and the husband and his goods shall not in such case be charged or impeached."

For any injury to her person or property, the wife could bring no action for redress without her husband's joinder and suing in his name as well as her own.

Nor could she be sued, ordinarily, unless the husband were sued together with her. The only exception was in the event the husband had " abjured the realm " or been banished, thus becoming " dead in law ".

But in criminal matters, the wife could be indicted and punished separately, " for the union is only a civil union ". For the commission of some felonies, and lesser crimes and torts, she was presumed to be under the constraint of her husband, and thus excused.

The husband might give his wife moderate correction, but he was prohibited from using any violence to her " otherwise than lawfully and reasonably belonged to him for her due government and correction ". While either spouse could have security of the peace against the other, at a later period, the courts of law still permitted a husband to restrain a wife of her liberty " in case of any gross misbehaviour ".

Women had no remedy at law against attacks upon their character by malicious persons, but " were perfectly exposed to the slanders of malignity and falsehood ".

In inheritance of lands, male heirs had preference over females. Kindred derived from male ancestors, however remote, to be preferred to kindred from the blood of the female ancestors, however near, unless the land came from a female ancestor. Originally, under the feudal system, females were wholly excluded from inheritance of lands, " not only from their inability to perform the feudal engagements, but because they might, by marriage, transfer the possession of the feud to strangers and enemies ". A son, though younger than all his sisters, inherited the whole of real property in an estate.

At marriage, the husband became absolutely master of the profits from the wife's lands during *coverture*. If he had by her a living child, and himself outlived the wife, he retained the whole of her lands, that were inheritable by her heirs, during his life. He had this right also, called *tenancy by curtesy*, in the property of his wife held for her by a trustee, known as her *equitable separate estate*.

For her part, if she outlived her husband, the wife was entitled to her *dower*, or life use of one-third of her husband's lands which were subject to inheritance — unconditioned, however, upon birth of issue. But she had no dower right in any trust estate of her husband.

Upon marriage, a woman's personal property, then owned, and afterward acquired, became her husband's absolutely, and he might dispose of it as he chose.

The father was the sole natural guardian of the minor children of a marriage, the mother having the right only upon the death of the father. As the father contributed the support of the children, he was entitled to their services and earnings until they became of age. If the spouses separated, the father had the superior right to the custody and control of the children. He might by will appoint a guardian to have such control and custody of them after his death.

Since the child born out of wedlock was no one's child, the mother had no right of inheritance in any property owned by the child at its death.

In trials of any sort, husband and wife were not allowed to be witnesses for or against each other, " partly because it is impossible their testimony should be indifferent, but principally because of the union of person; and therefore, if they were admitted to be witnesses for each other, they would contradict one maxim of law, ' no one is allowed to be a witness in his own cause '; and if against each other, they would contradict another maxim, ' no one is bound to accuse himself ' ". However, this rule was usually suspended where the offence was directly against the person of the wife, as in the case of a forced marriage, where her testimony would be the only evidence in her behalf.

Women might not participate in government, since they rendered no military service.

Intervention of Equitable Estates.

To relieve numerous injustices and abuses that arose under such provisions of law, the ecclesiastical, or equity, courts acted for the king, upon complaints of wives, involving in their administration principles borrowed from the civil law. An invention of these courts to protect property of wives from greedy husbands was the *equitable separate estate*, wherein a trustee acted for the wife in management and disposition of such property, thus preventing the title to the property from coming into the hands of the husband.

Development into Status of To-day.

With the extension of educational privilege, the impact of the industrial revolution, new opportunities through commercial development, and other liberalising factors, women began to make concerted protest against such restrictions as the common law placed about them. Instead of the *separate equitable estate*, gradually the concept of the *separate estate of a married woman* under her own name and control began to appear in the laws of America and England. The full flower of this is seen to-day in the various forms of the so-called women's acts, as adopted in every common-law jurisdiction of the United States of America.

The extent to which these have changed the position of a married woman will appear from consulting the following summary on her separate property rights in connection with the preceding synopsis of the original common law. The various States have not been uniform in the extent of their respective modifications of common-law rules, but in no State does the married woman remain under the entire disability created by the English system.

Status of Women under Common Law in the United States of America.

Strictly speaking, there is no common law *of* the United States, " in the sense of a national customary law ", as was said by the Supreme Court of Montana in 1931. The opinion continues :

" . . . the courts of the United States enforce the law as they find it in the several States and apply the common law, as a national institution, in the interpretation of the Constitution. "[1]

The latitude exercised by the national judiciary in the application of common-law rules is demonstrated in a 1933 decision of the Federal Supreme Court. Overruling prior conflicting opinions, and holding that a wife might testify in behalf of her husband in a criminal proceeding, the court said :

" The rule of the common law which denies the competency of one spouse to testify in behalf of the other in a criminal prosecution has not been modified by congressional legislation ; nor has Congress directed the Federal courts to follow State law upon that subject as it has in respect of some other subjects. That this court and the other Federal courts in this situation and by right of their own powers may decline to enforce the ancient rule of the common law under conditions as they now exist, we think is not fairly open to doubt."[2]

The situation among the States is somewhat different, as appears from the following statement :

" The common law of the States consists of the principles of the English common law, developed and modified by American custom and judicial precedent. Having this great common substratum of the English common-law principles, the non-statutory law of the several States is, in very many respects, the same throughout the United States. But in other respects, statutory enactment and divergent customs and judicial determinations have led to important differences.

" In general, however, except where statutes have expressly amended the English common law as it was at the time of the separation from England, or where clear judicial *dicta* to the contrary are to be found, the general doctrines of the English common law are held to be in force."[3]

The relation between the common law and the statute law of a State is demonstrated in the following excerpt from an opinion of the Supreme Court of Kentucky :[4]

" The rights of the husband as regards his wife and her property, and his obligations to her under the common law of England, were adjusted by it without much reference to principle. As it concerned the husband and wife, his right to her property, her legal duty to him, and his legal obligations to her, it is in force in this State, except where abrogated, altered, or modified by statute. . . By statute, the husband is not liable for any debts or responsibilities of the wife contracted or incurred before or after marriage, (*a*) except to the amount or value of the property he may receive from her by virtue of the marriage, and (*b*) except he is liable by the express wording of the statute, for ' necessaries ' furnished to her after marriage. (See sections 2127, 2128 and 2130, Ky. Statutes.)

" . . . The term ' necessaries ', as it is used in section 2130, in the absence of a statute defining it, must be given its common-law meaning, and must be regarded as including such things as it embraced at common law.

" Therefore it may be correctly said that not only the husband's common-law liability for her burial expenses has been continued by section 2130 as between him and the estate and the heirs of his wife, but it has continued his primary liability to any third party who may furnish the requirements and services for her burial."

In a requested opinion on the matter of women's eligibility to public office in New Hampshire, the supreme court of that State thus voiced the prevailing judicial view of the relative bearing of the Nineteenth Amendment, State Constitutions, and the common law :

" The authorities elsewhere appear to be unanimous in the opinion that there are now no constitutional limitations upon the eligibility of women to public office. The conclusion is not always based upon the same reasoning, and is of course reached with reference to the particular provisions of the Constitution of the State where the question arose.

" In addition to the removal of constitutional inhibitions, express or implied, it is the conclusion in most States that legislative action abolishing the common-law rule of disability is also required to enable women to hold office."[5]

Instead of an attempt to sift out of American jurisprudence the specific common-law rules currently applicable to the status of married women, a summary of the general situation by the Supreme Court of Colorado in 1935 will serve for the purpose of this section.

---

[1] State ex rel. Powell *v.* State Bank (1931), 90 Mont. 539, 557, 4 Pac. (2d) 717, 80 A.L.R. 1494.
[2] Funk *v.* United States (1933), 290 U.S. 371, 382, 54 S. Ct. 212, 93 A.L.R. 1136.
[3] WILLOUGHBY, W. W. : " Constitutional Law of the United States ", Second Students' Edition, 1933, page 559.
[4] Palmer *v.* Turner (1931), 241 Ky. 322, 325, 327, 43 S. W. (2d) 1017.
[5] Opinion of Justices (1927), 83 N.H. 589, 591, 139 Atl. 180.

" Statutes that were designed to remove from married women the disabilities imposed upon them by the common law have been enacted in most, perhaps all, of the States. They vary greatly in their scope, some being narrow and illiberal, others broad and liberal. The same may be said of the construction given by the courts to the various statutes. The earlier decisions, especially, were narrow and illiberal."[1]

The same court, in an earlier case,[2] declared Colorado's attitude in definite terms :

" . . . the Colorado wife is not the wife as at common law, but is vested with absolute control and dominion over her property and her person."

According to the further statement of the court, a wife in Colorado is wholly emancipated " from the condition of thraldom in which she was placed at common law ".

At the other end of the scale, the latest code of statute law (1933) in one State provides :

" The husband is the head of the family and the wife is subject to him ; her legal civil existence is merged in the husband, except so far as the law recognises her separately, either for her own protection, or for her benefit, or for the preservation of public order."[3]

Grouped around these two standards and varying in approach to them practically according to the number of States involved are the remaining jurisdictions other than the eight community-property States.[4]

Part II. — The Federal Government and the Woman Citizen.

Respective Authority of Federal and State Governments in Matters of Individual Rights.

The National Government, in its regulation of individual rights, has to do with certain definite, delegated matters, and no other. It may not invade the powers which the States of the Union have reserved to themselves. This is a basic theory of government in the United States of America, for the most part put into practice ; it has been set forth in a long line of cases and has been put thus tersely by the Federal Supreme Court in a recent opinion :

" Each State has all governmental powers save such as the people by their Constitution have conferred upon the United States, denied to the States, or reserved to themselves. The Federal Union is a government of delegated powers. It has only such as are expressly conferred upon it and such as are reasonably to be implied from those granted."[5]

In another case, the same court observed :

" Like the United States, although with more restriction and in less degree, a State may carry out a policy, even a policy with which we might disagree. . . It may make discriminations, if founded on distinctions that we cannot pronounce unreasonable and purely arbitrary. . . It may favour or discourage the liquor traffic, or trusts. The criminal law is a whole body of policy on which States may and do differ. . . And if again it finds a ground of distinction in sex, that is not without precedent. It has been recognised with regard to hours of work. . . It is recognised in the respective rights of husband and wife in land during life, in the inheritance after the death of the spouse. Often, it is expressed in the time fixed for coming of age. If Montana deems it advisable to put a lighter burden upon women than upon men with regard to an employment that our people commonly regard as more appropriate for the former, the fourteenth amendment does not interfere by creating a fictitious equality where there is a real difference. The particular points at which that difference shall be emphasised by legislation are largely in the power of the State."[6]

That the judicial authority of a State of the Union is supreme as to the construction of legislation within that State is recognised by the Federal Supreme Court in numerous instances. The following citations are representative :

" . . . no case [in Federal courts] yet has gone to the length of undertaking to correct the construction of State laws by State courts. The exclusive authority to enact those laws carries with it final authority to say what they mean. The construction of those laws by the Supreme Court of the State is as much the act of the State as the enactment of them by the legislature."[7]

---

[1] Rains *v.* Rains (1935), 97 Colo. 19, 21, 46 Pac. (2d) 740.
[2] Schuler *v.* Henry (1908), 42 Colo. 367, 369, 370, 94 Pac. 360, 14 L.R.A. (n.s.) 1009.
[3] Code of Georgia, 1933, sec. 53-501.
[4] Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, New Mexico, Nevada, Texas, Washington.
[5] United States *v.* Butler (1936), 297 U.S. 1, 63, 56 S. Ct. 312, 102 A.L.R. 914.
[6] Quong Wing *v.* Kirkendall (1912), 223 U.S. 59, 62, 32 S. Ct. 192.
[7] Jones *v.* Prairie Oil and Gas Co. (1927), 273 U.S. 195, 47 S. Ct. 338.

A later decision states :

" This court is without power to put a different construction upon the State enactment from that adopted by the highest court of the State. . . The meaning of the statute as fixed by its decision must be accepted here as if the meaning had been specifically expressed in the enactment. . . Exclusive authority to enact carries with it final authority to say what the measure means."[1]

In regard to political privileges, an outstanding authority on constitutional law has said :

" The requirement as to equal protection of the law does not operate to prevent the States from restricting the enjoyment of political privileges to such classes of their citizens as they may see fit. . .

" It will have been seen that the requirement of equal protection of the law applies to all persons similarly situated or circumstanced. Hence where there are rational grounds for so doing, persons or their properties may be grouped into classes to each of which specific legal rights or liabilities may be attached. This legislative discretionary right applies to the exercise of all the powers of the States — to their taxing and police powers as well as to their other powers.

" Thus, for example, the practice of certain professions may be limited to persons of the male sex, or to those of a certain age, or to those possessing other qualifications that may reasonably be held to indicate a fitness for the profession."[2]

The same author, citing Neal *v.* Delaware, 103 U.S. 370, and other cases, notes (page 267) :

" . . . the rather curious fact that the National Government, though able to control its citizenship by naturalisation, is not able to confer the suffrage for the election even of its own officials ; whereas the States may confer, and indeed, in a number of instances, have conferred, this suffrage upon persons not citizens of the United States."

In this connection it is fitting to cite a late case from Kentucky, wherein the highest State court observes :

" The nineteenth amendment, which was proclaimed on August 26th, 1920, did not confer, nor purport to confer, the right of suffrage upon women, although that is a popular, but erroneous, conception. It only prohibits discrimination against them on account of their sex in the exercise of that right of citizenship."[3]

The court, continuing, points out the national authority then to be exercised when such discriminations are established before the proper court :

" The Constitution of the United States with its amendments is the supreme law of the land. Before it, all conflicting constitutional and statutory laws must yield and become ineffective. As its preamble declares, it was ordained and established by the people, and by adopting it they acquiesced in the restrictions and rights which it created or rendered possible by its provisions. In many ways, it also operates directly on the States in their corporate or sovereign capacity (Martin *v.* Hunter, 1 Wheat. 304 4 L. Ed. 97). It controls the Constitutions and the laws of the respective States, and cannot be controlled by them (McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. Ed. 579). In its sphere, it binds every forum, whether it derives its authority from a State or from the United States (Cook *v.* Moffat, 5 How. 295, 12 L. Ed. 159). Judicial and legislative acts of a State hostile in their purpose or mode of enforcement to the authority of the Federal Government, or impairing the rights of citizens under the Constitution of the United States, are invalid and void (Taylor *v.* Thomas, 22 Wall. 479, 22 L. Ed. 789)."

Yet it is to be noted that, in practical administration, the Federal provisions are not always perfectly observed. The constitutional authority previously quoted marks the defection under the fourteenth amendment's provision for the reduction of the Congressional representation of a State in that proportion which the number of male citizens denied the right to vote bears to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in the State. He comments thus :[4]

" No serious attempt has been made to enforce this constitutional mandate, although, as is well known, in a number of the States, by one means or another, the suffrage has been, in effect, denied to male adult citizens upon grounds other than those specified in the amendment."

---

[1] Morehead *v.* New York (1936), 298 U.S. 587, 609, 56 S. Ct. 918.
[2] Willoughby, W. W. : " Constitutional Law of the United States ", Second Students' Edition. 1933, pages 826, 827.
[3] Prewett *v.* Wilson (1932), 242 Ky. 231, 233, 46 S. W. (2d) 90.
[4] Willoughby, W. W. : *Op. cit.*, pages 143-144.

Citizenship and Naturalisation Provisions.

General Statement.

The Constitution of the United States declares that :

> " All persons born or naturalised in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside."[1]

Construing this amendment, adopted in 1868, the United States Supreme Court holds that it makes Federal citizenship " paramount and dominant " to State citizenship.[2]

The Federal Congress has the legislative power, under the Constitution, to establish " a uniform rule of naturalisation ".[3] No individual State may adopt laws governing the naturalisation of aliens.[4]

In 1933, the President of the United States appointed a Committee, composed of the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Labour, to review the nationality laws of the United States and codify them into one comprehensive national law for recommendation to Congress. However, this Committee has not yet submitted its report to the President.

Pan-American Convention on the Nationality of Women.

The United States of America ratified on June 30th, 1934, the Convention on the Nationality of Women proposed in the seventh International Conference of American States, at Montevideo, Uruguay.

By its provisions, the signatory Powers agree that among them "there shall be no distinction based on sex as regards nationality, in their legislation or in their practice ".

By ratification, this agreement is now in effect between the United States Government and seven other Pan-American States.[5]

Citizenship — How acquired.

A person becomes a citizen of the United States, if subject to its jurisdiction, by birth or by naturalisation.[6]

The Federal statute provides that all persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign Power are citizens of the United States.[7]

Citizenship — Minor born abroad.

The mother, equally with the father, if a citizen of the United States at the time of the birth of a child abroad, may transmit United States citizenship to the child.[8]

Naturalisation of Women.

Citizenship of the United States may be conferred upon an eligible alien, whether male or female, married or unmarried, upon full compliance with the laws governing naturalisation proceedings.

The law specifically provides that the right of any woman to become a naturalised citizen cannot be denied or abridged because of her sex or because she is a married woman.[9]

Independent citizenship for women was the objective sought in the adoption of the Cable Act,[10] effective September 22nd, 1922. Succeeding amendments[11] to the act have been directed to perfecting the attainment of the objective.

In a statement on " American Citizenship Rights of Women ", presented on March 2nd, 1933, to a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Immigration, representative John L. Cable, author of the Cable Act, made the following remarks :

> " The second amendment of the women's independent citizenship act did in fact place men and women on exactly the same footing, so far as citizenship is concerned. The last vestige of discrimination against women was eliminated. Our law for the first time now completely recognises the dignity of an American woman's citizenship and permits her to feel that her allegiance to our Government is as fine, intimate and sincere as a man's.
>
> " Within a decade, this great transformation of our law has taken place. No longer will an American-born woman ever be deprived of her American citizenship, regardless of whom she may marry or where or how long she may reside, unless she herself formally renounces her allegiance to the United States, becomes naturalised in some foreign country or takes the oath of allegiance to another sovereign. The woman who lost her citizenship by marriage to an alien before 1922 or because of her residence abroad after marrying an alien subsequent to 1922, may now return to the United States as a non-

---

[1] Constitution of the United States of America, Amendment XIV, Sec. 1.
[2] Selective Draft Law Cases (1918), 245 U.S. 366, 389, 38 S. Ct. 159.
[3] Constitution of the United States of America, Article 1, section 8, clause 4.
[4] United States *v.* Wong Kim Ark (1898), 169 U.S. 649.
[5] Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua.
[6] Constitution of the United States of America, Amendment XIV, sec. 1.
[7] Code of Laws of the United States, 1934, title 8, sec. 1.
[8] *Ibid.*, sec. 6.
[9] *Ibid.*, sec. 367.
[10] U.S. Statutes at Large, vol. 42, 1921-23, page 1021.
[11] Code of Laws of the United States, 1934, title 8, secs. 368*a*, 369, 369*a*.

quota immigrant and regain her native citizenship by a simple process of repatriation. No proof of residence here is required. She is no longer dominated by the will of her alien husband in this regard.

" An alien woman who marries an American now is permitted to be naturalised by shortening proceedings requiring only one year's residence[1] before filing her petition, instead of the customary five.

" Whether an alien man wishes to be naturalised or not, his alien wife may become a citizen in her own right by the regular naturalisation proceedings. That is true, even though her husband himself be ineligible for citizenship.

" To-day women in America enjoy citizenship status truly equal to and independent of that of men. Woman's citizenship victory is complete."

Voting Privilege guaranteed to Women by Federal Constitution.

The adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution in 1920 guaranteed to women the right to vote, by its prohibition of discrimination because of sex in the exercise of the voting privilege.[2]

Positions in the Federal Service.

Both elective and appointive offices in the three branches of the Federal Government are open to women who can qualify for them. Women now occupy with distinction posts in the Cabinet, the Congress of the United States, and the foreign service of the Government, as well as Federal judgeships.

Women may, in the discretion of the head of any department, be appointed to any of the positions therein authorised by law, upon the same requisites and conditions, and with the same compensations, as are prescribed for men.[3]

Employment in the Classified Civil Service.[4]

The majority of the permanent positions in the Federal service are classified — that is, position titles and compensation have been allocated by law according to the nature of the duties to be performed. In such allocations, the law enjoins the principle of " equal compensation for equal work irrespective of sex ".[5] Qualified applicants for positions are obtained by the United States Civil Service Commission through standard examinations, which are open to both sexes on the same terms.

Appointing officers, when requesting from the Civil Service Commission a list of eligibles from which to select an appointee, may designate whether one sex or the other is preferred.

Federal Trial Courts.

Women as Jurors.

The jurors in Federal trial courts are selected or exempted in accord with the provisions of State law for the highest court of law in the State where the court is sitting.[6]

A Bill is now (July 1937) under consideration by the National Congress (H.R. 285) which would so amend the Judicial Code as to permit women to be chosen for all jury service in any Federal trial court.

Women as Witnesses.

The competency of a witness to testify in any civil suit in United States courts is determined by the law of the State or territory in which the courts are held.[7]

In criminal proceedings, the common-law rule which excluded either spouse as a witness in behalf of the other has been superseded by a rule more in accord with modern trends and experience. The wife may now testify in behalf of the husband in such cases.[8] No specific ruling has been found relative to the husband's right to testify in behalf of the wife.

No rule has been laid down by Congress or court changing the incompetence of spouses to testify against each other, except as to certain marital offences. Then the complaining spouse may be called as a witness, but cannot be compelled to testify without the consent of the husband or wife. Nor can the witnessing spouse be permitted to testify as to any statement or communication made by either to the other during the marriage, deemed confidential at common law.[9]

---

[1] Three years' residence is required of an alien man or woman marrying an American citizen since May 24th, 1934, by provisions of an amendment of that date to the Cable Act — *Ibid.*, sec. 368.
[2] Constitution of the United States of America, Amendment XIX.
[3] Code of Laws of the United States, 1934, title 5, sec. 33 (July 12th, 1870).
[4] A somewhat fuller presentation of this subject has been made by the Women's Bureau, though not in published form.
[5] Code of Laws of the United States, 1934, title 5, sec. 664.
[6] *Ibid.*, title 28, sec. 411.
[7] *Ibid.*, sec. 631.
[8] Funk *v.* United States (1933), 290 U.S. 371, 54 S. Ct. 212, 93 A.L.R. 1136.
[9] Code of Laws of the United States, 1934, title 28, sec. 633.

Part III. — State Governments and the Woman Citizen.

[*Explanatory Note.* — For convenience of comparison in the following summary, the States for which the revision of the earlier report has been completed for both statutes and court decisions, as of July 1st, 1936, are designated as Section 1; those for which thus far only the statutes have been reviewed are designated as Section 2. For lists of States, see page 19.]

Age of Majority.

The age at which infants become adult citizens, capable at law of making valid contracts and managing their own property and business, is governed either by the common law or by specific statute.

Twenty-one years for both sexes is fixed by the common law as the age at which infancy ceases, and all disabilities of minority are removed. This rule is accepted as non-statutory law in twenty-one States (Sec. 1, eleven States; Sec. 2, ten States). It has been incorporated into statute law in nineteen States (Sec. 1, eleven States; Sec. 2 eight States).

In nine States, 21 years for males and 18 years for females has been set by statute (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, seven States).

Exceptions.

By a legal marriage, females become of age in thirteen States; males, in five States (Sec. 1 only).

By decree of court, granted only upon satisfactory evidence that the infant's best interests will be served, minors of both sexes may be relieved of disabilities for general or special purposes, as the court deems proper. This is possible in six States (Sec. 1 only).

Contract Rights.

Minors: Contractual Powers.

To minimise hardships for both minors and creditors, the common law permitted an infant to make valid contracts for " necessaries ", but such contracts were subject to severe scrutiny by the courts before the minor would be required to comply with them; all other contracts made before the age of 21 years were subject to the minor's ratification or rescission when he or she attained majority. This rule has been incorporated into statute law as to real property in twenty-four States and as to personal property in twenty-three States.

In some jurisdictions, married minors have limited powers to execute contracts and instruments of conveyance regarding their marital interests in the real property of the other spouse. Males have such powers in four States; females, in fourteen States. A minimum age-limit for the exercise of such powers is set in two States as to males, in six as to females.

Valid, but limited, contractual rights as to other than real property may be exercised by married male minors in three States, by married female minors in nine States. Similar powers, but limited also as to age of the minor, may be exercised by males in two States; by females in five. (All jurisdictions in Sec. 1; Sec. 2, review incomplete.)

Married Women (Adult): Contractual Rights regarding their Separate Property.

The property owned by a woman before her marriage, and that acquired by her afterward through gift, will or inheritance, or purchased with her separate funds, constitutes her separate property, as distinguished from the property acquired during the marriage through the co-operation of husband and wife.

In regard to her separate real property, a married woman is given unrestricted rights of contract or conveyance in twenty-five States (Sec. 1, nine States; Sec. 2, sixteen States). She has the right of contract or conveyance, but with one or more restrictions, in twenty-four States (Sec. 1, fifteen States; Sec. 2, nine States). The nature of the most usual restriction is the requirement of her husband's signature to conveyances of her lands, or of any right in them, generally where the marital right of curtesy or a statutory substitute for it exists. It should be noted that a similar restriction rests on the husband's right to convey his lands where the wife is entitled to dower or its statutory substitute.

As to her separate estate in personal property, an adult married woman may own, manage and dispose of it without restriction in thirty-three jurisdictions (Sec. 1, thirteen States; Sec. 2, twenty States). These rights exist, but with one or more restrictions, in sixteen States (Sec. 1, eleven States; Sec. 2, five States). Among these restrictions are her inability to become surety for the debt of another, and prohibitions against a business partnership with her husband.

Earnings of a married woman, obtained from services rendered outside of her duties to her husband and family in the home, belong to her as her separate property without restriction in thirty-seven jurisdictions (Sec. 1, nineteen States; Sec. 2, eighteen States).

Conditions or limitations upon this right are found in eleven jurisdictions (Sec. 1, four States; Sec. 2, seven States).

She is authorised to sue for such earnings in her own name, and to recover them for her sole use, in twenty-eight States (Sec. 1, twenty-one States; Sec. 2, seven States). Suit must be brought in her husband's name, or jointly with him, in five States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, three States).

Married Women: Right to engage in a Separate Business.

A married woman is free to engage in a separate business on her own account, without formal court proceeding, consent or petition of her husband, in eighteen States. A formal declaration or inventory of record to prevent liability to her husband's creditors is necessary in two States. Both court decree and the husband's consent are required in two States, but authority may be granted on the wife's sole petition in court in one State. The status is not clear in one State. (All figures for Section 1 only.)

Married Women: Liability for Family Necessaries.

A married woman is primarily liable on all contracts for necessaries or supplies which she makes in her own name and on her own credit in thirty-three States (Sec. 1, twenty States; Sec. 2, thirteen States).

Property Rights.

Married Women: Ownership of Personal Property owned before Marriage.

Under the statute law of all forty-nine jurisdictions, a married woman retains the ownership of the personal property belonging to her before her marriage (Sec. 1, twenty four States; Sec. 2, twenty-five States).

Married Women: Control of Separate Property during Marriage and Liability for the Husband's Debts.

The control and management of the wife's separate property during marriage vests solely in the wife in thirty-five States (Sec. 1, fourteen States; Sec. 2, twenty-one States). The husband has a limited or conditional control over such property in thirteen States (Sec. 1, nine States; Sec. 2, four States). Joint control, with the husband, obtains in one State as to the wife's separate real property (Sec. 1).

No liability attaches to the wife's separate property for payment of her husband's debts in twenty-eight States (Sec. 1, fifteen States; Sec. 2, thirteen States). Limited liability is recognised in ten States (Sec. 1, eight States; Sec. 2, two States).

Married Women: Right to distribute Separate Property by Will.

In each of the twenty-four jurisdictions included in Section 1, a married woman may make a will to dispose of her separate property at her death, both real and personal.

Limitations as to the extent of the property to pass under will occur, as to real property, for the wife in eighteen States, and for the husband in twenty States. As to personal property, such limitations exist for the wife in fifteen States and for the husband in seventeen States. (Sec. 1 only.)

Surviving Spouse's Share in the Estate of a Deceased Husband or Wife: Separate Property.

An equal share passes *absolutely* to the surviving husband or wife in real property owned at death by the deceased spouse in forty States (Sec. 1, nineteen States; Sec. 2, twenty-one States). This is true as to personal property in forty-one States (Sec. 1, nineteen States; Sec. 2, twenty-two States).

The widow's share of the real estate is greater than the husband's, conditionally, in six States (Sec. 1, four States; Sec. 2, two States); of the personal estate, in four jurisdictions, two of these conditionally (Sec. 1 only).

A less proportion of the real property descends to the widow in three States, two of these conditionally (Sec. 1, one State; Sec. 2, two States). As to personal property, she receives less, conditionally, in two States (one State each in Secs. 1 and 2).

Life interests in real property accrue to the surviving widow as common-law dower in six States (three each in Secs. 1 and 2), and to the husband as the common-law estate by curtesy in three States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, one State).

A statutory marital right in real property, in lieu of the common-law dower, inures to the widow in twenty-two States (Sec. 1, thirteen States, three of which are conditional; Sec. 2, nine States). A similar substitute for the husband's curtesy appears in eighteen States (Sec. 1, ten States, three conditionally; Sec. 2, eight States).

The life interests in real estate provided by statute are equal for the surviving spouse in fourteen States (Sec. 1, eight States; Sec. 2, six States). The widow's share is greater than that of a surviving husband in five States (Sec. 1, three States; Sec. 2, two States,

conditionally). Her share is less than the husband's in three States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, one State).

As to statutory life interests in personal property, the spouses receive the same proportion in three States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, one State). A widow's proportionate share is greater than a surviving husband's in one State (Sec. 1 only); her proportionate share is less in one State, conditionally (Sec. 1 only).

Support of Surviving Spouse and/or Family from Estate of Deceased Spouse during its Administration.

For the period required to close the estate of a deceased spouse, unless other provision is made by will, the statute usually provides that certain portions of the property, or its use, be allowed the decedent's family, or the surviving spouse if no dependent children survive.

The following analysis indicates the character and extent of such allowances.

Family clothing is set apart to the widow and children, or either, in twenty-seven States (Sec. 1, fourteen States; Sec. 2, thirteen States); to the widow and children in one State (Sec. 1 only); to the surviving spouse in twelve States (Sec. 1, seven States; Sec. 2, five States). The distribution of family clothing is left to the discretion of the probate court in two States (Sec. 1 only).

Occupancy of the family residence rent-free, for a limited time, is granted to the widow and children, or either, in at least fifteen States (Sec. 1, nine States, one conditionally; Sec. 2, six States, but record incomplete). The right is declared to the widow and children in three States (Sec. 1 only); to the surviving spouse in nine States (Sec. 1, four States; Sec. 2, five States).

Family support, usually from supplies on hand and for a limited period until the resources of the estate can be ascertained by the court, is set aside by statute to the widow and children, or either, in sixteen States (Sec. 1, twelve States; Sec. 2, four States reported). Such a provision is for the widow and children in six States (Sec. 1); for the surviving spouse in five States (Sec. 1, four States; Sec. 2, one State reported).

A fixed maximum amount of cash or personal property is provided by law in some States to be set aside for the use of the family. This is set apart to the widow and children, or either, in eighteen States (Sec. 1, nine States; Sec. 2, nine States); to the surviving spouse in ten States (five States each in Secs. 1 and 2).

Right of Surviving Spouse to reject Unsatisfactory Provisions of a Deceased Spouse's Will.

To preclude inadequate provision or manifest injustice through the terms a deceased spouse to the surviving widow or husband, a statutory right of election accrues to the surviving spouse in fifteen States, to the widow in six other States (Sec. 1 only).

In such cases of unsatisfactory testamentary provisions, the law makes available outright on election of the surviving spouse a definite portion of the decedent's property. Either spouse has this right as to real and personal property in fifteen States. The right accrues to the widow only as to real property in two States, and as to personal property in six States (Sec. 1).

Or the surviving spouse may elect to take a life interest in real property, if the financial condition of the estate points to this as the wiser choice in view of the priority of such an interest over claims of the estate's creditors. The survivor has this privilege in five States, the widow only in six States (Sec. 1).

Ownership, Control and Right of Testamentary Disposition with regard to Property acquired after Marriage through the Co-operative Efforts of Husband and Wife.

The spouses have equal rights as to ownership of property acquired after marriage through co-operative efforts in eight States (Sec. 1, three States; Sec. 2, five States).

In none of the forty-nine jurisdictions have husband and wife equal rights as to the management and control of this class of property, which in forty-one common-law jurisdictions is deemed the property of the husband alone (Sec. 1, twenty-one States; Sec. 2, twenty States).

In forty-three jurisdictions, one conditionally (Sec. 1, twenty-one States; Sec. 2, twenty-two States), the husband only has the power to dispose of such property by will. Each spouse may make testamentary disposition of his or her community half of such property in six States (three States each in Secs. 1 and 2).

For the protection of the family from improvidence or misfortune, many States permit the declaration of a homestead out of the real property owned by one of the spouses and occupied by the family as a home. Under such provisions, the homestead cannot be disposed of nor any valid lien be created against it, without the joint action of both spouses. (See subject immediately following.)

Statutory Exemptions of Property from Execution for Debt.

As to personal property owned by *single persons*, women have equal consideration with men in the allowance of exemptions from seizure for debt in eighteen States (Sec. 1 only).

The exemption allowed in personal property to *married persons* are the same for men and women in twenty-four States (Sec. 1 only).

Exemptions in real estate are limited to the homestead, which may be claimed by single women as well as single men in fourteen States (Sec. 1 only) when the conditions on which the exemption is allowed have been met, as, for example, the responsibility of the person for the support and care of dependent relatives in the household.

The homestead exemption to married persons is limited to one or the other of the spouses, and is granted to the wife, if not claimed by the husband, in nineteen States (Sec. 1 only).

Insurance for the benefit of the wife on the life of her husband, or, in some instances, a third person, is made exempt from administration or creditors' claims, to the wife or her heirs, in ten States (Sec. 1 only). A similar provision for the benefit of the husband is found in three of these States (Sec. 1 only).

Parents and Children.

Respective Rights of Father and Mother as Heirs of their Child dying Intestate.

The mother and father share equally in that portion, if any, passing to the parents from their intestate child's estate, as to both real and personal property, in forty-nine jurisdictions (Sec. 1, twenty-four States; Sec. 2, twenty-five States).

The Mother's Right to inherit Property from her Intestate Child born out of Wedlock.

At common law, an illegitimate child had no heirs except its lawful issue. Accordingly, the mother of the child had no share in any of its property. But the statute laws of forty-seven jurisdictions provide for her inheritance from her child's estate (Sec. 1, twenty-three States; Sec. 2, twenty-four States). One State makes no provision for such a case (Sec. 1), and the policy of one other State is not clear (Sec. 2).

Respective Responsibility of the Father and Mother for Support of their Child born out of Wedlock.

Under the common law, no legal responsibility attaches to either parent for the support of an illegitimate child. The obligation is one of natural affection on the part of the mother, and of human concern on the part of the community where the child resides.

By statutory provision in forty-three States (Sec. 1, nineteen States; Sec. 2, twenty-four States), the paternity of such a child may be put to proof in a regularly prescribed court proceeding. If the identity of the father is established, the court must charge him with contribution to the maintenance and support of the child, under bond and upon penalties for failure. The amount of contribution, the manner of payment, and the period of time over which payments must extend, vary considerably in the several States. In some jurisdictions, these details are left to the discretion of the court, but usually a maximum is set by the statute.

Joint responsibility of the parents is provided by statute in two States, conditional, of course, upon the paternity of the child having been established (Sec. 1 only).

The mother's responsibility for support is fixed by law in three States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, one State), but conditional upon her ability to meet the obligation.

Statutory liability for the expense incident to the birth of the child is charged upon the father, when determined, in eleven jurisdictions (Sec. 1, ten States; Sec. 2, one State); upon the mother in seven States (Sec. 1 only); upon both father and mother in two States (Sec. 1 only).

Respective Rights of Parents to the Earnings and Services of their Minor Children.

Both parents are entitled equally to the earnings and services of minor children by statute in twenty-six jurisdictions (Sec. 1, ten States; Sec. 2, sixteen States). The father's right is prior in twelve jurisdictions (Sec. 1, five States; Sec. 2, seven States).

In eight States, the parents have equal right to the child's earnings, conditionally (Sec 1, six States; Sec 2, two States) The father's right is greater in two States, conditionally (Sec. 1).

Respective Rights of Parents as to Guardianship of their Minor Children.

With respect to the natural guardianship of a child's person — that is, having custody of the child and directing its education — the mother and father have equal right by statute in forty-three States (Sec. 1, twenty-one States; Sec. 2, twenty-two States); the father has the superior right in six States (Sec. 1, three States; Sec. 2, three States).

As to the right to be appointed by the court as guardian of any estate belonging to the child, the mother and father have equal consideration in six States (Sec. 1 only); the father is preferred by statute in four States (Sec. 1 only; Sec. 2 incomplete).

Respective Rights of Parents to appoint a Testamentary Guardian of their Minor Children.

Only one State (Sec. 2) has a provision whereby a father may appoint by his last will a guardian of the person of his minor child, to whom custody of the child may be given in preference to the mother.

In other States, the right to appoint such a testamentary guardian either is limited to the parent who survives upon the death of one, or is conditional upon the written assent of both parents to the proceeding.

Marriage.

Validity of Common-law Marriages.

Common-law marriages are declared void by express statute in eighteen States (Sec. 1, eight States; Sec. 2, ten States). A State policy of non-recognition as to such unions has been announced by judicial opinions in five States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, three States).

Comparison by Sex of Ages for contracting a Valid Marriage.

In order to contract a valid marriage *without consent of parents*, the respective parties must have reached certain ages, as follows :

21 years : Males — forty-two States (Sec. 1, twenty-two States; Sec. 2, twenty States).
Females — eleven States (Sec. 1, seven States; Sec. 2, four States).

20 years : Males — one State (Sec. 1 only).
Females — no State.

18 years : Males — four States (Sec. 1, one State; Sec. 2, three States).
Females — thirty-seven States (Sec. 1, seventeen States; Sec. 2, twenty States).

The minimum *ages of consent to contract a valid marriage* as set out in various State laws are as follows :

18 years : Males — eighteen States (Sec. 1, six States; Sec. 2, twelve States).
Females — no State.

17 years : Males — four States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, two States).
Females — no State.

16 years : Males — ten States (Sec. 1, three States; Sec. 2, seven States).
Females — fifteen States (Sec. 1, five States; Sec. 2, ten States).

15 years : Males — one State (Sec. 1 only).
Females — seven States (Sec. 1, three States; Sec. 2, four States).

14 years : Males — two States (Sec. 1 only).
Females — eleven States (Sec. 1, four States; Sec. 2, seven States).

13 years : Males — no State.
Females — one State (Sec. 1 only).

12 years : Males — no State.
Females — one State (Sec. 1 only).

The minimum *ages of consent to contract a valid marriage* as fixed by the common law — 14 years for males and 12 years for females — are in effect in thirteen States (Sec. 1, ten States; Sec. 2, three States).

Health Certificate made requisite to Issuance of Marriage License: Comparison by Sex.

Before a license to marry may be issued, some States require evidence of the physical or mental fitness of one or both applicants to enter the marital relation.

A physician's certificate showing the absence of venereal disease, after prescribed tests made within a limited period prior to application for license to marry, is required of the male in nine States (Sec. 1, six States; Sec. 2, three States); of the female, in two States (Sec. 1 only).

The applicant's certificate as to freedom from venereal disease is required of the male only in three States (Sec. 1, two States; Sec. 2, one State); of both male and female, in six States (three States each in Secs. 1 and 2).

As to other specified diseases or mental affliction, a physician's certificate is required of both male and female in one State (Sec. 2 only). The applicant's own certificate in this connection is required of the male only in one State (Sec. 2), and of both male and female in six States (three States each in Secs. 1 and 2).

Annulment of Marriage.

Some attempted marriages are declared by statute to be void from the beginning, and no court action is necessary to restore the parties to their former status.

Other marriages are declared voidable, upon regular court proceeding, at the instance of one of the parties. Various grounds for voiding or annulling a marriage appear in the statutes, and, with the exception of one ground in one State, are available without discrimination as to sex.

Absolute Divorce: Availability of Statutory Grounds to Respective Sexes.

A wife may be granted an absolute divorce on satisfactory proof of one of the following seven grounds, available only to her :

Non-support for one year or more, seventeen States (Sec. 1, eight States ; Sec. 2, nine States) ; wilful neglect, five States (Sec. 2 only) ; abandonment by the husband, one State (Sec. 2) ; ouster from the home by the husband, one State (Sec. 2) ; the husband's vagrancy, two States (one State each in Secs. 1 and 2) ; husband's desertion of wife, who is United States resident, to become a citizen of a foreign country, leaving her for three years without claiming marital rights or making suitable provision for her support, or willingly absenting himself for three years without suitably providing for his wife's support, one State (Sec. 1).

The husband is entitled to an absolute divorce when the required evidence has been submitted by him of the following eight causes for complaint against the wife's conduct :

Pregnancy at the time of marriage by another than her husband, and undisclosed to him, fourteen States (Sec. 1, six States ; Sec. 2, eight States) ; lascivious behaviour on the part of the wife without actual proof of an act of adultery, one State (Sec. 2) ; her refusal to move into the State with the husband, and her wilful absenting of herself from him for two years, one State (Sec. 2) ; the wife a prostitute before marriage, unknown to the husband at the time of marriage, one State (Sec. 1) ; the wife willingly absenting herself from her husband without his consent for three years consecutively, one State (Sec. 1) ; the wife's illicit intercourse prior to marriage, not known to the husband at marriage, one State (Sec. 1) ; wife given to intoxication, one State (Sec. 1) ; wife residing outside State for ten years away from husband, without returning to claim her marriage right, one State (Sec. 1).

The forty-eight remaining grounds for absolute divorce, compiled from various States, are available to either party to the marriage who is aggrieved or injured by the conduct of the other.

Respective Rights of Domicile of Husband and Wife.

The common-law rule as to rights of domicile prevails generally. Under this, the husband has the right to establish the domicile for his family, including, of course, his wife, since, by the reasoning of the common law, she and her husband are one person for legal purposes. In some cases, this right of the husband is tempered with a statutory provision that the domicile he selects must be one suitable for his family and in keeping with its social status.

However, with the development of modern conditions, for the protection of individual political privileges, the wife has been accorded the right to establish a separate domicile, by specific statute, in ten States for voting, in seven States for holding office, in three States for jury service, and in one State for taxation (by judicial ruling). (Sec. 1 only.)

Political Rights.

Eligibility of Women for Election to Public Office.

Women are eligible for election to public office on the same basis as men in forty-five States (Sec. 1, twenty-one States ; Sec. 2, twenty-four States) ; on the same basis but limited to certain offices, in two States (one State each in Secs. 1 and 2) ; status uncertain in two States (Sec. 1).

Women's Eligibility to Jury Service.

Women are eligible for jury service in twenty-four States (Sec. 1, thirteen States ; Sec. 2, eleven States). Their service as jurors is optional in twelve States (Sec. 1, eight States ; Sec. 2, four States) ; it is based on the same terms as that of male jurors in ten States (five States each in Secs. 1 and 2).

Competence of Husband and Wife as Witnesses for or against Each Other.

Restrictions upon the competency of spouses to testify for or against each other apply equally, as a general rule, to husband and wife.

Any advantage is with the wife, as appears in the provision of some States for the competence of her testimony against the husband, without his consent, in cases of abandonment.

Discriminatory Laws or Rulings against the Employment of Women.

As to existing laws, no State has passed openly discriminatory laws against the employment of women in public positions.

No discriminatory rulings are reported by local governments, as countries, cities or school boards, as to employment of single women. With regard to married women, such

discrimination is reported in city or county governments in two States; by school-board rulings in eleven States. (Sec. 1 only).

Inequalities in Administration of Law with regard to Women.

Inequalities in administration are reported in one State (Sec. 1) and occur in the matter of appointments to State employment. This is reported to have been rather general in the State recently, owing to a reactionary legislative tendency.

Lists of States designated in the Foregoing Summary as Sections 1 and 2.

Section 1, for which the revision of the earlier report has been completed for both statutes and court cases, consists of twenty-four States :

Alabama	Maine	Nebraska
Connecticut	Maryland	New Hampshire
District of Columbia[1]	Massachusetts	Ohio
Florida	Michigan	Rhode Island
Indiana	Minnesota	Texas
Iowa	Mississippi	Virginia
Kansas	Missouri	Washington
Louisiana	Montana	Wisconsin

Section 2, for which the revision thus far has covered only the statutes, consists of twenty-five States :

Arizona	Nevada	Pennsylvania
Arkansas	New Jersey	South Carolina
California	New Mexico	South Dakota
Colorado	New York	Tennessee
Delaware	North Carolina	Utah
Georgia	North Dakota	Vermont
Idaho	Oklahoma	West Virginia
Illinois	Oregon	Wyoming
Kentucky		

[1] For the purpose of this study, considered as a State.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1938

1-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

Ser. L.o.N. P.		Pages
1938.V.1.	Status of Women. Communications received from Governments and Women's International Organisations.	448-451
1938.V.2.	International Repression of Terrorism. Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. Observations by Governments, Series III.	452-456
1938.V.3.	Proceedings of the International Conference on the Repression of Terrorism, Geneva, November 1st to 16th, 1937.	457-525
1938.V.4.	Ratification of Agreements and Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations. Nineteenth List.	526-635
1938.V.5.	Ratification of International Conventions concluded under the Auspices of the League of Nations. Results of the Eighth Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930.	636-639

[Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: **C. 84. M. 38.** 1938. V.

Geneva, February 28th, 1938.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

STATUS OF WOMEN

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

The present document is a continuation of the series of communications received from Governments and Women's International Organisations published under the Nos. A.33.1936.V, and A.14, A.14(*a*), A.14(*b*), A.14(*c*), A.14(*d*) and A.14(*e*).1937.V.

CANADA

January 10th, 1938.

THE POLITICAL AND CIVIL STATUS OF WOMEN

(Reply to C.L.184.1936.V.).

The resolution of the Assembly of September 27th, 1935, requested information as to the existing political and civil status of women under the national laws of each country, together with observations as to action which the League might take.

It will be evident from this memorandum that Canada has to a large extent given effect to the principle of equality of status as between men and women.

Unlike the question of traffic in women, the question of political and civil status is one of domestic concern rather than one requiring international action. While useful work can be done by the League in encouraging the study of the questions involved by the collection and distribution of information, it does not appear that there is particular need for the establishment of any general Convention on the subject.

As for the information requested, the preparation of it is, in Canada, a task requiring rather more extended investigation than is the case in most other countries. Under the federal form of government which exists in Canada, the political and civil status of women varies considerably in different parts of the Dominion, and it is necessary to examine not only federal legislation but also the statutes of each of the nine provinces, as well as the common law on the subject. As far as provincial laws are concerned, there is a cleavage between the eight common-law provinces whose laws are in general similar, and the civil-law province of Quebec.

In the distribution of legislative powers between the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial legislatures, set forth in the written constitution, the field of property and civil rights, except as to certain matters expressly committed to the Dominion, is declared to be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. The political and civil status of women is therefore largely dependent upon the laws of the individual provinces.

For convenience of reference, the information on the subject may be summarised under three main headings : *first*, the political and civil status of women in federal (*i.e.*, Dominion) matters ; *second*, the political and civil status of women in the province of Quebec ; *third*, the political and civil status of women in the eight common-law provinces.

3490 — S. d. N. 930 (F.) 950 (A.). 3/38. Imp. Granchamp.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL
1938. V. 1.

I. Political and Civil Status in Matters under the Jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada (*i.e.*, the Dominion Parliament).

A. Political Status.

Electoral Rights.

Women have the same right as men to vote in Dominion elections.

Eligibility for Parliament.

Women have the same right as men to be appointed to the Senate (the Upper House of Parliament) and to be elected to the House of Commons (the Lower House).

Eligibility for Civil Service.

Generally speaking, the Civil Service Act makes no differentiation with respect to sex, and the conditions governing the employment of men govern also the employment of women. However, the competition for certain positions may be limited to men, or to women, if the administrative authorities think it desirable. Furthermore, resignation is compulsory for women on marriage and, with some exceptions, married women are not eligible for appointment to the service.

Judiciary.

With the exception of police magistrates, justices of the peace and similar minor judicial officers, all judges are appointed by the Dominion Government. The Judges Act does not discriminate against women. However, judges must be chosen from members of the Bar. Eligibility for membership in the Bar is regulated by the provinces.

Nationality and Naturalisation.

An alien unmarried woman may become naturalised in the same way as a man. The alien wife of an alien may become a British subject if her husband first becomes naturalised.

A female British subject who marries an alien may, in some cases, retain her British nationality.

The wife of a British subject may retain her British nationality even though her husband ceases to be a British subject.

B. Civil Status.

Banking.

Under the Bank Act women may make deposits in a bank on the same terms as men.

Bankruptcy.

There is some question as to whether the Bankruptcy Act applies to married women who are not traders. However, married women traders and unmarried women are, under the Act, on the same footing as men.

Divorce.

Divorce is solely within the legislative jurisdiction of the Dominion. Divorce courts exist in every province except Quebec. The principal ground for divorce is adultery, whether the husband or the wife is suing. Divorces are also granted by Act of Parliament.

Court actions for divorce can be brought only in the province in which the husband is domiciled. However, an exception to this rule exists for the benefit of deserted wives.

II. Political and Civil Status of Women in the Province of Quebec.

A. Political Status.

Electoral Rights.

(1) Quebec Legislature. — Women have no vote in elections for the Legislative Assembly.

(2) Municipal Bodies. — Generally speaking, widows and spinsters can vote but married women cannot. However, in the City of Montreal, which has a special charter, some married women can vote.

Eligibility for Political Office.

(1) Quebec Legislature. — Women cannot be elected to the Legislative Assembly, but it is probable that they can be appointed to the Legislative Council.

(2) Municipal Bodies. — Women cannot be elected to municipal office. An exception may exist in the case of the City of Montreal, but the point has not arisen.

Eligibility for Civil Service.

The Quebec Civil Service Act does not differentiate between men and women.

Minor Judges and Juries.

Certain minor judges are appointed by the province. They must be chosen from members of the Bar, and women cannot be members of the Quebec Bar. However, women are eligible for appointment as justices of the peace.

Women cannot be members of a jury.

B. Civil Status.

Education.

Women are not eligible for election as school commissioners or school trustees. Widows and spinsters are possibly entitled to vote in such elections, but in practice only men vote. In the larger cities, members of the school boards are appointed under special statutes, which do not expressly exclude women.

Professions.

Women are excluded from the practice of law. They are, strictly speaking, excluded from the profession of pharmacy but in fact there are a few women pharmacists. Medicine, dentistry and other professions are open to women. The right to become a clergyman is governed by the ecclesiastical bodies themselves.

Mothers' Pensions.

Pensions are provided for mothers who are unable to support their young children.

Civil Rights under the Civil Code.

Property rights and relations between husband and wife are dealt with in the Civil Code. Unmarried women and married women separate as to bed and board are under no disability. However, married women not separate as to bed and board are under numerous disabilities. A few of the features of the law will be mentioned.

(1) *Property Regimes.* — There are three property regimes — legal community, separation of property and conventional community. Conventional community is so rare that it may safely be ignored. Legal community is the regime which comes into being automatically upon the celebration of a marriage unless, prior to the marriage, the parties have entered into a contract of marriage stipulating separation of property or conventional community.

In this memorandum, the words " wife common as to property " mean a woman married without any contract of marriage ; the words " wife separate as to property " mean a wife who has before marriage entered into a contract stipulating separation of property or who has, after the marriage, obtained a judgment in separation of property. The words " wife separate as to bed and board " mean a wife who has obtained a judicial separation from bed and board, which always entails dissolution of the community and thereafter separation as to property.

(2) *Wife Separate as to Property.* — A wife separate as to property may contract with respect to anything which pertains to the administration of her property, the free enjoyment of her revenues and the alienation of her movable property. She cannot, without marital or judicial authorisation, alienate her immovables or accept a gift of immovables or take any legal proceedings concerning her immovable properties. Her capacity to take or defend actions concerning her movables is at present in doubt.

(3) *Wife Common as to Property.* — A wife common as to property cannot, generally speaking, appear in any judicial proceedings without her husband or his authorisation. She cannot enter into any contracts without the written authorisation of her husband or judicial authorisation. The husband alone administers the property of the community.

(4) *Wills.* — A wife, whatever her matrimonial status, may make a will without the authorisation of her husband.

(5) *Separation from Bed and Board.* — Generally speaking, there is no discrimination between husband and wife as far as the right to sue for separation from bed and board is concerned.

(6) *Dissolution of Legal Community.* — Legal community is dissolved by death, by separation of property (which can be obtained only by the wife and only from the Court), by separation from bed and board, and in some cases by absence.

Following dissolution, a partition is made of the assets of the community.

(7) *Reserved Property.* — Since 1931, under all property regimes, the proceeds of the personal work of the wife and certain other property is reserved to the entire administration of the wife, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

(8) *Wife's Duty towards Husband.* — A wife owes obedience to her husband. She is obliged to live with him and to follow him wherever he thinks fit to reside.

(9) *Domicile.* — A married woman not separate as to bed and board has the same domicile as her husband.

(10) *Dower.* — There are two kinds of dower : (*a*) prefixed or conventional, (*b*) legal or customary. The former is that which the parties have agreed upon by the contract of marriage. Legal or customary dower is that which the law, independently of any agreement, and as resulting from the mere act of marriage, establishes upon the property of the husband in favour of the wife as usufructuary and of the children as owners. Conventional dower ordinarily excludes customary. In most cases, registration is necessary in order to preserve dower.

(11) *Rights over Children.* — The father alone exercises, during marriage, the parental authority over children.

III. Political and Civil Status of Women in the Eight Common-Law Provinces : Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia.

A. General.

British Columbia and Alberta have passed Sex Disqualification Removal Acts which provide : " A person shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage from the exercise of any public function, or from being appointed to or holding any civil or judicial office or post, or from entering or assuming or carrying on any civil profession or vocation, or for admission to any incorporated society ".

B. Political Status.

Electoral Rights.

In all these provinces, women have the same right as men to vote in elections for the provincial legislature and in municipal elections. This is subject to some slight exceptions in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Eligibility for Political Office.

In all these provinces, women have the same right as men to be candidates for the provincial legislature and in municipal elections.

Eligibility for Civil Service.

Generally speaking, women are eligible for appointment in the Civil Service on the same terms as men, in all these provinces. The chief exception is a discrimination in some provinces against married women.

Minor Judges and Juries.

The provinces appoint minor judicial officers such as magistrates and justices. There is no legal obstacle to the appointment of women except perhaps in Ontario and Nova Scotia. In Ontario, women are not eligible for appointment as magistrates, with one exception. In Nova Scotia, the matter is in doubt.

Women are not eligible for jury service except in Alberta and British Columbia.

C. Civil Status.

Education.

Generally speaking, women have the same right as men to vote for and be elected to local school boards. Universities are open to women students on the same terms as to men students.

Professions.

The professions — law, medicine, etc. — are open to women as to men. An exception exists in the case of divinity ; admission to the ministry is controlled by the respective churches.

Mothers' Pensions.

All the provinces, except Prince Edward Island, provide pensions or allowances for mothers for the support of young children in proper cases, that is, where otherwise the mother would be unable to support the children. Widows are, of course, among the chief beneficiaries.

Unmarried Mothers.

All the provinces have legislation under which an unmarried mother may compel the father to contribute to the support of their child.

Deserted Wives.

All the provinces have laws compelling a husband to contribute to the support of a wife whom he has deserted.

Contractual, Juridical and Property Rights.

Generally speaking, women have the same right as men to acquire and own property, to dispose of it *inter vivos* or by will, to contract and carry on business, to sue and be sued. This applies to married women as well as to unmarried.

Wife's Duty towards Husband.

The common law rule applies. It is the duty of a wife to reside with her husband. However, a husband is not entitled, if his wife refuses to live with him, even without any reasonable cause, to restrain her by force or to keep her in confinement.

Domicile.

The common law rule that a wife's domicile follows that of her husband has not been altered.

Rights over Children.

In British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario, it is expressly laid down that, in the absence of a court order, a husband and wife have joint guardianship or control over children.

Dower.

All the provinces assure to a wife a life interest in part of her husband's real property. In Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the right to use the " home " property for life is specifically protected.

General Status.

At common law, husband and wife were for legal purposes regarded as one person. As appears from this memorandum, this theory of the unity of the person has been abrogated for most purposes — especially in matters of property, contract and litigation.

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: A. 24 (b). 1936.V.

Geneva, February 21st, 1938.

452

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

OBSERVATIONS BY GOVERNMENTS

Series III

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

In execution of the Council's decision of January 23rd, 1936, the Secretary-General invited the Governments to forward to him by July 15th, 1936, any observations they might desire to submit to the Assembly on the texts of the above-mentioned draft Conventions drawn up by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its second session, held from January 7th to 15th, 1936 (see document A.7.1936.V).

The first two series of replies were printed and published in documents A.24.1936.V and A.24*(a)*.1936.V, but the under-mentioned replies were received after the close of the Assembly's ordinary session in 1936 and were distributed to the Governments in roneographed form as documents C.552.M.356.1936.V and C.194.M.139.1937.V.

In order that all the observations received from Governments on the drafts drawn up by the Committee at its second session may be easily available for reference in printed form, the present document, forming Series III, is now issued.

	Page		Page
China	1	Czechoslovakia	2

C.552.M.356.1936.V.

China.

[*Translation.*]

November 27th, 1936.

My Government is in agreement with the principles of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court; on the other hand, it regrets that the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism does not embody the suggestions submitted by the Chinese Government in reply to your Circular Letter 219.1934.V, of December 27th, 1934.

In my letter of April 26th, 1935,[1] I conveyed to you two suggestions which my Government would have wished the Committee of Experts to adopt—namely:

(1) That, in countries where extra-territoriality is in force, foreigners entitled to the regime of consular courts should forfeit the benefit of this regime and become amenable to local jurisdiction whenever they are accused of any of the acts constituting terrorist action for political ends;

[1] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V.

3494—S.d.N. 755 (F.) 750 (A.) 3/38.—Imp. Réunies, Chambéry.

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1938. V. 2.

(2) That, in the case of countries in whose territory are situated " concessions, settlements or leased territories ", every facility should be afforded to the authorities of such countries with a view to the repression, in the above-mentioned territories, which are removed from their administration, of crimes committed for purposes of political terrorism.

As I informed you in that letter, my Government attaches particular importance to the embodiment in the Convention of these two provisions, which would greatly facilitate the prosecution of accused persons who are in China.

I should be glad if you would be good enough to communicate my present letter to the Committee of Experts, whose members, knowing how greatly the prevention and punishment of crime is complicated by the existence of the system of extra-territoriality and of " concessions, settlements and leased territories ", will certainly be able to appreciate the utility of my Government's suggestions. My Government will, moreover, explain its views in detail when the draft Convention in question is discussed.

C.194.M.139.1937.V.

Czechoslovakia.

March 13th, 1937.

[*Translation.*]

I. Concerning the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

The Czechoslovak Government has been following with close attention and cordial sympathy the various efforts made to ensure collaboration between States in suppressing criminal violence as a weapon in political strife. It accordingly welcomes the proposal of the French Government and of the experts on international criminal law to frame a draft international convention for the prevention and punishment of the acts of violence, committed for political ends, commonly known as terrorism. The conclusion of a series of conventions to which a large number of States are parties demonstrates the possibility of standardising the offences and the corresponding penalties provided for in the laws of the various countries, and the further possibility, by bringing national laws into unison on this point, of obtaining an effective means of coping with the use of criminal violence for political ends. The Czechoslovak Government has in mind the results obtained by means of the Convention of April 20th, 1929, for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, and, more recently, by the Convention of June 26th, 1936, for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. In principle, therefore, the Czechoslovak Government's attitude towards the draft Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is a positive one, but it fully realises that the solution of the problem is fraught with serious difficulties which make it necessary to proceed with the greatest circumspection. While the criminal acts of individuals or groups or associations of individuals must, indeed, be punished, the Convention must not be allowed to apply to acts falling within the scope of public international law—*e.g.*, the law of war. Nor must the repression of terrorism be allowed to become a pretext for unduly restricting or even entirely abolishing the free expression of opinion. These various points must be borne in mind when scrutinising the draft of January 1936 submitted by the Committee of Experts.

Passing on to the various provisions of the draft, the Czechoslovak Government desires to submit the following observations :

Ad *Article* 1.

The Committee of Experts discussed what was meant by the word " terrorism ", and whether it was necessary to specify that what was intended was political terrorism. The prevailing opinion in the Committee was that the term " terrorism " was universally understood and that no further definition was required. It was also held that " terrorism " should be deemed to include only the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 of the draft, and subject to the conditions therein named. If this view is correct, Article 1 should, in the Czechoslovak Government's opinion, be deleted, assuming that the Convention itself will be described as a Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, or that there will be a preamble to that effect.

If Article 1 is maintained, the term " terrorism " should be replaced by the words " the punishable acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 ". It is important, in a Convention providing for co-operation between States in matters of criminal law, to avoid, as far as possible, ambiguous terms which might involve divergent interpretations of the rights and obligations ensuing from the Convention. The Committee of Experts found that, although it had regarded the meaning of terrorism as generally understood, a definition of its exact significance and scope would present certain difficulties. The solution proposed by the Czechoslovak Government —viz., to refer to the various acts explicitly mentioned in the Convention—would obviate these difficulties.

Ad *Article* 2.

1. As has been pointed out above, it cannot be the purpose of the proposed Convention to make acts which are governed by public international law into offences punishable under criminal law. Thus, by definition, the Convention cannot apply to acts performed by those

amenable to public international law. Such being the case, the nature of the punishable acts coming within the scope of the Convention should be established by elimination ; more particularly, acts of violence subject, for example, to the law of war would be excluded, and the new conventional rules would only apply to punishable acts committed by individuals or groups or associations of individuals, in so far as the latter could not, under international law, be regarded as belligerents. At the same time, it is important to remember that the purpose in view is the framing of international regulations, and that consequently the offences in question must be in the nature of international or, it may be, world offences, the suppression or prevention of which has an interest of a legal character for the international community of States. If the international character of the punishable acts is to be specially stressed in this way, it will obviously be necessary to make it clear that the conventional rights and obligations do not embrace any acts which are restricted to the territory of a single State and the effects of which are not felt in the territory of another State. So long as the term " terrorism " is retained in the title of the Convention, in its preamble, or in the various provisions, the Czechoslovak Government considers it desirable to insert the qualification " international ", or to incorporate in the Convention an interpretative rule to the above effect.

2. The text framed by the Committee of Experts does not make it clear whether the Convention is based upon a subjective or objective conception of the acts concerned—that is to say, whether the decisive factor is to be the offender's *intention* of bringing about the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services or a disturbance in international relations, by the use of violence or by the creation of a state of terror, or whether it is to be the fact that the act is in itself capable of producing such effects that shall be decisive.

The Czechoslovak Government is inclined to think that, in framing the proposed conventional regulations, the question should be approached from *both these points of view*, and that the subjective and the objective criteria should be adopted in conjunction. At the same time, the decision as to whether the conditions for the application of the Convention under the terms of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the present draft are all fulfilled must obviously rest, in any case, with whatever State might be called upon to take action under the terms of the Convention.

As regards the several provisions of Article 2, the Czechoslovak Government feels some doubt as to how any essential distinction can be made between the various means employed to commit an act of terrorism. The terms " violence " and " creation of a state of terror " used in the Convention are not at all clear, since " violence " may also, it would seem, mean " threat ". Nor is it certain whether the expression " violence " is intended to mean only acts directed against the person who is the immediate object of the attack, or whether that term should also include acts aimed indirectly at another person. The expression " state of terror " seems, on the contrary, to imply that more than one person is involved.

In directing attention to the possibility that the terms employed may be variously interpreted, the Czechoslovak Government recommends that they be more accurately defined.

Accepting the method of drafting which follows from the Czechoslovak Government's observations concerning Article 1, it would moreover be possible to avoid all the difficulties just noted, if Article 2, paragraph 1, were worded as follows :

> " Each High Contracting Party should make the following acts criminal offences, whether they affect his own interests or those of another High Contracting Party, in all cases where they are directed to the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services or a disturbance in international relations—viz. : "

In this way, it would be possible to dispense with the words " by the use of violence or by the creation of a state of terror ", which would become superfluous by reason of the limitative enumeration of the acts concerned ; and would moreover obviate the difficulties that might very easily arise as to the significance of these terms in conjunction with the acts enumerated in Article 2, paragraph 1, Nos. (1) to (5).

Ad *Article 2, Paragraph* 1.

The Czechoslovak Government thinks that it will be necessary to specify whether the obligations of the contracting parties refer *ex conventione* to all the persons named therein, and whether the contracting States would be bound to extend such protection to nationals of their own to whom they had hitherto accorded no exceptional protection. Another question which arises in connection with Article 4, is whether the Convention involves an obligation to provide special protection for the persons named, or whether the degree of protection to be provided by any given State should be the same as that accorded to its own nationals of similar rank, irrespective of the degree of protection accorded to the said persons by the laws of their own countries. The Government also thinks that it should be decided, in connection with Article 4, whether the contracting parties shall be free to make the protection of the persons concerned conditional, in each case, on reciprocity and, possibly, equality.

Ad *Article 2, Paragraph* 3.

The Czechoslovak Government considers that the amendments proposed by the Polish Government in its observations of September 3rd, 1936 (document A.24*(a)*.1936.V), are better suited to the purpose of the Convention, and accordingly recommends their adoption.

Ad *Article 2, Paragraph 4.*

If the provisions of this paragraph are to apply to preparatory acts in any form, " purchase " and " brokerage ", which are not at present covered by the Convention, should be added to the list of punishable acts.

Ad *Article 2, Paragraph 5, and Article 3.*

The draft Convention employs the terms " giving assistance " (Article 2, paragraph 5), " wilful complicity " and " any help " (Article 3, paragraph 1, point (2)), in which it is difficult to distinguish any essential difference. From the fact that the expression " giving assistance " is used in Article 2, it can only be inferred that assistance given to the person guilty of an offence or his accomplice is itself to constitute a separate offence the commission of which may take the form of " wilful complicity " or " any help ". It is not at all clear from the text what essential difference there is between these various expressions. If the term " any help " means assistance given to the offender after he has committed the punishable act, this is not sufficiently clear from the Convention.

The Czechoslovak Government accordingly recommends further consideration of the question whether acts which are essentially the same should be designated by different terms. It recommends also that the various forms of activity in respect of which proceedings are to be taken should be designated by terms which cannot be construed to mean that there is no essential difference between them.

The Czechoslovak Government would prefer, on the contrary, to employ, as far as possible, the same terminology as in the other international Conventions relating to criminal law, more particularly the most recent in date, that of June 26th, 1936, on the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. The Government refers more particularly to the terminology employed in Article 2, letters *(b)*, *(c)* and *(d)*, of that Convention.

As regards paragraph 2 of Article 3, it would be more in keeping with the purpose of the Convention to adopt a formula whereby acts committed in different States can be punished separately. Since a definite distinction must be made between the obligation to prosecute in respect of these various acts, and the subsequent possibility of a joint trial—which would be determined by considerations of convenience of procedure and expediency—the Czechoslovak Government recommends that the wording of paragraph 2 of Article 3 be brought into line with that of Article 4 of the above-mentioned Convention of June 26th, 1936.

Ad *Article 4.*

The expression " but this provision is without prejudice to the characterisation of offences and other special provisions " does not exclude the possibility that the contracting States may, among the persons mentioned in Article 2, make a distinction as regards persons who are nationals of foreign States, provided this does not affect the obligation imposed on the contracting States to punish, at all events in a general fashion, the acts mentioned in the Convention. The expression " certain persons mentioned at point (1) of Article 2 " would seem to give the contracting State the right to select the group of persons to be protected.

In directing attention to these possible interpretations and to its observations concerning Article 2 of the draft, the Czechoslovak Government recommends that the meaning and scope of the expressions " the characterisation of offences and other special provisions " and " certain persons " should be more closely defined.

Ad *Article 5.*

Paragraph 1 should be brought into line as far as possible with the text of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs.

Paragraph 2 might give rise to various objections if it is to be interpreted as an undertaking to give effect to foreign criminal sentences, even to the extent of taking them as a basis for imposing additional penalties or for ordering and carrying into effect provisional measures.

Ad *Article 7.*

The Czechoslovak Government recommends that the text of this article be brought into line with that of Article 7 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

Ad *Article 8.*

The Czechoslovak Government takes a similar view as regards the text of Article 8.

In the matter of detail, it recommends the deletion in letter *(a)* of the words " has been demanded and ".

The draft text would be amended to read as follows :

" *(a)* Extradition cannot take place for a reason independent of the act itself."

This amendment is more in keeping with the spirit of the Convention, which is designed to preclude the possibility of evading the obligations laid down in the Convention, which possibility would at present exist if extradition were not demanded.

The Czechoslovak Government also proposes the deletion of letter *(c)*, since this provision would result in immunity from prosecution for the nationals of certain States and, thus, in an unequal apportionment of the rights and obligations ensuing from the Convention. A similar provision was discussed in June 1936 at the Diplomatic Conference on Dangerous Drugs, and was deleted from the text of the Convention.

Ad *Article* 9.

The Czechoslovak Government recommends that the text of this article should be arranged as far as possible in the same way as that of the corresponding Article 9 of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs. At the same time, the reservations laid down in Article 9, No. 4, of that Convention would hardly be acceptable.

Ad *Article* 10.

This article raises doubts as regards Article 3 of the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. In the Committee of Experts, there has already been some discussion as to whether, by sending a case for trial to the International Criminal Court, a State would be released from its conventional obligations *vis-à-vis* a State which was not a party to the proposed Convention concerning that Court. The Czechoslovak Government rather inclines to the view that such a possibility should only exist as between States bound by the Convention concerning the International Criminal Court, and that it cannot apply to States which are not parties to that instrument.

Ad *Article* 12.

The Czechoslovak Government endorses the amendments proposed by the Polish Government in its observations of September 3rd, 1936 (document A.24*(a)*.1936.V).

Ad *Articles* 14, 15 *and* 16.

The Czechoslovak Government thinks that these provisions should be brought into line with the similar provisions of the above-mentioned Convention relating to dangerous drugs (Articles 11, 12 and 13).

As regards paragraph 4 of Article 16, the Czechoslovak Government notes that this provision is not in accordance with the practice followed in regard to the languages to be used in the letters of request mentioned in similar international Conventions. These go on the principle that the State applied to is not itself obliged to procure a translation. The Czechoslovak Government recommends that, on this point, the text of the Convention should be modelled on that of Article 13 of the Convention concerning traffic in dangerous drugs.

The Czechoslovak Government recommends further that consideration be given to the question of the languages to be used in the relations between the central services mentioned in Article 15. Here, too, it would be possible to adopt the rules recommended for application to letters of request (Article 16), as the contracting States might perhaps agree on one or more languages in which the central services should, for instance, draw up reports supplied at the same time to similar services in a number of States.

Ad *Article* 17.

The Czechoslovak Government thinks that the provisions of this article should be brought into line with the similar Article 14 of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs.

Ad *Article* 18.

Similarly, this article should be brought into line with Article 15 of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs.

Ad *Article* 23.

To this article might be added a clause placing the contracting parties under an obligation to communicate to one another, through the League of Nations Secretariat, any *legal* measures that they may take to enforce the Convention.

Ad *Articles* 19-28.

During the discussions on the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, it was recommended that a model set of formal articles should be prepared for use in all multilateral agreements concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations. The Czechoslovak Government shares this view and recommends further that the formal articles of the proposed new Convention should be brought into line as far as possible with the text of the corresponding articles of the last Convention of this kind—that is to say, the above-mentioned international Convention of June 26th, 1936, for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

II. Concerning the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

The Czechoslovak Government is in sympathy with the idea of concluding an international Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, to have the character of a permanent tribunal competent to try the specific criminal cases referred to it. The idea is not a new one and, as examples of similar courts, mention may be made of the Rhine and Elbe International Commissions, which have heard appeals against the judgments, in penal matters, of the ordinary navigation tribunals.

Since, however, many States have adopted a negative attitude towards this draft Convention, it seems unlikely that any agreement will be reached in the near future, and the Czechoslovak Government is opposed to any discussion of this draft which would delay the successful conclusion of the first Convention.

Some decision must be taken as regards Article 3 of the Convention concerning the International Criminal Court, from the point of view of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. That article entitles the parties to send certain accused persons before the Court for trial and judgment. The Czechoslovak Government has already expressed doubt—in connection with Article 10 of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism—as to whether a signatory State can release itself in this way from its obligations *vis-à-vis* other States which have not accepted the second Convention. As in the case of Article 10 of the first-named Convention, it thinks that this possibility should be open only, and on reciprocal terms, to States which are parties to both the Conventions.

* * *

Annex.

Extracts from the Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

. . . . . .

Article 2.

. . . . . .

(b) Intentional participation in the offences specified in this article ;

(c) Conspiracy to commit any of the above-mentioned offences ;

(d) Attempts and, subject to the conditions prescribed by national law, preparatory acts.

. . . . . .

Article 4.

Each of the acts specified in Article 2 shall, if committed in different countries, be considered as a distinct offence.

. . . . . .

Article 6.

In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is recognised, foreign convictions for the offences referred to in Article 2 shall, subject to the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, be recognised for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

Article 7.

1. In countries where the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country, after the commission abroad of any of the offences referred to in Article 2, shall be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed in the said territory, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. This provision does not apply if, in a similar case, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 8.

Foreigners who are in the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the offences set out in Article 2 shall be prosecuted and punished as though the offence had been committed in that territory if the following conditions are realised —namely, that :

(a) Extradition has been requested and could not be granted for a reason independent of the offence itself ;

(b) The law of the country of refuge considers prosecution for offences committed abroad by foreigners admissible as a general rule.

Article 9.

1. The offences set out in Article 2 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been or may hereafter be concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty or on reciprocity shall, as between themselves, recognise the offences referred to above as extradition crimes.

3. Extradition shall be granted in conformity with the law of the country to which application is made.

4. The High Contracting Party to whom application for extradition is made shall, in all cases, have the right to refuse to effect the arrest or to grant the extradition of a fugitive offender if his competent authorities consider that the offence of which the fugitive offender is accused or convicted is not sufficiently serious.

. . . . . .

Article 11.

1. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall set up, within the framework of its domestic law, a central office for the supervision and co-ordination of all operations necessary to prevent the offences specified in Article 2, and for ensuring that steps are taken to prosecute persons guilty of such offences.

2. This central office :

(a) Shall be in close contact with other official institutions or bodies dealing with narcotic drugs ;

(b) Shall centralise all information of a nature to facilitate the investigation and prevention of the offences specified in Article 2 ;

(c) Shall be in close contact with and may correspond direct with the central offices of other countries.

3. Where the Government of a High Contracting Party is federal in character, or where the executive authority of its Government is distributed between central and local Governments, the supervision and co-ordination specified in paragraph 1 and the execution of the functions specified in *(a)* and *(b)* of paragraph 2 shall be carried out in conformity with the constitutional or administrative system thereof.

4. Where the present Convention has been applied to any territory by virtue of Article 18, the requirements of the present article may be carried out by means of a central office set up in or for that territory acting in conjunction, if necessary, with the central office in the metropolitan territory concerned.

5. The powers and the functions of the central office may be delegated to the special administration referred to in Article 15 of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 1931.

Article 12.

1. The central office shall co-operate with the central offices of foreign countries to the greatest extent possible in order to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the offences specified in Article 2.

2. The office shall, so far as it thinks expedient, communicate to the central office of any country which may be concerned :

(a) Particulars which would make it possible to carry out any investigations or operations relating to any transactions in progress or proposed ;

(b) Any particulars which it has been able to secure regarding the identity and the description of traffickers with a view to supervising their movements ;

(c) Discoveries of secret factories of narcotic drugs.

Article 13.

1. The transmission of letters of request relating to the offences referred to in Article 2 shall be effected :

(a) Preferably by direct communication between the competent authorities of each country or through the central offices, or

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries or by direct communication from another competent authority of the country making the request to the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made, or

(c) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made. For this purpose, the letters of request shall be sent by such representative to the authority designated by the country to which the request is made.

2. Each High Contracting Party may, by communication to the other High Contracting Parties, express its desire that letters of request to be executed within its territory should be sent to it through the diplomatic channel.

3. In case *(c)* of paragraph 1, a copy of the letter of request shall at the same time be sent by the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letter of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority to which request is made or in a language agreed upon by the two countries concerned.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method, or methods, of transmission mentioned above which it will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, its existing procédure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. The execution of letters of request shall not be subject to payment of taxes or expenses other than the expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws or to execute letters of request otherwise than within the limits of their laws.

Article 14.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 15.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that the offences referred to in Articles 2 and 5 shall in each country be defined, prosecuted and punished in conformity with the general rules of its domestic law.

. . . . . .

Article 19.

The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be equally authoritative, shall bear this day's date, and shall, until December 31st, 1936, be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations, or of any non-member State which received an invitation to the Conference which drew up the present Convention, or to which the Council of the League of Nations shall have communicated a copy of the Convention for this purpose.

Article 20.

The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in the preceding article.

Article 21.

1. As from January 1st, 1937, the present Convention shall be open to accession on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State mentioned in Article 19.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in that article.

Article 22.

The present Convention shall come into force ninety days after the Secretary-General of the League of Nations has received the ratifications or accessions of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States. It shall be registered on that date by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 23.

Ratifications or accessions received after the deposit of the tenth ratification or accession shall take effect as from the expiration of a period of ninety days from the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 24.

1. After the expiration of five years from the date of the coming into force of the present Convention, it may be denounced by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and shall operate only as regards the Member of the League or non-member State on whose behalf it has been deposited.

2. The Secretary-General shall notify all the Members of the League and the non-member States mentioned in Article 19 of any denunciations received.

3. If, as a result of simultaneous or successive denunciations, the number of Members of the League and non-member States bound by the present Convention is reduced to less than ten, the Convention shall cease to be in force as from the date on which the last of such denunciations shall take effect in accordance with the provisions of this article.

Article 25.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may at any time be made by any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State bound by this Convention by means of a notice addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notice shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to the other Members of the League of Nations or non-member States bound by this Convention, and, if endorsed by not less than one-third of them, the High Contracting Parties agree to meet for the purpose of revising the Convention.

[Communicated to the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No. : **C.94.M.47.**1938.V.

Geneva, June 1st, 1938.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

PROCEEDINGS

of the

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

on the

REPRESSION OF TERRORISM

Geneva, November 1st to 16th, 1937

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1938. V. 3.

SUMMARY TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Part I.

Page

OFFICIAL INSTRUMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE:

1. Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism 5
2. Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court 19
3. Final Act of the Conference 35

Part II.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE:

1. List of Members of Delegations 39
2. President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference and Members of the Bureau 43
3. Text of the Debates [1] 44
4. Annexes [2] 182

Part III.

LIST OF REFERENCES TO PREPARATORY DOCUMENTS NOT REPRODUCED IN THE PRESENT VOLUME 205

[1] For a detailed Table of Contents of the Text of the Debates, see pages 44 to 48.
[2] For a detailed list of the Annexes, see page 182.

Première Partie.

INSTRUMENTS OFFICIELS DE LA CONFÉRENCE

---

1. CONVENTION POUR LA PRÉVENTION ET LA RÉPRESSION DU TERRORISME

(y compris les signatures apposées jusqu'au 31 *mai* 1938.*)*

. . . . . .

Désireux de rendre de plus en plus efficaces la prévention et la répression du terrorisme, lorsqu'il présente un caractère international,

Ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires :

. . . . . .

Lesquels, après avoir produit leurs pleins pouvoirs trouvés en bonne et due forme, ont convenu des dispositions suivantes :

Article premier.

1. Les Hautes Parties contractantes, réaffirmant le principe du droit international d'après lequel il est du devoir de tout Etat de s'abstenir lui-même de tout fait destiné à favoriser les activités terroristes dirigées contre un autre Etat et d'empêcher les actes par lesquels elles se manifestent, s'engagent, dans les termes ci-après exprimés, à prévenir et à réprimer les activités de ce genre et à se prêter mutuellement leur concours.

2. Dans la présente Convention, l'expression « actes de terrorisme » s'entend des faits criminels dirigés contre un Etat et dont le but ou la nature est de provoquer la terreur chez des personnalités déterminées, des groupes de personnes ou dans le public.

Article 2.

Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes doit prévenir dans sa législation pénale, s'ils n'y sont déjà prévus, les faits suivants commis sur son territoire, s'ils sont dirigés contre une autre Haute Partie contractante et s'ils constituent des actes de terrorisme au sens de l'article premier :

(1) Les faits intentionnels dirigés contre la vie, l'intégrité corporelle, la santé ou la liberté :

a) Des chefs d'Etat, des personnes exerçant les prérogatives du chef d'Etat, de leurs successeurs héréditaires ou désignés;

b) Des conjoints des personnes ci-dessus énumérées;

c) Des personnes revêtues de fonctions ou de charges publiques lorsque ledit fait a été commis en raison des fonctions ou charges que ces personnes exercent.

(2) Le fait intentionnel consistant à détruire ou à endommager des biens publics ou destinés à un usage public qui appartiennent à une autre Haute Partie contractante ou qui relèvent d'elle.

(3) Le fait intentionnel de nature à mettre en péril des vies humaines par la création d'un danger commun.

(4) La tentative de commettre les infractions prévues par les dispositions ci-dessus du présent article.

(5) Le fait de fabriquer, de se procurer, de détenir ou de fournir des armes, munitions, produits explosifs ou substances nocives en vue de l'exécution, en quelque pays que ce soit, d'une infraction prévue par le présent article.

Part I.

OFFICIAL INSTRUMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE.

---

1. CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

(showing the Signatures received down to May 31st, 1938).

. . . . . .

Being desirous of making more effective the prevention and punishment of terrorism of an international character,

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries :

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions :

Article 1.

1. The High Contracting Parties, reaffirming the principle of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against another State and to prevent the acts in which such activities take shape, undertake as hereinafter provided to prevent and punish activities of this nature and to collaborate for this purpose.

2. In the present Convention, the expression " acts of terrorism " means criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons, or a group of persons or the general public.

Article 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall, if this has not already been done, make the following acts committed on his own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 :

(1) Any wilful act causing death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to :

(a) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(b) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity.

(2) Wilful destruction of, or damage to, public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party.

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public.

(4) Any attempt to commit an offence falling within the foregoing provisions of the present article.

(5) The manufacture, obtaining, possession, or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article.

Article 3.

Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes doit également prévoir dans sa législation pénale les faits suivants s'ils sont commis sur son territoire en vue d'actes de terrorisme visés à l'article 2, dirigés contre une autre Haute Partie contractante, en quelque pays que ces actes doivent être exécutés :

(1) L'association ou l'entente en vue de l'accomplissement de tels actes;

(2) L'instigation à de tels actes, lorsqu'elle a été suivie d'effet;

(3) L'instigation directe publique aux actes prévus par les numéros 1, 2 et 3 de l'article 2, qu'elle soit ou non suivie d'effet;

(4) La participation intentionnelle;

(5) Toute aide donnée sciemment en vue de l'accomplissement d'un tel acte.

Article 4.

Chacun des faits prévus à l'article 3 doit être considéré par la loi comme une infraction distincte dans tous les cas où il devra en être ainsi pour éviter l'impunité.

Article 5.

La répression par une Haute Partie contractante des faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 doit être la même, que ces faits soient dirigés contre cette Haute Partie contractante ou une autre Haute Partie contractante, sous réserve des dispositions spéciales du droit national touchant la protection particulière des personnalités visées à l'article 2, N° 1, ou des biens visés à l'article 2, N° 2.

Article 6.

1. Les pays qui admettent le principe de la récidive internationale reconnaissent dans les conditions établies par leurs législations respectives, comme génératrices d'une telle récidive, les condamnations étrangères prononcées du chef de l'un des actes prévus aux articles 2 et 3.

2. Lesdites condamnations seront, en outre, reconnues de plein droit ou à la suite d'une procédure spéciale par les Hautes Parties contractantes dont la législation admet la reconnaissance des jugements étrangers en matière pénale, en vue de donner lieu, dans les conditions prévues par cette législation, à des incapacités, déchéances ou interdictions de droit public ou privé.

Article 7.

Dans la mesure où la constitution de parties civiles est admise par la législation interne, les parties civiles étrangères, y compris éventuellement une Haute Partie contractante, doivent jouir de l'exercice de tous les droits reconnus aux nationaux par les lois du pays où se juge l'affaire.

Article 8.

1. Sans préjudice des dispositions de l'alinéa 4 ci-dessous, les faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 sont compris comme cas d'extradition dans tout traité d'extradition conclu ou à conclure entre les Hautes Parties contractantes.

2. Les Hautes Parties contractantes qui ne subordonnent pas l'extradition à l'existence d'un traité reconnaissent, dès à présent, sans préjudice des dispositions de l'alinéa 4 ci-dessous, les faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 comme cas d'extradition entre elles, sous la condition de réciprocité.

3. Aux fins du présent article, est également considéré comme cas d'extradition, tout fait énuméré aux articles 2 et 3, qui a été commis sur le territoire de la Haute Partie contractante contre laquelle il a été dirigé.

4. L'obligation d'extrader en vertu du présent article est subordonnée à toute condition et restriction admises par le droit ou la pratique du pays auquel la demande est adressée.

Article 3.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall make the following acts criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to an act of terrorism falling within Article 2 and directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the act of terrorism is to be carried out :

(1) Conspiracy to commit any such act;

(2) Any incitement to any such act, if successful;

(3) Direct public incitement to any act mentioned under heads (1), (2) or (3) of Article 2, whether the incitement be successful or not;

(4) Wilful participation in any such act;

(5) Assistance, knowingly given, towards the commission of any such act.

Article 4.

Each of the offences mentioned in Article 3 shall be treated by the law as a distinct offence in all cases where this is necessary in order to prevent an offender escaping punishment.

Article 5.

Subject to any special provisions of national law for the protection of the persons mentioned under head (1) of Article 2, or of the property mentioned under head (2) of Article 2, each High Contracting Party shall provide the same punishment for the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3, whether they be directed against that or another High Contracting Party.

Article 6.

1. In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is accepted, foreign convictions for any of the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 will, within the conditions prescribed by domestic law, be taken into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

2. Such convictions will, further, in the case of High Contracting Parties whose law recognises foreign convictions, be taken into account, with or without special proceedings, for the purpose of imposing, in the manner provided by that law, incapacities, disqualifications or interdictions whether in the sphere of public or of private law.

Article 7.

In so far as *parties civiles* are admitted under the domestic law, foreign *parties civiles*, including, in proper cases, a High Contracting Party shall be entitled to all rights allowed to nationals by the law of the country in which the case is tried.

Article 8.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below, the offences set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been, or may hereafter be, concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall henceforward, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below and subject to reciprocity, recognise the offences set out in Articles 2 and 3 as extradition crimes as between themselves.

3. For the purposes of the present article, any offence specified in Articles 2 and 3, if committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom it is directed, shall also be deemed to be an extradition crime.

4. The obligation to grant extradition under the present article shall be subject to any conditions and limitations recognised by the law or the practice of the country to which application is made.

Article 9.

1. Lorsqu'une Haute Partie contractante n'admet pas le principe de l'extradition des nationaux, ses ressortissants qui sont rentrés sur le territoire de leur pays, après avoir commis à l'étranger l'un des faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3, doivent être poursuivis et punis de la même manière que si le fait avait été commis sur son territoire, et cela même dans le cas où le coupable aurait acquis sa nationalité postérieurement à l'accomplissement de l'infraction.

2. Les dispositions du présent article ne sont pas applicables lorsque, dans un cas semblable, l'extradition d'un étranger ne peut pas être accordée.

Article 10.

Les étrangers qui ont commis à l'étranger un des faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 et qui se trouvent sur le territoire d'une des Hautes Parties contractantes doivent être poursuivis et punis de la même manière que si le fait avait été commis sur le territoire de celle-ci, lorsque les conditions suivantes sont réunies :

a) L'extradition ayant été demandée n'a pu être accordée pour une raison étrangère au fait même;

b) La législation du pays de refuge reconnaît la compétence de ses juridictions à l'égard d'infractions commises par des étrangers à l'étranger;

c) L'étranger est ressortissant d'un pays qui reconnaît la compétence de ses juridictions à l'égard des infractions commises par des étrangers à l'étranger.

Article 11.

1. Les dispositions des articles 9 et 10 s'appliquent également aux faits prévus aux articles 2 et 3 qui ont été commis sur le territoire de la Haute Partie contractante contre laquelle ils ont été dirigés.

2. En ce qui concerne l'application des articles 9 et 10, les Hautes Parties contractantes n'assument pas l'obligation de prononcer une peine dépassant le maximum de celle prévue par la loi du pays où l'infraction a été commise.

Article 12.

En vue de prévenir efficacement toutes les activités contraires au but visé par la présente Convention, chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes doit prendre sur son territoire et dans le cadre de sa législation et de son organisation administrative les mesures qu'elle estimera appropriées.

Article 13.

1. Indépendamment des dispositions de l'article 1, N° 5, doivent être réglementés le port, la détention et la circulation d'armes à feu (autres que les armes de chasse à canon lisse) et des munitions. Le fait de céder, de vendre ou de distribuer ces armes ou munitions à une personne ne justifiant pas de l'autorisation ou de la déclaration lorsqu'elle est requise par la législation interne pour la détention ou le port de ces objets sera réprimé; il en sera de même pour la cession, la vente ou la distribution des explosifs.

2. Les fabricants d'armes à feu, autres que les armes de chasse à canon lisse, doivent être obligés de marquer chaque arme d'un numéro d'ordre ou signe distinctif de nature à l'identifier; les fabricants et les détaillants doivent tenir un registre des noms et adresses des acheteurs.

Article 14.

1. Doivent être punis :

a) Tous les faits frauduleux de fabrication ou d'altération de passeports ou autres documents équivalents;

b) Le fait d'introduire dans le pays, de se procurer ou de détenir de tels documents qui sont faux ou falsifiés, sachant qu'ils le sont;

c) Le fait de se faire délivrer de tels documents sur déclarations ou pièces fausses;

d) L'usage fait sciemment de tels documents faux ou falsifiés ou établis à une autre identité que celle du porteur.

Article 9.

1. When the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised by a High Contracting Party, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country after the commission abroad of an offence mentioned in Articles 2 or 3 shall be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed on that territory, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. The provisions of the present article shall not apply if, in similar circumstances, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 10.

Foreigners who are on the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the offences set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be prosecuted and punished as though the offence had been committed in the territory of that High Contracting Party, if the following conditions are fulfilled—namely, that:

(a) Extradition has been demanded and could not be granted for a reason not connected with the offence itself;

(b) The law of the country of refuge recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners;

(c) The foreigner is a national of a country which recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners.

Article 11.

1. The provisions of Articles 9 and 10 shall also apply to offences referred to in Articles 2 and 3 which have been committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom they were directed.

2. As regards the application of Articles 9 and 10, the High Contracting Parties do not undertake to pass a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence provided by the law of the country where the offence was committed.

Article 12.

Each High Contracting Party shall take on his own territory and within the limits of his own law and administrative organisation the measures which he considers appropriate for the effective prevention of all activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article 13.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of head (5) of Article 2, the carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition shall be subjected to regulation. It shall be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute such arms or munitions to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles; this shall apply also to the transfer, sale or distribution of explosives.

2. Manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, shall be required to mark each arm with a serial number or other distinctive mark permitting it to be identified; both manufacturers and retailers shall be obliged to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

Article 14.

1. The following acts shall be punishable:

(a) Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration of passports or other equivalent documents;

(b) Bringing into the country, obtaining or being in possession of such forged or falsified documents knowing them to be forged or falsified;

(c) Obtaining such documents by means of false declarations or documents;

(d) Wilfully using any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. Doit être réprimé le fait de la part des fonctionnaires compétents de délivrer sciemment des passeports, autres documents équivalents ou visas, en vue de favoriser une activité contraire au but visé par la présente Convention, à des personnes sachant qu'elles n'ont pas le droit, conformément aux lois ou règlements, d'obtenir lesdits documents ou visas.

3. Les dispositions du présent article s'appliquent sans égard au caractère national ou étranger du document.

Article 15.

1. Dans chaque pays et dans le cadre de sa législation nationale, les résultats des recherches en matière d'infractions prévues par les articles 2 et 3 et par l'article 14, dans la mesure où l'infraction à celui-ci peut être en rapport avec la préparation d'actes de terrorisme, seront centralisés dans un service.

2. Ce service doit être en contact étroit :

a) Avec les autorités de police à l'intérieur du pays;

b) Avec les services similaires des autres pays.

3. Il doit, en outre, réunir tous les renseignements pouvant faciliter la prévention et la répression des actes prévus par les articles 2 et 3 et des actes prévus par l'article 14, dans la mesure où ceux-ci pourraient être en rapport avec la préparation d'actes de terrorisme; il doit, dans la mesure du possible, se tenir en contact étroit avec les autorités judiciaires à l'intérieur du pays.

Article 16.

Chaque service, dans les limites où il le jugera désirable, devra notifier au service des autres pays, en leur donnant toutes informations nécessaires :

a) Tout acte prévu par les articles 2 et 3, même s'il est encore à l'état de projet; cette notification sera accompagnée de descriptions, de copies ou de photographies;

b) Les recherches, poursuites, arrestations, condamnations, expulsions de personnes s'étant rendues coupables d'actes visés par la présente Convention, ainsi que le déplacement de ces personnes et tous renseignements utiles, notamment leurs signalement, empreintes digitales et photographies;

c) La découverte des écrits, armes, engins ou autres objets se rapportant aux actes prévus par les articles 2, 3, 13 et 14.

Article 17.

1. Les Hautes Parties contractantes sont tenues d'exécuter les commissions rogatoires relatives aux infractions visées par la présente Convention selon leur législation nationale, leur pratique en cette matière et les conventions conclues ou à conclure.

2. La transmission des commissions rogatoires doit être opérée :

a) Soit par voie de communication directe entre les autorités judiciaires;

b) Soit par correspondance directe des ministres de la Justice des deux pays;

c) Soit par correspondance directe entre l'autorité du pays requérant et le ministre de la Justice du pays requis;

d) Soit par l'intermédiaire de l'agent diplomatique ou consulaire du pays requérant dans le pays requis; cet agent enverra directement ou par l'intermédiaire du ministre des Affaires étrangères la commission rogatoire à l'autorité judiciaire compétente ou à celle indiquée par le gouvernement du pays requis, et recevra directement de cette autorité ou par l'intermédiaire du ministre des Affaires étrangères les pièces constituant l'exécution de la commission rogatoire.

3. Dans les cas *a)* et *d)*, copie de la commission rogatoire sera toujours adressée en même temps au ministre de la Justice du pays requis.

4. A défaut d'entente contraire, la commission rogatoire doit être rédigée dans la langue de l'autorité requérante, sauf au pays requis à en demander une traduction faite dans sa langue et certifiée conforme par l'autorité requérante.

5. Chaque Haute Partie contractante fera connaître, par une communication adressée à chacune des autres Hautes Parties contractantes, celui ou ceux des modes de transmission susvisés qu'elle admet pour les commissions rogatoires de cette Haute Partie contractante.

6. Jusqu'au moment où une Haute Partie contractante fera une telle communication, sa procédure actuelle en fait de commission rogatoire sera maintenue.

7. L'exécution des commissions rogatoires ne pourra donner lieu au remboursement de taxes ou frais autres que les frais d'expertises.

8. Rien, dans le présent article, ne pourra être interprété comme constituant, de la part des Hautes Parties contractantes, un engagement d'admettre, en ce qui concerne le système des preuves en matière répressive, une dérogation à leur loi.

2. The wilful issue of passports, other equivalent documents, or visas by competent officials to persons known not to have the right thereto under the laws or regulations applicable, with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Covention, shall also be punishable.

3. The provisions of the present article shall apply irrespective of the national or foreign character of the document.

Article 15.

1. Results of the investigation of offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 14 shall in each country, subject to the provisions of its law, be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. Such service shall be in close contact :

(a) With the police authorities of the country;

(b) With the corresponding services in other countries.

3. It shall furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 14; it shall, as far as possible, keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

Article 16.

Each service, so far as it considers it desirable to do so, shall notify to the services of the other countries, giving all necessary particulars :

(a) Any act mentioned in Articles 2 and 3, even if it has not been carried into effect, such notification to be accompanied by descriptions, copies and photographs;

(b) Any search for, any prosecution, arrest, conviction or expulsion of persons guilty of offences dealt with in the present Convention, the movements of such persons and any pertinent information with regard to them, as well as their description, finger-prints and photographs;

(c) Discovery of documents, arms, appliances or other objects connected with offences mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 13 and 14.

Article 17.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention in accordance with their domestic law and practice and any international conventions concluded or to be concluded by them.

2. The transmission of letters of request shall be effected :

(a) By direct communication between the judicial authorities;

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries;

(c) By direct correspondence between the authority of the country making the request and the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made;

(d) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request, either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the competent judicial authority or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made and shall receive the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request from this authority either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. In cases *(a)* and *(d)*, a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the Minister of Justice of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letters of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority making the request, provided always that the country to which the request is made may require a translation in its own language, certified correct by the authority making the request.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method or methods of transmission mentioned above which he will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, his existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. Execution of letters of request shall not give rise to a claim for reimbursement of charges or expenses of any nature whatever other than expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws.

Article 18.

La participation d'une Haute Partie contractante à la présente Convention ne doit pas être interprétée comme portant atteinte à son attitude sur la question générale de la compétence de la juridiction pénale comme question de droit international.

Article 19.

La présente Convention laisse intact le principe en vertu duquel la qualification des faits visés par elle, les peines applicables, la poursuite, le jugement, le régime des excuses, le droit de grâce et d'amnistie relèvent dans chaque pays des règles de sa législation interne, sans que jamais l'impunité puisse résulter d'une lacune dans les textes de cette législation en matière pénale.

Article 20.

1. S'il s'élève entre les Hautes Parties contractantes un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application de la présente Convention, et si ce différend n'a pu être résolu de façon satisfaisante par voie diplomatique, il sera réglé conformément aux dispositions en vigueur entre les Parties concernant le règlement des différends internationaux.

2. Au cas où de telles dispositions n'existeraient pas entre les parties au différend, elles le soumettront à une procédure arbitrale ou judiciaire. A défaut d'un accord sur le choix d'un autre tribunal, elles soumettront le différend à la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, si elles sont toutes parties au Protocole du 16 décembre 1920 relatif au Statut de ladite Cour, et, si elles n'y sont pas toutes parties, à un Tribunal d'arbitrage constitué conformément à la Convention de La Haye du 18 octobre 1907, pour le règlement des conflits internationaux.

3. Les dispositions ci-dessus du présent article ne portent pas atteinte au droit des Hautes Parties contractantes membres de la Société des Nations de porter le différend, si le Pacte les y autorise, devant le Conseil ou l'Assemblée de la Société des Nations.

Article 21.

1. La présente Convention, dont les textes français et anglais feront également foi, portera la date de ce jour; elle pourra, jusqu'au 31 mai 1938, être signée au nom de tout Membre de la Société des Nations et de tout Etat non membre représenté à la Conférence qui a élaboré la présente Convention ou auquel le Conseil de la Société des Nations aura, à cet effet, communiqué copie de la présente Convention.

2. La présente Convention sera ratifiée. Les instruments de ratification seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société ainsi qu'aux Etats non membres visés au paragraphe précédent.

Article 22.

1. A partir du 1er juin 1938, la présente Convention sera ouverte à l'adhésion de tout Membre de la Société des Nations ou de tout Etat non membre visé à l'article 21 par qui cette Convention n'aurait pas été signée.

2. Les instruments d'adhésion seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société et aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 21.

Article 23.

1. Les Membres de la Société des Nations et Etats non membres qui seraient disposés à ratifier la Convention conformément au second paragraphe de l'article 21 ou à y adhérer en vertu de l'article 22, mais qui désireraient être autorisés à apporter des réserves à l'application de la Convention, informeront de leur intention le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations. Celui-ci communiquera immédiatement ces réserves à tous les Membres de la Société et Etats non membres au nom desquels un instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion aura été déposé, en leur demandant s'ils ont des objections à présenter. Si la réserve est formulée au cours des trois ans qui suivront l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention, la même communication sera adressée aux Membres de la Société et Etats non membres dont la signature n'a pas encore été suivie de ratification. Si dans un délai de six mois à partir de la date de la communication du Secrétaire général aucune objection n'a été soulevée contre la réserve, celle-ci sera considérée comme acceptée par les Hautes Parties contractantes.

2. Au cas où des objections seraient soulevées, le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations en informera le gouvernement qui désire formuler une réserve et l'invitera à lui faire savoir s'il est disposé à ratifier la Convention ou à y adhérer sans la réserve ou s'il préfère s'abstenir de toute ratification ou adhésion.

Article 18.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be intepreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of the limits of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 19.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, provided the offender is not allowed to escape punishment owing to an omission in the criminal law, the characterisation of the various offences dealt with in the present Convention, the imposition of sentences, the methods of prosecution and trial, and the rules as to mitigating circumstances, pardon and amnesty are determined in each country by the provisions of domestic law.

Article 20.

1. If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

2. If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

3. The above provisions of the present article shall not prevent High Contracting Parties, if they are Members of the League of Nations, from bringing the dispute before the Council or the Assembly of the League if the Covenant gives them the power to do so.

Article 21.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall be both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until May 31st, 1938, it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and on behalf of any non-member State represented at the Conference which drew up the present Convention or to which a copy thereof is communicated for this purpose by the Council of the League of Nations.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Article 22.

1. After June 1st, 1938, the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations, and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 21, on whose behalf the Convention has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 21.

Article 23.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State which is prepared to ratify the Convention under the second paragraph of Article 21, or to accede to the Convention under Article 22, but desires to be allowed to make reservations with regard to the application of the Convention, may so inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall forthwith communicate such reservations to all the Members of the League and non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited and enquire whether they have any objection thereto. Should the reservation be formulated within three years from the entry into force of the Convention, the same enquiry shall be addressed to Members of the League and non-member States whose signature of the Convention has not yet been followed by ratification. If, within six months from the date of the Secretary-General's communication, no objection to the reservation has been made, it shall be treated as accepted by the High Contracting Parties.

2. In the event of any objection being received, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall inform the Government which desired to make the reservation and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to ratify or accede without the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification or accession.

Article 24.

La ratification par une Haute Partie contractante ou son adhésion à la présente Convention implique l'assurance de sa part que sa législation et son organisation administrative la mettent en mesure de pourvoir à l'exécution de la Convention.

Article 25.

1. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut déclarer, au moment de la signature, de la ratification ou de l'adhésion, que, par son acceptation de la présente Convention, elle n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble ou toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lequels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la présente Convention ne sera pas applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration.

2. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes pourra ultérieurement notifier au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations qu'elle entend rendre la présente Convention applicable à l'ensemble ou toute partie de ses territoires ayant fait l'objet de la déclaration prévue au paragraphe précédent. En adressant ladite notification, la Haute Partie contractante intéressée pourra spécifier que l'application de ladite Convention à l'un quelconque de ces territoires sera subordonnée à toutes réserves qu'elle aura formulées et qui auront été acceptées aux termes de l'article 23. Dans ce cas, la Convention s'appliquera, avec lesdites réserves, à tous les territoires visés dans la notification quatre-vingt-dix jours après la réception de cette notification par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations. Au cas où une Haute Partie contractante désirerait formuler, en ce qui concerne l'un quelconque de ces territoires, des réserves autres que celles qu'elle a déjà apportées aux termes de l'article 23, la procédure à suivre sera celle qui est fixée audit article 23.

3. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut, à tout moment, déclarer qu'elle entend voir cesser l'application de la présente Convention pour l'ensemble ou pour toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la Convention cessera d'être applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration un an après la réception de cette déclaration par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

4. Le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations communiquera à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 21 les déclarations et notifications reçues en vertu du présent article.

Article 26.

1. La présente Convention sera enregistrée, conformément aux dispositions de l'article 18 du Pacte, par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, le quatre-vingt-dixième jour qui suivra la réception par le Secrétaire général du troisième instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion.

2. La Convention entrera en vigueur le jour de cet enregistrement.

Article 27.

Chaque ratification ou adhésion qui interviendra après le dépôt du troisième instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion sortira ses effets dès le quatre-vingt-dixième jour qui suivra la date de la réception de l'instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion respectif par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

Article 28.

Une demande de revision de la présente Convention pourra être formulée en tout temps par toute Haute Partie contractante, par voie de notification adressée au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations. Cette notification sera communiquée par le Secrétaire général à toutes les autres Hautes Parties contractantes, et, si elle est appuyée par un tiers au moins de celles-ci, les Hautes Parties contractantes s'engagent à se réunir en une conférence aux fins de revision de la Convention.

Article 29.

La présente Convention pourra être dénoncée au nom de toute Haute Partie contractante, par notification écrite adressée au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, qui en informera tous les Membres de la Société et les Etats non membres visés à l'article 21. La dénonciation sortira ses effets un an après la date à laquelle elle aura été reçue par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations; elle ne sera opérante qu'au regard de la Haute Partie contractante au nom de laquelle elle aura été effectuée.

Article 24.

Ratification of, or accession to, the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation enable him to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

Article 25.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applied to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. In making such notification, the High Contracting Party concerned may state that the application of the Convention to any of such territories shall be subject to any reservations which have been accepted in respect of that High Contracting Party under Article 23. The Convention shall then apply, with any such reservations, to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Should it be desired as regards any such territories to make reservations other than those already made under Article 23 by the High Contracting Party concerned, the procedure set out in that Article shall be followed.

3. Any High Contracting Party may at any time declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States referred to in Article 21 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 26.

1. The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the third instrument of ratification or accession.

2. The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration.

Article 27.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the third instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 28.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by means of a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

Article 29.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 21. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires ont signé la présente Convention.

FAIT à Genève, le seize novembre mil neuf cent trente-sept, en simple expédition, qui sera déposée dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations; copie certifiée conforme en sera transmise à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et à tous les Etats non membres visés à l'article 21.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, on the sixteenth day of November one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven, in a single copy, which will be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States referred to in Article 21.

ALBANIE — ALBANIA

Ad referendum :
Th. LUARASSI

RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE — ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

Enrique RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ

BELGIQUE — BELGIUM

Ad referendum :
S. SASSERATH

INDE — INDIA

Denys BRAY

BULGARIE — BULGARIA

N. MOMTCHILOFF

CUBA — CUBA

Dr Juan ANTIGA

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE — DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Ch. ACKERMANN

ÉGYPTE — EGYPT

Aly SHAMSY Abdel Latif TALAAT

ÉQUATEUR — ECUADOR

Alejandro GASTELÚ

ESPAGNE — SPAIN

Cipriano DE RIVAS CHERIF.

ESTONIE — ESTONIA

J. KÔDAR.

FRANCE — FRANCE

Me référant à l'article 25 de la Convention, je déclare que le Gouvernement français n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble de ses colonies et protectorats, ainsi que des territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié [1].

BASDEVANT

GRÈCE — GREECE

S. POLYCHRONIADIS

HAÏTI — HAITI

Alfred ADDOR

MONACO — MONACO

Xavier RAISIN

NORVÈGE — NORWAY

Ad referendum :
H. H. BACHKE

---

[1] *Translation by the Secretariat of the League of Nations :*

With reference to Article 25 of the Convention, I declare that the French Government does not assume any obligation as regards the whole of its Colonies and Protectorates, or the territories for which a mandate has been entrusted to it.

PAYS-BAS	van Hamel	THE NETHERLANDS
PÉROU	J. M. Barreto	PERU
ROUMANIE	Vespasien V. Pella.	ROUMANIA
TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE	Dr Koukal	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TURQUIE	Vasfi Mentes	TURKEY
UNION DES RÉPUBLIQUES SOVIÉTIQUES SOCIALISTES		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

En signant la présente Convention, je déclare que le Gouvernement de l'Union des Républiques soviétiques socialistes ne sera à même de la ratifier que sous la réserve suivante :

« En matière de règlement des contestations relatives à l'interprétation et à l'application de la présente convention, le Gouvernement de l'Union des Républiques soviétiques socialistes n'assume d'autres obligations que celles qui lui incombent en tant que Membre de la Société des Nations. »[1]

M. Litvinoff.

VENEZUELA	C. Parra-Pérez J. M. Ortega-Martinez Alejandro E. Trujillo	VENEZUELA
YOUGOSLAVIE	Thomas Givanovitch.	YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] *Translation by the Secretariat of the League of Nations :*

In signing the present Convention, I declare that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be able to ratify it only subject to the following reservation :

" With regard to the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes only such obligations as are incumbent upon it as a Member of the League of Nations."

2. CONVENTION POUR LA CRÉATION D'UNE COUR PÉNALE INTERNATIONALE

(y compris les signatures apposées jusqu'au 31 mai 1938).

. . . . . .

Désireux, à l'occasion de la conclusion de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme, signée à la date de ce jour, de créer une Cour pénale internationale en vue de réaliser par là un progrès dans la lutte contre les infractions présentant un caractère international,

Ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires :

. . . . . .

Lesquels, après avoir produit leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes :

Article premier.

Il est institué une Cour pénale internationale en vue de juger dans les conditions ci-après spécifiées les individus accusés d'une infraction prévue dans la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

Article 2.

1. Dans les cas visés par les articles 2, 3, 9 et 10 de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme, toute Haute Partie contractante à la présente Convention a la faculté, au lieu de faire juger par ses propres juridictions, de déférer l'accusé à la Cour.

2. Elle a en outre la faculté, dans les cas où elle peut accorder l'extradition conformément à l'article 8 de ladite Convention, de déférer l'accusé à la Cour, si l'Etat qui demande l'extradition est également partie à la présente Convention.

3. Les Hautes Parties contractantes reconnaissent qu'en faisant usage de la faculté prévue par le présent article, les autres Parties contractantes se conforment à leur égard aux prescriptions de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

Article 3.

La Cour est constituée de façon permanente. Toutefois, elle ne devra se réunir que lorsqu'elle sera saisie d'une poursuite relevant de sa compétence.

Article 4.

Le siège de la Cour est fixé à La Haye. La Cour, consultée par son Président, peut, pour une affaire déterminée, décider de se réunir ailleurs.

Article 5.

La Cour se compose de magistrats choisis parmi les jurisconsultes possédant une compétence reconnue en matière de droit pénal qui sont ou qui ont été membres de tribunaux siégeant en matière pénale ou qui réunissent les conditions requises pour être nommés dans leur pays.

Article 6.

La Cour se compose de cinq juges titulaires et de cinq juges suppléants appartenant chacun à une nationalité différente, sous réserve cependant que les juges titulaires et juges suppléants doivent être des ressortissants des Hautes Parties contractantes.

2. CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

(showing the Signatures received down to May 31st, 1938).

. . . . . .

Being desirous on the occasion of concluding the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, which bears to-day's date, of creating an International Criminal Court with a view to making progress in the struggle against offences of an international character,

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries :

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions :

Article 1.

An International Criminal Court for the trial, as hereinafter provided, of persons accused of an offence dealt with in the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is hereby established.

Article 2.

1. In the cases referred to in Articles 2, 3, 9 and 10 of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, each High Contracting Party to the present Convention shall be entitled, instead of prosecuting before his own courts, to commit the accused for trial to the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party shall further, in cases where he is able to grant extradition in accordance with Article 8 of the said Convention, be entitled to commit the accused for trial to the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a Party to the present Convention.

3. The High Contracting Parties recognise that other Parties discharge their obligations towards them under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism by making use of the right given them by the present article.

Article 3.

The Court shall be a permanent body, but shall sit only when it is seized of proceedings for an offence within its jurisdiction.

Article 4.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. For any particular case, the President may take the opinion of the Court and the Court may decide to meet elsewhere.

Article 5.

The Court shall be composed of judges chosen from among jurists who are acknowledged authorities on criminal law and who are or have been members of courts of criminal jurisdiction or possess the qualifications required for such appointments in their own countries.

Article 6.

The Court shall consist of five regular judges and five deputy judges, each belonging to a different nationality, but so that the regular judges and deputy judges shall be nationals of the High Contracting Parties.

Article 7.

1. Tout Membre de la Société des Nations et tout Etat non membre à l'égard desquels la présente Convention est en vigueur pourra présenter deux candidats au plus aux fonctions de juge à la Cour.

2. La Cour permanente de Justice internationale sera priée de choisir les juges titulaires et suppléants parmi les personnes ainsi présentées.

Article 8.

Tout membre de la Cour doit, avant d'entrer en fonction, prendre en séance publique l'engagement solennel d'exercer ses attributions en pleine impartialité et en toute conscience.

Article 9.

Les Hautes Parties contractantes reconnaissent aux membres de la Cour, dans l'exercice de leurs fonctions, les privilèges et immunités diplomatiques.

Article 10.

1. Le mandat des juges est de dix ans.

2. La Cour se renouvelle tous les deux ans à raison d'un membre titulaire et d'un membre suppléant.

3. Pour la première période de dix ans, l'ordre suivant lequel ce renouvellement aura lieu sera déterminé au moyen d'un tirage au sort au moment de la première élection.

4. Le mandat des juges peut être renouvelé.

5. Les juges restent en fonction jusqu'à leur remplacement.

6. Toutefois, après ce remplacement, ils continuent de connaître des affaires dont ils ont déjà été saisis.

Article 11.

1. En cas de vacance d'un siège par expiration du mandat du titulaire ou pour toute autre cause, il y est pourvu conformément à l'article 7.

2. En cas de démission d'un membre de la Cour, la démission prendra effet au moment où notification en sera reçue par le Greffier.

3. En cas de vacance d'un siège se produisant plus de huit mois avant la date du renouvellement normal de ce siège, les Hautes Parties contractantes doivent, dans le délai de deux mois, procéder aux présentations prévues à l'article 7, paragraphe 1, en vue de pourvoir à cette vacance.

Article 12.

Un membre de la Cour ne peut être relevé de ses fonctions que si, au jugement unanime de tous les autres membres, titulaires et suppléants, il a cessé de répondre aux conditions requises.

Article 13.

Le juge nommé en remplacement d'un juge dont le mandat n'est pas expiré achève le terme du mandat de son prédécesseur.

Article 14.

La Cour élit pour deux ans son Président et son Vice-Président; ils sont rééligibles.

Article 15.

La Cour établira elle-même un règlement pour son fonctionnement et sa procédure.

Article 16.

Le Greffe de la Cour sera assuré par le Greffe de la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, si celle-ci y consent.

Article 7.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State, in respect of which the present Convention is in force, may nominate not more than two candidates for appointment as judges of the Court.

2. The Permanent Court of International Justice shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

Article 8.

Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, give a solemn undertaking in open Court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

Article 9.

The High Contracting Parties shall grant the members of the Court diplomatic privileges and immunities when engaged on the business of the Court.

Article 10.

1. Judges shall hold office for ten years.

2. Every two years, one regular and one deputy judge shall retire.

3. The order of retirement for the first period of ten years shall be determined by lot when the first election takes place.

4. Judges may be re-appointed.

5. Judges shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled.

6. Nevertheless, judges, though replaced, shall finish any cases which they have begun.

Article 11.

1. Any vacancy, whether occurring on the expiration of a judge's term of office or for any other cause, shall be filled as provided in Article 7.

2. In the event of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall take effect on notification being received by the Registrar.

3. If a seat on the Court becomes vacant more than eight months before the date at which a new election to that seat would normally take place, the High Contracting Parties shall within two months nominate candidates for the seat in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1.

Article 12.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of all the other members, including both regular and deputy judges, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Article 13.

A judge appointed in place of a judge whose period of appointment has not expired shall hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 14.

The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for two years; they may be re-elected.

Article 15.

The Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure.

Article 16.

The work of the Registry of the Court shall be performed by the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice, if that Court consents.

Article 17.

Les archives de la Cour sont confiées au Greffier.

Article 18.

La Cour siège au nombre de cinq membres.

Article 19.

1. Les membres de la Cour ne peuvent participer au jugement d'aucune affaire dans laquelle ils sont antérieurement intervenus à un titre quelconque. En cas de doute, la Cour décide.

2. Si, pour une raison spéciale, l'un des membres de la Cour estime ne pas devoir siéger dans une affaire déterminée, il en fait part au Président dès qu'il a été informé que la Cour est saisie de cette affaire.

Article 20.

1. Si la présence de cinq juges n'est pas assurée, ce nombre est parfait par l'appel en fonction de juges suppléants dans l'ordre du tableau.

2. Le tableau est dressé par la Cour en tenant compte d'abord de la priorité de nomination et, ensuite, de l'ancienneté d'âge.

Article 21.

1. En ce qui concerne l'application de la loi pénale de fond, la Cour appliquera la loi la moins rigoureuse. A cet effet, elle prendra en considération la loi du pays sur le territoire duquel l'infraction a été commise et la loi du pays qui a saisi la Cour.

2. Pour toutes contestations sur la question de savoir quelle est la loi pénale de fond à appliquer, la Cour statuera.

Article 22.

Si la Cour est appelée, conformément à l'article 21, à appliquer la loi d'un Etat qui ne compte pas de ressortissant parmi les juges siégeant dans l'affaire, elle pourra appeler à siéger à ses côtés, avec voix consultative et à titre de juriste assesseur, un jurisconsulte ayant une compétence reconnue en la matière.

Article 23.

La Haute Partie contractante qui use de la faculté de déférer un accusé pour jugement à la Cour en informera le Président par l'intermédiaire du Greffe.

Article 24.

Le Président de la Cour, dès qu'une Haute Partie contractante lui a communiqué sa décision de déférer un accusé à la Cour, conformément à l'article 2, en informe l'Etat contre lequel l'infraction a été dirigée, celui sur le territoire duquel elle a été commise, ainsi que celui dont l'accusé est ressortissant.

Article 25.

1. La Cour est saisie par le fait qu'une Haute Partie contractante lui défère l'accusé.

2. L'acte par lequel un Etat défère un accusé à la Cour doit contenir l'énoncé des charges principales et les éléments sur lesquels elles s'appuient, ainsi que la désignation de l'agent par lequel cet Etat sera représenté.

3. L'Etat qui a déféré l'accusé à la Cour assume la charge de soutenir l'accusation, à moins que l'Etat contre lequel l'infraction a été dirigée ou, à son défaut, l'Etat sur le territoire duquel l'infraction a été commise n'exprime le désir de se substituer à lui.

Article 26.

1. Tout Etat qualifié pour saisir la Cour pourra intervenir devant elle, prendre connaissance du dossier, présenter un mémoire à la Cour et participer aux débats.

2. Toute personne qui a été lésée directement par l'infraction pourra, si la Cour l'y autorise et dans les conditions fixées par celle-ci, se constituer partie civile; elle ne pourra prendre part au débat que lorsqu'il s'agira pour la Cour de se prononcer sur les dommages-intérêts.

Article 17.

The Court's archives shall be in the charge of the Registrar.

Article 18.

The number of members who shall sit to constitute the Court shall be five.

Article 19.

1. Members of the Court may not take part in trying any case in which they have previously been engaged in any capacity whatsoever. In case of doubt, the Court shall decide.

2. If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not sit to try a particular case, he shall so notify the President as soon as he has been informed that the Court is seized of that case.

Article 20.

1. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly to age.

Article 21.

1. The substantive criminal law to be applied by the Court shall be that which is the least severe. In determining what that law is, the Court shall take into consideration the law of the territory on which the offence was committed and the law of the country which committed the accused to it for trial.

2. Any dispute as to what substantive criminal law is applicable shall be decided by the Court.

Article 22.

If the Court has to apply, in accordance with Article 21, the law of a State of which no sitting judge is a national, the Court may invite a jurist who is an acknowledged authority on such law to sit with it in a consultative capacity as a legal assessor.

Article 23.

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to commit an accused person for trial to the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 24.

The President of the Court, on being informed by a High Contracting Party of his decision to commit an accused person for trial to the Court in accordance with Article 2, shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, the State on whose territory the offence was committed and the State of which the accused is a national.

Article 25.

1. The Court is seized so soon as a High Contracting Party has committed an accused person to it for trial.

2. The document committing an accused person to the Court for trial shall contain a statement of the principal charges against him and the allegations on which they are based, and shall name the agent by whom the State will be represented.

3. The State which committed the accused person to the Court shall conduct the prosecution unless the State against which the offence was directed or, failing that State, the State on whose territory the offence was committed expresses a wish to prosecute.

Article 26.

1. Any State entitled to seize the Court may intervene, inspect the file, submit a statement of its case to the Court and take part in the oral proceedings.

2. Any person directly injured by the offence may, if authorised by the Court, and subject to any conditions which it may impose, constitute himself *partie civile* before the Court; such person shall not take part in the oral proceeding except when the Court is dealing with the damages.

Article 27.

La Cour ne peut juger d'autres accusés que ceux qui lui ont été déférés, ni juger les accusés pour d'autres faits que ceux en raison desquels ils lui ont été déférés.

Article 28.

La Cour abandonnera la poursuite et ordonnera la mise en liberté de l'accusé, si, l'accusation étant retirée, elle n'est pas immédiatement reprise par un Etat ayant qualité pour la présenter.

Article 29.

1. Les accusés pourront se faire défendre par des avocats faisant partie d'un barreau et agréés par la Cour.

2. Dans le cas où la défense ne serait pas assurée par un avocat choisi par l'accusé, la Cour désignera pour chaque accusé un défenseur d'office choisi parmi les avocats faisant partie d'un barreau.

Article 30.

L'individu déféré pour jugement à la Cour devra recevoir communication du dossier de l'affaire ainsi que du mémoire de la partie civile.

Article 31.

1. La Cour décide si l'individu qui lui est déféré doit être mis ou maintenu en état d'arrestation. Elle fixe, le cas échéant, les conditions de sa mise en liberté provisoire.

2. Pour l'exécution de la prise de corps, l'Etat sur le territoire duquel siège la Cour mettra à la disposition de celle-ci un lieu d'internement approprié ainsi que le personnel de gardiens nécessaire.

Article 32.

Les parties pourront proposer des témoins et experts à la Cour, sous réserve pour celle-ci de décider s'il y a lieu de les citer et de les entendre. La Cour pourra toujours, même d'office, procéder à l'audition d'autres témoins et experts. Il en sera de même pour tous autres éléments de preuve.

Article 33.

Les commissions rogatoires dont l'envoi serait jugé utile par la Cour seront transmises, selon la méthode fixée par son règlement, à l'Etat compétent pour leur donner suite.

Article 34.

Il ne pourra être procédé devant la Cour à aucun interrogatoire, à aucune audition de témoins ou d'experts, ni à aucune confrontation qu'en présence des conseils de l'accusé, des représentants des Etats prenant part à la procédure ou ces représentants dûment appelés.

Article 35.

1. Les audiences de la Cour sont publiques.

2. Toutefois, la Cour pourra, par un jugement motivé, décider qu'il sera procédé à huis clos. Le jugement sera toujours prononcé en audience publique.

Article 36.

Les délibérations de la Cour sont secrètes.

Article 37.

Les décisions de la Cour sont prises à la majorité des juges.

Article 38.

Tout arrêt de la Cour est motivé et lu en audience publique par le Président.

Article 27.

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person committed to it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been committed.

Article 28.

The Court shall not proceed further with the case and shall order the accused to be discharged if the prosecution is abandoned and not at once recommenced by a State entitled to prosecute.

Article 29.

1. Accused persons may be defended by advocates belonging to a Bar and approved by the Court.

2. If provision is not made for the conduct of the defence by a barrister chosen by the accused, the Court shall assign to each accused person a counsel selected from advocates belonging to a Bar.

Article 30.

The file of the case and the statement of the *partie civile* shall be communicated to the person who is before the Court for trial.

Article 31.

1. The Court shall decide whether a person who has been committed to it for trial shall be placed or remain under arrest. Where necessary, it shall determine on what conditions he may be provisionally set at liberty.

2. The State on the territory of which the Court is sitting shall place at the Court's disposal a suitable place of internment and the necessary staff of warders for the custody of the accused.

Article 32.

The parties may submit to the Court the names of witnesses and experts, but the Court shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts. The same rules shall apply as regards any other kind of evidence.

Article 33.

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall be transmitted to the State competent to give effect thereto by the method prescribed by the regulations of the Court.

Article 34.

No examination, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for the accused and of the representatives of the States which are taking part in the proceedings or after these representatives have been duly summoned.

Article 35.

1. The hearings before the Court shall be public.

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place *in camera*. Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

Article 36.

The Court shall sit in private to consider its judgment.

Article 37.

The decisions of the Court shall be by majority of the judges.

Article 38.

Every judgment or order of the Court shall state the reasons therefor and be read at a public hearing by the President.

Article 39.

1. La Cour statuera sur les confiscations éventuelles et restitutions.

2. La Cour pourra prononcer contre les individus qui lui ont été déférés des condamnations aux dommages-intérêts.

3. Les Hautes Parties contractantes sur le territoire desquelles se trouvent les objets à restituer ou des biens appartenant aux condamnés sont tenues de prendre toutes mesures prévues par leurs propres lois afin d'assurer l'exécution de ces condamnations.

4. Les dispositions de l'alinéa précédent s'appliquent aussi lorsqu'il s'agit du recouvrement des peines pécuniaires prononcées par la Cour ou des frais de procédure.

Article 40.

1. Les peines privatives de liberté seront exécutées par la Haute Partie contractante que la Cour désignera après avoir pris son assentiment. L'Etat qui aura déféré le condamné à la Cour ne pourra refuser son assentiment. Toutefois, cette exécution sera assurée par l'Etat qui a déféré le condamné à la Cour, si cet Etat en a exprimé le désir.

2. La Cour déterminera l'affectation des amendes.

Article 41.

Si la peine de mort a été prononcée, l'Etat désigné par la Cour pour exécuter la peine aura la faculté de lui substituer la peine privative de liberté la plus grave dans sa législation nationale.

Article 42.

Le droit de grâce sera exercé par l'Etat chargé de l'exécution de la peine. Il prendra au préalable l'avis du Président de la Cour.

Article 43.

1. Contre les arrêts de condamnation rendus par la Cour, il n'y aura d'autre voie de recours que la revision.

2. La Cour déterminera par son règlement les cas dans lesquels la revision pourra lui être demandée.

3. Auront le droit de demander la revision les Etats mentionnés à l'article 25 et les personnes mentionnées à l'article 29.

Article 44.

1. Les indemnités des juges sont à la charge des Etats dont ils sont ressortissants, sur la base d'un barème établi par les Hautes Parties contractantes.

2. Il sera institué un fonds commun alimenté par les Hautes Parties contractantes et sur lequel seront prélevés les frais de procédure et autres frais imposés par le jugement de l'affaire, y compris éventuellement les honoraires et frais de l'avocat d'office, sauf recouvrement à charge du condamné. L'indemnité spéciale du Greffier et les frais du Greffe seront supportés par ledit fonds.

Article 45.

1. La Cour statue sur les questions qui pourraient surgir au sujet de sa propre compétence au cours d'une affaire dont elle est saisie; elle applique à cet effet les dispositions de la présente Convention ainsi que de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme et les principes généraux du droit.

2. Si une Haute Partie contractante, autre que celle qui aura saisi la Cour, conteste l'étendue de la compétence de celle-ci par rapport à ses propres juridictions nationales et si cette Haute Partie contractante ne croit pas devoir se borner à faire trancher cette question par la Cour pénale internationale en intervenant à cette fin dans la procédure, cette contestation sera considérée comme s'élevant entre cette Haute Partie contractante et la Haute Partie contractante qui aura saisi la Cour, et elle sera réglée comme il est dit à l'article 48.

Article 39.

1. The Court shall decide whether any object is to be confiscated or be restored to its owner.

2. The Court may sentence the persons committed to it to pay damages.

3. High Contracting Parties in whose territory objects to be restored or property belonging to convicted persons is situated shall be bound to take all the measures provided by their own laws to ensure the execution of the sentences of the Court.

4. The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply to cases in which pecuniary penalties imposed by the Court or costs of proceedings have to be recovered.

Article 40.

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by a High Contracting Party chosen with his consent by the Court. Such consent may not be refused by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court for trial. The sentence shall always be executed by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court if this State expresses the wish to do so.

2. The Court shall determine the way in which any fines shall be dealt with.

Article 41.

If sentence of death has been pronounced, the State designated by the Court to execute the sentence shall be entitled to substitute therefor the most severe penalty provided by its national law which involves loss of liberty.

Article 42.

The right of pardon shall be exercised by the State which has to enforce the penalty. It shall first consult the President of the Court.

Article 43.

1. Against convictions pronounced by the Court, no proceedings other than an application for revision shall be allowable.

2. The Court shall determine in its rules the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

3. The States mentioned in Article 25, and the persons mentioned in Article 29, shall have the right to ask for a revision.

Article 44.

1. The salaries of the judges shall be payable by the States of which they are nationals on a scale fixed by the High Contracting Parties.

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases, including any fees and expenses of counsel assigned to the accused by the Court, shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

Article 45.

1. The Court shall decide any questions as to its own jurisdiction arising during the hearing of a case; it shall for this purpose apply the provisions of the present Convention and of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the general principles of law.

2. If a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, disputes the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts and does not see his way to appear in the proceedings in order that the question may be decided by the International Criminal Court, the question shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 48.

Article 46.

1. Les représentants des Hautes Parties contractantes se réuniront en vue de prendre toutes décisions nécessaires concernant :

a) La constitution et la gestion du fonds commun, la répartition entre les Hautes Parties contractantes des sommes jugées nécessaires pour créer et maintenir ce fonds et, d'une manière générale, toutes questions ayant trait à l'établissement et au fonctionnement de la Cour;

b) L'organisation des réunions prévues au paragraphe 3 ci-dessous.

2. Les représentants des Hautes Parties contractantes décideront également à leur première réunion les adaptations qui seraient nécessaires en vue de réaliser le but de la présente Convention.

3. Le Greffier de la Cour convoquera les réunions ultérieures conformément aux règles qui auront été établies à cet effet.

4. Toutes les questions qui pourront se poser lors des réunions visées au présent article feront l'objet de décisions prises à la majorité des deux tiers des Hautes Parties contractantes représentées à la réunion.

Article 47.

1. Tant que la présente Convention ne sera pas en vigueur entre douze Hautes Parties contractantes, il sera possible qu'un juge et un juge suppléant soient ressortissants de la même Haute Partie contractante.

2. L'application de l'article 18 et de l'article 20, paragraphe 1, ne peut avoir pour conséquence de faire siéger simultanément un juge et un juge suppléant ressortissants du même Etat.

Article 48.

1. S'il 's'élève entre les Hautes Parties contractantes un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application de la présente Convention et si ce différend n'a pu être résolu de façon satisfaisante par voie diplomatique, il sera réglé conformément aux dispositions en vigueur entre les Parties concernant le règlement des différends internationaux.

2. Au cas où de telles dispositions n'existeraient pas entre les parties au différend, elles le soumettront à une procédure arbitrale ou judiciaire. A défaut d'un accord sur le choix d'un autre tribunal, elles soumettront le différend à la Cour permanente de Justice internationale, si elles sont toutes parties au Protocole du 16 décembre 1920 relatif au Statut de ladite Cour, et si elles n'y sont pas toutes parties, à un Tribunal d'arbitrage constitué conformément à la Convention de La Haye du 18 octobre 1907, pour le règlement pacifique des conflits internationaux.

Article 49.

1. La présente Convention, dont les textes français et anglais feront également foi, portera la date de ce jour; elle pourra, jusqu'au 31 mai 1938, être signée au nom de tout Membre de la Société des Nations et de tout Etat non membre au nom desquels la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme a été signée.

2. La présente Convention sera ratifiée. Les instruments de ratification seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société ainsi qu'aux Etats non membres visés au paragraphe précédent. Toutefois, le dépôt d'un instrument de ratification sur la présente Convention est subordonné au dépôt, par la même Haute Partie contractante, de l'instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion à la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

Article 50.

1. A partir du 1er juin 1938, la présente Convention sera ouverte à l'adhésion de tout Membre de la Société des Nations et de tout Etat non membre par qui cette Convention n'aurait pas été signée. Le dépôt d'un instrument d'adhésion est subordonné au dépôt, par la même Haute Partie contractante, de l'instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion à la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

2. Les instruments d'adhésion seront transmis au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, pour être déposés dans les archives de la Société; il notifiera les dépôts à tous les Membres de la Société et aux Etats non membres visés à l'article 49.

Article 46.

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning :

(a) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;

(b) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

2. At their first meeting, the representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall also decide what modifications are necessary in order to attain the objects of the present Convention.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. All questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in the present article shall be decided by a majority of two-thirds of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

Article 47.

1. Until the present Convention is in force between twelve High Contracting Parties, it shall be possible for a judge and a deputy judge to be both nationals of the same High Contracting Party.

2. Article 18 and Article 20, paragraph 1, shall not be applied in such a manner as to cause a judge and a deputy judge of the same nationality to sit simultaneously on the Court.

Article 48.

1. If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the Parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

2. If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

Article 49.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until May 31st, 1938, it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State on whose behalf the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism has been signed.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League. The Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The deposit of an instrument of ratification of the present Convention shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of, or accession to, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 50.

1. After June 1st, 1938, the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State which has not signed this Convention. Nevertheless, the deposit of an instrument of accession shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of, or accession to, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 49.

Article 51.

Il ne pourra être fait de réserve à la signature, à la ratification de la présente Convention ou en adhérant à elle, que sur l'article 26, paragraphe 2.

Article 52.

1. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut déclarer, au moment de la signature, de la ratification ou de l'adhésion, que, par son acceptation de la présente Convention, elle n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble ou toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la présente Convention ne sera pas applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration.

2. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes pourra ultérieurement notifier au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations qu'elle entend rendre la présente Convention applicable à l'ensemble ou à toute partie de ses territoires ayant fait l'objet de la déclaration prévue au paragraphe précédent. Dans ce cas, la Convention s'appliquera à tous les territoires visés dans la notification quatre-vingt-dix jours après la réception de cette notification par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

3. Chacune des Hautes Parties contractantes peut, à tout moment, déclarer qu'elle entend voir cesser l'application de la présente Convention pour l'ensemble ou pour toute partie de ses colonies, protectorats, territoires d'outre-mer, territoires placés sous sa suzeraineté ou territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié; dans ce cas, la Convention cessera d'être applicable aux territoires faisant l'objet d'une telle déclaration un an après la réception de cette déclaration par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations.

4. Le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations communiquera à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et aux Etats non membres visés aux articles 49 et 50, les déclarations et notifications reçues en vertu du présent article.

Article 53.

1. Le Gouvernement des Pays-Bas est prié de convoquer une réunion des Etats ayant ratifié la présente Convention ou y ayant adhéré, réunion qui se tiendra dans le délai d'un an à compter de la réception par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations du septième instrument de ratification ou d'adhésion. Cette réunion aura à fixer la date de la mise en vigueur de la présente Convention. La décision sera prise à la majorité des deux tiers sans que ce chiffre puisse être inférieur à six voix. Cette réunion prendra également les décisions nécessaires pour l'application de l'article 46.

2. La mise en vigueur de la présente Convention est, toutefois, subordonnée à la mise en vigueur de la Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme.

3. La présente Convention sera enregistrée conformément à l'article 18 du Pacte par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations au jour qui sera fixé par la réunion ci-dessus visée.

Article 54.

Chaque ratification ou adhésion émanant d'un Etat qui n'a pas été appelé à prendre part à la réunion visée à l'article 53 produira effet quatre-vingt-dix jours après sa réception par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, sans que cet effet puisse se produire moins de quatre-vingt-dix jours après l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention.

Article 55.

La présente Convention pourra être dénoncée au nom de toute Haute Partie contractante par notification écrite adressée au Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations, qui en informera tous les Membres de la Société et les Etats non membres visés aux articles 49 et 50. La dénonciation sortira ses effets un an après la date à laquelle elle aura été reçue par le Secrétaire général de la Société des Nations; elle ne sera opérante qu'au jegard de la Haute Partie contractante au nom de laquelle elle aura été effectuée.

Article 56.

1. Lorsque la Cour aura été saisie d'une affaire avant la dénonciation de la présente Convention ou l'avis prévu à l'article 52, paragraphe 3, elle en achèvera néanmoins l'examen et le jugement.

2. La Haute Partie contractante appelée à donner effet à une condamnation conformément à la présente Convention restera tenue de ses obligations à l'égard de toute condamnation intervenue antérieurement à sa dénonciation.

Article 51.

Signature, ratification or accession to the present Convention may not be accompanied by any reservations except in regard to Article 26, paragraph 2.

Article 52.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates or oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may, at any time, declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in Articles 49 and 50 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present article.

Article 53.

1. The Government of the Netherlands is requested to convene a meeting of representatives of the States which ratify or accede to the present Convention. The meeting is to take place within one year after the receipt of the seventh instrument of ratification or accession by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and has for object to fix the date at which the present Convention shall be put into force. The decision shall be taken by a majority which must be a two-thirds majority and include not less than six votes. The meeting shall also take any decisions necessary for carrying out the provisions of Article 46.

2. The entry into force of the present Convention shall, however, be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

3. The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in accordance with Article 18 of the Covenant on the day fixed by the above-mentioned meeting.

Article 54.

A ratification or accession by a State which has not taken part in the meeting mentioned in Article 53 shall take effect ninety days after its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, provided that the date at which it takes effect shall not be earlier than ninety days after the entry into force of the Convention.

Article 55.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 49 and 50. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

Article 56.

1. A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 52, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party who before denouncing the present Convention has under the provisions thereof incurred the obligation of carrying out a sentence shall continue to be bound by such obligation.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires ont signé la présente Convention.

FAIT à Genève, le seize novembre mil neuf cent trente-sept, en simple expédition, qui sera déposée dans les archives du Secrétariat de la Société des Nations; copie certifiée conforme en sera transmise à tous les Membres de la Société des Nations et à tous les Etats non membres représentés à la Conférence.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, the sixteenth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven, in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States represented at the Conference.

BELGIQUE / BELGIUM

Ad referendum :
S. SASSERATH

BULGARIE / BULGARIA

N. MOMTCHILOFF

CUBA / CUBA

Dr Juan ANTIGA

ESPAGNE / SPAIN

Cipriano DE RIVAS CHERIF.

FRANCE / FRANCE

Me référant à l'article 52 de la Convention, je déclare que le Gouvernement français n'entend assumer aucune obligation en ce qui concerne l'ensemble de ses colonies et protectorats, ainsi que des territoires pour lesquels un mandat lui a été confié [1].

BASDEVANT

GRÈCE / GREECE

S. POLYCHRONIADIS

MONACO / MONACO

Xavier RAISIN

PAYS-BAS / THE NETHERLANDS

VAN HAMEL

ROUMANIE / ROUMANIA

Vespasien V. PELLA.

TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE / CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr KOUKAL

---

[1] *Translation by the Secretariat of the League of Nations :*

With reference to Article 52 of the Convention, I declare that the French Government does not assume any obligation as regards the whole of its Colonies and Protectorates, or the territories for which a mandate has been entrusted to it.

TURQUIE

Vasfi MENTEŞ

TURKEY

UNION DES RÉPUBLIQUES SOVIÉTIQUES SOCIALISTES

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

En signant la présente Convention, je déclare que le Gouvernement de l'Union des Républiques soviétiques socialistes ne sera à même de la ratifier que sous la réserve suivante :

« En matière de règlement des contestations relatives à l'interprétation et à l'application de la présente convention, le Gouvernement de l'Union des Républiques soviétiques socialistes n'assume d'autres obligations que celles qui lui incombent en tant que Membre de la Société des Nations. »[1]

M. LITVINOFF.

YOUGOSLAVIE

Thomas GIVANOVITCH.

YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] *Translation by the Secretariat of the League of Nations :*

In signing the present Convention, I declare that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be able to ratify it only subject to the following reservation :

" With regard to the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes only such obligations as are incumbent upon it as a Member of the League of Nations."

N° officiel : C.548.M.385.1937.V.

3. ACTE FINAL DE LA CONFÉRENCE

LES GOUVERNEMENTS DE L'AFGHANISTAN, DE L'ALBANIE, DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE, DE LA BELGIQUE, DU ROYAUME-UNI DE GRANDE-BRETAGNE ET D'IRLANDE DU NORD, DE LA BULGARIE, DU DANEMARK, DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE, DE L'EGYPTE, DE L'EQUATEUR, DE L'ESPAGNE, DE L'ESTONIE, DE LA FINLANDE, DE LA FRANCE, DE LA GRÈCE, D'HAÏTI, DE LA HONGRIE, DE L'INDE, DE LA LETTONIE, DE LA LITHUANIE, DU MEXIQUE, DE MONACO, DE LA NORVÈGE, DES PAYS-BAS, DU PÉROU, DE LA POLOGNE, DE LA ROUMANIE, DE SAINT-MARIN, DE LA SUISSE, DE LA TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE, DE LA TURQUIE, DE L'UNION DES RÉPUBLIQUES SOVIÉTIQUES SOCIALISTES, DE L'URUGUAY, DU VENEZUELA ET DE LA YOUGOSLAVIE,

Ayant accepté l'invitation qui leur a été adressée en exécution de la résolution du Conseil de la Société des Nations en date du 27 mai 1937, en vue de la conclusion :

1° D'une Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme;

2° D'une Convention pour la création d'une cour pénale internationale;

Ont désigné les délégués ci-après :

(Pour la liste des délégués, voir pages 39 à 42.)

Qui se sont réunis à Genève du 1er au 16 novembre 1937.

Le Conseil de la Société des Nations a appelé aux fonctions de Président de la Conférence :

Son Excellence le comte CARTON DE WIART, Ministre d'Etat, Délégué permanent de la Belgique près la Société des Nations.

La Conférence a désigné :

Comme Vice-Présidents :

M. Jules BASDEVANT, Professeur à la Faculté de droit de l'Université de Paris, et

Son Excellence le docteur Enrique RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ, Délégué permanent de la République Argentine près la Société des Nations, Envoyé extraordinaire et Ministre plénipotentiaire près le Conseil fédéral suisse, et

Comme Rapporteur général :

Son Excellence M. Vespasien V. PELLA, Envoyé extraordinaire et Ministre plénipotentiaire de Sa Majesté le Roi de Roumanie près Sa Majesté la Reine des Pays-Bas, Professeur de droit pénal à la Faculté de droit de l'Université de Bucarest.

A rempli les fonctions de Secrétaire général de la Conférence :

M. L. A. PODESTA COSTA, Conseiller juridique de la Société des Nations, représentant le Secrétaire général de la Société.

* * *

Au cours des réunions tenues du 1er au 16 novembre 1937, la Conférence a examiné les projets élaborés par le Comité d'experts constitué conformément à la résolution adoptée par le Conseil de la Société des Nations le 10 décembre 1934, et elle a adopté les actes ci-après énumérés :

1. Convention pour la prévention et la répression du terrorisme;

2. Convention pour la création d'une cour pénale internationale.

Official No. : C.548.M.385.1937.V.

3. FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE.

THE GOVERNMENTS OF AFGHANISTAN, ALBANIA, THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC, BELGIUM, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, BULGARIA, DENMARK, THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EGYPT, ECUADOR, SPAIN, ESTONIA, FINLAND, FRANCE, GREECE, HAITI, HUNGARY, INDIA, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, MEXICO, MONACO, NORWAY, THE NETHERLANDS, PERU, POLAND, ROUMANIA, SAN MARINO, SWITZERLAND, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, TURKEY, THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, URUGUAY, VENEZUELA, AND YUGOSLAVIA,

Having accepted the invitation addressed to them in pursuance of the resolution of the Council of the League of Nations dated May 27th, 1937, with a view to the conclusion of :

1. A Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism;
2. A Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court;

Appointed the following delegates :

(For the list of delegates, see pages 39 to 42.)

Who assembled at Geneva from November 1st to 16th, 1937.

The Council of the League of Nations appointed as President of the Conference :

His Excellency Count CARTON DE WIART, Minister of State, Permanent Delegate of Belgium to the League of Nations.

The Conference appointed :

As Vice-Presidents :

M. Jules BASDEVANT, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Paris; and

His Excellency Dr. Enrique RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ, Permanent Delegate of the Argentine Republic to the League of Nations, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Swiss Federal Council.

As General Rapporteur :

His Excellency M. Vespasien V. PELLA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of His Majesty the King of Roumania accredited to Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, Professor of Criminal Law at the Faculty of Law of the University of Bucharest.

The functions of Secretary-General of the Conference were assumed by :

M. L. A. PODESTA COSTA, Legal Adviser of the League of Nations, representing the Secretary-General of the League.

* * *

In the course of a series of meetings held between November 1st and 16th, 1937, the Conference examined the drafts drawn up by the Committee of Experts set up by the resolution adopted by the Council of the League of Nations on December 10th, 1934, and adopted the following Acts :

1. Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism;
2. Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les délégués ont signé le présent Acte.

FAIT à Genève, le seize novembre mil neuf cent trente-sept, en simple expédition qui sera déposée dans les archives de la Société des Nations; copie certifiée conforme en sera remise à tous les États représentés à la Conférence.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the delegates signed the present Act.

DONE at Geneva, the sixteenth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven, in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the League of Nations and of which authenticated copies shall be delivered to all States represented at the Conference.

Pour le Président de la Conférence : *For the President of the Conference :*

BASDEVANT

Les Vice-Présidents : *The Vice-Presidents :*

BASDEVANT

E. RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ

Le Rapporteur général : *The General Rapporteur :*

Vespasien V. PELLA

Le Secrétaire général de la Conférence : *The Secretary-General of the Conference :*

L. A. PODESTA COSTA

AFGHANISTAN — AFGHANISTAN

M. HAÏDAR

ALBANIE — ALBANIA

Th. LUARASSI

RÉPUBLIQUE ARGENTINE — ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

Enrique RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ

BELGIQUE — BELGIUM

S. SASSERATH

GRANDE-BRETAGNE ET IRLANDE DU NORD — GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

ainsi que toutes parties de l'Empire britannique non membres séparés de la Société des Nations : — and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations :

John Fischer WILLIAMS

Leslie Stuart BRASS

BULGARIE — BULGARIA

N. MOMTCHILOFF

DANEMARK — DENMARK

Carl Gustav WORSAAE

RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE — DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Ch. ACKERMANN

ÉGYPTE — EGYPT

Aly SHAMSY — Abdel Latif TALAAT

ÉQUATEUR — ECUADOR

Alejandro GASTELÚ

ESPAGNE — SPAIN

Victor MARTI

ESTONIE — ESTONIA

J. KÔDAR.

FINLANDE	J. Nyyssönen.	FINLAND
FRANCE	Basdevant G. Cassagnau	FRANCE
GRÈCE	S. Polychroniadis	GREECE
HONGRIE	Sebestyén	HUNGARY
INDE	Denys Bray	INDIA
LETTONIE	J. Feldmans.	LATVIA
LITHUANIE	K. Skirpa	LITHUANIA
MONACO	Xavier Raisin.	MONACO
NORVÈGE	H. H. Bachke	NORWAY
PAYS-BAS	van Hamel	THE NETHERLANDS
PÉROU	J. M. Barreto	PERU
POLOGNE	Tytus Komarnicki Lucien Bekerman	POLAND
ROUMANIE	Vespasien V. Pella.	ROUMANIA
SUISSE	Delaquis	SWITZERLAND
TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE	Dr Koukal	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TURQUIE	Vasfi Mentes	TURKEY
UNION DES RÉPUBLIQUES SOVIÉTIQUES SOCIALISTES	Eugène Hirschfeld	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA	C. Parra-Pérez J. M. Ortega-Martinez Alejandro E. Trujillo	VENEZUELA
YOUGOSLAVIE	Thomas Givanovitch	YUGOSLAVIA

Part II.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE.

1. LIST OF MEMBERS OF DELEGATIONS.

AFGHANISTAN

Delegate :

His Excellency MOHAMMED HAÏDAR Khan, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations.

Secretary :

M. Abdul KADER Khan, Secretary of the Permanent Delegation to the League of Nations.

ALBANIA

Delegate :

M. Thomas LUARASSI, Chargé d'Affaires *a.i.* of the Permanent Delegation to the League of Nations.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

Delegate :

His Excellency Dr. Enrique RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the Swiss Federal Council.

BELGIUM

Delegates :

His Excellency Count CARTON DE WIART, Minister of State, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations.

M. Simon SASSERATH, Advocate at the Brussels Court of Appeal.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND AND ALL PARTS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE WHICH ARE NOT SEPARATE MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Delegates :

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS, C.B.E., K.C.

Mr. L. S. BRASS, Assistant Legal Adviser to the Home Office.

BULGARIA

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Nicolas MOMTCHILOFF, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the Swiss Federal Council.

Substitute :

M. Evguèni SILIANOFF, Secretary of Legation.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Delegate :

M. Antonín KOUKAL, Counsellor in the Ministry of Justice.

Expert :

M. Vladimír SOLNAR, Professor Extraordinary of Criminal Law and Procedure in the Faculty of Law of the Charles IV University.

DENMARK

Delegates :

M. Carl Gustav WORSAAE, First Secretary of the Permanent Delegation to the League of Nations.

M. Carl Otto Emil SCHLEGEL, Procurator-General, Supreme Court.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Delegate :

M. Charles ACKERMANN, Consul-General at Geneva.

ECUADOR

Delegate :

M. Alejandro GASTELÚ, Secretary of the Permanent Delegation to the League of Nations, Consul-General in Switzerland.

EGYPT

Delegates :

His Excellency Aly EL SHAMSY Pasha, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations.

M. Abdel Latif TALAAT Bey, Chargé d'Affaires in Spain.

ESTONIA

Delegate :

M. Johannes KÔDAR, Counsellor of Legation, Permanent Delegate *a.i.* to the League of Nations.

FINLAND

Delegate :

M. Johannes NYYSSÖNEN, Counsellor of Legation, Permanent Delegate *a.i.* to the League of Nations.

FRANCE

Delegate :

M. Jules BASDEVANT, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Paris.

Adviser :

M. Gaston CASSAGNAU, Advocate-General at the Paris Court of Appeal.

Secretary :

M. BRINCARD, Attaché at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

GREECE

Delegate :

His Excellency M. S. POLYCHRONIADIS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations.

HAITI

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Y. CHATELAIN, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the President of the French Republic.

Substitute :

M. Alfred ADDOR, Consul at Geneva.

HUNGARY

Delegates :

M. Paul SEBESTYÉN, Departmental Counsellor, Head of the International Treaties Section at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

M. Eugène ASZTALOS, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Justice.

INDIA

Delegate :

Sir Denys BRAY, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., C.B.E.

LATVIA

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Jules FELDMANS, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the Swiss Federal Council.

LITHUANIA

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Kazys SKIRPA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations.

UNITED STATES OF MEXICO

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Isidro FABELA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations.

Secretary and Substitute :

M. Manuel TELLO, Secretary of the Permanent Delegation to the League of Nations.

MONACO

Delegate :

M. Xavier-John RAISIN, Consul-General at Geneva.

THE NETHERLANDS

Delegate :

M. J. A. VAN HAMEL, former Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Amsterdam.

Secretary :

M. C. M. E. VAN SCHELVEN.

NORWAY

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Halvard Huitfeldt BACHKE, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the President of the French Republic.

Adviser-Expert :

M. Finn HIORTHÖY, Director at the Royal Ministry of Justice.

PERU

Delegate :

Dr. José-Maria BARRETO, Counsellor of the Permanent Delegation to the League of Nations.

POLAND

Delegates :

His Excellency M. Tytus KOMARNICKI, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate to the League of Nations, President of the Delegation.

M. Władysław KULSKI, Head of the Legal Division at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

M. Lucien BEKERMAN, Procurator of the Republic in the Supreme Court.

ROUMANIA

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Vespasien V. PELLA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of His Majesty the King of Roumania accredited to Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, Professor of Criminal Law at the Faculty of Law of the University of Bucharest.

SAN MARINO

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Enrico GARDA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the President of the French Republic.

SPAIN

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Luis JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Substitute :

M. Victor HURTADO MARTI, Vice-consul at Geneva.

SWITZERLAND

Delegate :

Professor Ernest DELAQUIS, former Chief of the Department of Police of the Federal Department of Justice and Police and former Swiss Consul in Hamburg.

TURKEY

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Vasfi MENTEŞ, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the Swiss Federal Council.

Adviser :

M Mehmet Ali ORKUS, Director of Section in the *Sûreté générale.*

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Delegate :

M. Eugène HIRSCHFELD, Counsellor of Embassy at Paris.

URUGUAY

Delegate :

His Excellency Dr. Alberto GUANI, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James.

VENEZUELA

Delegates :

His Excellency Dr. C. PARRA-PÉREZ, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary accredited to the Swiss Federal Council.

M. José-Maria ORTEGA-MARTINEZ;

Dr. Alejandro E. TRUJILLO, Consul-General.

YUGOSLAVIA

Delegates :

Dr. Thomas GIVANOVITCH, Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Belgrade.

Dr. Slavko STOYKOVITCH, Professor of Law, Legal Adviser at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Legal Adviser :

Dr. Stoyan GAVRILOVITCH, Head of the League of Nations Department in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Secretary :

Dr. Milenko MILITCH, Attaché of Legation.

Attended the Conference in the capacity of observer :

BRAZIL

M. J. Olinto DE OLIVEIRA, First Secretary of Legation, in charge of the Consulate in Geneva.

2. PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE CONFERENCE AND MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU.

President :

His Excellency Count CARTON DE WIART (Belgium).[1]

Vice-Presidents :

M. Jules BASDEVANT (France).

His Excellency Dr. Enrique RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ (Argentine Republic).

General Rapporteur :

His Excellency M. Vespasien V. PELLA (Roumania).

Members of the Bureau :

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS, C.B.E., K.C. (United Kingdom);

M. J. A. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands);

His Excellency M. Tytus KOMARNICKI (Poland);

M. Antonín KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia);

M. Eugène HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Secretary-General of the Conference :

M. L. A. PODESTA COSTA (Legal Adviser of the League of Nations), representing the Secretary-General of the League.

[1] Appointed by the President of the Council in accordance with a decision taken by the Council on May 27th, 1937 (See *Official Journal*, May-June 1937, page 309.)

3. TEXT OF THE DEBATES OF THE CONFERENCE.

CONTENTS.

Page

FIRST MEETING, November 1st, 1937, at 11 a.m. :

1. Opening Speech by the President 49
2. Constitution of the Committee to report on the Credentials of the Delegates 50
3. Election of Vice-Presidents 50
4. Examination and Adoption of the Draft Rules of Procedure of the Conference ... 51
5. Appointment of the General Rapporteur of the Conference 51
6. Appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference 51

SECOND MEETING, November 1st, 1937, at 4 p.m. :

7. Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Credentials of the Delegates . 51
8. Election of Members of the Bureau of the Conference 52
9. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : General Discussion :

   Speeches by Sir John Fischer Williams (United Kingdom), M. Bachke (Norway), M. Givanovitch (Yugoslavia), Sir Denys Bray (India), M. van Hamel (Netherlands), M. Sebestyén (Hungary) 52

THIRD MEETING, November 2nd, 1937, at 10.30 a.m. :

10. Representation of Uruguay at the Conference : Communication by the President. 56
11. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : General Discussion *(continuation)* :

    Speeches by M. Chatelain (Haiti), M. Komarnicki (Poland), M. Basdevant (France), M. Koukal (Czechoslovakia), M. Hirschfeld (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), M. Delaquis (Switzerland), M. Sasserath (Belgium), M. Jiménez de Asúa (Spain), M. Parra-Pérez (Venezuela) 56

FOURTH MEETING, November 2nd, 1937, at 4 p.m. :

12. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : General Discussion *(continuation)* :

    Speeches by M. Ruíz Guiñazú (Argentine Republic) and M. Pella (Roumania) 64

FIFTH MEETING, November 3rd, 1937, at 10.45 a.m. :

13. Question of the Participation in the Work of the Conference of the International Criminal Police Commission : Communication by the President..... 69
14. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) :

    Title of the Convention 70

    Article 1 71

    Amendments to Article 1 71

    General Discussion on the Text of Article 1 and the Amendments thereto 72

    Detailed Examination of Article 1, Paragraph 1, and the Amendments thereto..... 75

SIXTH MEETING, November 3rd, 1937, at 3.30 p.m. :

15. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

    Article 1 *(continuation)* :

    Detailed Examination of Article 1, Paragraph 1, and the Amendments thereto *(continuation)* 76

    Amended Text of Article 1 proposed by the Czechoslovak Delegation.. 80

Page

SEVENTH MEETING, November 4th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m. :

16. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Article 1 *(continuation)* :

Detailed Examination of Article 1, Paragraph 2, and the Amendments thereto 81

Article 2 83

EIGHTH MEETING, November 4th, 1937, at 3 p.m. :

17. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Article 3 87

NINTH MEETING, November 5th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m. :

18. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Article 3 *(continuation)* 91
Articles 4, 5 and 6 93

TENTH MEETING, November 5th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m. :

19. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Articles 4, 5 and 6 *(continuation)* 96
Articles 7, 8 and 9 99
Article 10 106
Article 11 107

ELEVENTH MEETING, November 6th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m. :

20. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Article 1 *(continuation)* 108
Article 11 *(continuation)* 108
Article 12 108
Article 13 110
Article 14 112
Article 15 112
Article 16 112
Article 17 114
Article 18 114

21. Appointment of the Drafting Committee 116

TWELFTH MEETING, November 8th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m. :

22. Question of the Participation in the Work of the Conference of the International Criminal Police Commission *(continuation)* 117

23. Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : General Discussion *(continuation)* 117

24. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) :

Article 1 118
Article 2 118
Article 3 119
Article 4 123
Article 5 123
Article 6 123
Article 7 125
Article 8 125
Article 9 125

Page

Article 10 125
Articles 11 to 16 125
Article 17 126
Articles 18 to 20 126
Articles 21 and 22 126
Articles 23 to 25 127

THIRTEENTH MEETING, November 9th, 1937, at 11.30 a.m. :

25. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Article 19 127
Article 20 130
Article 21 130
Article 22 130
Article 23 132
Article 24 132
Articles 25 to 28 133

FOURTEENTH MEETING, November 9th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m. :

26. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) *(continuation)* :

Article 22 *(continuation)* 134
Article 26 134
Article 27 134
Article 28 134
Article 29 134
Article 30 135
Articles 31 to 33 135
Article 34 135
Article 35 138
Article 36 139
Article 37 140
Article 38 140
Article 39 142
Article 40 142
Article 41 143
Article 42 143
Article 43 143
Article 44 143
Articles 45 to 53 144

FIFTEENTH MEETING, November 12th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m. :

27. Absence of Count Carton de Wiart, President of the Conference : Communication by M. Basdevant, Vice-President 145

28. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : General Discussion *(continuation)* : Declaration by the Delegate of Uruguay 146

29. Examination, at a Second Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Drafting Committee :

Title of the Convention 146
Preamble 147
Article 1 147
Article 2 149
Article 3 149
Article 3*bis* (Article 4 of the Final Text) 150
Article 4 (Article 5 of the Final Text) 150
Article 5 (Article 6 of the Final Text) 150
Article 6 (Article 7 of the Final Text) 150
Article 6*bis* (deleted) 151
Article 7 (Article 8 of the Final Text) 151
Article 8 (Article 9 of the Final Text) 152
Article 9 (Article 10 of the Final Text) 152
Article 10 (Article 11 of the Final Text) 152
Article 11 (Article 12 of the Final Text) 152
Article 12 (Article 13 of the Final Text) 153

Page

SIXTEENTH MEETING, November 13th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m. :

30. Examination, at a Second Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Drafting Committee *(continuation)* :

Article 13 (Article 14 of the Final Text) 154
Article 14 (Article 15 of the Final Text) 154
Article 15 (Article 16 of the Final Text) 154
Article 16 (Article 17 of the Final Text) 154
Article 17 (Article 18 of the Final Text) 155
Article 18 (Article 19 of the Final Text) 155
Article 18*bis* (new Article proposed by the Polish Delegation) 158
Article 19 (Article 20 of the Final Text) 159
Article 20 (Article 21 of the Final Text) 159
Article 21 (Article 22 of the Final Text) 159
Article 22 (Article 23 of the Final Text) 159
Article 23 (Article 24 of the Final Text) 159
Article 24 (Article 25 of the Final Text) 160
Article 25 (Article 26 of the Final Text) 160
Article 26 (Article 27 of the Final Text) 160
Article 27 (Article 28 of the Final Text) 160
Article 28 (Article 29 of the Final Text) 160

31. Second Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Credentials of the Delegates 161

SEVENTEENTH MEETING, November 13th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m. :

32. Examination, at a Second Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : Text prepared by the Drafting Committee :

Title of the Convention 161
Preamble 162
Article 1 (former Article 1) 162
Article 2 (former Article 3) 162
Article 3 (former Article 2) 162
Article 4 (former Article 15) 162
Article 5 (former Article 4) 163
Article 6 (former Article 5) 163
Article 7 (former Article 6) 163
Article 8 (former Article 10, Paragraph 2) 163
Article 9 (former Article 13) 163
Article 10 (former Article 7) 163
Article 11 (former Article 11) 163
Article 12 (former Article 12) 164
Article 13 (former Article 8) 164
Article 14 (former Article 14, Paragraph 1) 164
Article 15 (former Article 42) 164
Article 16 (former Article 14, Paragraph 2) 164
Article 17 (former Article 41) 164
Article 18 (former Article 19, Paragraph 1) 164
Article 19 (former Article 10, Paragraph 1, and former Article 18) 164
Article 20 (former Article 9 and Article 19, Paragraph 2) 164
Article 21 (former Article 17) 165
Article 22 (former Article 20) 165
Article 23 (former Article 16) 165
Article 24 (former Article 21) and Article 25 (former Article 22) 165
Article 26 (former Article 23) 166
Article 27 (former Article 34) 166
Article 28 (former Article 22, Paragraph 4) 166
Article 29 (former Article 29) 166
Article 30 (former Article 24) 166
Article 31 (former Article 26) 166
Article 32 (former Article 25) 167
Article 33 (former Article 27) 167
Article 34 (former Article 28) 167
Article 35 (former Article 30) 167
Article 36 (former Article 31) 167
Article 37 (former Article 32) 167
Article 38 (former Article 33) 167
Article 39 (former Article 35) 167
Article 40 (former Article 36) 168
Article 41 (former Article 37) 168
Article 42 (former Article 38) 168

Page

Article 43 (former Article 39) 169
Article 44 (former Article 40) 169
Article 45 (former Article 43) 169
Article 46 (former Article 44) 169
Article 47 (new Article) 170
Article 48 (former Article 45) 170
Article 49 (former Article 46) 170
Article 50 (former Article 47) 170
Article 51 (new Article) 170
Article 52 (former Article 48) 170
Article 53 (former Article 49) 171
Article 54 (former Article 50) 171
Article 55 (former Article 52) 171
Article 56 (former Article 53) 171
Article 21 (former Article 17) *(continuation)* 171
Article 40 (former Article 36) *(continuation)* 172

33. Examination and Adoption of the Draft Final Act of the Conference 172

EIGHTEENTH MEETING, November 16th, 1937, at 4 p.m. :

34. Communications from Count Carton de Wiart, President of the Conference, and from Sir Denys Bray, Delegate of India 173

35. Printing of the Records of the Conference 173

36. Full Powers of the Spanish Delegate 174

37. Signature of the Instruments of the Conference : Declarations made by Certain Delegations at the Moment of Signature 174

38. Close of the Conference 175

FIRST MEETING.

Held on Monday, November 1st, 1937, at 11 a.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

1. Opening Speech by the President.

The PRESIDENT.—I owe to the President of the Council of the League of Nations,[1] who has called upon me to preside over this Conference, the honour, in the first place, of welcoming those eminent delegates who have been appointed by the Governments of their respective countries to represent them at a solemn discussion, the importance and expediency of which will be apparent to everyone. This Conference cannot fail to bring closer together all the States which have deputed you and sent you here, reflecting as it does their common desire to elucidate and settle problems of a political, juridical and diplomatic character affecting the interests of peace and of human civilisation.

You will allow me, I trust, with the object of refreshing your memories and presenting the facts in their true perspective, to give a brief summary of the conditions under which this Conference has been convened here to-day.

The studies which led to its convocation were carried out in pursuance of a resolution adopted by the Council of the League of Nations on December 10th, 1934.[2] That resolution was itself adopted as the result of an enquiry which the Council had been called upon to institute into the circumstances in which King Alexander of Yugoslavia and M. Barthou were assassinated at Marseilles on October 9th, 1934. The Council, in its resolution, stated that, in its opinion, " the rules of international law concerning the repression of terrorist activity are not at present sufficiently precise to guarantee efficiently international co-operation in this matter ", and it decided " to set up a Committee of Experts to study this question with a view to drawing up a preliminary draft of an international convention to assure the repression of conspiracies or crimes committed with a political and terrorist purpose ".[3]

This Committee was composed of experts appointed by the following Governments : Belgium, the United Kingdom, Chile, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Switzerland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

At its first meeting, held in April and May 1935, the Committee of Experts examined the proposals submitted to it by the French Government[4] with a view to the conclusion of an international agreement on the subject of terrorism and the creation of an International Criminal Court by which, under certain conditions, persons charged with terrorist acts might be tried. It also examined the observations received from thirteen other Governments on the French proposals and on the general question of international anti-terrorist action. The following is a list of those Governments : Austria, China, Cuba, Denmark, Estonia, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Latvia, Roumania, Turkey, United States of America and Yugoslavia.[5] A draft Convention and a memorandum from the Executive Bureau of the International Criminal Police Commission were also communicated to the Committee.

The Committee framed a first draft containing the essential provisions of a Convention for the repression of terrorism. This draft, accompanied by a preliminary draft of articles instituting an International Criminal Court, which certain members of the Committee had presented but which the Committee as a whole was not able to discuss, was reproduced in a report to the Council which was circulated to all the Governments.[6]

The second session of the Committee of Experts was held in January 1936. On this occasion, the Committee adopted a report presenting to the Council two draft Conventions concerning, respectively, terrorism and the creation of an International Criminal Court.[7] While preparing these drafts, the Committee had an opportunity of taking note of the observations of three other Governments : the Argentine Republic, Egypt and the Netherlands.[8] The first stage of the procedure laid down in the Council resolution was thus completed.

The preparation of the texts now laid before the Conference then underwent a second phase : the Council submitted the drafts of the Committee of Experts to Governments for an opinion, requesting them to submit their observations, and the question was placed on the agenda of the 1936 session of the Assembly. Nineteen Governments presented in writing criticisms or proposals for amendments : Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and

---

[1] See *Official Journal*, May-June 1937, page 309.
[2] See *Official Journal*, December 1934 (Part II), page 1760.
[3] For the text of the resolution, see Annex 1, page 183.
[4] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 22.
[5] *Ibid.*, pages 11 to 22.
[6] *Ibid.*, pages 2 to 11.
[7] Document A.7.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), pages 2 to 13.
[8] *Ibid.*, pages 13 to 16.

Northern Ireland, China, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, India, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Roumania, Siam, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Venezuela.[1]

Such were the circumstances in which the problem as a whole was debated by the Assembly of the League of Nations in 1936. The First Committee of the Assembly devoted the greater part of four meetings to an exhaustive consideration of the proposals of the Committee of Experts and of the Governments' observations.[2] The conclusions which it reached, and which were adopted by the Assembly, are summed up in the resolution adopted by the latter on October 10th, 1936.[3]

The Assembly having recommended that the Committee of Experts should revise its conclusions in the light of the observations to be found in the Governments' replies, the Committee, in pursuance of this task, met for the third and last time in April 1937, and the results of its deliberations were communicated to all the Governments.[4]

After this lengthy preparation, the Council, at its meeting on May 27th, 1937,[5] directed the Secretary-General to invite the Members of the League and certain non-member States to be represented at a diplomatic Conference for the purpose of " considering the two draft Conventions drawn up by the Committee of Experts ".[6] The Secretary-General despatched this invitation on June 23rd, 1937,[7] and your Governments have duly replied by appointing you to represent them.

You will forgive me, I am sure, for having thus dwelt on the origins of our Conference. It is a history of patient and painstaking endeavour. And I think that we have no reason to regret it, since all the elements of a problem which is both complex and delicate have thus been the subject of exhaustive study and debate by representatives appointed by their Governments by reason of their special competence and have, moreover, been submitted to the Governments themselves for their observations. Our Conference thus has ready to hand raw material and constructional data of no uncertain value. It will be for it to employ that material as it thinks fit and as may best serve the great purpose entrusted to it.

Entitled though we are to claim that, thanks to the efforts and sacrifices of succeeding generations, our civilisation has succeeded, in many spheres, in toning down the savagery and brutality of primitive times, we cannot but realise with shame and disquiet how advancing knowledge and improved communications have served in their turn to menace the security of persons and property and helped to promote acts designated by that new term " terrorism "— acts which, by reason of their gravity and contagious nature, are prejudicial not only to the interests of individuals as such or of one or more specific States, but may affect mankind as a whole.

Against the common peril of such criminal acts, international solidarity is but a vain and hollow formula. Some means must be found whereby that solidarity may assert itself, with the object of securing the universality of measures for the repression of crimes of this nature and of ensuring that their authors shall never escape the punishment they deserve, but that the latter shall be both swift and efficacious.

It rests with you, then, to forge the legal and diplomatic instrument whereby the community of States can achieve this purpose. Such a task is worthy of your conscientious endeavours and learning. And if, responding to the confidence which the League of Nations has placed in you, your joint and co-ordinated efforts are successful in this task, you will have rendered to civilisation a service for which all honest men will be indebted to you.

These are the feelings, these are the hopes, which I lay before you as I now declare open the Conference for the International Repression of Terrorism.

2. Constitution of the Committee to Report on the Credentials of the Delegates.

The PRESIDENT proposed the constitution of a Committee to report on the credentials of the delegates consisting of the following members :

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela);

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland);

M. KÔDAR (Estonia).

The President's proposal was adopted.

3. Election of Vice-Presidents.

The PRESIDENT proposed the election of two Vice-Presidents : M. BASDEVANT (France) and M. RUIZ GUIÑAZÚ (Argentine Republic).

The President's proposal was adopted.

---

[1] Documents A.24.1936.V. (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6); A.24(*a*).1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.7); C.552.M.356. 1936.V; C.194.M.139.1937.V.
[2] See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 156, pages 28 to 62.
[3] See Annex 1, page 183.
[4] Document C.222.M.162.1937.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1937.V.1). (See Annex 3, page 185.)
[5] See *Official Journal*, May-June 1937, page 309.
[6] For the text of the resolution, see Annex 1, page 183.
[7] Document C.L.104.1937.V.

4. Examination and Adoption of the Draft Rules of Procedure of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the draft Rules of Procedure of the Conference.

In reply to a question raised by Sir John Fischer Williams (United Kingdom) regarding the interpretation of Rule 8, the President stated that the procedure laid down in that article applied to the plenary meetings of the Conference, and that it must be left to any committees that might be appointed to decide whether they wished to adopt the same rule.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring also to Rule 8, considered that the rule requiring a unanimous vote in order to allow a draft resolution or motion proposed at a meeting to be discussed and voted upon was too rigid. He suggested that the Conference might be willing to accept a majority vote in such a case.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the words " by unanimous vote " be amended to read " by a two-thirds majority ".

The President's proposal was adopted.

The Rules of Procedure, as amended, were unanimously adopted (Annex 2, page 184).

The PRESIDENT said that, should any question of procedure arise which was not provided for by the Rules of Procedure, the Conference would apply by analogy the Rules of Procedure of the Assembly of the League of Nations.

5. Appointment of the General Rapporteur of the Conference.

M. PELLA (Roumania) *was appointed General Rapporteur of the Conference.*

6. Appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference.

M. PODESTA COSTA, Legal Adviser of the League of Nations, *was appointed Secretary-General of the Conference.*

SECOND MEETING.

Held on Monday, November 1st, 1937, at 4 p.m.

President: Count CARTON DE WIART.

7. Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Credentials of the Delegates.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela), Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee on Credentials, read the following report:

" The Committee appointed by the Conference on the International Repression of Terrorism to verify the credentials of delegates met on November 1st, 1937, at 3 p.m. in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, and appointed me Chairman and Rapporteur.

" The Committee proceeded to consider the documents submitted as credentials by the delegations taking part in the Conference, as communicated to the Committee by the Secretariat of the League.

" I.

" The Committee found that the delegates of the following States had submitted powers emanating from a Head of State, Minister for Foreign Affairs or an authority having similar or equivalent competence:

" Argentine Republic, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Greece, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Roumania, San Marino, Spain, Venezuela.

" The powers in question in the case of these countries relate both to negotiations and to the signature of any act resulting therefrom.

" II.

" The delegates of the following States have submitted powers emanating from a Head of State, Minister for Foreign Affairs or an authority having similar or equivalent competence, entitling them to take part in the Conference:

" Belgium, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Denmark, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland.

" III.

" The Turkish delegation has been accredited by telegram from the Minister for Foreign Affairs to take part in the Conference and to sign any acts resulting therefrom.

" The Committee is unable to decide whether the powers of the delegates of the States above mentioned in Sections II and III can be interpreted as authorising the delegates in question to sign acts resulting from the Conference. It accordingly requests the Conference to invite the said delegates to state in what sense their powers should be interpreted.

" IV.

" The delegations of the following States have been accredited to represent their respective countries at the Conference by telegrams from their Ministers for Foreign Affairs or by letter from their permanent delegates accredited to the League of Nations, or by letters from the delegates to the Conference themselves :

" Albania, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Haiti, Hungary, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

" The Committee ventures to propose that the Conference should authorise delegates of the above category of States to take part in the Conference, at the same time requesting them to submit subsequently powers in good and due form.

* * *

" The Consul of the United States of Brazil has notified the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that his Government has appointed an Observer to attend the Conference.

* * *

" The Committee draws attention to the necessity of all delegates not provided with the requisite powers for the signature of acts of the Conference forwarding the necessary documents to the Secretariat at the earliest possible date, so as to facilitate the work of the Conference."

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was somewhat at a loss as to the effect of the classification adopted by the Committee on Credentials. In his opinion, full powers emanating from a Head of State or from a Minister for Foreign Affairs must be valid, no matter how they were transmitted. There was, therefore, no reason for establishing a distinction between delegations whose full powers had been communicated by letter and delegations accredited by telegram.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela), Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee on Credentials, referred the Conference to the practice adopted by the League in similar cases. No doubt there were strong presumptions in favour of the validity of full powers transmitted by telegram; but from a strictly legal point of view a telegram could not have the same force as a document in writing. It was customary to make that distinction at League Conferences and Assemblies; the Committee on Credentials had followed the established practice in the matter.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked M. Parra-Pérez for his explanations. Nevertheless, a distinction must be made between participation in the work of the Conference and the signing of acts. He understood that, for the signing of acts, credentials in writing were necessary; but, in his view, telegraphic credentials should be sufficient to enable delegates to take part in the work of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT did not think that the question raised was of much practical importance. It was obvious that delegations with telegraphic credentials were entitled to participate in the work of the Conference on the same footing as those who had presented credentials in writing.

The report of the Committee on Credentials was adopted.

8. Election of Members of the Bureau of the Conference.

On the proposal of the President, *the Conference appointed as members of the Bureau :* Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom), M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands), M. KOMARNICKI (Poland), M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) and M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

9. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court[1]: General Discussion.

The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the principles underlying the draft Conventions before the Conference.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that His Majesty's Government, after pointing out in its observations to the League of Nations on August 13th, 1936,[2] certain difficulties

[1] For the text of the draft Conventions, see Annex 3, pages 186 and 191.
[2] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 4.

raised by the original draft of the Convention for the International Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, had given its closest attention to the views expressed by other Governments.

In the view of His Majesty's Government, it was an existing principle of international law, recognised in Article 1 of the draft Convention, that all States should refrain from encouraging or facilitating in any way terrorist activities in another State. His Majesty's Government attached the greatest importance to a strict observance of that principle.

In the United Kingdom, the existing arrangements had been found sufficient to enable the authorities to deal with any attempt in the United Kingdom to promote terrorist activities in another country.

His Majesty's Government was willing and anxious that the question whether any Convention could usefully be drafted to secure improved co-operation between States in that matter should be explored.

His Majesty's Government had given very careful attention to the proposals of the Committee as well as to the views expressed by other Governments. Many States might find a Convention on the lines suggested by the Committee of Experts a useful step towards international co-operation in that matter. While His Majesty's Government was most anxious to abstain from any step which would hinder the achievement of that object, it had come to the conclusion that, as far as the United Kingdom was concerned, the difficulties of dealing with the matter on the lines suggested in certain articles of the draft Convention would be grave. Those difficulties were perhaps greater in the United Kingdom than in many other countries.

While the existing law of the United Kingdom was thought to be sufficient to enable effective steps to be taken for dealing with such activities, that result was attained by methods different from those proposed in the draft Convention. Before His Majesty's Government could ratify a convention on the lines suggested in the draft, changes of a very substantial character would be necessary in the form of the criminal law. Legislation for that purpose would involve departures from British traditions, which the people of the United Kingdom would be reluctant to accept. The fact that there was no practical need in the United Kingdom for such changes would make it extremely difficult to ask Parliament to approve the necessary legislation.

One difficulty in the way of such legislation would be that it would raise the question of restricting the free expression of public opinion which, especially in the political sphere, had for centuries been zealously safeguarded in Great Britain.

Moreover, English criminal jurisprudence followed the territorial principle. Exceptions to that principle were limited, and any proposal which might seem to extend their scope would not secure general approval in the absence of any circumstances clearly calling for such a change.

The export of fire-arms, etc., was regulated by an export licensing system; and, if at any time the existing law should be found insufficient, the natural course in the United Kingdom would be to take the necessary legislative measures to stop any gaps by amendments of the existing system.

His Majesty's Government had also given careful consideration to the proposal in the draft Convention relating to extradition. As already pointed out in His Majesty's Government's observations to the League on August 13th, 1936,[1] it was precluded from surrendering persons in respect of political offences; and extradition treaties with other States always contained an exception in respect of such offences. English courts placed, however, in that connection a very narrow construction upon offences of a political character. His Majesty's Government was only authorised by the legislature to grant extradition in respect of limited classes of crimes, and it felt unable to ask Parliament to extend those classes. The United Kingdom had already concluded extradition treaties with the great majority of States; and those treaties ordinarily provided for the surrender of persons accused or convicted of the crimes of murder, causing grievous bodily harm and damage to property.

His Majesty's Government therefore wished to have an opportunity, after the termination of the Conference, to study the text of any convention which might be drawn up, with a view to considering whether it could later become a party to that convention.

His Majesty's Government had sympathetically considered the proposed Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, but was of opinion that the time had not yet arrived for the creation of such a Court. There would appear to His Majesty's Government to be no general analogy between the Permanent Court of International Justice and the proposed International Criminal Court. While the existing Court applied recognised rules of international law, the judgments of the proposed Court would be dependent on the national law to be applied in the particular case. The administration of criminal justice reflected the national traditions of the different peoples, and it did not appear possible to bring them into unison at the present time. It was also felt that the work which the proposed Court would perform could generally be done more efficiently by national courts. In those circumstances, His Majesty's Government did not see its way to participate in any proposal for an International Criminal Court.

---

[1] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 4.

So far as His Majesty's Government could foresee, the Court, being limited to one class of crime only, would seldom be used; and it was doubtful whether the creation of such a Court would at the present time be conducive to improved international co-operation. In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, harm was done to international institutions generally by the establishment of an institution not supported by the general assent of public opinion. His Majesty's Government accordingly suggested that the proposal to link such a Court with the League of Nations should, for the time being at any rate, be abandoned. His Majesty's Government had, however, no desire to hamper the creation of such a Court by the action of those States which viewed its institution with favour, so long as the Court had no organic connection with the League.

M. BACHKE (Norway) said that the Norwegian Government accepted the main principles embodied in the revised draft of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism; but it felt obliged to repeat the remarks and reservations already made by the Norwegian delegation during the discussion in the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly,[1] and in the letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the League by the Norwegian Government on July 20th, 1936.[2]

The Norwegian Government noted with satisfaction that account had been taken, in the revised draft, of the observations submitted by the Norwegian delegation and by certain other countries in regard to the rules concerning extradition. As set forth in the new draft—namely, with the reservation expressed in Article 7, paragraph 4—the said rules were acceptable to the Norwegian Government. The Norwegian delegation was concerned to point out that one of the essential conditions for the accession of Norway to the Convention was that the Convention must not oblige the signatories to grant extradition where extradition was contrary to Norwegian legislation on the subject. Moreover, the Norwegian Government interpreted the Convention to mean that the rules set forth in Articles 8, 9 and 10 of the draft in regard to the obligation to punish so-called acts of terrorism were limited in their application in the same manner as the obligation to extradite criminals in connection with political offences.

In regard to the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, the Norwegian Government had already stated that it could not, for reasons of principle, accede to such a Convention.[3]

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that, in current usage, the term " terrorism ", both in the Latin and other languages, had always been taken to refer to a particular group of offences, acts of violence committed, with intent to intimidate, against persons and property; but the offences in question had never been precisely defined. In the absence of any legal definition, psychological interpretations of the term had held the field, and had led (as was to be expected) to misunderstandings.

The term " terrorism " was also current in the theory of criminal law, though again no attempt had ever been made to define it. There was, in fact, no need for a definition, inasmuch as the codes contained no category of offences described as " terrorist ".

Neither did the codes, it would be remembered, specially cover political offences. As, however, such offences involved a number of legal consequences, both in municipal and in international law, attempts had been made by legal theorists to define such offences.

If only for that reason—as also in consequence of the repeated commission, during the last ten years, of acts of terrorism—criminal law theorists had turned their attention to the subject of terrorism, and had endeavoured to define it in its various forms. In particular, the International Office for the Unification of Criminal Law, at its Conferences, had encouraged research in this field. The last of these Conferences, held at Copenhagen in 1935, had evolved the draft of an enactment on terrorism. The ground had thus been cleared, though no wholly satisfactory result in the matter had been attained.

The League of Nations Committee on Terrorism had turned this work to account and, after long deliberations, had succeeded in submitting to the present Conference a text which was judiciously drafted. The search for the truth in this matter of terrorism had lasted a long time; but sufficient information was at last available to enable a definitive legal text to be drafted.

A most unhappy event in the history of Yugoslavia, the death of the heroic martyr-king Alexander I at the hand of a terrorist, was closely connected with the renewed attention paid to the theoretical and legislative aspects of the problem of terrorist offences. It was in tribute to the memory of a great king, as well as of the great French statesman, M. Barthou, who died at his side, that the League of Nations had taken steps to prepare a draft Convention for the international organisation of the campaign against terrorism. The Government of Yugoslavia had assisted in the completion of the French Government's draft;[4] and the Governments represented on the Committee had also assisted in the study of the question. The Yugoslav delegation was grateful to them for their assistance; and the Office for the Unification of Criminal Law would undoubtedly welcome the official continuance of these efforts to establish rules of law on this delicate subject.

It was not sufficient, in order to arrive at a clear and accurate picture of terrorism, to define its different forms. It was necessary, in the first place, to define terrorism in general, by establishing the elements common to every particular form of terrorism. That was such a highly delicate matter, that a definition must be given in the legislative text itself. It was not possible to leave the lawyers to evolve a definition without any legal basis.

---

[1] See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 156, pages 37, 50, 54 and 61.
[2] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 9.
[3] *Ibid.*, page 10.
[4] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 22.

The Committee, following upon the discussion on terrorism in the Copenhagen Conference on the unification of criminal law, had done well in defining Article 1 of the draft.

It would perhaps be useful to take into account also the subjective element, and thus to define at the same time, either separately or in one and the same definition, what was meant by the term " terrorist ".

Articles 2, 3, 12 and 13 of the draft specified different forms of terrorism, direct, indirect and preparatory. The discussion on the texts would show whether that list of offences was or was not, complete.

In this matter of terrorism, the problem of extradition was a very difficult one. But it had obviously been studied with great care by the Committee; and the solution proposed had at least been formulated in precise terms.

In general, it might be said that the draft submitted afforded a solid basis for a successful issue to the Conference's work. On behalf of the Yugoslav delegation, M. Givanovitch thanked the Committee of experts for its work.

Sir Denys BRAY (India) said that the Government of India, while unable to associate itself with the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, was in accord with the general principles of the draft Convention for the International Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. The Government of India had felt very deeply the great tragedy in which the Convention had its origin, which had been so movingly referred to by the delegate of Yugoslavia. It also felt deeply that it was incumbent upon the nations to take up as far as possible a concerted attitude against terrorist activities.

The new draft was a great improvement on that discussed the previous year in the First Committee. Certain ambiguities and difficulties had been removed and the draft Convention appeared to offer a businesslike basis for the deliberations of the Conference. Some difficulties and inadequacies no doubt remained; in particular, the Government of India was most anxious to see the control of easily concealed fire-arms tightened up.

It was in the sincere hope that there would emerge from the deliberations of the Conference a draft Convention acceptable to the Government of India and to a large body of nations that the Indian delegation would take part in the proceedings.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) said that the Government of the Netherlands regarded the fact of its being represented at the Conference as a proof of its desire to co-operate in a positive manner in the work of the Conference, including the drafting of a Convention.

By sending representatives to the Conference, the Netherlands had therefore given evidence of its desire to participate in the campaign against international disturbances and terrorism. The existing Netherlands institutions furnished the necessary means for action in Netherlands territory; but, if there was a need for an international agreement, the Netherlands Government was certainly ready to take its part in the discussions, subject to the right to discuss details, ask for explanations or propose amendments.

The Netherlands Government attached particular importance to the legal problem of extradition, and it wanted to be sure that any international provisions which might be adopted would not in practice give rise to difficulties for the Governments in the matter of extradition. The Netherlands Government made reservations, not only in respect of the question of law, but also in respect of its existing practice; its reservation applied, not only to questions of extradition properly so called, but also to cognate questions, such as letters of request (rogatory commissions) and police reports. The Netherlands delegation would require more definite information on those points.

In regard to the International Criminal Court, the Government of the Netherlands had already expressed the opinion in its written communications [1] that the said Court might serve a useful purpose in the international field and had stated that it was ready to examine in a constructive spirit, and to support in principle, the proposals made in that connection. It was even of the opinion that, if such a Court were instituted, it seemed essential that it should find a place within the framework of the League. Such an arrangement would be to its advantage as emphasising its international character. M. van Hamel added that the Netherlands Government attached so much importance to the creation of an International Criminal Court that it had proposed, in its written communications, the insertion in the Convention itself of a provision making the application of the first Convention conditional on reciprocity in respect of the second. He reserved the right to revert to that point in the course of the discussion.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that the Royal Hungarian Government accepted as a basis for discussion the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, in the form in which it had emerged from the latest deliberations of the Committee of Experts. The Hungarian Government was convinced that the Conference, in following the lines laid down in that draft, would not only be taking a step forward on behalf of international co-operation in the field of criminal law, but would also be performing a task of great value in view of existing conditions in Europe.

As to the second draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, the Hungarian Government had on several occasions already stated its attitude as regards the principle. It was, for the time being, opposed to the creation of such a Court [2]: but that did not by any

---

[1] Documents A.7.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), page 14, and A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 10.

[2] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 5.

means imply that Hungary intended to do anything to prevent the creation of the Court. On the contrary, the Hungarian delegation would offer its technical co-operation in the drafting and preparation of the text of a Convention on the subject.

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

THIRD MEETING.

Held on Tuesday, November 2nd, 1937, at 10.30 a.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

10. Representation of Uruguay at the Conference: Communication by the President.

The PRESIDENT said that he had received a telegram from M. Guani, delegate of Uruguay, apologising for his absence and explaining that reasons of health prevented him from being present at the first few meetings of the Conference.

11. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court[1]: General Discussion (continuation).

M. CHATELAIN (Haiti) said that, as he had not yet received any special instructions from his Government, his observations would be purely personal. Since, however, he was thoroughly conversant with the principles underlying the penal legislation of his country and with the main lines of Haiti's policy, it was most probable that his views would be found to coincide with those of the Government as well as of the legislative authorities and the judicature of Haiti.

He had examined with the greatest interest the two draft Conventions which the Conference was called upon to discuss. He felt most fully in sympathy with the first of those drafts. It was, in his opinion, capable of immediate realisation and its adoption would seem to be a matter of urgency, in view of the existing circumstances and of the nature of the acts which were to be prevented and punished. It was based on the idea of international co-operation in the repression of terrorism. No Government worthy of the name could remain indifferent to such a cause. The interdependence of States existed not only in economic, social and intellectual matters but also in the sphere of internal peace and security; so true was this that it was no exaggeration to say that to co-operate in the repression of acts which disturbed, or were capable of disturbing, internal peace and security was at the same time to co-operate in the maintenance of international order.

No doubt some of the clauses of the draft Convention might be at variance with the traditions of certain countries or with the principles of their public law : he alluded more particularly to the clauses concerning extradition, which was not generally admitted, and which the Republic of Haiti did not itself admit, in the case of acts of a political character. Since, however, the purpose was to protect and defend the very life and structure of the State, and since terrorist acts, as had been so truly said, constituted crimes against civilisation, they should, in virtue of the claims of international solidarity, be excluded from the category to which he had referred. Thus, delinquents would never be able to count on impunity, but would always be tried or extradited by the State on whose territory they might happen to be.

M. Chatelain was not, however, a supporter of the plan for an International Criminal Court; however legitimate the reasons adduced in favour of its creation might seem to him to be, the advantages of the scheme did not, in his view, make up for its drawbacks. The length of time required before such a Court—which would be permanent only in name—could get to work would, in the majority of cases, involve the loss or deterioration of material evidence and would not always permit of witnesses being heard. Moreover, the Court would be very expensive to maintain, and difficulties would be encountered in practice as regards, for example, the recovery of costs chargeable to the participating nations, or the choice of judges, for whom certain nations would certainly claim equality of treatment which it would be impossible to ensure.

In conclusion, M. Chatelain repeated that his remarks were in no way binding on his Government, and that the instructions which he might receive might make it necessary for him to modify his attitude.

M. KOMARNICKI (Poland) reminded the Conference of the resolution of the Council of the League of Nations, dated December 10th, 1934,[2] which had inaugurated the work of the special Committee appointed to study the question of " drawing up a preliminary draft of an international convention to assure the repression of conspiracies or crimes committed with a *political* and terrorist purpose ". The Polish Government had greeted with the deepest sympathy and the keenest interest the proposal of the French Government[3] which had formed the basis of that Council

---

[1] For the text of draft Conventions, see Annex 3, pages 186 and 191.
[2] See *Official Journal*, December 1934 (Part II), page 1760. (See also Annex 1, page 183.)
[3] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 22.

resolution. Poland's constructive attitude towards the problem had been reflected in her representatives' active participation in the three sessions of the Committee and in the observations which the Polish Government had forwarded to the League of Nations Secretariat.[1]

The problem was one of great practical importance, involving as it did not merely the internal repression of a certain category of illicit acts, but also the organisation of international co-operation for the prevention and punishment of terrorist conspiracies the repercussions of which were calculated to disturb good relations between the peoples. Those considerations and the general reprobation of terrorist crimes in all civilised countries constituted full justification for exceptions to the right of asylum, which for Poland as for the other States, nevertheless constituted one of the most eminent principles of public law.

The Polish Government had co-operated most sincerely in examining the various aspects—some very delicate—of that complex problem, realising that a convention had to be prepared the object of which, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations of October 10th, 1936, was as follows:

> " (1) To prohibit *any* form of preparation or execution of terrorist outrages upon the life or liberty of persons taking part in the work of foreign public authorities and services;
>
> " (2) To ensure the *effective* prevention of such outrages and in particular, to establish collaboration to facilitate *early* discovery of preparations for such outrages;
>
> " (3) To ensure *punishment* of outrages of a terrorist character in the strict sense of the word which have an international character either in virtue of the place in which preparations for them were made or the place in which they were carried out, or in virtue of the nationality of those participating in them or their victims."

Poland, it might be noted, like all the other countries, possessed adequate laws for the repression of terrorist conspiracies on her own territory. The Convention which it was now proposed to conclude under the League's auspices should, in the Polish Government's view, contribute something really new to the existing situation, and should, in particular, make it impossible for terrorist crimes to go unpunished. That purpose might be achieved by incorporating in the Convention the principle that a criminal must either be tried by the country in the territory of which he had sought refuge or must be extradited and transferred to the authorities of the country against which his crime was directed.

The Polish Government noted with regret that the draft framed at the Committee's third session now contained very little trace of the principle *aut dedere aut judicare*, which should have been the keystone of the whole Convention.

The obligation to extradite was so hemmed in by restrictions and conditions that the adoption of the draft would, in point of fact, produce no change in the existing situation; as to the obligation to try the accused in case of non-extradition, that was not even made explicitly compulsory.

The Polish delegation would do its best to have the present draft amended, in order to make it really operative; and the delegation's final attitude towards the Convention would depend upon the efficacy of the provisions of that instrument.

The Polish delegation desired also to stress the principle of the equality of the obligations stipulated in the proposed Convention. It seemed out of the question that certain signatories should be required to assume more far-reaching obligations than others simply by reason of the fact that the legislation of certain countries provided for institutions which other countries had not thought fit to adopt.

M. Komarnicki would offer no comment on the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, as the Polish Government did not propose to accede to any such Convention. Poland, however, did not in any way intend that her attitude should prevent other countries from organising an International Court or recognising its jurisdiction as between themselves. At the same time, the Polish Government desired to state explicitly that it could not allow the existence of the Court to affect in any way the obligations entered into in virtue of the principal Convention.

The Polish Government hoped that the observations just submitted on its behalf and any further observations that the Polish delegation might think fit to make in the course of the discussion would result in the draft Convention being amended in a way which would enable Poland to accede to it. It was the more anxious that this should be so, as it was convinced that the problem was one of the utmost gravity and that it ought to be settled on international lines.

M. BASDEVANT (France) referred to the position of principle adopted by the French Government towards the two draft Conventions. There was no need, he said, to emphasise the importance which France attached to the international repression of terrorism. The action taken by the French Government on December 9th, 1934,[2] in laying before the Council of the League of Nations a proposal for an international agreement for the repression of terrorism, and the circumstances in which that action had been taken, would be recalled by everyone. The French Government had followed with the keenest interest and closest attention the proceedings of the three sessions of the Preparatory Committee. Its interest in the discussions concerning the framing of a Convention for the international repression of terrorism was not purely " personal ", but had in view rather the general interests of society. The problem was one of international co-operation, and that was the aspect under which the question must be considered. That, moreover, was how it had been considered up to the present. The utility of international co-operation in the matter had repeatedly been emphasised since the opening of the Conference.

---

[1] Document A.24.*(a)* 1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.7), page 1.
[2] See *Official Journal*, December 1934 (Part II), pages 1739 and 1839.

Two draft Conventions had been submitted to the Conference. The French Government was prepared to approve, in principle, both those drafts. That did not mean, however, that it might not wish to discuss particular provisions, or to examine specific proposals. The text of the proposed Conventions must be most exhaustively studied by the Conference. The French Government was prepared, however, to assent at once to the principles and general policy underlying the two drafts.

The draft Convention dealing more directly with the prevention and punishment of terrorism was held by some to be somewhat limited in scope, in that it contained an undertaking by States to do what they were doing already in virtue of their own legislation or by reason of the responsibility which they felt for repressing crime in its various forms. Some, indeed, might consider the draft inadequate. It was understood that any suggestions that might be submitted with a view to extending its scope must be very carefully examined. But limited though it was, and even though it did not go far beyond the existing national laws, the draft might serve a useful purpose, for it was only right, in a matter for which international co-operation was essential, that the form of that co-operation should be settled in advance; it was right that it should be settled by means of provisions which had already been embodied in the various legislations, by provisions which, on that account, did not appear to introduce any new and imperative idea; it was right that existing tendencies should be duly incorporated and a policy laid down. The progress of law was not achieved simply by means of imperative provisions.

All the clauses of the first draft Convention had one common aim—to establish and regulate international co-operation with a view to preventing and punishing terrorist crimes of an international character. That point had claimed the particular attention of the First Committee in 1936,[1] and that point stood out clearly now in the present text of the draft : the purpose in view was the repression of terrorist crimes of an international character. No objections had been raised to the principle of international co-operation on those lines. The only point to be decided was whether such collaboration was adequately provided for, whether everything that was desirable and possible was being done, whether some proposals might not be going too far, with the resulting danger that they might conflict with the imperative provisions of this or that national legislation.

The point just referred to touched on the substance of the problem. Agreement had been reached as to the principle. The problem was how that proposed international co-operation could be most suitably regulated; and, if successful results were to be achieved, it was essential not to conflict with anything in a given country that might appear to be of capital importance in the eyes of that country. In the realm of pure reason, disregarding contingent possibilities, it was possible to fix on this or that absolute conception, a system of universal repression, which might find supporters, perhaps many supporters, in an international congress for the study of questions of penal law. But the members of the present Conference must descend from the realm of pure reason to that of practical politics; they must take account of possibilities and establish a system of international co-operation. They must therefore call upon the goodwill that existed and take into account the possibilities open to each of those countries whose co-operation was desired. In other words, it was essential, in the proposed Convention, to avoid any conflict with what might appear to a given country to be of capital importance, even if that country's prejudices appeared to be unjustified. The main purpose of the Conference was, it would seem, to consider carefully whether or not the draft conflicted with anything of essential import in any particular country, and to adjust the draft by reference to the conclusions that the Conference might reach on that point. In that connection, two main aspects of the draft would have to be considered.

In the first place, seeing that what was contemplated was terrorist acts of an international character which the contracting States were to be under an obligation to repress, would that obligation exist irrespective of the place in which the act had been committed?

Certain countries attached particular importance, from the point of view of penal repression, to the territorial principle. With certain limited exceptions, they did not punish crimes committed abroad, but only crimes committed on the territory of the State. Articles 2 and 3 of the draft Convention now before the Conference, which specified the acts which the contracting States undertook to repress, declared specifically that it was acts committed on its own territory that the State in question undertook to punish.

The penalty laid down in Article 9 for acts committed abroad by foreigners was, moreover, attended by guarantees which appeared to leave intact the principle of territoriality for States which clung to that principle. That, no doubt, was a point in regard to which some might consider the Convention inadequate if concluded on the bases now indicated. But the draft did at least possess one merit, in that it did not conflict with certain conceptions which States considered essential in the matter of penal repression.

The second point regarding which fundamental conceptions must be taken into account was the question of extradition, which had been raised both in Governments' observations and, more particularly, during the discussion in the First Committee of the Assembly in 1936. Many countries felt that they could not grant extradition for political acts. M. Basdevant did not propose to consider at that juncture what was the precise purpose of excluding political acts; he merely noted that that was a point to which many States attached very great importance. There, again, conflicting notions were no doubt apparent. Some might think that the complete efficacy of anti-terrorist measures should imply the relinquishment of the conception of non-extradition for political crimes. But it must not be forgotten—that fact had been stated very plainly in the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly—that there were many countries which were absolutely determined to maintain the principle of non-extradition for political acts. That was one of the realities that must be taken into account.

Perhaps the text prepared by the Committee of Experts had not given sufficient consideration to those realities; it had not been sufficiently clear to prevent a divergency of views. It had been

[1] See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 156.

interpreted in opposite senses, and that was the origin of the debate in the First Committee of the Assembly. But, after that discussion, the text had been revised and rectified. It now left each State free to adopt its own attitude regarding non-extradition for political crimes. The text, as newly drafted, would thus appear to satisfy the preoccupations of certain States. It was clear from the observations already sumbitted at the Conference that that conciliatory attitude had been appreciated and that, where objections had previously been encountered, objections no longer existed to-day.

Such, as regards the essential points, were the general bases of the first draft Convention. The French Government was of opinion that, without going as far as was theoretically possible, the draft did at least establish between views which were opposed on certain points—although everyone was agreed as to the object in view—a *media sententia* which, in its opinion, might constitute a formula for an agreement that would prove a useful instrument of international co-operation. The draft was admittedly limited in scope; for that very reason, it could the more readily hope to win acceptance by Governments.

The second draft certainly could not be described as modest. On the contrary—as had already been made clear at the present Conference and previously in both the First Committee of the Assembly and the Committee of Experts—the scheme for the creation of an International Criminal Court, which was the subject of that draft, represented a bold innovation. It was its very boldness, indeed, which had caused misgiving, reservations and opposition. Such opposition however, had been manifested in a way which had given M. Basdevant particular satisfaction, because it was obviously not systematic; because, although it had been made clear that certain Governments were not inclined to subscribe to a Convention of that kind, they nevertheless either recognised its importance and appreciated its purpose and the motives of its sponsors, or, at the very least, were unwilling to stand in the way of other Governments which might desire to become parties to such an agreement.

To propose the creation of an International Court with jurisdiction over terrorist offences was unquestionably a bold innovation. In certain quarters, no doubt, such boldness had been carried to still greater lengths and there had even been suggestions—although quite unconnected with the work of the present Conference—for the creation of some kind of criminal court with jurisdiction over the offences of the States themselves. That, however, was not the present purpose; nor, indeed, could the jurisdiction at present under consideration be used to lead up to that to which reference might from time to time have been made. The purpose of the present scheme was not the trial of States, which hitherto were not amenable to any criminal jurisdiction; but solely the trial of individuals already fully subject to criminal jurisdiction, of individuals proceeded against for terrorist offences, of individuals subject to the jurisdiction of national courts, for which it was now proposed to substitute an international court.

Such a proposal undoubtedly represented a radical change, a daring reform, a great innovation; but, at the same time, it was clear that the scheme was solely concerned with the trial of persons who must be tried, and that the sole question was the manner of their trial. Was it to be by a national court, as had always been the case in the past, or by a court of some other character—that was to say, a court set up under an international agreement and composed of judges of different nationalities? That this was an innovation could not be questioned, but it was much less radical than that contemplated in certain quarters.

The proposed innovation had given rise to various objections. By some it was regarded as compromising the principle that no man may be removed from the jurisdiction of the courts to which he is normally subject—a principle which M. Basdevant himself would be the last to contemn, as he knew it to be the very foundation of modern liberty. But what was the precise import of that principle? It meant the setting aside, the rejection, of what was sometimes called " trial by commission "—that was to say, trial by a body of so-called judges specially constituted to try a given offence and set up after the fact. Such, however, was not in any sense the purpose of the present proposal which, on the contrary, aimed at the constitution in advance—some might say, on paper —of a court whose composition would be such as to afford the fullest guarantees—that no one could deny—of competence and impartiality. That was far removed from the procedure to which he had just referred. Such being the case, M. Basdevant considered that the first objection was really unfounded.

A country might, indeed, object with much greater force that, having confidence in its own judges, it was unwilling to deprive them of jurisdiction over a case which should properly come before them. That was an attitude which he could well understand, and an attitude which was eminently worthy of respect, and which he himself, in fact, respected. M. Basdevant pointed out, moreover, that the draft Convention also respected that attitude, as it provided that the reference of cases to the International Court should be optional. It would be for the Governments themselves to decide whether or not they would follow such a course.

What could be their reasons for so doing? What purpose would be served by recourse to that tribunal? It must be recognised that the circumstances attaching to terrorist offences might be very different. In certain cases, their punishment could without disadvantage be left to the ordinary courts. In other cases, however, the punishment of such offences by the ordinary courts, the methods of procedure of such courts, their view of the possibly complicated circumstances of the case before them, the perhaps doubtful authenticity of the evidence and the nature of the judgment rendered, might be viewed in a different light in different countries. Indeed, the court's decision in such a case might well lead to political tension between the country affected by the terrorist offences and the country in which judgment was passed.

It was in view of cases of this kind that, for the sake of good understanding between nations, it might be desirable to send the offender for trial before judges whose impartiality and independence were beyond question, and it was for that reason that the draft Convention provided that recourse to the International Court should be optional.

Such a proposal no doubt represented an innovation and it was probably for that reason that there was some reluctance to accept it; that was probably the real objection of those who did not wish to have anything to do with the second draft. The degree of favour with which one viewed an innovation depended no doubt on one's state of mind and also on circumstances. It was true that this second proposal was an innovation, but an innovation introduced in such a way as not to interfere with anybody because of its optional character, and also because it was perfectly conceivable that the various States should choose their own time for entering the system for which the Convention provided. That was why the matter was dealt with in a separate draft. The innovation was undeniable, but M. Basdevant would ask those who were unwilling to support it and to bring the scheme into operation, those, in short, who were not prepared to send a case falling within the jurisdiction of their national courts before an international tribunal, to give this innovation a fair trial and let the future decide who was right.

M. Basdevant was, moreover, optimistic as to the possibility of giving the scheme a fair trial because, in spite of the opposition to the principle involved and in spite of the objections raised in the Committee to the creation of an International Criminal Court, those from whom such opposition and objections came had co-operated most valuably in the elaboration of the draft now before the Conference. They had warned the advocates of an International Court of the objections which might be taken to various features of the scheme; they had themselves suggested amendments. They had been of great help in working out the text as it now stood and had therefore already been to some extent instrumental in giving the scheme the fair trial for which he had appealed. It was to be hoped that their willingness to co-operate had not ended with the Committee of Experts, and that it would be possible to carry the trial of the scheme still further.

Such, in essence, were the reasons for which the French Government, in principle, supported the two drafts now before the Conference.

At the previous meeting, emphasis had been laid upon the very great political importance of international co-operation in this matter. M. Basdevant agreed absolutely with what had been said, and would add that, in addition to its unquestionable political importance, he considered the present proposal to be of genuine moral importance also.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) recalled with what keen sympathy and satisfaction the Czechoslovak Government had received the French Government's proposals in 1934 for closer co-operation between civilised States in the campaign against terrorist acts. The Czechoslovak Government had at once realised that the principle underlying those proposals was the protection of the common heritage of the whole civilised world—security of life and limb, health, liberty and public property intended for the common use—against the criminal activities of certain terrorists. It had studied the possibilities of bringing all the Governments concerned into closer co-operation with a view to guarding against those dangers and also ways and means of establishing such co-operation.

As certain doubts had been cast on the international character of terrorist activities, M. Koukal would refer to some of the many precedents to be found both in the domestic legislation of the various States and in the Conventions regulating certain aspects of international relations. He recalled, in particular, that, since 1856, Belgian law had adopted a restrictive definition of political offences by which terrorist outrages were excluded; and the so-called " Belgian Clause " embodying that distinction had been subsequently included in hundreds of extradition Conventions and Treaties, so that it was now almost universally recognised. The substance of the Belgian Clause had also been embodied in Article 6 of the Model Convention drawn up by the Penitentiary Commission in 1931. The same clause was to be found in the Caracas Convention of 1911, the Bustamente Code (Article 355) and the Montevideo Convention. It might even be said that the Belgian Clause corresponded exactly to the provisions of Article 2, paragraphs 1 *(a)* and *(b)* of the draft Convention for the International Repression of Terrorism.

The Swiss Extradition Law of 1892 went even further : the Swiss Government was empowered to grant extradition for related offences when the ordinary criminal offences preponderated over the political offence.

In the Swedish Law of 1913 these two principles were combined. Attention should also be drawn to the German Extradition Law of 1929, Article 3 of which contained a provision authorising extradition for any intentional act directed against the lives of human beings, unless such act was committed in the course of an open conflict. Lastly, the French Extradition Law of 1924 authorised extradition for acts committed in the course of civil war, whenever such acts were characterised by vandalism or barbarism.

In view of these numerous precedents, the Czechoslovak Government had decided to contribute to the organisation of international action against terrorism, and on March 30th, 1937,[1] had submitted the observations which it thought appropriate.

M. Koukal expressed his appreciation of the work of the Committee of Experts which had achieved positive results, and stated that his Government accepted the draft Convention for the Repression of Terrorism as a basis for the elaboration of a final text.

Nor had the Czechoslovak Government overlooked the other aspect of the question—namely, the need for guarantees of impartial trial. Adequate guarantees must be given to those charged with, but not yet convicted of, terrorist acts, as well as to the injured States. Both must be convinced that justice would be done in an atmosphere of complete impartiality. That idea had been successfully embodied in the second draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. M. Koukal had listened with satisfaction to M. Basdevant's remarks on the provisions of that draft, and agreed with all that he had said. The Czechoslovak Government accepted the second draft Convention as a basis for discussion.

---

[1] Document C.194.M.139.1937.V.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his Government had shown keen interest in the initiative taken with a view to the international repression of terrorism. It considered that the two draft Conventions submitted to the Conference represented a remarkable collective effort and constituted a solid foundation for the Conference's work. While recognising the close connection between the first and second draft Conventions, the Soviet delegate did not think it either expedient or logical to establish an unbreakable link between those two texts. Accession to the Convention for the International Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism should not be made conditional upon accession to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

He was glad to note the desire for international co-operation revealed by the two drafts drawn up by the Committee of Experts, in whose work a Soviet representative had participated.

He reserved the right to submit, during the examination of the texts, certain observations or draft amendments defining the rights and obligations of the parties, in order to allay certain misgivings; those observations and amendments would not, however, diminish the efficacy of the Conventions.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) said that the competent Swiss authorities had found that the draft International Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism now before the Conference marked an advance over the previous one, in that its scope had been restricted and account had been taken of the remarks made at the 1936 League Assembly.

Nevertheless, the fundamental concept underlying the draft Convention to be found in Article 1, paragraph 1, was still too vague and was expressed in terms (such as " to create a state of terror ") with which Swiss federal legislation—and particularly the federal law on the use of explosive substances—was familiar, but which had been eliminated for practical reasons.

Moreover, in the opinion of the Swiss authorities, the scope of the draft was still too wide. Certain provisions relating to extradition did not seem to them acceptable.

Lastly, and chiefly, the position of Switzerland in the sphere of penal law was a very special one. There was every likelihood that a referendum would be asked for on the draft Unified Penal Code, which the Federal Chambers had at present under consideration and which would probably be finally adopted by Parliament in December. It was not easy to forecast the result of that referendum. If the people rejected the Unified Penal Code, the Confederation could hardly frame a special law in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. On the other hand, if the people accepted the Unified Penal Code, Switzerland, on the basis of that Code, could not fulfil all the obligations resulting from the Convention.

Consequently, Switzerland was not likely to be in a position to consider the possibility of signing the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Nevertheless, while bearing in mind the situation referred to above, the Swiss authorities would still be able to afford support in the administrative sphere. Switzerland, which had always combated subversive activities, was willing to afford assistance in the future to the same extent as in the past as regarded collaboration in police matters.

As to the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, Switzerland, from the outset of the work of the Committee of Experts, had never been able to accept the view that the creation of such a Court was necessary; but it would, of course, do nothing to thwart the desire of other countries to accede to that Convention.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) said that the Belgian Government reserved the right to accede to the international conventions which the Conference was about to discuss after it had examined them, thus availing itself of the possibility allowed to States under Articles 20 and 46 of the drafts, which provided that the Conventions could be signed until a certain date on behalf of any Member of the League and any non-member State represented at the Conference. This reservation did not mean, however, that the Belgian Government had any prejudice against the drafts, in the framing of which, moreover, the Belgian delegates had collaborated in the Committee of Experts under the chairmanship of Count Carton de Wiart. It was based solely on the desire to ascertain, before acceding to them, whether the Conventions resulting from the Conference's deliberations conflicted with any fundamental principle of Belgian legislation in the matter of international relations.

So far from this reservation implying any unfavourable attitude towards the drafts, the Belgian Government took a keen interest in them, the object of which was to develop international co-operation against crime. It would examine the Conventions with a sincere desire to contribute as fully as possible in any efforts made effectively to guarantee friendly international relations. Moreover, the Belgian delegation had been instructed to take an active part in the efforts made to ensure the success of the Conference, and to achieve the best possible results in the interests of peace. Further, how could it fail to accede in principle to a draft, Article 1 of which proclaimed that it was the duty of States to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State, and asserted that the object of the Convention was to ensure co-operation between States for the prevention and punishment of such acts when they were of an international character?

The Belgian delegate wished to stress the words " when they are of an international character ", because the stipulation that acts of terrorism must be of an international character in order to be covered by the Convention justified the framing of an international treaty directed against such acts—that was almost a truism—and met the objection that the majority of attempts on the lives of persons and attacks on property which constituted the external and criminal manifestations of acts of terrorism, were already provided for in most domestic laws. That applied to Belgium, as it did to the majority of civilised countries. But was not that also the case with other

international Conventions already concluded with a view to the more effectual punishment of other international crimes? There was, for instance, the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women. The punishment of those crimes, and certain manifestations of those crimes, such as the corruption of minors, the abduction of minors, offences against morals, etc., was already provided for by the municipal law of the various nations. It had nevertheless been found necessary to frame an international convention for the effective punishment of that odious traffic, the effects of which were mainly felt in the international sphere. There was, further, the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency. There again, municipal law had for a long time past made full provision for the punishment of the crime in question within the country. It had been found, however, that the crime of counterfeiting currency was chiefly committed in the international field and that it was impossible to ensure its effective suppression unless States concluded a treaty for the purpose. Such a treaty had fortunately been signed, so that it was possible to put a stop to that traffic, which did the greatest harm to States.

The same applied to terrorist outrages which, in the form of attempts on the lives of persons or attacks on property, revealed the existence of international criminal activities, the terrorists passing from one country to another with the greatest ease. They prepared the crime in one country, executed it in a second and took refuge in a third. But why, it was said, should crimes which were already punished as such, whether they were of a terrorist nature or not, be described as terrorism? The reply—which the members of the Conference had doubtless hit upon for themselves—was as follows : while extradition treaties provided for the effective punishment of those crimes when they were not of a terrorist nature, it had been found that they often went unpunished when they assumed a terrorist character. There were many reasons for this; M. Sasserath would merely mention the two or three principal ones.

The first two applied to all crimes whatsoever of an international character. They were not confined to crimes of terrorism. In the first place, the international police organisation was inadequate, or, to put it more accurately, there was an inadequate exchange of information between the police authorities of the different countries concerning the activities of individuals who were preparing outrages and concerning suspicious persons and their movements. There was therefore every reason for Article 15 of the draft, which provided that States acceding to the Convention for the prevention and punishment of terrorist activities should organise a systematic exchange of information between their respective police authorities, and no one could deny its utility.

There was a second reason which applied to all crimes of an international character as well as to crimes of terrorism—namely, the faulty, incomplete or dilatory execution of letters of request (rogatory commissions). It was for that reason that another article of the draft rightly provided that States which signed the Convention in question should execute fully and rapidly the letters of request sent to them by the magistrates entrusted with the investigation of the crimes covered by the Convention.

The third reason related more especially, if not exclusively, to terrorist outrages; it was that those outrages often went unpunished because the countries concerned did not agree as to their real nature. That consideration met the objection referred to above. The explanation was as follows : The members of the Conference knew that many countries—and Belgium was one of the foremost—firmly refused to grant extradition for a political crime. But certain aspects of terrorism were closely related to political crime. That was the difficulty. Nevertheless, there was no question, be it noted, of inducing supporters of the Convention to agree to extradition for political crimes if that were contrary to their laws or traditions. If such were the purpose of the Convention, Belgium assuredly could not accede. Moreover, if any States still felt uneasy on that point, there was a provision in Article 7, paragraph 4, which read : " The obligation to grant extradition under the present article shall be subject to any limitations recognised by the law of the country to which application is made ". Consequently, the different States still retained their sovereign right to examine each individual case, as was quite comprehensible, seeing that the question at issue was one of individual cases rather than one of principle. Obviously, it would be necessary, in each case, for a State to which application for extradition for a terrorist crime was made to consider whether, and to what extent, that crime was political in character.

The object of the two Conventions—that point could not be sufficiently emphasised in the early stages of the debate—was not to restrict the sovereignty of the contracting States, a position which no State would agree to, but, as far as possible, to avoid the scandal of impunity for certain international crimes of particular gravity and to do so within the scope of the sovereignty of States.

From a general consideration of the structure of the two Conventions—which, in reality, though not organically connected, were complementary to one another, since the Convention concerning the International Criminal Court was simply an instrument placed at the disposal of States which might care to use it as a means of enforcing the agreement between the signatories to the first Convention to prevent impunity for terrorist crimes—it would be seen that, when a terrorist crime was committed and the country of asylum was called upon to punish the crime, that country could either grant extradition or hand over for trial to its own national courts the individual accused of having committed a terrorist act on the territory of another State. It might, of course, happen that the State of asylum wished neither to hand over the accused nor to try him itself. That was what happened nowadays, and when it did happen it meant that a criminal was allowed to go unpunished; it meant impunity in favour of one who, nevertheless, had committed a crime of an extremely serious character, not only because it constituted an attack on the life and property of another, but also because the crime was calculated to cause international difficulties which might result in the direst catastrophe.

If the two drafts were accepted, it would mean, at all events for States acceding to the second Convention together with the first—which was quite optional—that, when a State a signatory to both Conventions wished neither to hand over a foreign individual who had committed a terrorist act on foreign territory nor to judge him itself, because it had no interest in the affair, it would have the right to hand over the delinquent to the International Criminal Court. It was quite conceivable, indeed, that a foreign individual who had committed a terrorist crime on foreign territory might be a source of serious international difficulty to the country of asylum. There was the danger, for example, that the criminal might be acquitted by the courts of the country of refuge or be given so negligible a sentence that the injured State would regard the punishment as quite inadequate. Such a situation might cause serious international difficulties or, at all events, difficulties of very serious import such as to disturb the good understanding between the two States in question. In such a case, why not make it, if not incumbent upon the State acceding to the International Criminal Court, at all events optional for that State, to hand over the accused to the International Criminal Court, which would mete out judgment with strict guarantees of impartiality?

There was no need, after M. Basdevant's excellent exposé, to do more than stress the point that the possibility of having recourse to the International Court was optional for States signatories to the Convention but was not in any sense obligatory. The reservations submitted by certain States—by Belgium for one—concerning the institution of an organ of international justice, which was in the nature of a bold innovation encroaching upon the age-long and exclusive character of national criminal jurisdiction, were quite understandable. But the fact had been overlooked that accession to the Convention instituting an International Criminal Court left the signatory States perfectly free to decide whether they would have recourse to it and that they would never be obliged to have recourse to it at the expense of their own national and domestic repressive institutions, so that there could never be any question of infringing the sovereignty of the contracting States.

Speaking in the name of Belgium, M. Sasserath trusted that the deliberations of the Conference would be entirely successful and would lead to a better reciprocal understanding between States and increase their esteem for and confidence in one another. He hoped that they might be able in that way to reinforce peace in an atmosphere of concord, and that they would manage to provide greater security against crime with the help of all men of good-will.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) said that the Spanish Government welcomed both draft Conventions, and had followed with the liveliest interest the process by which they had come into being. The Spanish Government was gratified to note the considerable progress made between the first study of the problem of terrorism by the International Office for the Unification of Criminal Law and its present discussion by the League. The Convention drawn up at the Madrid Conference in 1933 was not acceptable to certain countries, including Spain, which were precluded by their Constitutions from extraditing persons committing political—and even social—offences. But Spain was prepared to accept the draft Convention now before the Conference, provided the present text was not altered to such an extent as to render such acceptance impossible.

The Spanish delegation considered that the two terms " terrorism " and " extradition " called for precise definition.

It was impossible to find a definition of terrorism which was in no way subjective; but, if the conception of the term must to some extent be subjective, it was essential at any rate to eliminate from the definition any considerations of motive. That stipulation appeared to be met in Article 1 of the present draft, though it was possible that the present text might still be improved.

The second problem, that of extradition, was closely connected with the first. It was true that paragraph 4 of Article 7 left the country applied to free to establish restrictions; but that was not the point. What was important was that the Convention should be drafted in such a way as to allow of extradition by all States.

The draft therefore could still be improved, though the Spanish delegation had no objection to raise.

The Spanish Government supported the proposal for the creation of an International Criminal Court, and was in favour of discussing it. A number of objections had been raised against the creation of such a court since the opening of the Conference, as well as in the Committee of Experts and in the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly. It had been said, in particular, that care must be taken not to call into being an institution with precarious chances of survival. But that was not the only side to the question. It was true that the law ought to be in accordance with the stage of development of a people, and, in the present case, with the stage of development of the international community. But it must not be forgotten, on the other hand, that laws and conventions were in themselves educational. This proposal for the establishment of an International Criminal Court had been under consideration for a long time past. In the years immediately following on the world war, the suggestion had not only been met with sympathy, but was regarded as capable of realisation in the near future. Since then, the idea had been forgotten, until the French proposal in 1934 had brought it once more into prominence. The present was a happy moment for giving it a trial, as the French delegate had just said. As resort to the Court was not to be compulsory, it would soon be seen whether its existence was justified. If the answer were in the affirmative, its powers could be extended, and an increasing number of cases might then come before it. If the answer were in the negative, the new organ would disappear, and no harm would have been done in any direction.

On those grounds, the Spanish Government was prepared to sign both Conventions, subject to improvement where improvement was possible. The Spanish delegation believed that the application of the two draft Conventions would contribute to the progress of peace.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) said that the Venezuelan delegation's attitude during the discussions of the Conference would be in accordance with the standpoint indicated in the reply from the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General of the League of August 7th, 1936.[1] In that communication, the Venezuelan Government stated that it was in favour of the immediate conclusion of a Convention for the Prevention and Repression of Terrorism. Its attitude in regard to the proposal for the establishment of an International Criminal Court was somewhat more reserved. There was not, of course, the slightest objection on the part of Venezuela to other States giving the proposal what M. Basdevant had called a fair chance. The Venezuelan Government's attitude in the matter was, in short, rather expectant than definitely adverse.

The Venezuelan Government in its reply, had explained its point of view and had drawn attention to one consideration which might affect the application, under certain circumstances, of criminal law enactments in Venezuela. The Venezuelan Government had to bear in mind that, under the federal system of Venezuela, crimes and misdemeanours specified in the first draft Convention were justiciable by the separate courts of the several States belonging to the Union as courts of final instance. It was conceivable that difficulties might arise in that connection of which the Federal Government would have to take account. That consideration was one explanation of the reserved attitude of Venezuela in regard to the proposed Court.

The Venezuelan delegation was prepared to co-operate cordially in the discussion of the text. Its attitude in so doing was facilitated by the fact that the Venezuelan Criminal Code itself penalised severely the criminal acts in question.

In conclusion, the delegate of Venezuela explained that, in his country, the question of arms came under a special Law of 1928, which prohibited the import and manufacture of arms, trade in arms, and the possession or carrying of arms, whether fire-arms or side-arms.

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

FOURTH MEETING

Held on Tuesday, November 2nd, 1937, at 4 p.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

12. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court: [2] General Discussion (continuation).

M. RUÍZ GUIÑAZÚ (Argentine Republic) said that his country already possessed national laws adequate to ensure the repression of the punishable acts described as acts of terrorism, and had also signed international Conventions having the same object. The experience of the problem thus acquired entitled his Government to venture the statement that the first draft Convention submitted to the Conference was a document of undoubted value. The Argentine Government would therefore support the said draft as a whole.

Under Article 212 of the Argentine Penal Code, any person was liable to punishment who, without express permission, manufactured, sold, transported or concealed explosives or appliances and materials for their manufacture liable to cause damage. By a Convention concluded in 1932 with Peru, the contracting parties undertook to expel from their territory, in accordance with the procedure laid down by their respective national laws, individuals of foreign nationality whose presence was prejudicial to public order. Accordingly, under reciprocal terms, no person so expelled by one contracting party was allowed in the territory of the other contracting party, except nationals of the latter, whose admission could not be refused.

This principle found no place in the text submitted to the Conference, and M. Ruíz Guiñazú ventured to suggest that it might usefully be considered in connection with the present draft.

He further proposed that a provision should be included to the effect that " all parties to the Convention which do not possess laws regarding the admission and expulsion of foreigners or legislation for the prevention and punishment of offences committed against public order, shall undertake to promulgate the same as soon as possible ".

Again, the provisions to prevent extremist propaganda and the perpetration of the offences described in Articles 2 and 3 as acts of terrorism should include arrangements for the exchange of *état civil* papers, finger-prints and information regarding all aspects of the subject's past history on a scale still more complete than that proposed in Articles 11 to 15 of the draft, so as to cover, not only individuals, but also associations and groups unable to prove the legality of their establishment.

The Argentine authorities had dealt with this matter with complete impartiality and with a desire to co-operate with other countries, since, in America, where the right of asylum was interpreted in a more essentially humanitarian spirit than in Europe, it was not granted to terrorists because terrorism was not a political conception, but a method of action consisting in assassination, sequestration, incendiarism, bomb-throwing and the like. Lastly, a Convention to facilitate international police action had been signed by the Argentine Republic with Uruguay.

---

[1] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 12.
[2] For the text of the draft Conventions, see Annex 3, pages 186 and 191.

As to the second draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, M. Ruíz Guiñazú recognised its importance from the scientific point of view as also the weight of the theoretical arguments in favour of the creation of such a Court, and especially the force of M. Basdevant's advocacy : but he confessed that he still had certain misgivings on the subject.

If States fulfilled their obligations under the first Convention, there would be no ground for the intervention of the Court, since it was not proposed that it should take action under Article 9, except in cases where a State retained an offender and refused to bring him to trial on its own initiative.

The second draft Convention covered only terrorism : but it would appear illogical not to extend the proposed co-operation to other offences of an international type, such as piracy, the traffic in women and counterfeiting of currency, all of which were of at least as frequent occurrence as terrorist offences.

M. Ruíz Guiñazú noticed that Article 40 made provision for the obligatory establishment of a common fund to meet the expenses of the Court. The salaries of the judges were to be paid by the States of which they were nationals. The terms of that article and of Article 44, would involve the countries signing the Convention in pecuniary obligations of a quite indefinite character.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, speaking, in the first instance, as delegate of Roumania, stated that his Government gave its full support to the principles underlying the two draft Conventions. Provided those principles were not affected as a result of the discussion that was about to take place, he could say at once that Roumania was prepared to sign both the Convention for the Repression of Terrorism and that for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, the latter being regarded by the Roumanian Government as calculated to ensure impartial justice in cases of a particularly delicate nature.

In its first reply to the Secretary-General of the League, dated April 9th, 1935,[1] the Roumanian Government signified its full agreement with the French Government's proposals of December 1934 [2] for the creation of the Court.

M. Pella wished, moreover, to recall that, following upon the concepts he had himself propounded in 1919 regarding the creation of an international criminal jurisdiction and in accordance with the proposals he had made, since 1924, as Roumanian delegate at the various international conferences, the Roumanian Government had urged in 1928, before the ninth Assembly of the League, that jurisdiction in criminal matters should be granted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.[3]

Roumania had always looked upon an International Criminal Court as a necessary corollary to the contemporary movement in favour of inter-State criminal jurisdiction. As it had been observed, that movement " was destined to acquire increasing scope and force because it is in conformity with the evolution of law in all human communities ".[1]

As regards the first Convention, that relating to terrorism, M. Pella need only say that, long before the grave events which had obliged the League to concern itself with the problem, the Roumanian Government, in a communication addressed to the Secretary-General of the League on November 20th, 1926, had proposed that an International Convention should be drawn up to universalise the repression of terrorism.[4]

M. Pella proceeded next, in his capacity as Rapporteur, to discuss the various points of view which had been expressed during the general discussion.

On the primary issue of the legal conception of terrorism, he shared the views of M. Givanovitch, M. Sasserath and Professor Jiménez de Asúa. It was evident that, while one might have quite a clear idea as to what constituted an act of terrorism, it was not easy to find a legal definition for the term. Terrorism was not so much an offence *sui generis*—that was to say, an offence having characteristics which were invariably the same—as a manifestation *sui generis* of criminality, taking the form of a variety of crimes and offences, all of which were punishable at the present time under the criminal laws of most countries.

A study of the draft drawn up in 1935 [5] by the Committee of Jurists appointed by the League Council, of the second draft drawn up in 1936 [6] and of the third draft of 1937 [7] would reveal the difficulties the Committee had had to overcome in its attempts to define the characteristic features which differentiated any particular crime or offence as an act of terrorism. Those difficulties were enhanced by the necessity for carefully limiting the scope of the Convention to cover only acts of terrorism of an international character. This criterion of " international character " was determined either *(a)* by the nature of the injuries inflicted or *(b)* by the method of perpetration of the crime or offence, the latter criterion presupposing, in certain cases, the extension of the perpetration of the crime or offence to the territory of more than one State.

It was clear also, in that connection, that the problem must be considered also from the standpoint of the international obligations of each State. M. Sasserath had referred [8] to the duty incumbent upon every State to abstain from acts calculated to favour terrorist activities directed against public safety and order in another State, a duty, which, moreover, already existed as an unwritten rule of international law, and which it was now sought to re-affirm in precise form

---

[1] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 19.
[2] *Ibid.*, page 22.
[3] See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 65, page 35.
[4] Document C.196.M.70.1927.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1927.V.1), page 221.
[5] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 4.
[6] Document A.7.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), page 3.
[7] Document C.222.M.162.1937.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1937.V.1), page 3. (See Annex 3, page 186.)
[8] See page 61.

in the Convention, as a result of the proposal made by M. Kulski in the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly [1] and in the Committee of Jurists by the Polish representative, M. Bekerman.

It was by no means an easy matter to draw a distinction between acts of terrorism and political crimes or offences. Apart from the conceptions prevailing in one or two countries which regarded political offences as more reprehensible than offences at ordinary law, and which, in principle, were in favour of extradition even for purely political offences—it was almost unanimously agreed in other countries that political offences were not of an anti-social character and did not shake the foundations of social life.

Those offences were of an anti-governmental character. Consequently, they conflicted only with the principles of a quite special morality—namely, principles which were often connected with the form of government of each State and varied from one country to another. As had been pointed out, those who to-day were regarded as political offenders might to-morrow be regarded as heroes. It was therefore advisable that other States should not intervene in questions which concerned the political life of a given State. Those States should intervene only when their own internal order or international order had been threatened by such offences. If a State helped to repress political offences which merely injured the interests of another State, that participation might be regarded as interference in the internal affairs of the latter State.

The principle of the non-collaboration of foreign States in the repression of political offences represented therefore a homage paid to the sovereignty mutually accorded by States, a recognition of the fact that every nation had full liberty to regulate its economic and social policy as it thought fit, and of its absolute right to modify the fundamental institutions of the State in whatever way it considered expedient and by its own means, all intervention by foreign Powers in such questions being excluded.

While, in principle, the value of such arguments could not be disputed, M. Pella did not think they could justify the absolute principle of the non-collaboration of other countries in repressing offences which, owing to their nature, did not merely endanger the order of a given State but social order in general. Whatever the perpetrator's motive, it was obvious, bearing in mind the odious nature of the offence and the fact that the " political will of the offender " had expressed itself in acts of barbarity and terrorism, that the principle of the non-collaboration of States in this matter would constitute the most flagrant repudiation of the duties of international solidarity.

M. Pella also stressed the existence of certain offences which, owing to their nature or their consequences, shook the very foundations of the international community—that was to say, threatened the conditions of peaceful co-existence of the nations. In the case of such offences, the application of the principle of the non-collaboration of other States in their repression was likewise inconceivable.

While as regards offences of a complex nature (anti-social offences) or heinous offences against the State (assassination, devastation, arson, etc.), the international spirit of solidarity had exerted some influence even as long ago as the second half of the nineteenth century—and while, in such cases, the theory that other nations should stand aloof was being more and more frequently rejected—it was none the less true that that same international spirit would also be called upon to exert an increasingly powerful influence on the principles of criminal law concerning the co-operation of foreign States in repressing offences against the State which likewise jeopardised the fundamental interests of the international community.

M. Pella recalled that, as long ago as 1856, the Belgian law had provided that " outrages against the head of a foreign Government or the members of his family, constituting either murder, premeditated murder or poisoning, shall not be deemed to be a political offence or offence related thereto ".

This " clause relating to outrages " had been inserted in a large number of extradition treaties.

The United States of America, which had at first been opposed to the Belgian Clause, had nevertheless concluded in 1888 an extradition treaty with Belgium in which that clause had been inserted. Since then, it had been reproduced in certain treaties concluded by the United States with other countries, as, for instance, in the treaties of 1895 with Russia, of 1898 with Brazil and of 1902 with Denmark.

The movement in favour of extending the Belgian Clause had been strengthened when the Institut de Droit international itself advocated the general adoption of that clause.

After a series of formulæ proposed in 1882 (Bluntschli's proposal made at the Oxford session), the Institut adopted, in 1892 at its Geneva session, a resolution with a view to the elimination of acts of terrorism from the category of political offences.

Article 14 of the Rules on Extradition drawn up by the Institut de Droit international at its Geneva session provided that " criminal acts directed against the bases of all social organisation, and not only against a certain State or a certain form of government are not considered political offences in the application of the preceding Rules ".

Article 13 of those Rules gave a list which, if it was not complete, was at any rate precise, of acts which should give rise to extradition. Those acts, according to the Institut de Droit international were : " crimes of great gravity from the point of view of morality and of the common law, such as murder, manslaughter, poisoning, mutilation, grave wounds inflicted wilfully with premeditation, attempts at crimes of that kind, outrages to property by arson, explosion or flooding, and serious thefts, especially when committed with weapons and violence ".

The American Institute of International Law also stipulated in draft No. 17 that " acts

---

[1] See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 156, page 58.

characterised as anarchy by the laws of both nations shall not be considered political crimes ".

After the world war, the movement in favour of the exclusion of acts of terrorism from the category of political offences also found expression in a series of draft penal codes and new laws, as, for instance, the Finnish Law of February 11th, 1922, which refused to regard murder or attempted murder as a political offence, unless it was committed in the course of open hostilities.

Consequently, only cases of rebellion or civil war were excluded. Those exceptions were not of great importance since, in the majority of cases, acts of terrorism could be committed even without open hostilities. Such acts, on the contrary, paved the way for revolution. M. Pella also quoted the Roumanian Penal Code, which came into force on January 1st, 1937, under which acts of terrorism " shall never be regarded as political offences, whatever the offender's motive or the circumstances in which he committed or attempted to commit the offence ".

Lastly, of all the conventions on extradition, the one which solved the problem of acts of terrorism most completely was the Convention of February 6th, 1930, between Portugal and Roumania. Article 7 of that Convention provided " that from the point of view of extradition the following acts shall never be regarded as political offences : *(a)* Murder, manslaughter, poisoning, mutilation, grave wounds inflicted wilfully with premeditation; *(b)* outrages to property by arson, explosion or flooding, and serious thefts committed with weapons and violence ".

While considerable progress could be made by municipal law or bilateral agreements relating to extradition, it was clearly much more difficult to achieve such results by means of a multilateral agreement open for the accession of a large number of States whose traditions and principles of public law in regard to the repression of political offences differed so widely.

In order to achieve such a multilateral agreement, the text of the convention should be fairly elastic and above all States should not be required to go further than was called for by the international campaign against terrorism. The Committee should encroach as little as possible upon the complex and shifting field of controversy in the matter of political offences and the right of asylum, and should avoid any kind of conflict with the almost universally admitted principle of non-intervention by another State in the punishment of purely political offences.

In consequence, the somewhat pessimistic points of view expressed by certain delegates, in particular, by those of the United Kingdom [1] and Switzerland,[2] should be examined in the light of those brief observations.

The primary necessity was that every country should be in a position, through its national laws, to carry on an effective campaign against terrorism, while at the same time co-operating in international action for the prevention and punishment of that scourge by means of the Conventions to which it was a party.

The statements made by Sir John Fischer Williams had afforded all the necessary assurances in regard to the United Kingdom, even though the methods of the latter were different from those contemplated in the draft Convention. The Conference would therefore have to consider solutions which took into account the special difficulties of certain countries in the matter of the amendment of existing laws.

M. Pella was glad to note that all the other speakers had been in favour of the principles underlying the first draft Convention.

The most important point arising out of the remarks made by the delegates of the United Kingdom, Norway[3], the Netherlands[4] and Switzerland was of course the question of extradition. In that connection, the delegate of Poland, M. Komarnicki,[5] had expressed a point of view with which, theoretically, everyone was bound to agree—namely, that there should be complete equality, in that field, between the various contracting parties as regards the obligations undertaken by them. If it were possible in all cases to make a precise distinction between a political offence and an act of terrorism, the principle of *aut dedere aut punire* should obviously be taken as the sole and unvarying basis of international co-operation in regard to extradition. M. Pella recalled that certain Governments were in favour of that principle and that he personally regarded it as the only one which could in every case ensure the effective repression of acts of terrorism. Unfortunately, its adoption would involve such considerable changes in the criminal law and practice of various countries that, while affirming the desirability and moral value of such a principle, they would have to be satisfied for the present (as M. Basdevant had remarked) [6] with more modest solutions commanding more general acceptance. M. Pella therefore fully appreciated the misgivings expressed by the delegates of the United Kingdom, Norway, the Netherlands and Switzerland.

At the time when it discussed the draft texts, the Conference would have to consider to what extent the draft Convention affected the liberty of States to decide, in each particular case, whether the terrorist aspect of the extraditable act outweighed its political aspect or *vice versa*. M. Pella himself anticipated that the discussion on that point would show clearly that the liberty of States was in no way affected.

---

[1] See page 52.
[2] See page 61.
[3] See page 54.
[4] See page 55.
[5] See page 56.
[6] See page 59.

Turning to the proposal for the creation of an International Criminal Court, M. Pella noted that reservations of principle had been made in that connection by certain delegates. Others, on the contrary, had declared their readiness to support, or had at least expressed sympathy with, the principles underlying the scheme for setting up an International Criminal Court. Even those delegates who did not propose to sign the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court were not opposed to the adoption of such a Convention by the present Conference.

In the first place, M. Pella recalled that the United Kingdom delegate, after stating the reasons which made it impossible for His Majesty's Government to accept the principle of the Court, had said that His Majesty's Government had no desire to hamper or impede the creation of such a Court by the action of those States which viewed its institution with favour, so long as the Court had no organic connection with the League.[1] The delegate of Hungary also had stated that, while Hungary was opposed to the creation of such a Court, it did not intend to do anything to prevent its creation.[2] On the contrary, the Hungarian delegation would continue to offer its co-operation, as it had already done in the Committee or Experts—M. Pella was glad of the opportunity to pay a sincere tribute to its work on that Committee—in the legal drafting of the text. Statements to a similar effect, of which he took grateful note, had been made by the delegates of Switzerland, Poland and Venezuela.[3]

M. Pella had no intention of repeating all the arguments which had been used for and against the creation of an International Criminal Court. His own scientific work, as also certain action taken by him in the same connection seventeen years previously, were on record to show how prominent a place the conception of the court had occupied in his life and thought; that being so, he could not refuse to abandon the cold and serene heights of objective study in order to defend with all the energy at his command ideas upon which he set so high a value and which constituted for him the faith of a lifetime.

For that reason, M. Pella accepted the arguments developed with so much perspicuity by M. Basdevant, M. van Hamel, M. Koukal [4] and M. Sasserath, and he further agreed with what had been said in favour of the Court by M. Jiménez de Asúa.[5] It only remained for him to clear up certain misunderstandings.

In the first place, the Court, as conceived in the draft Convention, conflicted with no principle whatsoever.

Countries which were not attracted by the idea—it was really a question of feeling rather than of principle—were free not to take part in it; and the judicial operation of the Court was conceived in such a manner that their legal position would not be affected thereby.

On the other hand, countries which accepted the Court, did not in any way renounce the principle of the competence of their national courts, or even that of the priority in competence enjoyed by the latter. There was no derogation of their right to have individuals guilty of terrorist acts tried by the national courts or to extradite them, as the case might be. Such countries could therefore entrust the repression of terrorism to an International Court in the exercise of their full and complete sovereignty, even interpreting the idea of sovereignty in the absolute and unrestricted sense which had obtained in former days. No one, moreover, could prevent a country from handing over for trial to such a Court offenders who had committed acts of terrorism on its territory or had taken refuge there. To dispute the right of a State to act thus would be an infringement of its sovereignty.

As to the assertion made by certain speakers that no analogy could be established between the Permanent Court of International Justice and the Criminal Court, M. Pella agreed that no such analogy was conceivable as things were at present.

The Permanent Court of International Justice applied international law, which, when no general or special international conventions existed laying down rules recognised by the contending States, was unfortunately ill-defined, being based on international custom, general legal principles, judicial decisions and the doctrine of the most competent publicists of the different nations.

On the other hand, the Criminal Court—that was its special merit—would be applying specific and clearly defined penal legislation, with which every delinquent might be presumed to be acquainted.

M. Pella agreed also that it was out of the question that the International Criminal Court should have the same organic links with the League of Nations as the Permanent Court of International Justice. The organic links between the Permanent Court and the League were determined in the first place by provisions of the Covenant, of which there was no question in the case of the International Criminal Court. There was no suggestion of amending the Covenant in order to create an organic link between the proposed new Court and the League of Nations.

Certain delegates—the representative of Haiti in particular [6]—had objected that, in many cases, the evidence would no longer be available and that the International Criminal Court could not administer justice under the same conditions as a national court. But every State was free to decide upon its own course of action : it might try the individual itself, or extradite him, or hand him over to the International Criminal Court. In the case, for example, of an individual who had sought refuge in Haiti and whose extradition was applied for by the Netherlands, the proofs of evidence would be no fresher if the individual were extradited to the Netherlands as a country, than if he were sent before the Criminal Court whose seat was in Netherlands territory. It would therefore have to be decided in each particular case whether it was desirable to refer the case to the International Criminal Court.

---

[1] See page 54.
[2] See page 55.
[3] See pages 61, 57 and 64.
[4] See page 60.
[5] See page 63.
[6] See page 56.

M. Pella would venture to reply to the observations of the Argentine delegate made at the present meeting, at the time when the Conference was examining the texts; but he could give some information at once concerning one objection submitted by M. Ruíz Guiñazú—namely, if the Convention for the repression of terrorism worked satisfactorily, the delinquent would either be extradited or would be tried by the national court of the State in whose territory he happened to be, and the punishment would be adequate. But M. Pella pointed out that the ideal was sometimes far removed from the reality. It must not be forgotten that no hard and fast line could in every case be drawn between terrorism and political crimes. Supposing that an individual who had committed an act of terrorism in country X, where the dominant political doctrine was different from that of country Y, took refuge in the last-named country and that country X applied for extradition. Country Y might find it difficult to grant extradition because, in the opinion of its judges, the offence had certain political aspects. The constitution of country Y might even prohibit extradition for political offences. True, if there were any doubt as to the political nature of the offence, country Y could—if its legislation allowed it to do so—bring the offenders before its own courts. In many countries, such questions were decided by the jury.

But those very motives, those very imponderabilia, which had led country Y to refuse extradition might also lead its jury or its courts to acquit the individual in question.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that, according to universally admitted principles, in the event of acquittal even by the competent courts, a country could not disclaim responsibility. Thus, extradition was impossible, because the Constitution forbade it; and, in the event of acquittal, the country was still responsible from an international point of view. What then was the solution? Only one solution remained—namely, to refer the case to the International Criminal Court.

M. Pella mentioned certain examples and added that countless similar cases could be adduced. True, the Court would be in the nature of an innovation, but potentially its scope of action was very wide.

In conclusion, he agreed with the argument put forward by certain speakers that the Court would have very few cases to try, and he trusted that that argument would prove to be well founded, for he would prefer to see an International Criminal Court with no cases at all to try, rather than to see serious disputes arise between States either because extradition was refused or because the sentences imposed by the national courts were inadequate or because such courts acquitted the offenders. In view of these arguments, therefore, he fully agreed with the observations made by certain Governments in their replies to the League—namely, that [1] " the establishment of an International Criminal Court meets the double requirements of ensuring impartial justice in specially delicate cases and covering the responsibility of the State whose courts would have to try crimes of this kind ". The proposed Court might extend its jurisdiction at some not too distant date, by means of protocols signed by the States, to other offences of an international character forming the subject of special inter-State conventions already concluded or which might be concluded hereafter.

M. Pella ventured to hope that, with the technical assistance even of the representatives of those States which were unable for the moment to agree to the idea of the Court, it might be possible for the Conference to create an institution which would completely fulfil the moral and juridical aspirations of mankind.

The PRESIDENT pronounced the general discussion closed.

FIFTH MEETING.

Held on Wednesday, November 3rd, 1937, at 10.45 a.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

13. Question of the Participation in the Work of the Conference of the International Criminal Police Commission : Communication by the President.

The PRESIDENT informed the Conference that the Bureau had received an unofficial communication from the International Criminal Police Commission offering to participate in the work of the Conference on the technical side, which interested it more particularly. Subject to the approval of the Conference, the Bureau was of the opinion that the Commission should be informed that, if it thought fit to send a representative to participate in the work of the Conference, the latter would welcome his assistance in an advisory capacity. The President proposed that the Conference should follow the Bureau's advice.

The Bureau's proposal was adopted.

---

[1] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 23.

14. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937).

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to begin its examination at a first reading, of the text of the draft Convention prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its third session (1937).[1]

TITLE OF THE CONVENTION.

The PRESIDENT thought that, before examining Article 1, the Conference should discuss the title of the Convention. The present title was " Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism ". That did not quite correspond with the title of the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism, which had prepared the work of the Conference. The title proposed embodied the ideas of prevention and punishment. The Conference would have to consider whether that really conveyed the purport of the Convention.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the idea of prevention corresponded exactly, not only to the spirit, but to the letter of the Convention. Article 1 provided for co-operation between the contracting parties for the prevention and punishment of acts of terrorism. Articles 13, 14 and 15 and the articles following referred both to the perpetration of such acts and to their preparation. The title now proposed would thus appear to be quite in keeping with the Convention and with the object of the Conference.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) questioned whether that was the moment to discuss the title of the Convention. It would be preferable to decide first as to its contents. Certain acts mentioned in the present draft were not regarded as coming within the category of terrorist acts. The title would thus seem to be incomplete. The exact title had better be left over until a later stage in the discussion.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) agreed with the Czechoslovak delegate. He suggested, however, that the title might be adopted provisionally, subject to revision, if necessary, when the examination of the text of the Convention was sufficiently advanced. He wished to say at once, however, that in his view the word " *international* " ought to appear in the title. It appeared already in the title of the Committee of Experts. The Convention might perhaps be entitled : " *Convention for the International Prevention and Repression of Terrorism* ".

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought that the title of the Convention ought to reflect both the idea of prevention and that of repression. He was not quite sure, however, about the order in which those two ideas should be mentioned. The primary and essential purpose of the Convention was the repression of terrorism, and it was only Articles 14 and 15 that dealt with prevention. Seeing, however, that prevention was more important than repression, it ought perhaps to be mentioned first. In any case, the final title should be held over until the second reading.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that the final title could not be decided yet, since it would depend on the substance of the Convention.

As the Czechoslovak delegate had quite rightly pointed out, certain provisions of the draft did not directly refer to terrorism. But those provisions—the provisions, for instance, concerning forged passports—had been introduced with a view to the prevention of terrorism, and were thus connected—indirectly, if not directly—with it.

Replying to the suggestion put forward by the delegate of Venezuela, M. Pella observed that the formula " international prevention and repression " implied repression carried out, as it were, " internationally ". That, however, was not the position, since, under the terms of the Convention, repression would be carried out by the national authorities and, even though the International Criminal Court might be called upon to give judgment in certain cases, the execution of the sentence would always be entrusted to a national authority. There might therefore be some misunderstanding on that point.

He suggested, accordingly, that the title of the Convention should be provisionally adopted, on the understanding that it might be re-examined at the second reading of the draft.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed to the title being regarded as provisional, but suggested that it might be amended to include the idea of "*international terrorism*", which was very important.

The PRESIDENT said he gathered that the Conference did not wish to take a final decision at the moment; he proposed that the title of the Convention be left over till the second reading.

The President's proposal was adopted.

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.

ARTICLE 1.

1. Acts of terrorism within the meaning of the present Convention are criminal acts which are directed against a State and which are intended or calculated to create a state of terror among individuals, groups of persons or the general public.

2. The object of the present Convention is to ensure co-operation between the High Contracting Parties for the prevention and punishment of such acts when they are of an international character, it being the duty of States to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State.

The PRESIDENT pointed out the direct connection between Article 1 and the Assembly resolution of 1936,[1] whose provisions he recalled, explaining the difference between the text of Article 1 in the draft now submitted to the Conference and the text originally framed by the Committee of Experts at its first two sessions.[2]

AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 1.

Amendment proposed by the Belgian Delegation.[3]

To delete, in paragraph 1, the words " *among individuals, groups of persons or the general public* ", and to add, after the words " *to create* ", the words " *or have the effect of creating* ".

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) pointed out that paragraph 1 of Article 1, defining acts of terrorism within the meaning of the Convention, was a fundamental provision. All the members of the Conference would, he thought, agree that it was essential it should appear at the beginning of the Convention. It was important that Article 1 should define the idea dealt with in the succeeding provisions. The first paragraph appeared to fulfil that purpose, by specifying that acts of terrorism were " criminal acts which are directed against a State ". That important point ought to be brought out. The Belgian delegation proposed, however, that the idea reflected in the words " are intended or calculated to create " should be supplemented by the further notion embodied in the phrase " have the effect of creating ", since it might be possible to commit an act which, though not intended to create a state of terror, produced that effect.

The Belgian delegation also proposed the deletion, at the end of paragraph 1, of the words " among individuals, groups of persons or the general public ". It proposed the deletion of those words on the ground that the existence of a state of terror was a question of fact which need not be defined in the Convention. Moreover, the list given in the present draft was not a very happy way of defining the general purpose in view.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation.[3]

To add, in paragraph 2, after the words " *international character* ", the following words : " *owing to the circumstances of their preparation or their accomplishment, or to the nationality of the persons involved in them or of the victims or to the place to which those persons have escaped* ".

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) said that the purpose of the amendment was to stress the international character of the acts mentioned in Article 1. The present text was vague and might lend itself to different interpretations. It might, for instance, be argued that acts of terrorism were not of an international character unless the acts themselves were international. But, in the view both of the 1936 Assembly and of the Committee of Experts, the international character of terrorist acts might be attributable to other elements; and it was those elements that the Polish amendment proposed to introduce into Article 1. If the provisions of paragraph 2 of that article were not clearly defined, as the Polish delegation proposed, disputes might arise in consequence.

Texts proposed by the Yugoslav Delegation.[3]

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said, as regards the definition of terrorism in Article 1, that it should embody both the objective and subjective elements characterising terrorism. The Yugoslav delegation desired to submit the following observations on Articles 2, 3, 12 and 13, defining the

---

[1] See Annex 1, page 183.

[2] *First draft* (see document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 4) :

" *Article* 1.

" The purpose of the present Convention is to ensure international co-operation for the prevention and punishment of crimes which, by their character of violence or by creating a public danger or a state of terror, are of a nature to cause a change in or impediment to the operation of the public authorities or services of the High Contracting Parties or to disturb international relations."

Second draft (see document A.7.1936.V (L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), page 3 :

" *Article* 1.

" The purpose of the present Convention is to ensure international co-operation for the prevention and punishment of terrorism."

[3] Document Conf. R.T.4.

various kinds of terrorism and hence the acts of terrorism which should come within the definition given in Article 1 :

In the first place, there should be some definition of the subjective element required to constitute a " terrorist crime ". The articles of the draft Convention to which he had just referred showed that the necessary subjective element was the intention though not necessarily accompanied by any particular motive. That element should accordingly be mentioned in Article 1. The word " terrorist " should also be defined, either separately or together with " terrorism ".

Secondly, with regard to the words " criminal acts which are directed against a State ", in paragraph 1 of Article 1, those acts, in the view of the Yugoslav delegation, were not specified in sufficient detail in the remainder of the paragraph, and should be made to include acts prejudicial to the honour of the State.

Thirdly, the Yugoslav delegation asked that the words " which are intended " in paragraph 1 of Article 1 should be replaced by the expression " which tend " or " which are designed ".

M. Givanovitch also objected to the use of the words " create a state of terror among " in paragraph 1 of Article 1, and proposed the substitution of the word " terrify " or " intimidate ".

Lastly—to come to the Yugoslav delegation's main criticism—the conception of terrorism conveyed by the text seemed quite inadequate.

To sum up, M. Givanovitch proposed that terrorism should be defined in one of two ways : the first, or objective definition might read as follows :

> *" Acts of terrorism, within the meaning of the present Convention, are criminal acts which are aimed, directly or indirectly, against a State, in respect of its security or of the maintenance of public order, and which, by their nature or object, have a capability of terrorising (individuals, groups of persons or the general public) which is utilised by the authors of the acts as a means of injuring the said interests of the State ".*

The subjective definition proposed was as follows :

> *" A person is guilty of terrorism within the meaning of the present Convention who intentionally commits a criminal act which is aimed, directly or indirectly, against a State, in respect of its security or the maintenance of public order, and which, by its nature or object, possesses a capability of intimidating (individuals, groups of persons or the general public) which is utilised by the author of the act as a means of injuring the said interests of the State."*

Those proposals were not formal proposals for amendment but were simply intended as suggestions for the Drafting Committee in amending the text of paragraph 1 of Article 1.

General Discussion on the Text of Article 1 and the Amendments thereto.

M. Polychroniadis (Greece) said that the terms of the second paragraph of Article 1 seemed almost contradictory. The obligation incumbent upon the contracting parties to co-operate in the prevention and punishment of acts of terrorism of an international character did not ensue from the duty of States to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State. The drafting of the paragraph was imperfect and should be amended.

The President asked whether the Greek delegation wished to translate its comments into the shape of a formal amendment.

M. Polychroniadis (Greece) said that it should be made clear that the elementary obligation entered into by States was to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State, and that the obligation imposed on the contracting parties to co-operate for the prevention and punishment of terrorist acts did not ensue from the first-named obligation.

M. Pella (Roumania), Rapporteur, agreed with the delegate of Greece that two ideas entirely independent of one another were embodied in the same text. The objection just raised was particularly apposite as regards the end of paragraph 2. The obligation to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State was a fundamental principle which ought to be embodied in a separate paragraph, to allow of the principle being postulated at the beginning of the Convention. He suggested, since the observation of the delegate of Greece referred to a question of form, that it should be held over until the Drafting Committee came to deal with the final text of Article 1.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

M. Sebestyén (Hungary) submitted a general observation with a view to elucidating the position in regard to Article 1. It appeared from the amendments and from the suggestions put forward during the discussion that Article 1 did not contain provisions embodying any obligations properly so-called for States, but was rather in the nature of a statement of principle. He suggested accordingly that the Conference should consider whether it might not be desirable to draw up a preamble stating the position in international law with regard to the obligation incumbent on States not to intervene in the affairs of other States, and declaring that it was the

duty of States to co-operate in the prevention and punishment of certain acts. The position in international law and the duty to which he had referred could be enunciated in greater detail in a preamble than in an article of the Convention.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) reminded the Conference that the Netherlands Government, in its observations on the first draft Convention,[1] had pointed out that the intention was what counted in penal law and had stressed the fact that, in defining terrorist acts, it was necessary to lay stress on the deliberate nature of such acts. Accordingly, the Netherlands Government had been in favour of substituting for the idea of being " directed to " certain objects the idea of being " intended to " produce certain effects. The expression " directed to ", appearing in the second draft prepared by the Committee of Experts (Article 2),[2] had been deleted in the third draft Convention, but had been replaced by the words " calculated to ", which did not stress the idea of deliberate intention so clearly. He suggested that it might be preferable simply to revert to the words " *intended to* ".

As the question of a preamble had been raised, M. van Hamel would suggest at once embodying in the preamble the provisions of Article 11 dealing with the duties incumbent on the contracting parties. Those provisions were too elastic, and they might appear less inacceptable if they were put in the preamble.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, referring to M. Sebestyén's proposal, said that, even before discussing Article 1, he wished to urge the necessity for a preamble. Nevertheless, a preamble was not on the same footing as the text of a Convention; it had not the same legal force. M. Sebestyén had proposed that certain points in connection with the definition of terrorism should be relegated to the preamble. Article 1, however, served as a basis for the whole Convention. Articles 2 and 3 and subsequent articles became applicable only if the acts specified—for example, in Article 2— were also subject to the conditions mentioned in Article 1. For example, in the case of a wilful act directed against the life of a person exercising the prerogatives of head of the State, the Convention would be applicable only if the act in question were covered by Article 1, in other words, if the object of the act were to create a state of terror, or its character were such as to create that state, and if it were directed in the last analysis against the State itself. Such stipulations as these, therefore, could not possibly be transferred from Article 1 to the preamble.

M. Sebestyén had also suggested that the general obligation incumbent on all States to abstain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities might be included in the preamble. M. Pella could not support that suggestion either. The Polish delegation's proposal was designed to transform an obligation already operative under the unwritten rules of international law into a positive prescription of that law. If that were really its intention, the obligation should be made binding by inclusion in the text of the Convention. To leave it as a more or less platonic declaration in a preamble, was not enough. For that reason, while M. Pella agreed with M. Sebestyén that a preamble was necessary, he thought that the provisions of Article 1 should not be included in it. In his view, they should figure, subject to such modifications of form as might be thought desirable, in the text of the Convention.

Turning to M. van Hamel's remark, the Rapporteur fully appreciated that the absence of any reference in Article 1 to the wilful nature of the act might suggest that the authors of the Convention had wished also to penalise—in certain cases—unintentional acts. In order to fall within the meaning of the present Convention, a terrorist act would require to be covered by Article 2 as well; that article specified in very precise language that such acts must be wilfully performed. In other words, only wilful acts were covered, and Article 2 contained an express statement to that effect. Such acts must also come within the meaning of Article 1, by being intended, or calculated, to create a state of terror among individuals, groups of persons or the general public, and by being directed against a State. No discussion therefore was possible in regard to Article 1. An act of terrorism, by its very nature, was a wilful act.

Since the Conference was now approaching the substance of the problem, M. van Hamel had laid stress on the question of the purpose of such acts. But, when they spoke of " purpose ", it was no longer a question of "wilful intent" but of what criminal law called "motive". According to the Convention, terrorist acts must be wilful acts and at the same time must be committed with the intention of creating a state of terror among individuals, groups of persons or the general public. The draft also allowed for a further hypothesis : it might happen that an act was not committed with the intention of creating a state of terror, yet that it was of such a nature to arouse terror. Clearly, even in that case, the act would have to be wilful and to be directed against a State. M. van Hamel wished that second possibility to disappear.

To adopt M. van Hamel's view would be, M. Pella believed, to narrow the scope of the Convention. He agreed with M. van Hamel that in no case could a terrorist act be treated as criminal, when wilful intention was lacking. He hoped that his explanations would give full satisfaction to the delegate of the Netherlands. But if some doubt were still felt as to the need for an element of wilful intent in any terrorist act falling within the scope of the Convention, he would suggest that any additional clarification required should be introduced when Article 2 of the draft Convention was under discussion.

---

[1] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 10.
[2] Document A.7.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), page 3.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) explained that he had never proposed to transfer paragraph 1 of Article 1 to the preamble, since it obviously constituted an essential provision of the Convention and should figure at the head of the latter. He was fully in agreement with the Rapporteur on that point. His suggestion referred only to that part of the Convention which did not contain legal provisions in the strict sense of the term.

M. GARDA (San Marino), referring to the end of paragraph 2, thought it should be specified whether the words " of another State " referred to a contracting party or to any other State. Since the Convention would not be signed by all Governments, a clear indication should be given as to whether the obligations assumed by the contracting parties were to be applied *vis-à-vis* all Governments or only the other contracting parties.

M. STOYKOVITCH (Yugoslavia), referring to M. Polychroniadis' argument that paragraph 2 of Article 1 contained a contradiction, said that the existing rules of common international law obliged States to prevent and punish international terrorism, and that paragraph 2 of Article 1 imposed no new obligation : it merely stated the existing obligation in more precise terms, the purpose of the Convention being to lay down the technical rules for such collaboration and to codify the rules of common international law.

As to the point raised by M. Garda, which was closely related to the previous question, in M. Stoykovitch's opinion, the words " another State " included all States whether contracting parties or not, since the end of paragraph 2 of Article 1 referred to an existing rule of international law which was binding upon all countries.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that M. Garda had raised a very important point. Although it was clear that the provisions of the Convention were only binding upon the contracting parties, it could not be gainsaid that the last part of paragraph 2 of Article 1 had a much wider application.

In declaring the duty of States to be " to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State ", this passage merely reaffirmed an obligation which was universally recognised in unwritten international law, and which therefore possessed universal application. This obligation, indeed, went even further, and M. Pella would, in due course, suggest an addition to the text.

A State was not only bound itself to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities; it was also bound to prevent the committing of such acts on its own territory. That obligation rested upon all States, whether parties to the Convention or not.

M. Pella thanked M. Garda for having given him an opportunity of explaining the matter, and expressed his entire agreement with the view just advanced by M. Stoykovitch.

As regards means for the prevention or punishment of terrorist acts, States might be divided into two categories.

States not parties to the Convention had, in accordance with the general obligation imposed upon them by unwritten international law, to take all measures deemed by them to be appropriate for preventing or punishing acts of terrorism directed against another State. Where proof was forthcoming that they had encouraged such acts, or even refrained from preventing them, the responsibility would rest with those States, according to the general principles of international law.

The obligations of States parties to the Convention were more explicit, since the Convention obliged them, on the one hand, to take appropriate steps for the prevention or punishment of terrorism and, on the other, to collaborate with the other contracting parties—following the rules laid down in the Convention—to ensure such prevention and punishment.

It followed, therefore, that the steps to be taken under the Convention were compulsory for a contracting party only when the terrorist acts were directed against another contracting party.

In conclusion, the Rapporteur expressed the view that, in any event, M. Polychroniadis' observation would have to be borne in mind; for, as M. Pella had already pointed out, that observation called for the preparation of a general clause to be inserted at the outset of Article 1 of the Convention. The clause would reaffirm the general principle of international law, binding upon all countries, that States must refrain from encouraging terrorist acts directed against another State, and must also prevent such acts. The later articles of the Convention, which were only binding upon the contracting parties, would then appear as the logical consequence of the general principle of international law reaffirmed in Article 1.

The PRESIDENT, summing up the discussion, proposed to refer the Greek delegate's remarks to the Drafting Committee, the latter to redraft Article 1 in such a form as to make it the duty of States not only to abstain from all action calculated to favour terrorist activities against another State, but also, as the 1936 Assembly had proposed, to prevent the preparation and execution on their territory of terrorist crimes directed against the life and liberty of persons charged with public functions or holding public positions abroad.

The President's proposal was adopted.

DETAILED EXAMINATION OF ARTICLE 1, PARAGRAPH 1, AND THE AMENDMENTS THERETO.

Amendment proposed by the Belgian Delegation[1] (continuation).

The PRESIDENT asked the Conference to take a decision on the amendment proposed by the Belgian delegation.

In reply to a question by the Rapporteur, M. SASSERATH (Belgium) said that the phrase " among individuals, groups of persons or the general public " which he proposed to omit from paragraph 1 did not make the idea any clearer, and might lead in practice to regrettable controversies. He recalled that, in criminal law, the more detailed the rule, the greater the risk that it would give rise to controversies the object of which was to evade its application. It would be much better to use a concise expression, such as " a state of terror ", which was at once sufficiently precise and at the same time indicative of what the Conference had in mind. Any amplification of the term was bound to provoke endless discussion when the Convention came to be applied.

M. CHATELAIN (Haiti), while fully in agreement with the Belgian proposal, to add after the words " to create " the words " or have the effect of creating ", wished to propose a formal modification thereof—namely, that the text should read : " *the intention, nature or result of which is to create a state of terror* ".

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) agreed to the proposed modification.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to take a decision as to the omission of the words " among individuals, groups of persons or the general public ".

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) preferred to retain the words in question. He recalled that the text of paragraph 1 had been discussed at length in the Committee of Experts and that the majority had been in favour of retaining the phrase under discussion.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that a definition of terrorism was a delicate matter, and the Conference was bound to lay itself open to criticism in the matter. The definition adopted by the Committee of Experts was not very scientific in character, and might even be said to beg the question. The more it was simplified, the more illogical it appeared. While he admitted that the words " among individuals, etc. " added little to the substance of the article, he though that, if they were omitted, something would have to be put in their place which did not show up too conspicuously the illogical nature of the definition. The point might be referred to the Drafting Committee.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that there was a shade of difference in the meaning. An earlier text considered by the Committee had referred to acts designed to create terror among duly specified persons—namely, persons who, by reason of their position, exercised an influence over the affairs of the State. Later, the Committee had substituted for those specified persons the word " individuals ". Logically, M. Sebestyén was right in saying that the text ought to be more explicit, since otherwise the definition of the idea would simply depend on the term employed. It would be preferable, therefore, to revert to the idea of " *duly specified persons* ", which would justify the scope of the text.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) was not satisfied with the definition in Article 1. It defined acts of terrorism as acts intended or calculated to create a state of terror, and made no mention of violence, which was the essential feature of terror. There was another characteristic feature of terror—namely, the power to spread panic among the general public. M. Bekerman thought, therefore, that as no better definition of terrorist acts had been found than that appearing in the third draft of the Convention now under discussion, the definition should be kept as it stood, since the reference to individuals, groups of persons and the general public was characteristic of a state of terror.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kindom) supported the Polish delegate's remarks.

He pointed out that the English text spoke of " a state of terror ", whereas the French text merely referred to " la terreur ". A state of terror generally implied something rather widespread among the public; it was certainly an advantage, in the English version, to insist on the fact that it might be confined to certain individuals, such as the Head of the Government or Cabinet. It was important, at any rate in the English text, to retain the mention of individuals, in order to emphasise the fact that a state of terror might be created, not necessarily in the public at large or in a considerable mass of people, but in definite individuals whose policy it was intended to affect.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether the delegate of Belgium would agree to substitute the expression " *certain persons* " for the word " *individuals* ", in view of the observations which had been submitted and the necessity of bringing the English and French texts into harmony.

---

[1] For the text of the Belgian amendment, see page 71.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) did not think that the formula proposed would meet the objection he had raised when he had proposed the deletion of the words immediately following the word " terror ". He pointed out, in the first place, to the Hungarian delegate that Article 1 was not intended simply to give a definition—which would indeed be begging the question and might be ironically interpreted. The purport of Article 1 was quite different : it was to the effect that acts of terrorism, within the meaning of the Convention, were in the first place criminal acts directed against a State. That was one point. Secondly, the terror or state of terror must have been deliberately aimed at by the person guilty of the act in question. Accordingly, first the purpose of the act and then its nature were indicated. M. Sasserath proposed the addition of a third feature—namely, that the act should have the effect of creating terror. The expression " criminal acts which are directed against a State and which are intended or calculated to create or have the effect of creating a state of terror " appeared to be the most satisfactory way of expressing what was wanted—for no one had yet found an ideal formula. If anything else were added after the word " terror ", the result would be that some loophole would be sought, in each particular case, whenever such an act had been committed. A reference in the Convention to a state of terror being created among certain persons, would give rise to discussions as to who those persons were. A reference in the Convention to the general public would give rise to the question where a state of terror among the general public began or ended. A reference to groups of persons would give rise to the same questions. The discussions on all those various points might prove interminable. Whereas, if the text simply said that, for an act to come within the scope of the Convention, it must be a terrorist act—that was to say, an act the purpose, nature and effect of which created a state of terror—it would be possible, in each individual case, to see whether the act in question did come within the scope of the Convention, and the latter would thus achieve its maximum effect.

The continuation of the examination of Article 1, *paragraph* 1, *and of the amendments thereto was adjourned to the following meeting.*

SIXTH MEETING.

Held on Wednesday, November 3rd, 1937, *at* 3.30 *p.m.*

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

15. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) [1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 1 (continuation).

DETAILED EXAMINATION OF ARTICLE 1, PARAGRAPH 1, AND THE AMENDMENTS THERETO *(continuation).*

Amendment proposed by the Belgian Delegation [2] (continuation).

The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that it had before it a Belgian proposal to suppress the words " among individuals, groups of persons or the general public "; that amendment had been discussed and had encountered certain objections, on the part of the United Kingdom delegation in particular.[3] He enquired whether the delegate of Belgium wished to maintain his amendment.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) explained that the proposals which he had submitted reflected his personal views. In his opinion, those various additions and deletions were of value. Since, however, they were not likely to improve the draft Convention very appreciably, and since, moreover, his proposal had met with objections from such an important delegation as that of the United Kingdom, M. Sasserath was quite prepared to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that it had to consider a proposal made by the Rapporteur to substitute for the word " individuals " the words " duly specified persons ".[3]

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) said that he personally was in favour of the proposal of the Belgian delegate, but that, as the latter had just withdrawn it, he would not pursue the matter. Seeing that that amendment had not been accepted, it was preferable to leave the text as it stood.

M. MENTES (Turkey) thought that the expression " duly specified persons " was better; it would improve and complete the text.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that the expression " duly specified persons " had been used in an earlier text considered by the experts. It was to be preferred from the point

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.
[2] For the text of the Belgian amendment, see page 71.
[3] See page 75.

of view of form. In order to appreciate the reasons for inserting the list in the draft, it would be necessary to be familiar with the point of view expressed by the United Kingdom delegate; but the reader of the convention who was not familiar with the work of the Committee of Jurists would find the expression " duly specified persons " easier to understand.

Sir Denys BRAY (India) said that the English text " to create a state of terror among individuals " necessarily implied that the state of terror must extend beyond one individual to two or three. He suggested that the meaning the Conference really wished to convey was that of a state of terror in a person or group of persons.

The PRESIDENT said that the Indian delegate's remark applied also to the French text. It must be made quite clear whether it was intended to cover acts calculated to create a state of terror in a given person.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thought that the very idea of terrorism implied indefinite plurality. Over-individualisation would lead away from the idea of terrorism. He added, however, that that was merely a suggestion, to which he did not attach very great importance.

M. van Hamel thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations given at the last meeting[1] concerning the phrase : " acts . . . which are calculated . . . ". He understood that the emphasis was on the manifest nature of the act—that was to say, the intention; that point was brought out if the French text were compared with the English text, which read " intended or calculated ". M. van Hamel was quite satisfied on that point. He observed that the use of the expression " have the effect of " proposed by the Belgian delegate would create difficulties for the criminologists. The effect might be accidental, which was precisely what the criminologists wished to avoid. For that reason, M. van Hamel asked the Belgian delegate not to insist on that point in his proposal.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) said that he agreed with the Netherlands delegate.

The PRESIDENT understood that the Conference was in favour of the expression " duly specified persons ", a formula which would cover even the hypothesis mentioned by the delegate of India.

The Conference accepted provisionally the formula " duly specified persons ".

Texts proposed by the Yugoslav Delegation[2] (continuation).

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, noted that the Yugoslav delegation had proposed two formulæ : the first objective and the second subjective. He would refer for the moment to the second. If asked for his opinion as a professor of criminal law, he would be prepared to accept that formula enthusiastically; it was very scientific. He pointed out, however, that the Convention would be read, not only by professors of law, but also by the general public. Only a learned brain would understand the full scope and subtlety of the formula suggested by the Yugoslav delegate.

That formula did, however, offer very interesting indications as to how the text could be made more precise and complete.

In the first place, the Yugoslav delegate had pointed out the desirability of defining what was meant by " criminal acts which are directed against a State ". His intention was to amend the somewhat general character of that formula by specifying that what was meant was criminal acts directed against the safety and public order of the State.

Again, the Yugoslav delegate had suggested defining the notion of terrorism by using the expression " which, by its nature or object, possesses a capability of intimidating ". There was obviously a shade of difference between the meaning of that phrase and the meaning of the phrase " calculated to create a state of terror " used in the text of the draft. While the expression proposed by the Yugoslav delegate might not be considered quite adequate by certain delegations, it did contain a suggestion which might offer a means of solving the difficulties in regard to the definition of terrorism.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that the Rapporteur had interpreted his views quite correctly. With the idea of completing the text, the Yugoslav delegation had simply wished to make a suggestion first with regard to the object of criminal acts directed against a State and, secondly, with regard to the necessity of defining the mode of terrorism, in order, if possible, to avoid begging the question in the definition.

The PRESIDENT thought that it might be possible to adopt the interesting idea embodied in the Yugoslav proposal. The formula " criminal acts which are directed against a State " had been criticised. It would make the text clearer and improve it, if the phrase " criminal acts directed against a Sate in respect of its safety or the maintenance of public order " were adopted, as the Yugoslav delegate had suggested.

---

[1] See page 73.
[2] For the texts proposed by the Yugoslav delegation, see page 72.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, saw no objection to adopting the formula proposed by the Yugoslav delegate. That addition, which would impart a more directly legal character to the text, would simply bring Article 1 and Article 2 more closely into harmony. He would, however, be glad to know the views of other delegations on that point.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) pointed out a shade of difference in the meaning of the text proposed by the Yugoslav delegate and the experts' draft. The latter was based upon reciprocity between the contracting parties. The Yugoslav formula was wider and extended the scope of action of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT said that the question of reciprocity was brought up in Articles 2 and 3. Article 1 was confined to a declaration of principle. It did not seem necessary to mention the idea of reciprocity in Article 1.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that the idea of reciprocity would be found in the amendment just submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation[1] in the reference to Articles 2 and 3.

M. BASDEVANT (France) questioned whether the addition proposed by the Yugoslav delegation would clarify the text very appreciably. In order to determine that point, it was necessary to consider the general structure of the texts and the relationship between Article 1 and Article 2. Under Article 2, the contracting parties undertook to make a whole series of acts criminal offences under their domestic legislation if such acts constituted acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1. Apart from that, those same acts were covered by the penal legislation of the country; the Convention did not deal with them. Accordingly, Article 1 would not be improved by the insertion of a complete and adequate definition of terrorist crimes. Article 1 might, moreover, conceivably be treated as part of Article 2. The object of Article 1 was to exclude from the scope of the Convention acts enumerated in Article 2 and not included within the scope of Article 1. The difficulty lay in the fact that the word " terrorism " had to be explained by the use of the word " terror ". An attempt had been made to find some other solution, but a different expression, such as " épouvante " or " intimidation ", conveyed the idea that was wanted no better than the word " terror ".

There was the further point that the acts covered by the Convention must be international in character.

Such was the structure of the draft : Article 1 did not claim to give a complete definition of acts of terrorism.

That being so, was it advisable to add the phrase mentioning " safety and public order "? If the terrorist act were committed within the territory of the State against which it was perpetrated, it was clear that it was directed against public order in that country. But the only terrorist acts with which the Convention was concerned were those committed in one State and directed against another State; that was the essential idea of the Convention. Since that was so, it would have to be considered whether an act committed in France, for example, and directed against Portugal, necessarily affected safety and public order in Portugal. M. Basdevant was not quite sure about that : it would depend upon the particular case. Supposing, for instance, that Portuguese nationals resident in France were in the habit of meeting on a sports ground, and that certain individuals, in order to act against Portugal, disturbed such meetings systematically by attacks directed, for example, against human life; could it be said that such acts were connected in any way with safety or public order in Portugal? Public order in France would be affected, but that was quite a different matter.

For these reasons, M. Basdevant was reluctant to accept the proposed addition. The Conference should not be too ambitious. It should be satisfied with the simpler formula in the experts' text. That formula might perhaps be open to criticism : there was something of naïveté in the attempt to define terrorism by terror : but, if it were desired to make a change, the Conference should not adopt a formula which, while satisfactory in theory, would be ill-adapted to the real object of the Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, had no wish to enter into a legal controversy on the point with M. Basdevant; but he wished nevertheless to draw attention to what was meant by " public order " : any criminal offence was an offence against public order. In that connection, there was a difference between international law and municipal law. Under municipal law, even when private interests had to be protected by the imposition of a penalty, the purpose of the penalty was always the defence of public order in the general sense of the term.

The example given by M. Basdevant did not seem to M. Pella to be relevant. If an act committed in France did not in any way affect public order in Portugal, it would not come under the Convention. It was not necessary to provide in an international Convention for acts which were only directed against the public order of the country in which they were committed. Moreover, the term " criminal act " necessarily implied an act calculated to disturb public order. If M. Basdevant could give him a single example of a criminal act directed against a State which would not be directed either against public order or against the safety of that State, M. Pella would say no more.

M. BASDEVANT (France) recalled that he had just said that a crime always affected the public order of the country in which it was committed. It was therefore impossible for him to give an example. If it were admitted that a criminal act directed against a country always affected the public order of that country, he failed to see what would be added by the proposed text.

---

[1] For the text of the Czechoslovak amendment, see page 80.

The PRESIDENT was of opinion that the addition suggested by M. Givanovitch would not change the meaning, and that M. Basdevant was right in thinking it superfluous.

The question remained whether it was not necessary to expand somewhat the first paragraph of Article 1 and, if so, whether the new wording would not be open to the objection already raised by certain delegates that the formula employed in the text might be understood to refer solely to acts directed against the State itself. As had been pointed out, if someone threw a grenade against a sentry-box or a police station, that could not be described as an act directed against the State.

The Conference had before it two suggestions : that of M. Basdevant, who proposed a more concise wording, and that of M. Givanovitch, whose wording was rather longer but had the merit of making the paragraph clearer. There was no divergence of principle : it was simply a matter of drafting.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thought it would be difficult for the Conference, at that stage, to vote for radical changes in a draft drawn up, after three readings, by the Committee of Experts. On the other hand, he had great admiration for the ideas underlying the Yugoslav proposal. Perhaps the more explicit text proposed by M. Givanovitch could be inserted in the report, to serve as an explanation and a basis of interpretation of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT said that everyone had the greatest respect for the text drawn up by the Committee of Experts; but there was no reason to consider it sacrosanct. If the Conference had been sufficiently enlightened by the discussion, it might now vote on the proposed amendment, and take up the point again, if necessary, at the second reading.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) pointed out that the term " public order " was not very clear, and that its meaning was not the same in international and in criminal law. In France, the terminology was the same in both cases; but in German, while the French expression " ordre public " was used in international law, in criminal law the expression used was " öffentliche Ordnung ". It was not correct to say that all offences were necessarily directed against what the Germans called " öffentliche Ordnung ", since the codes provided for a special category of offences, described as " Verbrechen gegen die öffentliche Ordnung ".

So far as criminal law was concerned, M. Givanovitch was right : but the introduction of the words " public order " would make the text ambiguous, which in its present form it was not.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) observed that the definition of terrorism in the first paragraph of Article 1 was a general definition which had no connection with the later provisions of the Convention. Would it not meet the difficulty to insert a reference to the concrete provisions in the following articles? The Czechoslovak delegation had based its proposed amendment on M. Sasserath's amendment, not thinking that the latter would subsequently be withdrawn. But, given a reference to the concrete provisions of the following articles, the wording " criminal acts directed against a State " would be sufficient.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) fully agreed with M. Delaquis. The Spanish Penal Code contained a chapter dealing with offences against public order in the strict sense of the term—that was to say, offences of an essentially political nature. For that reason, he would vote against any reference to public order. If the Czechoslovak proposal to insert in Article 1 a reference to Articles 2 and 3 were accepted, he was prepared to accept the wording : " criminal acts directed against a State ".

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought it was very difficult for the Conference to take a decision there and then. On the one hand, it had before it a Czechoslovak amendment which had the advantage of getting round the difficulty by a reference to Articles 2 and 3, and on the other, M. Givanovitch's suggestion with the explanatory comments of M. Delaquis. He might point out that even the penalisation of offences against private interests was determined by the requirements of the public interest, which indeed constituted the justification of the penalty.

In view of the difficulty with which the Conference was faced, he proposed to refer the Yugoslav and Czechoslovak amendments to the Drafting Committee.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not accept the Yugoslav amendment, which enlarged the scope of the Convention and introduced conceptions foreign to its object. He was in favour of leaving the text as it stood or of inserting the text proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation. He could also agree to M. van Hamel's suggestion to embody in the report the ideas expressed in the Yugoslav proposal.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) observed that the terms " safety " and " public order " were also to be found in the second paragraph of the text proposed by the experts. The French Penal Code used the expression " sûreté extérieure et intérieure de l'Etat ". If that was what was meant, it would have been better to use the same expression.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) thought it was simpler to refer the amendments to the Rapporteur rather than to the Drafting Committee. The Rapporteur was in a better position to find the most satisfactory formula.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) thought it would serve no useful purpose to refer the matter to the Rapporteur or the Drafting Committee. It was preferable to take a decision at once . All the Rapporteur could do was to submit two texts, between which the Conference would have to choose, and it would then be confronted with the same difficulty.

M. Bekerman did not think it possible to introduce the expression " public order ", which, as had already been seen, had three or four different meanings in different connections. M. Delaquis had just given one example. The Spanish delegate had quoted the case of the Spanish Code. The Polish Code, for its part, distinguished between criminal acts directed against the State on the one hand and criminal acts directed against public order on the other. But the expression " criminal acts directed against the State " was not used in the text of the draft Convention in the sense it had in national penal codes. The reference was rather to the relation between acts of terrorism and the vital interests of the State, to the exclusion of acts aimed directly against private interests.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with M. Bekerman that there was no point in referring the text to the Drafting Committee or to the Rapporteur. The Conference must decide for one or other of the two solutions, leaving it to the Drafting Committee to find a wording embodying the Conference's decision. It was not for the Drafting Committee to decide between the two texts.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, was grateful to M. Bekerman and M. Hirschfeld for relieving him of a very delicate duty. Since it was not possible to come to an agreement on the basis of the formula proposed by M. Givanovitch, the Rapporteur proposed to retain the text of the first paragraph as it appeared in the experts' draft. On the other hand, if M. Givanovitch had no objection, M. Pella would like to adopt M. van Hamel's suggestion and embody in the report the ideas contained in the Yugoslav proposal. Should there be no final report, the mere reading of the Minutes would suffice to show the scope of the text of paragraph 1, taking into account the very interesting observations made by the Yugoslav delegate.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) accepted M. Pella's proposal. As he had already stated when submitting his text, his only aim was to make suggestions. He was in the hands of the Drafting Committee.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

AMENDED TEXT OF ARTICLE 1 PROPOSED BY THE CZECHOSLOVAK DELEGATION.[1]

To replace Article 1 by the following text :

1. Acts of terrorism within the meaning of the present Convention are criminal acts which are dealt with below in Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention and which are directed against a State and are intended or are calculated to create or have the effect of creating a state of terror.

2. The High Contracting Parties in their relations with one another recognise that they have under the general rules of international law the duty to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities against the safety and public order of another State. They accordingly assume towards one another the obligation to prevent and punish all the terrorist activities dealt with in the present Convention.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) explained that the Czechoslovak delegation had embodied in its text all the amendments submitted by the other delegations. As the Belgian delegation had withdrawn its amendment, however, the words " or have the effect of creating " could be omitted in the text of the Czechoslovak amendment.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) thought that it would be well to give, if not a definition, at all events an objective description, of terrorism. He did not think that a definition should appear in the preamble, as that would raise the question of the value of the preamble in the interpretation of the Convention. No definition could ever hope to be perfect. Nor indeed was a definition absolutely necessary, seeing that the purpose of the Convention was to confer an international character on acts which were known to all criminologists. Again, it would be difficult to avoid tautology in any definition of terrorism.

He welcomed the Czechoslovak amendment proposing the insertion in Article 1 of a reference to Articles 2 and 3. If, however, it were decided to leave the text of Article 1 as it stood, it would be preferable to invert the order of the two paragraphs.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said the Czechoslovak amendment had many merits. One difficulty, nevertheless, arose from the fact that the international character of the acts covered by the Convention was indicated in other articles besides Articles 2 and 3—in particular, in connection with extradition.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.4(a).

The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that it had been decided to substitute the words " duly specified persons " for the word " individuals " in the experts' text.[1] The Czechoslovak amendment would conflict with that decision.

M. STOYKOVITCH (Yugoslavia) observed that the Czechoslovak amendment raised a technical difficulty, inasmuch as Article 2 itself contained a reference to Article 1. There was therefore a vicious circle, since Article 1 referred to Article 2 for the definition of the aims of the Convention, and Article 2 contained a similar reference to the previous article.

The PRESIDENT recognised that this was a serious objection. He proposed to consider the present text of paragraph 1 as adopted at a first reading. It would always be possible for the Conference to revert to it later, after considering Article 2.

The President's proposal was adopted.

SEVENTH MEETING.

Held on Thursday, November 4th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

16. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937)[2] (continuation).

ARTICLE 1 (continuation).

DETAILED EXAMINATION OF ARTICLE 1, PARAGRAPH 2, AND THE AMENDMENTS THERETO.

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Polish delegation had proposed an amendment to Article 1, paragraph 2,[3] with the object of emphasising the international character of the acts of terrorism which the Convention was designed to prevent and punish by its provisions for co-operation between States. The Czechoslovak delegation had also submitted an amendment to the same paragraph[4] which reproduced to some extent the Greek delegate's suggestion[5] that a clear statement should be included, in accordance with the Assembly resolution of 1936,[6] as to the obligation of States to refrain from interference in the political life of other States and to prevent the preparation and execution of terrorist crimes directed against other States. Since it had been decided, at the fifth meeting, to refer the Greek delegation's suggestion to the Drafting Committee, the President proposed to do the same with the Czechoslovak amendment, and to begin with the discussion of the Polish amendment.

The President's proposal was adopted.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation[3] (continuation).

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) recalled the arguments he had advanced, in submitting his amendment at the fifth meeting,[7] in order to show that, since the international character of the acts of terrorism to which the Convention was intended to apply was postulated in Article 1, paragraph 2, it was necessary to define what was meant by that international character.

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Committee of Experts had taken the view that Article 1 ought to be couched in general terms, to serve as an introduction to the Convention. The Polish amendment was of great interest, as it indicated the qualifications which gave an international character to acts of terrorism : but the Conference would have to consider, first, whether the Polish list of qualifications was a comprehensive one and, secondly, whether it was not calculated to overload paragraph 2, to which there were already amendments submitted by the Greek and Czechoslovak delegations. The President pointed out that paragraph 2 could not be expected to say everything that was to be said.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) accepted the idea on which the Polish amendment was based—namely, that the international character of the acts to be punished should be clearly defined—

---

[1] See page 77.
[2] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.
[3] For the text of the Polish amendment, see page 71.
[4] For the text of the Czechoslovak amendment, see page 80.
[5] See page 72.
[6] See page 183.
[7] See page 71.

but he doubted whether the amendment as it stood was as clear as its authors would like. Taken in conjunction with the articles of the Convention relating to the international character of specific acts of terrorism, it tended to confuse the issue. For example, under the Polish amendment, the nationality of the authors of acts of terrorism was a factor in determining the international character of the act. Article 2, on the other hand, did not take the factor of the offender's nationality into account. What gave an act of terrorism an international character under Article 2 was the fact of its being directed against another State. Further inconsistencies could be pointed out. The Polish amendment would therefore have to be more precisely worded. It might possibly meet the Polish delegation's objection to say in paragraph 2 of Article 1, that such acts must be prevented and punished " when they are of an international character *within the meaning of Articles, etc.*".

With reference to the Czechoslovak amendment, M. Sebestyén recalled that, at the fifth meeting,[1] he had pointed out that the passage in Article 1 relating to the duty of States to refrain from interference in the political life of another State was not drafted in the form of a provision of the Convention. Hence his suggestion that the obligation in question should be included in a preamble. M. Sebestyén noted that the Czechoslovak amendment, which was drafted in a legally binding form, could quite well be included in the text of the Convention itself; it imposed on States the obligation not to interfere in the affairs of other States. That provision was logical; and he was ready to support it, subject to the requisite revision of the text by the Drafting Committee.

The Spanish delegate's suggestion that the order of the two paragraphs of Article 1 should be reversed[2] deserved attention. It might well be referred to the Drafting Committee.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought it was very difficult to define the international character of a criminal act; for that reason he could not support the Polish amendment. Any list of qualifying clauses was bound to be incomplete; it was better to leave it to the legal practice of each country to establish the international character of the criminal acts to be punished. M. Givanovitch pointed out that the international character of a criminal act was determined by two factors : the international status of the person or property attacked, and the means by which the attack was effected. On the other hand, the terrorist's place of refuge could not, in his opinion, have any bearing on the international character of his crime, since his extradition could be demanded. In a word, M. Givanovitch did not think it advisable to attempt to specify in the text of the Convention the criteria by which to determine the international character of the acts concerned.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) insisted that, as the international character of acts of terrorism was postulated in the Convention, it was essential to define what was meant by that international character. If the list of qualifications given in the Polish amendment was incomplete, it could be supplemented in accordance with such suggestions as the Conference might put forward. On the other hand, if paragraph 2 were amended in the sense proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation, the definition of the international character of the acts concerned might be given in paragraph 1. M. Bekerman wished to insist on the necessity of clearly indicating in the Convention itself whether the international character was inherent in the act itself or dependent upon circumstances to be determined.

The PRESIDENT proposed, in the light of M. Bekerman's intimation that his list of qualifications was open to completion, to refer the Polish amendment to the Drafting Committee, as had already been done with the Greek and Czechoslovak amendments.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) said that, while he appreciated the idea behind the Polish amendment, he would prefer to see it put in more general language. The Conference was drawing up an international Convention, not a penal code or a contract. Governments should therefore be left free to decide for themselves as to the international character of the acts covered by the Convention. Subject to that reservation, M. van Hamel would not oppose the reference of the Polish amendment to the Drafting Committee.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) was willing for his amendment to be referred to the Drafting Committee.

Replying to the Netherlands delegate, he observed that the Convention which the Conference was called upon to draw up constituted a contract, and as such it should say clearly what was meant by the international character of the acts which the contracting parties were to undertake to prevent and punish.

The PRESIDENT proposed to refer paragraph 2 to the Drafting Committee, together with the Polish, Czechoslovak and Greek amendments and the suggestion made by the Netherlands delegate.

The President's proposal was adopted.

---

[1] See page 72.
[2] See page 80.

For the information of the Drafting Committee, the PRESIDENT remarked that the discussion had shown the Conference to be in favour of Article 1 being left in general terms. It was intended as an introduction to the Convention, and ought not to go into details. Its provisions should not be too meticulous, since no list could include all the acts of terrorism which it was intended to cover.

ARTICLE 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties should make the following acts committed on its own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 :

(1) Any act intended to cause death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to ;

(a) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(b) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity.

(2) Wilful destruction of or damage to public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party.

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public.

(4) The manufacture, obtaining, or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article.

(5) Any attempt to commit any of the acts falling within the present article.

AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 2.

Amendment proposed by the Belgian Delegation.[1]

In the introductory paragraph :

Add, after the words " *the High Contracting Parties should* ", the words " *if this is not already the case* ".

Suppress the words " *and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article* 1 ".

Amendment proposed by the Czechoslovak Delegation.[2]

Replace the introductory paragraph by the following text :

Each High Contracting Party should make the following acts committed on his territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and satisfy the conditions laid down in paragraph 1 *of the preceding article.*

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the Czechoslovak amendment was a logical consequence of the same delegation's amendment [3] to Article 1. Discussion of the amendment to Article 2 might therefore be posponed until the Drafting Committee had taken a decision in regard to Article 1.

M. Pella accepted the Belgian amendment. He pointed out that Roumanian criminal law already covered all the acts referred to in Article 2. The Belgian proposal to add " if this is not already the case " after the word " should " did not affect the scope of Article 2. The proposal was perfectly sound, and he felt sure the Conference would see its way to accepting it.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) said there was no need to dwell further on the first Belgian amendment, which the Rapporteur had so fully justified. Moreover, M. Sasserath believed that all the delegations were willing to accept it.

Turning to the second Belgian amendment, he pointed out that the various acts covered by Article 2 constituted ordinary criminal offences, so that to say, as the present text did, " if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 ", was to narrow the conception of an ordinary criminal offence. It was for that reason that the Belgian delegation proposed to omit the phrase. However, certain delegates had since pointed out to him that the Conference was not concerned with ordinary criminal offences except in so far as they were of a terrorist character, and had expressed a desire to retain the phrase used in Article 2. That being so, M. Sasserath would withdraw his amendment.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) had no objection to the first Belgian amendment, which was quite a reasonable one, although, in his view, the statement it contained was self-evident, and therefore served no purpose.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.5.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.5*(a)*.
[3] See page 80.

Passing next to point (4) of Article 2, M. Bekerman laid stress upon the importance of that provision. He observed, however, that the question of arms and ammunition was also partially covered by Article 12. Admittedly, some of the problems to which Articles 2 and 12 referred were treated from a different standpoint in the two articles; but in any case Article 12 was incomplete and required redrafting. It did not mention, for example, the manufacture of arms. The penalties which it prescribed related only to acts regarded as offences in themselves. If Article 12 were completed, point (4) of Article 2 might be unnecessary. Point (4) of Article 2 was purely subjective. It penalised only such acts as came within the category of offences the purpose of which brought them within the scope of the Convention. But experience showed how difficult it was to establish " purpose ". It might be preferable to treat the acts in question as offences in themselves. The acts specified in point (4) of Article 2 were preparatory acts and, as such, did not come under the criminal codes of most countries unless they were associated with major crimes. Moreover, the obligations incurred by the contracting parties under point (4) would necessitate the revision of their penal codes—a considerable undertaking for States which had only recently achieved such a revision. Such States might find it difficult on that account to adopt the Convention.

If the subjective character of the acts specified in point (4) were maintained, the contracting parties would be assuming an obligation which might well prove too onerous. Since the Convention already covered preparatory offences in connection with false passports and the purchase and carrying of arms, M. Bekerman proposed to treat the acts specified in point (4) as purely objective offences, and to incorporate them in Article 12.

In reply to the President, M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said his delegation was willing for its amendment to be referred to the Drafting Committee.

The Czechoslovak amendment was referred to the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT asked if the Conference was prepared to adopt the first part of the Belgian amendment.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) was in favour of referring the amendment to the Drafting Committee for further consideration in the light of Article 23 and others.

The first part of the Belgian amendment was referred to the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT, in answer to M. Bekerman's argument that point (4) was superfluous, pointed out that Article 12 covered neither the manufacture of arms nor the manufacture, purchase, etc., of harmful substances.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) explained that he had not said that point (4) was superfluous. He had expressed the opinion that it overlapped to some extent with Article 12, and had suggested that the latter article needed to be completed.

He added that it would be very difficult to punish the acts specified in point (4) as at present stated. The acts in question belonged to a category of offences which it was most difficult to prove, because their motive had to be clearly established. The Conference should take that consideration into account, since it made prosecution difficult. To take an example, a man might obtain a permit from the competent authorities to buy a revolver with which to commit an act of terrorism. In that case, the purchase of the revolver was a punishable offence in virtue of point (4); but how was it possible to prosecute, if the criminal obtained the necessary authorisation to make the purchase in question?

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought the Polish proposal perfectly logical; but he doubted, in view of the difficulties encountered in connection with Article 12 by the Committee of Experts, whether the scope of that article could be widened. Grave objections had been raised in the Committee to much less far-reaching proposals for supplementing Article 12, owing to the difficulty which some countries would have in modifying their administrative regulations as to the carrying and possession of arms. However, if M. Bekerman felt that the obstacles encountered in the Committee of Experts could be surmounted at the Conference, M. Pella would suggest the adoption, at the first reading, of point (4) as it stood. Should the scope of Article 12 be subsequently expanded, the Conference could then reconsider point (4) in the light of the new text of Article 12.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) agreed with M. Bekerman. Article 12 was concerned with administrative regulations respecting arms, whereas point (4) of Article 2 related to acts committed in preparation of the offences covered by that article. Article 2 therefore covered the crime itself, preparatory acts and attempted crimes. That was too much for a single article. Why not put attempted crimes and preparatory acts in a special article? Article 2 would then stop at point (3); points (4) and (5) would form a separate article—Article 3. That regrouping was æsthetically preferable, since Article 2 would then relate only to actual offences, and the new Article 3 to attemped crimes and preparatory acts. The Convention stood to gain by the change.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) was against any change in points (4) and (5) of Article 2, or in Articles 12 and 13.

In connection with points (4) and (5), he pointed out that " the manufacture, obtaining or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances, with a view to the commission

in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article " was not necessarily or exclusively a preparatory act. It was part and parcel of the act of terrorism itself. An act of terrorism did not consist solely in the final act of violence; it comprised all the preliminaries and all the means used for the perpetration of the act as well.

In Article 12, on the contrary, the idea of terrorism as such did not appear. Article 12 sought to prevent preparatory acts by stipulating that " The carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms . . . should be subjected to regulation, and it should be a punishable offence to transfer . . . them . . ."; but it did not take into account whether or not an act of terrorism was involved.

Similarly, Article 13 laid down that " The following acts should be punishable : *(a)* Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration of passports or equivalent documents ", but did not apparently deal further with the conception of terrorism. The Committee of Experts had been perfectly logical in the matter. In Article 2, it specified the different crimes and offences for which legal provision was to be made, if not already made, by the different countries in connection with terrorism within the meaning of Article 1. The Committee went on, in Articles 12 and 13, to specify preventive measures to be taken in order, as far as possible, to remove the customary instruments of crime from the reach of criminals. It was obvious that the general regulation of the carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, and the introduction of severe legal penalties against the manufacture or alteration and circulation of passports, must go a long way to restrict the facilities of terrorists for the accomplishment of their crimes.

Under those circumstances, any change either in Article 2, or in Articles 12 and 13, would seriously upset the scheme of the Convention as a whole. M. Sasserath hoped therefore that the Conference would keep the articles as they stood.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that some explanations were necessary with regard to the questions raised by the delegate of Poland and the delegate of Spain.

As regards the first, he repeated what he had already said—namely, that, if substantial changes were made in Article 12, it would be necessary to see whether such amendments affected point (4) of Article 2. Clearly, if the scope of Article 12 were extended so as to go beyond the enunciation of a general rule, it might be maintained that, in certain cases, Article 12 would overlap with point (4) of Article 2. At present there was no overlapping, because the draft made certain preparatory acts punishable in the form of special offences. That recommendation was necessary, because many legislations did not make such preparatory acts punishable. Speaking generally, preparatory acts were punishable only in particularly serious instances, in the case of crimes directed against the safety of the State and other very serious crimes in which the prevention of preparation meant the prevention of the offence itself.

The Rapporteur felt accordingly that point (4) of Article 2 should be kept as it stood and that the question of amending it should only be discussed, if, as a result of the amendment of Article 12, there was found to be overlapping. M. Pella therefore asked the Polish delegate to accept point (4) as it stood for the moment, on the understanding that he would be free to revert to his proposal at the second reading if, as the result of extending the scope of Article 12, point (4) of Article 2 was found to overlap with the former article.

As regards the Spanish proposal, the force of the Spanish delegate's arguments would depend on the view taken by the Conference. Clearly, since in point (4) of Article 2, the manufacture, obtaining and supplying of arms, etc., with a view to acts of terrorism, were made special criminal offences, it was for the Conference to decide whether or not attempts to commit those special offences should also be made punishable. From the strictly legal standpoint, they were not really attempts to commit preparatory acts, but rather, seeing that the preparatory acts were punishable as special offences, the acts in question were really themselves in the nature of attempted offences. It was for the Conference then to decide whether it wished an attempt to commit such an offence to be punishable or not. In the latter case, the position was quite clear; it was simply a matter of inverting points (4) and (5) of Article 2 : the new point (4) would read " *Any attempt to commit any of the acts mentioned above* " and the present point (4) would become point (5). Every country would of course have the right under its national legislation to declare attempts to commit those special acts punishable or not as it thought fit.

Consequently, as regards the question raised by the Spanish delegate, the point to be decided was whether the Conference wished the contracting parties to enter into an obligation to punish attempts to commit the offences named in point (4) of Article 2, or whether it wished to leave the matter to be decided by the contracting parties themselves. A decision was required on that point. If the Conference accepted the Spanish delegation's view, all that was necessary was to invert the order of points (4) and (5).

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) accepted the Rapporteur's proposal concerning point (4). He pointed out, at the same time, that he had not intended to submit a formal amendment, but had simply wished to direct the Conference's attention to the connection between point (4) of Article 2 and Article 12.

The Spanish delegate's observation appeared to him quite justified. He noted, however, that if, as the Rapporteur suggested, acts preparatory to the perpetration of terrorist acts were regarded as special offences, difficulties would arise in the matter of the national legislation. It must not be forgotten that point (1) of Article 2 concerned intentional acts directed against the liberty of certain persons. If, therefore, point (4) of Article 2 were allowed to stand, it would be necessary, in anticipation of the act of obtaining a revolver with a view to an attack on the liberty of certain persons, to provide in the national legislation for a special offence relating either to the loss of liberty in general or to the loss of liberty of the persons mentioned in the Convention. Provisions would thus have to be introduced into the national legislations covering all the different aspects of the acts covered by the Convention. That obviously would lead to difficulties.

The PRESIDENT noted that the delegate of Spain had not submitted a formal amendment. Nevertheless, his observations could be met by inverting points (4) and (5) of Article 2. In that way, attempts would only be punishable if they referred to the acts previously enumerated.

The President therefore proposed *the inversion of points* (4) *and* (5) *of Article 2.*

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) said that the inversion of points (4) and (5) was, in his view, a fundamental matter. It could not be said that the mere fact of making a preparatory act punishable meant that an attempt to commit that act could also be made punishable. But attempts could in fact be made punishable simply by inverting points (4) and (5).

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) suggested, in the interests of symmetry, that it would be better not to invert points (4) and (5) of Article 2, and proposed that point (5) should read : " *Any attempt to commit any of the acts falling within points* (1) *to* (3) *above* ". The various acts would thus follow in succession, and attempts to commit those acts would be mentioned later.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that if the idea of the preparatory act in itself were considered of importance, it would be better to redraft the article accordingly, and to mention first the act of execution, then the attempt to commit that act, and then the preparatory act. It would thus be more logical to put point (5) before point (4).

He wished to refer more particularly to one aspect of the matter which did not call for any decision by the Conference but was of importance from the point of view of the modifications which the adoption of the present Convention would necessitate in the national legislations. If the Conference adopted point (4) concerning preparatory acts, the national legislator would have a choice between several methods of giving effect to that text. He might first adopt the following method : make punishable certain acts, mentioned in points (1), (2) and (3) of Article 2, and then provide in general terms that preparatory acts with a view to their execution should be punishable. In that case, it would not even be necessary to repeat the list in point (4). That was a question of method to be left to the sole judgment of the national legislator. Another legislator, on the other hand, might adopt a different system. He might declare that each preparatory act was a special offence, indicating the specific features of that offence.

The Rapporteur thought therefore that it should be made clear that the national legislator remained perfectly free to follow whatever method he thought fit to make the preparation of acts covered by the Convention a criminal offence—whether all preparatory acts as such were made punishable under the terms of a general formula or whether they were made punishable as special offences.

In any case, the Spanish delegate's proposal was not affected by the particular aspect to which the Rapporteur had just referred, and it would be for the Conference to say whether it was in favour of the contracting parties entering into a formal obligation to make attempted preparatory acts punishable offences or whether it preferred to leave that punishment to their discretion.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) said that the formula proposed by the Belgian delegate met with his entire approval.

The Conference decided to examine the Polish delegate's proposal concerning point (4) *after the adoption of Article* 12 *at a first reading.*

It further adopted the drafting of point (5) *suggested by the Belgian delegate.*

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia), referring to point (4), asked why the word " possession " which had appeared in earlier texts of the draft Convention had been deleted in the present draft and replaced by the word " obtaining ", which was not the same thing.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that it was necessary to make the possession of arms with a view to the perpetration of an act of terrorism a punishable offence.

The Conference decided to insert the word " possession " after the word " obtaining " in point (4).

Article 2 was referred to the Drafting Committee together with the proposals made during the discussion.

EIGHTH MEETING.

Held on Thursday, November 4th, 1937, at 3 p.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

17. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) [1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 3.

1. Each of the High Contracting Parties should also make the following actions criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to acts of terrorism directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the acts of terrorism are to be carried into execution :

(a) Any agreement to commit any of the acts mentioned in Article 2 (Nos. (1) to (4));
(b) Any direct public incitement, whether successful or not;
(c) Any successful private incitement;
(d) Any wilful complicity;
(e) Any help given towards the commission of such an act.

2. Acts of participation in the offences falling within the present Convention shall be treated as separate offences when the persons committing them can only be brought to trial in different countries.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 3.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation.[2]

In paragraph 1 *(a)* replace the word "*agreement*" by the word "*combination*".

PARAGRAPH 1.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, gave the Conference the following explanations with reference to the Polish amendment.

The Committee had often discussed the question dealt with in the amendment. The Polish delegation had submitted the same proposal in the Committee, which had not, however, accepted it. The Polish delegation had now submitted it again at the Conference.

He pointed out that if certain serious acts of a terrorist character were to be effectively prevented, it would be necessary not only to punish the preparatory act, but also the " agreement " to commit that act. To begin with, adopting the terminology employed in the French law against anarchist conspiracies, the Committee of Jurists had used the expression " conspiracy to commit an act of terrorism ". That expression had not been approved by the Polish expert, and, after lengthy discussion, it had been decided to use the word " agreement ". A conspiracy was of course something quite different from a " combination ". The latter presupposed a concrete organisation and concrete forms of execution, whereas a conspiracy simply implied a decision arrived at by several persons to commit a given act.

Consequently, for the reasons which had led the French legislator to add the term " entente " (" conspiracy ") to that of " association " (" combination "), and for the reasons for which the British legislator had adopted the word " conspiracy ", which was wider in meaning than " combination ", (" association "), the Rapporteur asked the Conference not to adopt the amendment.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) thought it necessary, in any case, to retain the word " accord ", or some synonym, such as " entente ", which had the advantage of already appearing in several codes, and more particularly in certain French laws. The Conference might decide to add the word " association ", which was different in meaning from " entente ", and use the expression " association ou entente ", which was also found in several recent French laws.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) supported the proposal of the Belgian delegate, and quoted the precedent of the 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, which contained a similar clause in paragraph *(c)* of Article 2.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that, in the preliminary draft which he had submitted to the Committee, he had used the expression " asssociation ou entente ". The Committee had deleted the word " association " on the ground that there could be no " association " without " entente ". Personally, he could see no objection to reverting to the expression " association ou entente ".

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.6.

M. CASSAGNAU (France) explained why the French legislator had thought it necessary to add the word " entente ". " Association " implied an organisation and leaders. When measures had had to be taken to repress anarchist conspiracies, difficulties had arisen from the fact that the anarchists claimed that they could not have either organisation or leaders. To cope with that objection, the idea of an " entente " had been introduced.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that if the word " association " were to be inserted, it should be mentioned first, and then " entente ", since " association " was a more limited term and every " association " implied an " entente ".

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) explained that he had proposed the expression " association " because, in his view, it was more precise in meaning than the word " accord ". He had followed the French Penal Code, which referred in Article 265 to " associations de malfaiteurs ". As regards the English translation of the Polish proposal, he was not sufficiently conversant with English juridical terms to express an opinion as to the suitability of the term which had been used.

M. HIORTHÖY (Norway) said that the Norwegian delegation, while in agreement with the main principles of the draft Convention, considered that, as the Conference was covering new ground, it ought to proceed very cautiously. The Norwegian delegation was of opinion that the draft Convention was too far-reaching, in that it covered acts which, being of a less serious nature, ought not to come within the scope of the Convention. The Norwegian delegation, without wishing to submit any definite proposal, considered it preferable that the provisions of Article 3, concerning the different forms of participation, should refer only to sub-paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of Article 2, and not to sub-paragraph (4), which related to preparatory acts.

At the same time, the Norwegian delegation desired to inform the Conference that it was of the opinion that the question how far preparatory acts should be punishable ought to be decided by the internal laws of the various countries.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that, as the Conference had decided, in connection with Article 2, not to regard attempts to commit preparatory acts as offences, it would hardly be possible, from a purely logical point of view, to treat as an offence the fact of " association ou entente " with the object of committing preparatory acts.

It might obviously be asserted that, as " association ou entente " was an act presupposing the joint action of several individuals, it was thus more dangerous than an individual act. The Conference must therefore decide whether, in view of the collective nature of the act, it should or should not punish " agreement " (" entente ") to commit preparatory acts.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought that the phrase " Nos. (1) to (4) " in paragraph 1 *(a)* of Article 3 should be retained.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the decision taken at the morning meeting concerning the last paragraph of Article 2 [1] was an argument in favour of the Norwegian proposal.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) regretted that he had not been present at the discussion.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, understood the Yugoslav delegate's idea to be that, in the case of an " entente " or " association " the act was more serious in character because it was collective. It would be going too far to suggest the punishment of attempted acts in the case of individual preparatory acts, whereas collective acts for the purpose of preparing a terrorist crime ought to be punished. If the Conference accepted the Yugoslav delegate's views, it would be necessary to scrutinise the various points in Article 3, and to retain or exclude, in the case of each of them, the reference to sub-paragraph (4) of Article 2, according to whether the acts in question were individual or collective. If that method were followed, Article 3 would be brought into harmony both with the decision taken regarding Article 2 and with the Norwegian proposal.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported the Yugoslav delegate's suggestion on that point. Reverting to the question of the use of the term " association " or " entente ", he expressed the opinion that the Conference should decide in favour either of a more general term or of a more precise term such as the Polish delegate had suggested. It was not logical to combine in a single expression the general idea of an " entente " and the narrower idea of an " association ", the latter being simply a particular kind of " entente ". The Conference must decide on one or other of those terms. Personally, M. Hirschfeld preferred the word " entente ".

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that so far as the English text was concerned the United Kingdom delegation thought that it would be best to use the word " conspiracy ", which was stronger than " entente ".

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, quoted the precedent of the 1936 Convention for the suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs: Article 2 of that Convention used the expression

---

[1] See page 86.

" l'association ou l'entente " in the French text and the word " conspiracy " as its equivalent in the English text. The conclusion was that the authors of the 1936 Convention had been of opinion that the word " conspiracy " alone was sufficient to convey the idea embodied in the expression " association ou entente ".

The PRESIDENT said that the Conference had to come to a decision on two questions. The first was whether it should employ the expression " association ou entente " or the word " entente " alone. The second was whether, on the basis of the Yugoslav delegate's suggestion in conjunction with the Norwegian proposal, a distinction should be made, in sub-paragraphs *(a)* to *(e)* of Article 3 of the draft Convention, between individual acts and collective acts.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought, as regards the second point, that the Conference should simply take a decision of principle, leaving the Drafting Committee to frame the text if the Conference decided to accept the Norwegian proposal in conjunction with the Yugoslav delegate's suggestion. The Drafting Committee would also frame a special text concerning preparatory acts, to meet the views of the delegate of Spain.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) said that he had not quite grasped the scope of the Rapporteur's proposal. He supported the Norwegian proposal to delete in paragraph 1 *(a)* of Article 3 the reference to sub-paragraph (4) of Article 2, but he did not see why a collective act should be treated differently from an individual act. If the Convention was not to cover attempts representing the first stages of execution, it was illogical that it should be made to cover " ententes " which were not followed by the first stages of execution.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that, if the delegate of Switzerland would descend from the realms of pure logic and draw on his long experience in the matter of administrative and police researches, he would agree that it was frequently necessary to punish " entente " or " association " to commit preparatory acts. It should not be forgotten that the preparation and execution of acts of terrorism might extend over the territory of several States and that it might, in many cases, be impossible effectively to prevent acts of terrorism without punishing the agreement (entente) to commit such preparatory acts. There was no doubt, moreover, that a collective act presupposing agreement between several individuals was far more serious than an individual act. No penal law existed which punished a simple individual decision to commit a crime, but collective decisions in the form of " ententes " or " associations " to commit a crime were often punishable. It would be a mistake if, as a result of an apparent lack of logic, the provisions adopted left many terrorist activities untouched by the Convention.

The Rapporteur ventured accordingly to insist again on his proposal that the matter should be referred to the Drafting Committee, together with the Spanish delegate's proposal concerning preparatory acts. He warned the Conference against taking hasty decisions which might tend to weaken the Convention. He was afraid, indeed, that that had already been done.

In conclusion, M. Pella said he was unable to accept the Polish proposal that the word " accord " should be replaced by " association ", without the addition of the word " entente ". He proposed that the Conference should accept the text he had submitted to the Committee of Jurists at the outset, which made " association " or " entente " a punishable offence.

The Conference decided to substitute provisionally the expression "association ou entente " *for* " l'accord " *in the French text of paragraph* 1 (a) *of Article* 3 *and to refer the Norwegian proposal and the Yugoslav delegate's suggestion to the Drafting Committee, in accordance with the Rapporteur's proposal.*

M. BASDEVANT (France) wished to lay before the Conference certain points which had occurred to him since the last meeting of the Committee of Experts, concerning paragraph 1 *(c)* of Article 3. He felt that it might be going rather too far to make provision in an international convention for successful private incitement. He was aware that the law in several countries made that act a punishable offence. He did not wish to criticise those laws, but was afraid that certain legislators might hesitate to adopt the same procedure. It might perhaps be preferable to leave the question to the national legislation of each State.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that every legislation in the world made private incitement a punishable offence if it was successful; it was simply the expression " instigation " (incitement) which was new. Most systems of law used the term " provocation " instead of " instigation " and made " provocation " of a non-public nature by means of gifts, threats, abuse of authority and so forth a punishable offence if successful. That was the idea conveyed by the expression "private incitement" as opposed to public incitement, which latter was punishable whether successful or not. In M. Pella's opinion, failure to make provision for successful private incitement would constitute a serious omission, particularly in view of the fact that the law of certain countries went even farther and punished such private incitement even when it was unsuccessful.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) agreed with the Rapporteur. All legislations, he said, made the acts which it was intended to cover in paragraph 1 *(c)* punishable offences. As regards terminology, it would be preferable to substitute for the term " private incitement " the term " incitement ", in contrast to public incitement. If that terminology were adopted, it would be necessary to invert the order of sub-paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)* of paragraph 1 and to mention, first, incitement pure and simple, and then direct public incitement.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, reminded the Conference that the original French proposals [1] had also referred to public incitement to commit acts of terrorism and to the defence of such acts. He pointed out also that, if public incitement, even though unsuccessful, were made a punishable offence, then there was even more reason to punish successful private incitement, which was a far more serious act.

M. BASDEVANT (France) did not think that it was right to refer now to the French suggestions which had been submitted three years before and had simply been in the nature of a programme. The Rapporteur's instructive explanations had, nevertheless, left some doubt in his mind. The Rapporteur had said that all the legislations made private incitement a punishable offence and had given examples which corresponded to the idea of " qualified provocation ", since reference was made to the means employed. Those examples did not, however, cover every case. If someone, for instance, in the course of a private conversation, simply by means of his eloquence, persuaded another person to commit a crime, that was a case of private incitement but not of qualified provocation. If M. Basdevant could have some additional information on that point, he would feel reassured as to the usefulness of the provision now under discussion.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) said that he was in agreement with the Rapporteur, but wondered whether the word " private " might not create difficulties for those who were not jurists. *He proposed to keep the word " incitement, " to delete the word " private " and to invert the order of sub-paragraphs* (b) *and* (c) *in paragraph* 1. There would thus be no possibility of doubt, as everyone knew what was meant by " incitement ".

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) agreed with the Rapporteur. As regards terminology, he suggested using the word " *provocation* ", which was found in several codes. It was advisable, in his opinion, to avoid departing from the general terminology, at all events as far as possible.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) supported M. Basdevant's suggestion, largely on practical grounds. He thought that the mention of private incitement would make the Convention more difficult to accept, because it had an air of prying into private life and confidential communications. Moreover, private incitement was extremely difficult to prove, and any attempt to prove it probably meant using tainted evidence. In the general interest of the Convention, and with a view to its ultimate ratification, it would be advisable, for practical reasons, to omit that particular paragraph.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, did not think that the United Kingdom delegate's proposal met the French delegate's point. The Conference had to consider three questions.

There was first the Spanish delegate's proposal to omit the word " private ". In its first draft,[2] the Committee of Experts had followed M. Pella's advice in this matter, but it had subsequently added the word " private ", so that a clear distinction could be drawn between private and public incitement. Personally, he would find it difficult to oppose the deletion of that word, since he had not used it in his own preliminary draft. He would therefore certainly support the proposal made by M. Jiménez de Asúa.

There was also the Belgian delegate's proposal to substitute the word " provocation " for " incitement ". The Rapporteur saw no objection to that proposal, but thought that the term " incitement " was more in keeping with modern conceptions of penal law and would prevent confusion with the other meaning of the word " provocation ". That was simply a scientific consideration.

There was lastly the proposal of the French delegate. The latter had mentioned the only case which would not constitute qualified incitement. As regards that point, the Rapporteur thought that the Conference ought to face its responsibilities and decide whether it could admit that a person who made another commit an act of terrorism should not be punished.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the formula " *incitement by means of gifts, threats, abuse of authority, etc.* " was not more in keeping with the views of the delegate of France.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, asked, on the other hand, whether the formula " *qualified incitement* " would not satisfy the French delegate. He did not personally approve of that expression, but he had suggested it in a spirit of compromise and to avoid prolonging the present discussion. He proposed in any case to refer to the matter at the next meeting or when the draft was adopted at a second reading, as he considered that the simple and unqualified expression " *successful incitement* " should be used.

M. BASDEVANT (France) replied that the expression " qualified incitement " was not adequate. The formula suggested by the President seemed to him preferable.

The PRESIDENT thought that the Conference should adopt provisionally " incitement by means of gifts, threats, abuse of authority, etc.", leaving the Drafting Committee to frame a text.

The President's proposal was adopted.

---

[1] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 22.
[2] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V.

NINTH MEETING.

Held on Friday, November 5th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

18. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) [1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 3 (continuation).

PARAGRAPH 1 *(continuation)*.

M. SCHLEGEL (Denmark) had no serious objection to sub-paragraphs *(a)* to *(c)* ; but he wished to draw attention to sub-paragraph *(e)*. As he understood it, the latter covered any help given, whether intentional or not, towards the commission of any one of the acts specified in sub-paragraphs (1) to (4) of Article 2. If that were so, sub-paragraph *(e)* of Article 3 went too far. The idea of motive having already been introduced in connection with acts of terrorism, it should be introduced also in connection with the help given towards the commission of the act. He therefore suggested adding the word " *intentional* " before " *help* " in sub-paragraph *(e)*.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the Committee of Experts had never intended to regard unintentional help as an offence. To make that point clear, he suggested the wording " *any help knowingly given* ", which was quite in accordance with the intentions of the Committee.

The Conference decided to word sub-paragraph (e) *as follows :*

" (e) *Any help knowingly given towards the commission of such an act.*"

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary), referring to the more explicit wording proposed at the previous meeting for sub-paragraph *(c)* thought it might be advisable to use the general term "incitement", proposed by the Spanish delegate, and to leave the legislatures of the different countries free to decide what constituted incitement.

He further supported the Spanish delegate's proposal to invert the order of sub-paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)*.[2]

The PRESIDENT recalled that the word " private " had given rise to considerable discussion, and that it did not figure in the first draft Convention drawn up by the Committee of Experts.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) reviewed the tendencies of modern penal legislation on the subject of incitement. The more recent penal codes did not in the majority of cases define incitement; as far back as 1870, some codes which enumerated the different means of incitement had been at pains to add " and other means ", to indicate that their enumeration was not exhaustive. If the Convention referred to incitement, it should do so without attempting to define the term. It must not be forgotten that the Conference was drawing up an international convention; it could not introduce therein particular provisions which ran counter to the general tendencies and lines of development of criminal law. To define the means of incitement would be to challenge the very marked progress achieved in nearly all modern penal codes.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) explained that it was not incitement in general, but private incitement, which he had had in mind when he proposed at the previous meeting to eliminate all references to " incitement ".[2]

He added that the English wording of sub-paragraph *(a)* of paragraph 1 was very happy, and he hoped it would be kept.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) preferred to say merely " incitement ", and leave the legislature of each country free to interpret the term in the light of its own law.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, referring to the explanations given at the last meeting, thought that the question could best be solved by reverting to the wording adopted at the outset by the Committee of Experts—namely, "successful incitement"—the word "private" being dropped.

The Conference decided to word sub-paragraph (c) *as follows :*

" *Any successful incitement.*"

It was further decided to invert the order of sub-paragraphs (b) *and* (c).

Paragraph (1) *as amended was adopted at a first reading.*

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.

[2] See page 90.

PARAGRAPH 2.[1]

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the criterion adopted in certain earlier Conventions—namely, the Conventions for the international repression of counterfeiting currency and the suppression of the illicit drug traffic—for deciding whether offences should be considered as " separate offences " was not the same as in the present draft. The determining factor in the two Conventions in question was the place in which the crime was committed. The different criterion in the text under discussion did not appeal to him.

Again, paragraph 2 might be taken to refer only to intentional complicity. To make it perfectly plain that the paragraph covered all the acts to which paragraph 1 related, it should read " *the activities to which the preceding paragraph relates* ".

M. Koukal noted, as regards the criterion of " separate offences ", that, in paragraph 2, the consequences resulting from the acts committed constituted the factor determining the nature of those acts. He did not like that criterion. He preferred the criterion of the place of perpetration as in the previous Conventions he had cited. He had no formal amendment to propose, but would like it to be considered whether the wording of paragraph 2 could not be brought into accordance with that of the corresponding provisions of previous conventions.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the provision in the first draft prepared by the Committee [2] was practically identical with that of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency. He explained why the Committee had been led to abandon that wording in favour of that which was now before the Conference.

In Article 4 of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, it was provided that the acts mentioned in Article 3 of the Convention should be considered as separate offences if they were committed in different countries.

The authors of the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism had, in paragraph 2 of Article 3 of the draft now under discussion, suggested the wording " when the persons committing them can only be brought to trial in different countries " for " if they are committed in different countries ". The purpose of this amendment was to avoid controversy where all those participating in any special act were tried in the same country.

Certain authorities considered that the system of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency made it necessary to prosecute separately those guilty of different acts of participation, if such acts had been committed in different countries, even when the parties were tried in a single country.

M. Pella did not share that view, as the proceedings of the Conference for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency made it clear that the object was to prevent offenders going unpunished when a State was unable to try all the guilty parties owing to the fact that they were abroad and had committed their acts of participation abroad.

The report by the Committee which had prepared the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, the first draft of which had been drawn up by M. Pella in 1927, stated that " that rule did not compel States that might be competent to try acts considered as distinct offences to deal with them separately, but, on the contrary, left each State free to try them under one heading only ".

To avoid such discussion in the future and to dispel all uncertainty as to the exact scope of the text, M. Pella had, however, himself asked that the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism should specify that acts of participation must be considered as separate offences only when they could not be tried in the same country. Consequently, a State was not obliged to prosecute such acts separately.

As regards the substance of the problem, M. Pella felt that numerous opportunities of evading punishment would be afforded if the contracting parties were not bound to consider—in the circumstances specified in paragraph 2 of Article 3—acts of participation as separate offences.

He would not dwell on all the cases which might occur, but would only point out that, in many States, it was possible to evade punishment for accessory participation. That applied to all States whose laws treated complicity as an offence subsidiary to the principal offence, while at the same time recognising the principle of the non-punishment of offences committed abroad by foreigners and the principle of non-extradition of nationals.

The difficulty could only be eliminated by adopting " the theory of complicity as a distinct offence ", which had already been sanctioned by the Institut de Droit international at its session in Munich in 1883. This consisted in adopting as a basis of competence for the purpose of securing punishment, not the place where successful participation occurred, but the place where the individual happened to be at the moment when he committed the act of participation.

The Rapporteur likewise recalled that the French group of the International Union of Criminal Law had voiced the same opinion and had, in 1905, adopted the following formula : " Any act of co-operation or complicity constitutes a separate offence which may give rise to prosecution in the country where it has been committed and to trial according to the laws in force in that country ".

The Rapporteur concluded by drawing attention to the fact that nearly all international conventions for the prevention and punishment of certain offences had approved the ideas he

---

[1] For the text of paragraph 2 of Article 3, see page 87.
[2] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 4 (last paragraph of Article 2).

supported and that these conceptions had been embodied in many modern legislations. He thought that these means were the only ones capable of suppressing terrorist organisations whose ramifications often extended over the territory of several States.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) was in favour of keeping paragraph 2 as it stood, for the reasons stated by the Rapporteur. He appreciated M. Koukal's point as to the adoption of the place of perpetration as a determinant factor; but he thought there were other factors to be taken into account. The effect of paragraph 2 might be made more definite, if the last part of the text were to read " *when the agents* . . . " instead of " *when the persons* . . . ".

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) was grateful for the Rapporteur's clear and detailed statement of the position, which entirely met his argument. He had no further objection to the text of paragraph 2 as it stood.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, was not opposed to the proposal of M. Givanovitch to make the effect of paragraph 2 clearer by substituting the words " agents " for the word " persons ".

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that, personally, he thought the Convention would be the better for the omission of paragraph 2 of Article 3, which was of a rather delicate character, embodying as it did a somewhat subtle conception of criminal law. It could certainly be left to the different countries to decide, in accordance with their own law, their attitude in regard to the acts of the different parties to an offence : such acts, in his view, must include all acts constituting offences within the meaning of the Convention.

He said that when the competent authorities of the contracting States applied to their Parliaments to legislate on a text such as paragraph 2 of Article 3, that paragraph would be extremely difficult to explain; it was at once too precise and too vague. A national administration would have great difficulty in ascertaining whether the persons committing " acts of participation " could " only be brought to trial in different countries ", and the courts—at all events in the United Kingdom—could hardly settle what was to be done in other countries.

He did not wish to move an amendment, but suggested seriously that, at the second reading at any rate, the Conference should consider whether the omission of the passage in question would not simplify the Convention and render it more acceptable to the various Parliaments called upon to pass the legislation necessary for its adoption. That omission, he suggested, would render the whole Convention more acceptable, by avoiding a refinement which appeared to be unnecessary.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said, with reference to the United Kingdom delegate's objection and in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that he would endeavour to submit to the Drafting Committee an even more adaptable wording which would merely indicate that the contracting parties would have to consider the various acts mentioned in the Convention as separate offences in their legislation where this was necessary in order to prevent an offender escaping punishment.

The Conference adopted paragraph 2 of Article 3, subject to the reservation submitted by the United Kingdom delegate and with the substitution of the word " agents " for the word " persons ".

Article 3 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLES 4, 5 AND 6.

Article 4.

Without prejudice to the characterisation of offences and to other special provisions of national law relating to the persons and property mentioned in Article 2, no High Contracting Party shall make any distinction as regards the protection afforded by criminal law between acts, falling under Articles 2 and 3, directed against the Party itself and similar acts directed against another High Contracting Party.

Article 5.

1. In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is accepted, foreign convictions for any of the acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 will, within the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, be taken into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

2. Such convictions will, further, in the case of High Contracting Parties whose law recognises foreign convictions, be taken into account, with or without special proceedings, for the purpose of imposing, in the manner provided by that legislation, incapacities, disqualifications or interdictions whether in the sphere of public or of private law.

Article 6.

In so far as " parties civiles " are admitted under the domestic law, foreign " parties civiles ", including, in proper cases, a High Contracting Party, should be entitled to all rights allowed to nationals by the law of the country in which the case is tried.

Amendments to Articles 4, 5 and 6.

Amendments proposed by the Polish Delegation.[1]

To suppress Articles 4, 5 and 6.

M. Bekerman (Poland) said that Article 4 provided that the contracting parties should make no distinction as regards the protection afforded by criminal law between national persons and property and foreign persons and property, and that, consequently, it overlapped with Article 18. Moreover, there was a contradiction in Article 4, in that it contained a reservation concerning the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law relating to persons and property, and stipulated, on the other hand, that no contracting party should make any distinction, as regards the protection afforded by criminal law, between national and foreign persons and property. If a reservation were made concerning the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law, the Convention must not stipulate that the contracting parties should make no distinction between national and foreign property. It would, of course, be difficult to prevent a national legislation from making a distinction, as regards the protection afforded by criminal law, between national and foreign property, particularly in the case of public national property. Moreover, all the national legislations with which M. Bekerman was acquainted invariably referred, when speaking of an official or public property, to national officials or public property. The method of procedure laid down for the repression of acts directed against nationals or national property was not therefore the same as when the acts were directed against foreign property.

Article 4 would consequently prove inoperative and, if maintained, would be incompatible with Article 18. Furthermore, it would be a difficult matter to oblige the national legislatures to make no distinction as regards the protection afforded by criminal law between national and foreign property, as that would necessitate a radical amendment of the national laws. Moreover, Article 18 offered a perfectly satisfactory solution of the point covered by Article 4. In conclusion, M. Bekerman recalled that, in any international convention, the States parties to the instrument must be trusted to apply the provisions of the text in a proper manner.

Turning to Articles 5 and 6, which concerned respectively the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions and the question of *parties civiles* in criminal procedure, the Polish delegate said that there was a deep divergence on those matters between the different national laws, certain countries admitting the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions and others refusing to accept it. Seeing then that differences existed, he wondered how a country possessing a certain institution could undertake, under an international convention, to put its machinery into operation when another country, which did not possess that institution, was not bound by any such obligation. In his view, only reciprocal undertakings were conceivable in an international convention. Consequently, he could not accept, on Poland's behalf, any undertaking to enforce the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions, unless the other contracting parties were prepared to assume the same obligation. Obligations, he insisted, must be equal, and that was why he had asked for the deletion of Articles 5 and 6.

M. Bachke (Norway) supported the proposal to delete Article 5 and endorsed the Polish delegate's arguments. The provisions of Article 5 were hardly compatible with the Norwegian Code as regards the infliction of heavier penalties in the case of habitual criminality. The adoption of Article 5 would necessitate far-reaching amendments in Norwegian law. The Norwegian delegation would not oppose the deletion of Articles 4 and 6.

M. Hirschfeld (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Polish delegate concerning Article 4, the provisions of which were contradictory and were not in harmony with those of Article 18. He did not, however, approve of deleting Article 4. The text would have to be amended, but the principle of non-discrimination must be maintained, though it would, of course, have to make allowance for exceptions obtaining under the national laws.

In connection with Articles 5 and 6, the Polish delegation had raised the important question of material reciprocity. That could hardly be mentioned in the Convention, which left the national legislature free to decide how its provisions should be applied. All question of material reciprocity was thus excluded, and reciprocal goodwill must be relied on to enforce, with the necessary elasticity, the provisions of the Convention. The Soviet delegation was therefore in favour of retaining Articles 5 and 6.

The question of inequality between the different countries, mentioned by the Polish delegate in connection with the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions, did not worry M. Hirschfeld, since it was a matter for the national laws of each State. The Polish objection appeared to be based on a question of form; it might perhaps be met by amending the text so as to make it less imperative—for example, by the use of a phrase such as " *When the domestic law* ", etc., at the beginning of Article 5.

M. Pella (Roumania), Rapporteur, reminded the Conference that the Polish delegate had used the same arguments in the Committee of Experts and that the latter had decided in favour of retaining the provisions now under discussion. Article 4 embodied a principle which was an

---

[1] Documents Conf. R.T.7, 8 and 9.

elementary consquence of inter-State solidarity in the campaign against terrorism. That solidarity should be reflected in the acceptance of the principle of equality, as regards the protection afforded by criminal law, between the legal property of the State itself and the property of other States parties to the Convention. Accordingly, in order to demonstrate the principle of solidarity which the Conference wished to embody in the Convention, Article 4 should be retained. A similar article existed in the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency. If the inequality which was the outcome of national egoism was to be maintained, it was useless for the Conference to meet for the purpose of framing a Convention.

M. Pella admitted that difficulties had arisen in the matter of Article 4. It was impossible to seek equality as regards the protection afforded by criminal law—either for the characterisation of offences or for penalties—in the case of all the legal property mentioned in Article 2.

Many bodies of law, for example, regarded an attempt on a head of State as an attempt directed against the existence of the State itself, as an offence of the gravest nature against the entity of the State.

Nearly all exceptional regulations for the prevention and punishment of offences against the entity of the State also applied to offences against the life, security and personal liberty of a head of State. Other legislations went even farther and regarded such an act as a violation of the duty of allegiance which every citizen owed to a head of State. Other countries again, such as France, did not grant special protection under the criminal law to the head of the State. The President of the French Republic was, in this respect, only afforded the protection of the ordinary law.

The Committee of Experts had obviously had no intention of interfering with the characterisation of offences as determined by the strong traditions and constitutional organisation peculiar to each country. It had simply sought to affirm the principle of equality, in the matter of the protection afforded by criminal law, as a direct consequence of international solidarity in the campaign against terrorism.

Turning to the question of the international recognition of previous convictions, M. Pella reminded the Conference that a provision similar to that of Article 5 already existed in the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency. Under its terms, a State was under no international obligation in the matter unless its code provided for the international recognition of previous convictions. That principle was optional also in States such as Poland and Norway, whose legislation left it to the discretion of the judge whether he should or should not take foreign convictions into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality. Thus, countries which did not accept the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions, or which did so only in an optional form, had no reason to object to Article 5 of the present draft. That being so, he did not quite see the point of the Norwegian delegate's observations, since the international recognition of previous convictions was not, he understood, compulsory under the Norwegian Code. For France, Belgium, the United Kingdom and other countries, then, which did not accept the principle, Article 5 might be regarded as *res inter alios acta*. From a legal point of view, neither Poland nor Norway was affected by Article 5.

Stressing the moral value of Article 5, the Rapporteur pointed out that the Conventions signed at Geneva were much more general in scope; they exercised an influence in scientific and legal circles in the different countries. The provisions relating to the international recognition of previous convictions, which appeared in the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, had produced a movement of opinion in many countries which had led to the adoption of that principle in the new codes. Thus, apart from their specific object, international conventions helped to determine public opinion; in the field of criminal law, while international conventions might be rather difficult to draw up, they were indicative, when it was possible to adopt them, not only of an inter-State solidarity in the campaign against certain crimes, but also of the general tendencies of criminal legislation. That aspect of the question should be borne in mind.

Lastly, with regard to Article 6, concerning the constitution of the *parties civiles*, the Rapporteur recalled that the obligation to provide security for costs *(cautio judicatum solvi)* also existed in penal matters. In spite of the exemption from such security provided for in various agreements and in spite of the International Conventions of The Hague of 1896 and 1905, such exemption was only granted by a limited number of States and did not apply to some of the new States created after the war. It was therefore essential for the States which admitted the constitution of *parties civiles* that the Convention should lay down the principle that foreign plaintiffs could exercise the same right as those granted to nationals of the country by the laws of the State in which the case was tried.

It should be recognised, moreover, that the participation of a foreign *partie civile*, having the same rights as nationals of the country, might play an important part in the discovery of the offence and of the guilty persons. M. Pella also thought it essential, in view of certain cases which had recently occurred, that a foreign State which was the victim of an offence should be granted the right to constitute itself a *partie civile*. This was an elementary conception which arose out of the solidarity of all nations in the struggle against the scourge of terrorism.

In conclusion, M. Pella proposed that the principles embodied in Articles 4, 5 and 6 should be accepted, on the understanding that the texts might, if necessary, be amended in the interests of greater precision.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) was in favour of maintaining the principles embodied in Articles 4, 5 and 6. He regarded Article 4 as a substantial strengthening of the means of action against terrorism. Referring to Article 5, he pointed out that the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions was to be found in all the new codes and suggested that the older codes should be amended on those lines. Article 6 relating to *parties civiles* should prove

very useful. He agreed, however, with the Polish delegate on the subject of equality of obligations and reciprocity. He suggested that the Drafting Committee should try to find a formula to meet the Polish delegate's views.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) did not see that there was any contradiction in Article 4, though it might be open to criticism on the grounds that it was not sufficiently clear. This could be remedied by indicating that the persons and property to whom the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of the national law applied were those mentioned in sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) of Article 2, whereas, in the case of the acts mentioned in the following sub-paragraphs of the article, no distinction need be drawn according to whether they were directed against the injured State or against another contracting party.

M. Delaquis recalled the opinion which he had expressed in the Committee of Experts concerning Article 5. As regards the Polish delegate's objections, he wondered how any country which admitted under its laws the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions, could refuse to admit it in the case of a previously-convicted terrorist whom it regarded as a dangerous offender, on the grounds that another country did not accept the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions.

M. HIORTHÖY (Norway) said that the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions was admitted under the Norwegian Code.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland), replying to the Swiss delegate, pointed out that he had never said that his country would not apply the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions unless there was reciprocity in the matter. He had said that Poland would not enter into an international undertaking in the matter unless all the other contracting parties gave a similar undertaking.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, replying to M. Hiorthöy's remarks, said that national legislations might be divided into two categories, as regards their attitude towards the question of the international recognition of previous convictions. Certain countries, in given circumstances, automatically recognised foreign convictions for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality. Other legislations, such as the Polish and Norwegian, made the recognition of foreign convictions optional from that point of view. Since Article 5 stipulated that the admission of the principle of international recognition of previous convictions should be contingent on the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, it followed that, in the case of Norway, whose legislation made the acceptance of that principle optional, the obligation laid down in Article 5 would in its turn be purely optional. That was why M. Pella had said that Norway was not affected by Article 5.

The continuation of the discussion on Articles 4, 5 and 6 was adjourned to the next meeting.

TENTH MEETING.

Held on Friday, November 5th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Count CARTON DE WIART.

19. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937)[1] (continuation).

ARTICLES 4, 5 AND 6 (continuation).

M. BASDEVANT (France) desired to submit various further observations concerning Articles 4, 5 and 6.

Article 4 was based on the following notion: It seemed logical, if co-operation could be established for the repression of terrorism, that acts of terrorism directed against one of the signatory States should be repressed in the same way, to the same extent and by the application of the same penalties as if they had been directed against the State in which they were committed. There could be no objection of principle to that very simple idea, which the Committee of Experts had unhesitatingly accepted. At the same time, extremely serious objections occurred when the question of applying that idea was considered. The simplest example was that of crimes directed against the person of the sovereign; in such cases, special penalties were provided which the State concerned would not be willing to enforce if the crime were directed against the head of a foreign State. Without relinquishing the principle, therefore, certain restrictions must be stipulated. Similarly, in certain countries, special provisions might exist for the protection of public buildings which were not necessarily the same as those applicable to foreign public buildings. There again, some slight departure from the principle was necessary.

That was why Article 4 included a reservation relating to the characterisation of offences and the other special provisions of national law. Subject to that reservation, it was only right and proper, when an undertaking was being entered into for the severe repression of terrorist

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.

acts, that such repression should follow the rules laid down for similar attempts against internal order. There was no objection to some more appropriate formula, if that could be found, but the idea should be left intact. It was a perfectly sound idea, which ought to be embodied in the Convention.

M. Basdevant thought it wise to discuss Articles 5 and 6 together, seeing that they both dealt with the same question. They referred (1) to countries in which the international recognition of previous convictions was accepted; (2) to countries which recognised foreign convictions; (3) to countries which admitted *parties civiles*.

Articles 5 and 6 did not affect the question of national law, which was left intact on all the three above-mentioned points and which States had the right to amend as they thought fit. The text simply said that if a State accepted the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions, if it recognised foreign convictions, or if it admitted *parties civiles*, it should do so also in the case of terrorist acts directed against a foreign State. States were not asked to accept anything new, but simply to apply, in the matter of terrorism, what was admitted in other matters. As the delegate of Switzerland had said, they were being asked not to make an unfavourable exception for acts of terrorism.

M. Basdevant did not think that that was asking too much. States were not even being asked to enter into a new undertaking, since the provisions in question already existed. France, for example, could give no undertaking in regard to the first two points, but was quite prepared to enter into an undertaking not to depart from the rule in connection with *parties civiles*, of which the principle was admitted under French law.

Formal modifications could of course be introduced. A State might conceivably object that there was no reason for it to do what the other signatory States were not prepared to do. A less rigid text might meet that objection. He suggested, for example, a formula such as the following : "*The High Contracting Parties declare that it is their intention :* (1) *in so far as their law admits the international recognition of previous convictions, etc.;* (2) *in so far as their law admits the recognition of foreign criminal convictions; etc.;* (3) *in so far as their law admits* parties civiles, *etc.* He was not suggesting a formal text, but simply indicating the possibility of a more elastic formula. The Drafting Committee could go into the question of amendments conceived on those lines.

The Drafting Committee might also consider the question of amending paragraph 1 of Article 5. M. Basdevant had been struck by the doubts of the Norwegian delegation, although, as he interpreted that text, they seemed to him to be unfounded. Article 5 involved no obligation for the signatory States to modify their domestic law. As he understood the position, the Norwegian law admitted the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions as an optional measure, the Norwegian judge being free to decide whether he should or should not apply the principle. That optional right was in no way affected by Article 5, which contained the clause : " within the conditions prescribed by the domestic law ". The optional character of the acceptance of the principle was one of those conditions. It could perhaps be made clearer by amending the text to read " *to the extent and under the conditions prescribed in the national law* ". The Drafting Committee might consider that suggestion.

For the various reasons which he had laid before the Conference, M. Basdevant thought that the texts now under discussion should remain in the Convention.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) agreed with the Rapporteur and the delegate of France that Articles 4, 5 and 6 should be retained. At the same time, he thought that modifications could, if necessary, be introduced to meet the view of the Polish delegation.

Article 4 simply said that no contracting party should make any distinction between acts directed against the party itself and similar acts directed against another contracting party. That was a self-evident principle, and a necessary condition for the framing of an international convention. It was, however, wise on occasion to affirm the most obvious principle.

Taking into account the Polish delegation's reference to Article 18, it might perhaps be well to insert in Article 4 a reference to Article 18, adding, for example, after the reservation concerning the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law, the words : " *in conformity likewise with the provisions of Article* 18 ".

M. Sasserath agreed with the delegate of France that the wording of Article 5 left no doubt as to its scope. To take the Polish law, for example : Paragraph 1 of Article 60 of the Polish Penal Code made acceptance of the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions optional but not compulsory. If an individual committed a theft in Poland, and if it were proved that he had committed similar acts within the last five years in Roumania, the Polish judge was not forced to apply, but could at his discretion apply, the rules applicable to habitual criminality. Seeing, however, that Article 5 contained the clause : " within the conditions prescribed by the domestic law ", the exercise of the right laid down in the Polish Penal Code was still a matter for the judge's discretion and was not in the nature of an obligation. As to the question of reciprocity, M. Sasserath fully appreciated the doubts of the Polish delegation, which did not see why the rule concerning the international recognition of previous convictions should be enforced in regard to States which did not themselves accept it. But, seeing that, in Poland's case, the principle was optional, it need not be applied to such States. Article 5 could, indeed, be amended by the addition of the words : " *when the injured State itself accepts the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions* ".

M. Sasserath submitted, lastly, that Article 6 merely enunciated a rule which was already applied in every country. There seemed to be no reason why the recognition of the right of injured foreign parties to come forward as *parties civiles* should encounter any objection. There again the text might be amended to read " *without prejudice to the principle of reciprocity* ". That would not

affect the scope of the text, since all the States which admitted *parties civiles* extended that provision to foreigners. There was no objection, however, to mentioning the reservation.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) agreed with the previous speakers as to the importance of maintaining Articles 4, 5 and 6. At the same time, he thought that it would be a mistake to insist on the over-strict application of the principle of reciprocity. The Convention, it must be remembered, was intended to ensure international co-operation. There was the danger that the efficacy of the instrument might be weakened by the very laudable desire to insist on reciprocity. The wider application of certain principles—even though not admitted by other States—would open up fresh possibilities of future co-operation on international lines. The over-strict application of the principle of reciprocity would, however, tend to arrest co-operation, and might even mean a set-back. It was important to bear in mind the idea at the back of international co-operation—namely, that each State should co-operate so far as it was able, taking duly into account the peculiarities of its national law. If a State were prepared to make its contribution in the interests of progress, there was no reason why it should be prevented from doing so by a too rigid application of the principle of reciprocity.

M. BACHKE (Norway) thanked the French and the Belgian delegates for their explanations. Their interpretation of Article 5 had done much to allay the doubts of the Norwegian delegation. The latter would be quite satisfied if Article 5 were interpreted on the lines suggested by the delegate of France, and would be interested to see what formal amendments the Drafting Committee might decide to introduce.

The PRESIDENT said that although no concrete amendment had been submitted, several suggestions had been put forward which might well be considered by the Drafting Committee. It had been suggested, for instance, that Articles 4, 5 and 6 should be combined, and that the text should be slightly amended by the introduction of a clause such as "to the extent and under the conditions prescribed in the national law". The suggestion had also been made that, to meet the views of the Polish delegation, it should be stipulated that the reservation concerning the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law should not apply to points (3), (4) and (5) of Article 2. The Belgian delegate had also proposed inserting a reference to Article 18, and had suggested the possibility of introducing the idea of reciprocity. That last suggestion had, however, met with objections from the Greek delegation. Did the delegate of Belgium wish his proposal to stand?

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) said that he had simply put forward a number of suggestions.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that it would be well to make certain points quite clear. The Polish delegation would say if he were misinterpreting its views. In proposing the deletion of Articles 5 and 6, it had wished to arrive at a definition of the issue of reciprocity. If M. Pella understood the position, Poland was prepared to enforce certain domestic provisions, but only under her national law and not in virtue of an international undertaking. She refused to admit that a contracting party, the national law of which did not include the provisions mentioned in Articles 5 and 6, should be able to object that Poland had violated the Convention in that she had failed to apply the provisions of her national law. In a word, Poland could not agree that purely national legislative provisions should be transformed into international obligations.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) endorsed that interpretation.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, went on to discuss the Swiss delegate's proposal that the reservation in Article 4 with regard to the characterisation of offences and other special provisions of national law should apply only to points (1) and (2) of Article 2. The adoption of that proposal would, M. Pella thought, prevent misunderstanding. On the other hand, he was not in favour of the Belgian delegate's suggestion to insert in Article 4 a reference to Article 18, which would, in his view, simply complicate matters. If the Swiss delegate's proposal were accepted, M. Pella considered that the Belgian suggestion would be of no further use.

The French delegate's suggestion concerning the more careful wording of Articles 4, 5 and 6 might be referred to the Drafting Committee for consideration, although M. Pella would have preferred that Articles 5 and 6 be kept in their present form.

He trusted that the Polish delegation, which had already given proofs of its readiness to co-operate, would be prepared to withdraw its amendment in the light of the explanations he had just given, seeing that the issue which chiefly concerned it was the question of reciprocity.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations. He understood that the question was to be referred to the Drafting Committee, and said that the Polish delegation would wish to see whether it could accept the new formula.

The PRESIDENT proposed that Articles 4, 5 and 6 should be referred to the Drafting Committee, and that the latter should be asked to consider their amendment on the lines suggested by various delegates. He did not think there would be any misunderstanding on the subject, as due note had been taken of the observations submitted in the course of the discussion.

The President's proposal was adopted.

ARTICLES 7, 8 AND 9.

Article 7.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below, the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been, or may hereafter be, concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall henceforward, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below and subject to reciprocity, recognise the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 as extradition crimes as between themselves.

3. For the purposes of the present Article, any act specified in Articles 2 and 3, if committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom it is directed, shall also be deemed to be an extradition crime.

4. The obligation to grant extradition under the present Article shall be subject to any limitations recognised by the law of the country to which application is made.

Article 8.

1. When the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised by a High Contracting Party, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country after the commission abroad of an offence mentioned in Articles 2 or 3 should be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed in their own country, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. The provisions of the present Article shall not apply if, in similar circumstances, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 9.

Foreigners who are on the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 should be prosecuted and punished as though the act had been committed in the territory of that High Contracting Party, if the following conditions are fulfilled—namely, that :

(a) Extradition has been demanded and could not be granted for a reason not connected with the act itself;

(b) The law of the country of refuge recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners;

(c) The foreigner is a national of a country which recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners.

AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 7.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation.[1]

In paragraphs 1 and 2, strike out the words : " *without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below* ".

Strike out the whole of paragraph 4.

Amendment proposed by the Netherlands Delegation.[2]

In paragraph 4, insert after the words : " *recognised by the law* " the words " *or by the practice* ".

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 8.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation.[3]

Strike out paragraph 2.

AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 9.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation.[4]

Omit the words " *if the following conditions are fulfilled . . .* " down to the end of the article and replace by the following words : " *if extradition has been demanded and has not been granted* ".

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[5]

Strike out sub-paragraph *(c)*.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, pointed out that the Polish amendment was the more radical of the two amendments relating to Article 7. If it were rejected—but not otherwise—the Conference would have to discuss the Netherlands amendment.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.10 *(a)*.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.10.
[3] Document Conf. R.T.11.
[4] Document Conf. R.T.12.
[5] Document Conf. R.T.12 *(a)*.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) explained that the Polish proposals relating to Articles 7, 8 and 9 constituted a whole. They were an affirmation of the principle *aut dedere aut judicare*. To realise the scope of those amendments, it was necessary to remember the aims and origin of the Convention. He reminded the Conference, as M. Komarnicki had done,[1] that the original French proposals[2] had referred to " political terrorism ". That expression had now been abandoned in favour of " terrorism " alone. But, none the less, there was no doubt that political terrorism was what had been meant all along. The odious and tragic act which had been the origin of the draft Convention was in itself an act of political terrorism. The purpose of the Conference was not so much to wipe out political terrorism as to establish a line of demarcation between political terrorism and non-political terrorism. The Conference was not concerned with non-political terrorism. Acts which created a state of terror, though not political in character, were reprehensible in themselves and were extraditable, even without the conclusion of a new Convention. The provisions of the extradition treaties were sufficient for the purpose. It had been pointed out that, in the matter of extradition law, much had already been done to distinguish political offences properly so-called from offences which, by reason of the means and methods employed, must be excluded from the category of political offences. There was, for instance, the Belgian clause and the English judicial practice, with its special conception of political offences; there were other instances. In the present case, the Belgian clause, providing that acts directed against Heads of States should not be deemed to be political offences, might be adopted.

It was logical that terrorist offences should not be regarded as political offences. The odious character of those crimes of violence, which made them a scourge and a danger to peace and international relations, must not be forgotten. If Article 7 were left as it stood and if, for terrorist acts, the obligation to grant extradition were made " subject to any limitations recognised by the law of the country to which application is made ", the existing practice in the matter of extradition for terrorist crimes would still remain unchanged—that was to say, as defined in the existing extradition treaties. In the Polish delegation's view, the purpose of Article 7 should be to ensure that the contracting States would conclude new extradition treaties containing the necessary additions to cover terrorist crimes, for instance, in the form of a clause on the lines of the Belgian provision.

M. Bekerman could understand the inclusion of paragraph 4 of Article 7, if it were meant to refer simply to procedure, to extradition formalities; but as regards the substantive law, if the Convention were intended to introduce anything new in the matter of extradition, some clause must be inserted defining its object and making terrorist crimes extraditable under the Convention itself, and not under existing extradition treaties or laws.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, speaking as delegate of Roumania, reminded the Conference that, in reply to the first consultation carried out under the League's auspices on the subject of the repression of terrorism, the Roumanian Government had said that the Convention should lay down, for all offences of a terrorist character, the principle *aut dedere aut punire*.[3] States should be asked to enter into an undertaking either to punish acts of terrorism, or to surrender the offenders, or to refer the case to the International Criminal Court. The Roumanian Government's attitude was therefore quite clear.

If other delegates accepted the Polish proposal, M. Pella, as Roumanian delegate, would be prepared to do the same. Even supposing that the Conference did not adopt that proposal, a text already existed in the new Roumanian Code, providing that terrorist acts should never be deemed to be political offences. Roumania would propose that a clause should be inserted in the bilateral Conventions already existing between her and Portugal and Spain, and in all future conventions to be concluded by her, stipulating that terrorist acts should never be regarded as political offences. The Roumanian attitude on the subject was thus perfectly clear. It had already been clearly stated in the Committee of Experts, and the only reason that had led M. Pella to accept a different text had been in order that the Convention might be signed by the largest possible number of States.

On behalf of the Roumanian delegation, M. Pella desired to associate himself entirely with the Polish delegation's proposals.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that he had been very much interested in the Polish delegate's explanations and agreed with his views. He endorsed the Polish suggestions, for the reasons just explained by M. Pella.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Polish proposal was extremely logical, almost too logical, indeed. The object of the Convention was to define as far as possible cases which it was generally agreed should not be dealt with under the system adopted for political offences. The Conference must come to some agreement as to which offences, irrespective of motive, were to be regarded as terrorist acts, so that the author should not enjoy the benefit of the system prescribed for political offences. The Polish proposal was perfectly logical, and if it were adopted, the principle in question would be formally accepted.

The Polish proposal, he repeated, was, however, too logical. Paragraph 4 of Article 7 was a compromise text which was bound to exhibit the defects inherent in any compromise. Two tendencies were apparent: one was reflected in the proposal of the Polish delegation, the other in that of the Netherlands delegation. If the majority of the Conference were in favour of the

---

[1] See page 56.
[2] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 22.
[3] *Ibid.*, page 15.

Polish view, M. Hirschfeld would not hesitate to accept it. He could not, however, support the Netherlands proposal, which would not only weaken the compromise text but would even practically destroy it. M. Hirschfeld regretted therefore that he could not accept the Netherlands delegation's proposal. In his view, the text of the compromise in the draft was the minimum that was acceptable.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) supported the Polish proposal, in the name of the Yugoslav delegation. He pointed out that paragraph 4 of Article 7 might, in practice, produce effects contrary to the purpose of the Convention, by restricting its scope of application.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that the insertion in an international convention of an obligation compelling extradition whether or not the crime had a political character—that was to say, a political character in the sense in which British jurisprudence would interpret those words—was directly contrary to the principles of English law. If importance was attached to the favourable examination of the Convention by the United Kingdom Government it was necessary that paragraph 4 of Article 7 should stand. He was inclined to be an uncompromising advocate of compromise. He knew of no other way in which human affairs could be managed.

There was in the United Kingdom a long tradition of jurisprudence by which protection was given to political refugees. In determining whether a man was a political refugee or not, it must be considered, not whether the isolated act which he had committed was or was not of a certain quality, but rather what were the surrounding circumstances in which the act had been committed. If it had been committed in the general course of a political movement approaching though not necessarily rising to the horror of civil war, then the British tendency was to say that the act was political and that it was not an individual crime. On the other hand, if a crime or act which fell within the scope of English criminal law, whether terrorist or not, was not committed under those conditions of general agitation, the United Kingdom was prepared to surrender the criminal. But it was not prepared to make a general concession of a political tradition to which it attached very great value.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) said that the Swiss delegation took the same view on this point as the United Kingdom delegation. The conception in Switzerland of a political offence—it was based on the decisions of the Federal Court—was in the main the same as that held in the United Kingdom. Consequently, the Swiss delegation was unable to accept the Polish proposal. M. Delaquis recalled how a similar position had arisen in the Conference on Counterfeiting Currency. That Conference had even set up a Sub-Committee, of which he had been a member, to deal with the question; and the Sub-Committee had proposed the same solution, in the case of the Convention on Counterfeiting Currency, as that which appeared in paragraphs 1 to 4 of Article 7 of the Convention now before the Conference.

M. Delaquis recalled also the debate in the First Committee of the Assembly in 1936.[1] The cardinal point of the discussion was this same question of extradition; various delegations had then stated that they were unable to accept the point of view now upheld by the Polish delegation. In M. Delaquis' view, the question was of first-rate importance.

M. BASDEVANT (France) also regarded the question as extremely important. The Committee of Experts had not felt able to introduce in the Convention a provision binding the signatories to grant extradition for what they regarded as political offences, if they took the view that political offences were not extraditable. However keen might be the desire to put down terrorism, the Committee of Experts had not thought it possible to make an exception in the Convention to the recognised liberty of States to refuse extradition for political offences, if they saw fit. That point of view was already embodied in the draft of the Committee of Experts[2] which had been examined by the Assembly of the League :[1] but the texts were perhaps not sufficiently clear, and certain misunderstandings had crept in.

Attention had been devoted to the point in the First Committee of the Assembly;[1] and the clearest impression that emerged from the discussions was that a good many countries were not prepared to agree to the insertion in the Convention of a clause which did not leave them free, should such a decision be in accordance with their law, to refuse extradition for political offences. That attitude had been adopted by many delegations in the Assembly, including delegations of countries which were undoubtedly anxious to see a Convention for the repression of terrorism successfully concluded. That being so, the necessary conclusions must be drawn.

The Polish proposal envisaged a stricter undertaking, in virtue of which the acts of terrorism referred to in the Convention would create of themselves, and without further question, an obligation to grant extradition. M. Basdevant understood that conception, and paid a tribute to those who held it. He could imagine even the conclusion of agreements between particular States to give effect to that conception. But, in the present state of affairs, he did not think it possible to contemplate an international convention containing such a clause. He was therefore of opinion that the Conference should maintain paragraph 4 of Article 7 as it stood.

---

[1] See *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 156, pages 28 *et seq.*
[2] Document A.7.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), page 4.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) associated himself fully with the observations of Sir John Fischer Williams and M. Basdevant. The Belgian delegation would be unable to accede to a Convention which did not contain the provision embodied in Article 7, paragraph 4. Furthermore, he had made a very categorical statement in that respect during the general discussion.[1] He had in fact stated that " the members of the Conference knew that many countries—and Belgium was one of the foremost—firmly refused to grant extradition for a political crime." Certain aspects of terrorism were, however, closely related to political crime. That was the difficulty. But there was no question, be it noted, of inducing supporters of the Convention to agree to extradition for political crimes if that were contrary to their laws or traditions. If such were the purpose of the Convention, Belgium assuredly could not accede to it. Moreover, if any States still felt uneasy on that point, there was a provision in Article 7, paragraph 4, which read : " The obligation to grant extradition under the present Article shall be subject to any limitations recognised by the law of the country to which application is made ".

M. Sasserath reminded the Conference that Article 7, paragraph 4, did not appear in the first draft. It had been introduced as a result of the very plain observations of certain Governments, particularly the Belgian Government. It was therefore out of the question for the Belgian delegation to agree to strike out the paragraph; and, if it were maintained, it was obvious that the first Polish amendment to strike out the words " without prejudice to paragraph 4 below " in the first paragraph must also be dropped.

M. SCHLEGEL (Denmark) said that the views of the Danish delegation were in general agreement with those just expressed by the United Kingdom delegate. The Danish delegation was therefore in favour of retaining paragraph 4 of Article 7, amended in accordance with the Netherlands proposal.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thanked the Committee of Experts for having taken account, in its second draft, of the observations made by several Governments, including the Government of the Netherlands.[2] The latter Government was anxious that the texts should make it quite clear that each Government remained free to decide, in accordance with its tradition and practice, whether an offence should be regarded as of a political nature, and, in consequence, whether extradition should or should not be granted. Governments would certainly not take decisions in such cases without due consideration, or without regard to the claims of international solidarity and good neighbourly relations. There was no reason, therefore, to fear that they would make an arbitrary use of their sovereignty. But it was the bounden duty of the Government of the Netherlands to maintain, in the name of human civilisation, the principle that Governments must be free, in case of necessity, to protect political refugees and not lightly to hand over, in definitely political cases, individuals who had sought refuge in their territory. M. van Hamel believed that the right of asylum was of great benefit to mankind; and he thought all Governments might one day or another have cause to congratulate themselves that that principle was affirmed in a Convention.

He desired to allay the anxiety of the delegation of the Soviet Union on the subject of the Netherlands amendment. The Netherlands proposal was not of great international importance. Its aim was to meet certain difficulties arising out of Netherlands law. In the Netherlands, questions relating to the right of extradition were not regulated solely by the written law. They were governed also by case law and political practice. Consequently, if the Convention referred to law alone, misunderstandings might subsequently arise and references be made to certain gaps in Netherlands law. But the practice of the Government of the Netherlands had long since done much to fill those gaps. For that reason, the Netherlands delegation asked for the insertion, in paragraph 4, after the words " by the law ", of the words " or by the practice ".

To sum up, the Netherlands Government would be unable to accept the Convention if paragraph 4 of Article 7 were omitted; and it would have great difficulty in accepting it, if the Netherlands amendment were rejected.

It was perhaps some offset to the restriction involved in Article 7, paragraph 4, to know that, in availing themselves of the power conferred under paragraph 4, Governments would undoubtedly bear in mind the principles upon which the Convention was based. They would undoubtedly consider all the circumstances of each case before deciding, in the exercise of their sovereignty, whether any given act constituted a political offence. Governments would further regard it as a duty to do all in their power to see that proper police and administrative measures were taken to prevent terrorist manœuvres on their territory, and to remove any danger in that respect. The Government of the Netherlands was already doing so, and would continue with greater reason under the regime of the Convention, to make its contribution to the international campaign against terrorism.

In conclusion, M. van Hamel quoted from the Netherlands Government's observations in regard to the Conventions drawn up by the Committee of Experts, as follows : [3] " The Netherlands is not prepared to consider all the offences referred to in the present Articles 2 and 3 as being deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been or may hereafter be concluded between the Netherlands and all the other contracting States. Moreover, the extradition treaties hitherto concluded by the Netherlands Government are based, in general, on the principle that extradition cannot be granted for political offences. In view of the wide

---

[1] See page 62.

[2] Documents A.7.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.2), page 15, and A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 11.

[3] Document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 11.

differences of political opinion which at present exist in different countries on fundamental questions, the time does not seem favourable for completely abrogating this rule. The present circumstances as regards the national policies of different States are not such as to induce the Netherlands to depart from their historic tradition as regards the hospitality offered to political refugees."

M. BACHKE (Norway) referred to the statement of principle he had made during the general discussion,[1] as to the inability of the Norwegian Government to accept any Convention involving an obligation to grant extradition where such was contrary to Norwegian law. Norway was not prepared to abandon its traditions in regard to the extradition of persons guilty of political offences. Norway was concerned to maintain the right of asylum. He therefore associated himself with the statements of those who were in favour of maintaining Article 7, paragraph 4, as it stood. On the other hand, the Norwegian delegation was in favour of the Netherlands amendment.

Aly SHAMSY Pasha (Egypt) said that the acceptance of the Polish proposal would no doubt mean a great step forward in the repression of terrorism. But it could not be contested that, if the aim in view were to be achieved, it was essential that the Convention should be signed by as many States as possible. But a great many countries were definitely opposed to the Polish proposal and anxious for the maintenance of Article 7 in the form given to it by the Committee of Experts. Egypt associated herself with those countries, for the reasons set forth by the previous speakers.

The Netherlands amendment did not, in the opinion of the Egyptian delegation, raise any question of principle.

M. NYYSSÖNEN (Finland) said that the Finnish Government could not abandon its traditions on the subject of the right of asylum. It must be remembered that there were several kinds of terrorism; one form of terrorism even was Governmental terrorism, directed, for example, against national minorities or political opponents. The point of view of the Finnish Government was similar to that of the United Kingdom and Danish Governments. The Finnish Government would find it very difficult to extradite a person who had met terrorism in his country by an act of desperation. For those reasons the Finnish delegation hoped the Convention would restrict the right of asylum as little as possible.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) was unable to accept the Polish amendment. He felt, moreover, that, even if paragraph 4 were retained, Article 7 would not be entirely without practical value. The other paragraphs of the article were indicative of a certain tendency, as the Rapporteur had pointed out; and M. Sebestyén was convinced that the contracting States would not refuse, without due consideration, to extradite persons guilty of the offences covered by the Convention.

As for the Netherlands amendment, the Hungarian delegation thought the word " droit " in Article 7, which was a translation of the word " law " in the United Kingdom proposal, covered written law, customary law and even case law. The point had been cleared up by the Committee of Experts; and the Hungarian Government's acceptance of the text in question had always been subject to the statements made at the time in the Committee. M. Sebestyén did not think, therefore, that the Netherlands proposal was very important. If, however, the Netherlands delegation insisted on it, the Hungarian delegation would raise no objection to its adoption.

The PRESIDENT said that the Conference had now reached the crucial point of its discussions. Governments in favour of the radical solution envisaged by the Polish amendment could always conclude bilateral agreement or even an optional protocol, as in the case of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency; but he thought the great majority of the Conference was in favour of maintaining the general tenor of Article 7.

As for the question raised by the Netherlands amendment, it would seem, after the explanations of the Hungarian delegate, that that amendment was no longer of great importance. Nevertheless, he asked the Conference to take a decision with regard to it.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought the explanations given by M. van Hamel himself showed that his amendment was unnecessary. M. van Hamel's reservation applied, not merely to the law, but also to the case law, of his country. But, as M. Sebestyén had pointed out, the Committee of Experts had taken the expression " law " to mean both law and customary law, as well as case law. Had it been concerned only with legal enactments, it would have used a less general term than " law ".

M. Pella pointed out, further, that the Netherlands had signed the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, the text of which—as far as the question to which the Netherlands amendment referred was concerned—was identical with that of the present draft. Article 10 of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency stipulated that " Extradition shall be granted in conformity with the law of the country to which application is made ". He thought that, with that interpretation, confirmed by several members of the Committee of Experts, M. van Hamel need have no further anxiety.

---

[1] See page 54.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) was obliged to the Hungarian delegate and the Rapporteur for their explanations; but he preferred to maintain his amendment. There was no question of an academic discussion as to what was meant by " law ". The text proposed by the Committee of Experts might in the future involve the Government of the Netherlands in misunderstandings, for, in its opinion, it was not a question merely of statute law, customary law, or even case law, but also of the practice of the Department of Justice, which was responsible for extradition questions. Some doubt had been expressed in the Netherlands as to whether the practice of the Ministry of Justice in the solution of extradition questions came under the heading of law.

If M. van Hamel were speaking on his own behalf, the explanations he had just heard would perhaps satisfy him; but in view of the importance attaching to this question in his country and the opinion prevailing in Government circles, he must press his amendment. In reply to M. Pella's point that the Government of the Netherlands had signed the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, M. van Hamel observed that, while from the technical standpoint there might be some analogy between the two Conventions, the Convention for the repression of terrorism involved a far more delicate issue. He noted in any case that there had been no formal objection to the Netherlands amendment.

M. STOYKOVITCH (Yugoslavia) was unable to support the Netherlands proposal. The reasons advanced by previous speakers might be summarised in the statement that modern jurisprudence covered statute law, case law and everything connected with the enforcement of the law. Law, as defined in text-books, consisted of all the rules enforced by courts of law. Misunderstandings might arise, if anything whatever were added to the words " by the law ".

Article 7 was the result of a compromise; and for the Yugoslav delegation, which had accepted that compromise, it was mainly of psychological, of moral, value because it indicated a tendency to restrict the conception of political offences. The expression " by the practice " covered something which was not fixed; and, if it were inserted in the Convention, it might give ground for supposing that the Conference had intended to stabilise the present practice with regard to extradition for political offences. Yugoslavia hoped the Convention would mark a step forward; and it could not agree to the introduction of words that might have the effect of crystallising the present practice.

The PRESIDENT proposed to refer the question to the Drafting Committee. He gathered that it was agreed to maintain Article 7 at a first reading.

The President's proposal was adopted.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) pointed out that the Polish amendments to Articles 7, 8 and 9 formed a whole, and that the considerations he had advanced in support of the amendment to Article 7 applied to the suppression of the second paragraph of Article 8. The Polish amendment to Article 9 was in the same position. Both amendments exemplified the principle *aut dedere, aut judicare :* the first related to *dedere* and the second to *judicare.*

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, hoped the Polish delegation would recognise that, just as the Conference had been unable to reach a decision in the sense of the Polish amendment to Article 7, paragraph 4, neither could it agree to the suppression of Article 8, paragraph 2. He illustrated his meaning by an example. Suppose that a Roumanian and a Pole committed, in France, a crime against France, and both sought refuge in Roumania. France might then apply for the extradition of the Pole from Roumania. Roumania might reply : " I cannot extradite this person because, in application of Article 7, paragraph 4, I consider that the crime committed was of a political character ". But, if Article 8, paragraph 2, were omitted, Roumania would be compelled to take proceedings against her own national in the same matter. Consequently, if the Conference retained Article 7, paragraph 4, and omitted Article 8, paragraph 2, it would be establishing a discrimination against nationals in any given country.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) recognised the strength of M. Pella's point; it was for just that reason that, in referring to the Polish amendments to Articles 7, 8 and 9, he had said that they formed a whole. He regretted that the Conference had not accepted the Polish amendment to Article 7, and he thought that the Convention would lose much of its efficacy as a result.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) enquired whether paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)* of Article 9 really related to jurisdiction *in concreto.* The Netherlands courts had jurisdiction in respect of certain offences committed by foreigners abroad—for example, on board a Netherlands vessel. At the same time, the Government of the Netherlands would not be prepared to admit that, because of these exceptional cases, it could be claimed that sub-paragraphs *(b)* and *(c)* of Article 9 were generally applicable in cases other than the concrete acts to which Netherlands law referred.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that some modern legislation covered acts committed outside national territory (1) when the principle of active personality was admitted (offences committed by nationals abroad, for which case provision was made in Article 8); (2) in the case of the extension of the principle of territoriality; (3) when the offences were committed abroad and

the victims thereof were nationals. Legislation which admitted the principle of passive personality or of the protection of nationals was, moreover, very rare; (4) in the case of the application of the principle of real protection. Many States punished offences committed abroad when they directly affected certain interests of the State concerned (crimes against the safety of the State, counterfeiting of national currency, etc.); (5) when the principle of universality was admitted. Article 9 related to legal enactments which admitted the principle of universality, formulated in the Latin maxim *ubi te invenero, ibi te judicabo*. Consequently, M. Pella thought M. van Hamel need have no anxiety in the matter.

M. BASDEVANT (France) said the Rapporteur's explanations in reply to M. van Hamel's question were perfectly explicit; he asked that they should be put on record in one form or another. The Drafting Committee might revise Article 9 in the sense indicated, or the Rapporteur's explanations might be recorded in the proceedings of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the Soviet amendment to omit Article 9, sub-paragraph *(c)*.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the Soviet delegation was of opinion that the first two conditions were sufficient, and that the third condition, formulated in sub-paragraph *(c)*, to some extent restricted the application of the guiding principle of the Convention.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that this was a question which closely touched the British conception of territorial law. The paragraph in question was inserted with a view to meeting the difficulties of the United Kingdom; the United Kingdom delegate therefore hoped it would be maintained. It would be very difficult for his Government to accede to a Convention which recognised a principle it had always declined to accept—namely, the competence of a State to punish a foreigner for acts committed outside its jurisdiction.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, was afraid that the United Kingdom delegate's remarks might give rise to misunderstanding. Naturally, when a British national committed an offence abroad, the Government of the United Kingdom could not object if the State the public order of which had been disturbed took the elementary measures which the United Kingdom would take itself, should a foreigner commit an offence on its own territory. The point was that, as the United Kingdom accepted, generally speaking, the principle of territoriality as such—which was a logical principle from the English point of view, since it involved the principle of the extradition of nationals—it clearly could not admit the other view—namely, the punishment of offences committed abroad. It was therefore rather a question of legal attitude. The United Kingdom was anxious, in all cases, to retain the power to intervene whenever a British subject was prosecuted in another country for an offence committed outside that country and when it was of opinion that there might be some abuse. In other words, the United Kingdom did not desire to abandon its virtual right of intervention as a result of the insertion of a clause in the Convention. That was why the Committee of Experts had inserted the text in question in the draft.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said he must make it clear that the United Kingdom was not attempting to intervene in respect of British subjects who committed acts of terrorism or any other offences abroad, assuming that they were punished by the country in which the offences were committed. That was a perfectly logical attitude; and there was no difficulty in that respect.

The principle the United Kingdom delegation wanted to keep alive was that, if a British subject were sought to be prosecuted in one country for something he had done in another (both countries being foreign to Great Britain), the Government claimed the right to insist that the principles of international law did not permit a State to punish a foreigner for acts committed outside the jurisdiction of the country which was seeking to punish him.

The PRESIDENT asked whether M. Hirschfeld pressed his amendment.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what would happen if extradition were not granted by a country which recognised the competence of its courts to deal with offences committed by foreigners abroad. The offender would then be neither tried nor extradited.

On the other hand, if sub-paragraph *(c)* were maintained and the case contemplated by Sir John Fischer Williams arose, the offender might be tried in a country other than that in which the crime had been committed, provided that the conditions laid down in sub-paragraph *(c)* were fulfilled—that was to say, if the foreigner were a national of a country which recognised the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners. There was obviously a difference between Sir John Fischer Williams' thesis and the conception embodied in the present text of the draft Convention.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) replied that he had not intended to support any thesis. He had merely wished to point out that there were two conceptions of criminal jurisdiction. One was the territorial conception, according to which a crime disturbed the peace of the country where it was committed, and that country had full rights over the criminal. The other was the conception that a country was entitled to enact legislation even with regard to acts

committed outside its own jurisdiction by people who were not its subjects. That was a conception which was believed in England—and there was a long tradition behind the belief—to be inconsistent with international law. It was because the United Kingdom could not accept the insertion of such a conception in a convention which it was asked to sign that that paragraph had been introduced, and that the United Kingdom delegation was obliged to maintain its attitude in the matter.

Articles 7, 8 and 9 were referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 10.

The provisions of Articles 8 and 9 shall also apply to acts referred to in Articles 2 and 3 which have been committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against which they were directed.

As regards the application of Articles 8 and 9, the High Contracting Parties do not undertake to pass a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed by the law of the country where the offence was committed.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 10.

Amendment proposed by the Hungarian Delegation.[1]

Add, at the end of paragraph 2, the following text :

They shall further not be obliged to prosecute or punish the accused if he has already been prosecuted in another country and, in case he was convicted, has undergone his sentence or been reprieved or the sentence has ceased to be enforceable in virtue of some provision of the foreign law.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) explained that the Hungarian courts took into account to a large extent the legislation of the country in which the offence had been committed, whenever they were called upon to deal with acts committed abroad. That was why, in the Committee of Experts, the Hungarian representative had suggested the insertion of the second paragraph, which took account of Hungarian legislation and made it possible for Hungarian judges to apply the law of the country in which the offence had been committed, if the penalty prescribed by the latter were lighter. The Committee of Experts had drawn up that second paragraph in such a way as not to impose an obligation but simply to give States discretionary powers.

The amendment now proposed by the Hungarian delegation had the same object in view. It proposed to take account of sentences passed in another country, mitigating circumstances from a legal standpoint, quashing of sentences, etc., provided for under the foreign law. In application of the principle *ne bis in idem*, if an offence had been tried in a country or had ceased to be indictable, it should be possible to waive further proceedings. The Hungarian delegation had already suggested to the Committee of Experts that this provision should be added to Article 10 but it had been told that the principle was understood and that, moreover, Article 18 allowed the contracting States full freedom to apply their own rules. M. Sebestyén believed, however, that the Conference would facilitate the acceptance of the Convention if it adopted the amendment. If, for any reason, it were not prepared to do so, he would be satisfied with an authentic and formal statement by the Rapporteur, duly recorded, to the effect that the principle laid down in the amendment proposed by the Hungarian delegation was understood, and that Article 18 gave all contracting States the right to apply foreign law in regard to mitigating circumstances, right of pardon and right of amnesty.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that the point raised by the Hungarian delegation had already been discussed in the Committee of Experts. In the amendment submitted by the Hungarian delegation, the term " in another country " was very vague. Supposing that an individual who had committed in Yugoslav territory a crime directed against the safety of the French State, took refuge in Roumania, and the latter wished to punish him, Yugoslavia might conceivably pardon the offender, but France, against whom the crime had been directed, might not consider it expedient to do so. Referring also to other hypotheses, M. Pella said that crimes directed against the safety of the State were of a very delicate nature; in such cases, an exception might well be made even to the principle *ne bis in idem*, however general the application of the principle to all other offences. Many legal systems did not apply the principle *ne bis in idem*, nor even the principle of the deduction of the penalty in the case of crimes directed against the safety of the State.

M. Pella asked the Hungarian delegation to agree to the reference of its amendment to the Drafting Committee, to enable provision to be made to cover these important contingencies.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) would have preferred the Conference to take a decision on the question. If, however, the Rapporteur thought that the Drafting Committee would be able to find a formula which would allay both the technical apprehensions of the Hungarian delegation and his own political apprehensions, the Hungarian delegation would have no objection to the reference of the matter to the Drafting Committee.

Article 10 and the Hungarian amendment were referred to the Drafting Committee.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.13.

ARTICLE 11.

Each High Contracting Party should take on his own territory appropriate measures to prevent any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 11.

Amendment proposed by the Czechoslovak Delegation.[1]

Suppress Article 11.

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[2]

Redraft Articles 11, 12 and 13 as one article.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) recalled that the Czechoslovak delegation had submitted a text for Article 1.[3] It was in the hope that that text would be accepted that it had proposed the omission of Article 11, as a logical consequence of the acceptance of the text proposed for Article 1.

M. NYYSSÖNEN (Finland) said that the Convention should cover political terrorism of all kinds. The amendment to Article 1 proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation covered only the cases of terrorism specified in Articles 2 and 3. If Article 11 were omitted, the scope of the Convention would be considerably restricted. There were other kinds of terrorism besides those mentioned in Article 2—for example, the activities of organisations whose object it was to upset the Government of another country and the distribution of publications with the same object. If Article 2 were amended and Article 11 omitted, the Convention would no longer be a Convention for the suppression of terrorism, but merely a Convention for the suppression of certain kinds of terrorism.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said he felt sure his Finnish colleague was mistaken in thinking that the intention of the Czechoslovak delegation was to limit the scope of the Convention in any way. He was not a Czechoslovak; but he protested, on behalf of his Czechoslovak colleague, against such a supposition! M. Koukal had asked for the omission of the article solely for legal and conventional reasons of a technical character, his idea being that, if Article 1 were worded as he proposed, Article 11 would become superfluous.

M. Pella proposed that Article 11 should be retained for the reason that, in his opinion, its scope was not the same as that of Article 1. Article 11 dealt rather with administrative measures. For example, in its observations on the right of asylum, the Roumanian Government had expressed the following views :[4] " Account should also be taken of the situation of States bordering on the refugees's country of origin. It might be desirable to suggest that such States should refuse entry to certain refugees (at frontiers of countries other than their country of origin, of course) if they are not in a position to exercise surveillance over the activities of these refugees. In any case, steps should be taken to prohibit refugees from sojourning in districts near the frontiers of their country of origin. This would be one of the most effective means of preventing certain terrorist activities."

M. Pella then turned to the proposal of the Soviet delegation to redraft Articles 11, 12 and 13 as one article. It was true that Article 11 laid down a general principle, the practical application of which might be similar to that of Articles 12 and 13. But, again because of legal and conventional considerations of a technical character, he was reluctant to combine in a single article such intricate questions as the carrying and holding of arms and the forgery of passports, each of which alone might form the subject of a special Convention. For those reasons, he would urge the Soviet delegate not to press his amendment.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would defer to M. Pella's point of view.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) wished to inform the Conference of certain apprehensions to which the text of Article 11 had given rise in his country. The Netherlands Government was reluctant to bind itself by obligations formulated so broadly as those contained in Article 11. The observations made by the Finnish delegate showed that this formula might cover a very large number of contingencies, unless Article 11, as suggested by the Soviet delegate, were made, so to speak, a generic expression of the specific obligations embodied in Articles 12 and 13. M. van Hamel regarded Article 11 as a possible source of disputes and difficulties between Governments. Signatory States might, for example, receive requests from the other contracting States requiring action which the signatory State itself could not contemplate taking. It was true that, under Article 19, it was always possible in such a case to have recourse to arbitration. Nevertheless, Article 11 might give rise to contention and to arbitral disputes.

M. van Hamel would prefer the solution proposed by the Soviet delegate, unless the Conference agreed to replace in the text of Article 11 the words " *appropriate measures* " by " *such measures as they may deem appropriate* ".

He urged the Rapporteur to think over the observations he had put forward.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.14.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.14*(a)*.
[3] See page 80.
[4] Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 20.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, proposed that M. van Hamel's suggestion should be referred to the Drafting Committee; but he hoped the text which would be prepared to meet the difficulties raised would not be altogether illusory. It was essential that it should retain the character of an international obligation.

Article 11, *together with M. van Hamel's suggestion, was referred to the Drafting Committee.*

The Conference postponed its decision on the amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation until the next meeting.

ELEVENTH MEETING.

Held on Saturday, November 6th, 1937, at 10.30 *a.m.*

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

The PRESIDENT welcomed M. Guani (Uruguay).

20. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937)[1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 1 [2] (continuation).

ARTICLE 11 [3] (continuation).

Amended Text of Article 1 *proposed by the Delegations of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Roumania, Turkey and Yugoslavia.*

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that, in addition to the Soviet amendment, there was another one proposed by M. van Hamel with a view to a closer definition of the scope of Article 11. A third suggestion, not embodied in a formal amendment, had been made during the discussion at the previous meeting. Article 11, by its very nature, did not overlap with Article 1. Its object was to oblige the contracting parties to take the administrative measures necessary for a more efficient campaign against terrorism. The Drafting Committee should therefore take care to distinguish clearly between Article 11 and Article 1.

The Conference would remember that, during the discussion on Article 1, the Greek delegate [4] had submitted an amendment suggesting that the underlying principle of the whole Convention —namely, the obligation assumed by all States to refrain from, and prevent, terrorist activities— should be more clearly stated. The Czechoslovak delegate had made a similar proposal.[5] In the hope of lightening the task of the Drafting Committee by reconciling the different views expressed, the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Roumania, Turkey and Yugoslavia had proposed a new text for Article 1. While the sense remained unaltered, the new text laid greater stress on the fundamental principle of which he had spoken. That text read as follows : [6]

"*Article* 1.

"1. *The High Contracting Parties, reaffirming the principle of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State itself to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State and to prevent such acts, undertake to prevent and punish activities of this nature and to collaborate with one another for this purpose.*

"2. *Acts of terrorism within the meaning of the present Convention are criminal acts having an international character which are directed against the safety or public order of a State and which are intended or calculated to create a state of terror in particular persons, among groups of persons or among the general public.*"

M. Pella proposed that this amended text, in the preparation of which he himself had taken part as Roumanian delegate, should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

The Rapporteurs's proposal was adopted.

ARTICLE 12.

1. The carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition and explosives should be subjected to regulation, and it should be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute them to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by the domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles.

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.
[2] For the text of Article 1, see page 71.
[3] For the text of Article 11, see page 107.
[4] See page 72.
[5] See page 80.
[6] Document Conf. R.T.4(*b*).

2. Manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, should be required to mark each arm with a serial number and factory mark permitting it to be identified, and to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 12.

Amendment proposed by the Indian Delegation.[1]

Replace the final phrase of paragraph 2 after the word " *identified* " by the following text : " *and both manufacturers and retailers should be required to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers* ".

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) apologised on behalf of the delegate for India who was prevented by an indisposition from attending the meeting. Sir Denys Bray suggested that the amendment proposed by the Indian delegation should be referred to the Drafting Committee, subject to the approval of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Conference had before it an amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation for redrafting Articles 11, 12 and 13, the purport of which was the same, as one article.[2]

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) was reluctant to intervene in the discussion, as his Government's attitude in regard to these articles was one of considerable caution; but he wished to suggest that the Drafting Committee might consider whether Article 12 was the appropriate place for the mention of explosives. The term " explosives " was very wide, and had already been dealt with in sub-paragraph (4) of Article 2. Explosives were used in a large number of industries, in particular, in the mining industry; and the observance of a general obligation such as that contained in the first paragraph of Article 12 would entail numerous difficulties for many countries in view of their national legislation. The whole question of explosives called for very careful consideration.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) recalled that he had already drawn attention to the relation existing between sub-paragraph (4) of Article 2 and Article 12.[3] He would like the Drafting Committee to take his observations into account when examining Article 12.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) supported the Polish delegate's request.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, asked Sir John Fischer Williams if his remarks referred solely to the arrangement of the Convention, in which case, the Drafting Committee need only consider the order of the articles concerned, or if he objected to the question of explosives being treated in the Convention at all. The question of explosives was obviously important, and was so closely bound up with the problem of terrorism that it could not be passed over in silence in the Convention. It was essential that the preventive provisions of the Convention should include a reference to the question of explosives.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) assumed that the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 12 did not apply to fire-arms for the use of national armies.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, replied that it was Sir John Fischer Williams who had requested that a clause should be introduced providing that " manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, should be required to mark each arm with a serial number and factory mark permitting it to be identified, and to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers ".[4]

He added, in reply to a further question by M. Koukal, that this obligation could clearly not be enforced in the case of weapons supplied to armies, public authorities (such as police, Customs officers, frontier guards) and even public utility institutions. If Sir John Fischer Williams agreed with the interpretation just given by the Rapporteur, it might be included in the Minutes in order to satisfy M. Koukal.

The PRESIDENT observed that Article 12 required States to subject to regulation the carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, etc. He pointed out, however, that that provision assumed the existence of legislative or administrative regulations in regard to such arms in the States in question. Obviously, the provisions of Article 12 did not apply to arms, etc., for the use of public authorities.

Article 12 was referred to the Drafting Committee, together with the amendment proposed by the Indian delegation and the observations of Sir John Fischer Williams.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.14 *(b)*.
[2] See page 107.
[3] See pages 84 and 85.
[4] See Document C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 5.

ARTICLE 13.[1]

1. The following acts should be punishable :

(a) Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration of passports or other equivalent documents;

(b) Bringing into the country, obtaining or being in possession of such forged or falsified documents knowing them to be forged or falsified;

(c) Obtaining such documents by means of false declarations or documents;

(d) Using any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. The wilful issue of passports, other equivalent documents, or visas by competent officials to persons known not to have the right thereto under the laws or regulations applicable, with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention, should also be punishable.

3. The provisions of the present Article shall apply irrespective of the national or foreign character of the document.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 13.

Amendment proposed by the Yugoslav Delegation.[2]

Substitute for sub-paragraphs *(a)*, *(b)* and *(d)* of paragraph 1, the following text :

(a) *Any fraudulent manufacture of passports or other equivalent documents or alteration of such documents;*

(b) *Bringing of such documents into the country or obtaining or being in possession thereof knowing the documents to be forged or falsified;*

(c) . . .

(d) *Using any such documents or documents made out for a person other than the bearer.*

Aly SHAMSY Pasha (Egypt) reminded the Conference that at the 1936 session the Chilian representative on the Committee of Experts had pointed out that Article 13 was of general scope, but had recommended, in view of the admitted connection between the repression of terrorism and the falsification of passports, that the falsification of identity papers should be dealt with in a separate optional Protocol. As the International Conference for the Unification of Penal Law, which was to meet at Cairo in January 1938, was to deal with the falsification of identity papers, passports and other documents enabling their holders to travel from one country to another, the Egyptian delegate suggested that the question of the repression of the falsification of passports should be left to that Conference. He had no objection to an international undertaking for the repression of the falsification of passports; his suggestion was simply aimed at preventing the present Conference's work from overlapping that of the Cairo Conference on the point.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said he would answer the Egyptian delegate in the dual capacity of Rapporteur to the present Conference and Secretary-General of the Office and of the Conferences for the Unification of Penal Law. In this matter of passports, the ideal was obviously a Convention for the repression of all falsifications of identity papers, passports and other documents enabling their holders to travel from one country to another. But a general solution on those lines was not, in present circumstances, within the reach of the Conference. In the meantime, the fact remained that the falsification of passports was very closely connected with the problem of terrorism. It was only on very rare occasions that a terrorist travelled from one country to another without a falsified passport. The falsification of passports was therefore one of the characteristic forms of the preparation of terrorist outrages, or at any rate of the circulation of agents preparing such outrages. M. Pella therefore asked the Egyptian delegate to make allowance for all the difficulties which the Committee had encountered in that connection, and to agree to deal with the question of the falsification of passports in connection with the prevention of terrorism.

The function of the seventh Conference for the Unification of Penal Law to be held in Cairo in January 1938, in so far as the falsification of passports was concerned, would be to study the legislative forms to be introduced into the codes to give effect to the obligations entered into by States in the Convention now under discussion : in other words, it would be called upon to prepare the way for giving effect to the obligations of the Convention.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) observed that the limitation appearing in the second paragraph of Article 13 was not to be found in the first, so that the scope of the first paragraph was too wide. He proposed to introduce in the first paragraph the same limitation as in paragraph 2 by the addition of the words " *with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention* ". He showed by an example that, without that limitation, a person unjustly detained—for instance, in a concentration camp—who procured a forged passport in order to escape, would be punishable for so doing, although the use of a forged passport in such a case would be a legitimate means of escape. M. Delaquis did not propose any formal amendment; he merely put forward the suggestion for the consideration of the Drafting Committee.

---

[1] See also the amendment to Articles 11, 12 and 13, proposed by the Soviet delegation, page 107.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.14*(c)*.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) admitted the force of the arguments in favour of sub-paragraph *(b)*; but he felt obliged to point out that it would constitute an innovation in the law of certain countries. The form in which the sub-paragraph was drafted was also very subtle. He wondered if it would not be wiser to omit the words " *knowing them to be forged or falsified* ", and to refer only to the possession of the documents.

With reference to sub-paragraph *(c)*, M. Bekerman described the complications which would arise when a person obtained a false passport in country A from a consul of country B, and pointed out that the consul might be the genuine victim of the applicant's false statements.

The objection put forward by M. Delaquis did not seem to him well-founded. He thought it would be better to treat the offences referred to in Article 13 as offences in themselves. If the limitation " with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention " were introduced in paragraph 1, it would be very difficult to prove the existence of the motive in question. Referring to the example quoted by M. Delaquis, M. Bekerman pointed out that the use of forged passports could only be justified as long as the person unjustly detained was in the territory of the country which had arbitrarily deprived him of his freedom. As soon as he reached another country, the authorities could properly require him to reveal his true identity, and the use of a forged passport would be no longer justified. Every country possessed legislative or administrative provisions concerning passports and other identity papers; and the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism should only deal with passports in connection with acts of terrorism.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that this point had been discussed in the Committee of Experts. M. Delaquis had then made the same proposal, and the Committee had agreed, in a spirit of conciliation, to insert the limitative provision in question in paragraph 2, but had considered it impossible to introduce it in the first paragraph. M. Pella thought M. Delaquis would appreciate the argument that the absence of any specification of the purpose of the falsification made for more effective prevention of terrorism. He gave an example to show that it was very difficult, in certain circumstances, to prove the purpose aimed at by passport forgers, and that it was important to make it a punishable offence to introduce into a country, to procure or to carry forged passports, whatever the agent's object. Further, if M. Delaquis' view were accepted, establishment of the fact that the passport had been falsified to facilitate a terrorist act would make the falsification of the passport an act connected with a terrorist outrage, and Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention would thereupon come into play. The text proposed by M. Delaquis would then have no purpose.

The point made by M. Bekerman in regard to escaped prisoners was very sound. That an escaped prisoner should regularise his position as soon as he left the territory of the country which had arbitrarily deprived him of his freedom was essential, since it was necessary to prevent suspicious movements in the country of refuge.

In reply to M. Bekerman's suggestion to replace the acts enumerated in sub-paragraph *(b)* by the sole act of possession of such documents, M. Pella gave an example to show that possession was not the same as the introduction or obtaining of a passport. A person might be guilty of the introduction of a forged passport into a country without being in possession of the same.

As regards the second case—that was to say, the obtaining of false passports without utilising them—he considered that the acts should be penalised independently of the act of using false passports; for it was often very difficult to prove that use had been made of a passport anywhere else than at a frontier post. The omission of sub-paragraph *(c)* would make terrorist activities easier. On the other hand, the fact that a passport had been obtained by a false statement or by producing a false document was easy to establish. Reserving for the moment the contingency of consuls issuing passports abroad, M. Pella asked the Polish delegate not to oppose the maintenance of sub-paragraph *(c)*.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) said that it had not been his intention to propose the omission of sub-paragraph *(c)*. He believed that any false declaration of identity should be punishable. His only object had been to show the difficulties which might arise in connection with passports issued by consuls abroad.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) wished to ask a question in regard to the following passage in Article 13, paragraph 2 : " The wilful issue of passports, other equivalent documents, or visas by competent officials . . . should also be punishable ". Did the Rapporteur intend that to mean that penal legislation should be introduced to make the offence punishable, or would it be sufficient to deal with acts of that kind by administrative regulations?

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, replied that he assumed every country had a law under which an official issuing passports to persons who were not entitled to them was punishable by disciplinary or criminal proceedings, particularly when the official in question acted with the intention of encouraging activities contrary to the objects of the present Convention—namely, the prevention and repression of terrorism. He believed that the laws of all countries were in agreement in that respect.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether it was agreed that his proposal for the amalgamation of Articles 11, 12 and 13 [1] should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

Article 13 was referred to the Drafting Committee together with the amendments proposed thereto.

---

[1] See page 107.

ARTICLE 14.

1. The results of the investigation of offences provided for in Articles 2, 3 and 13 should in each country and within the framework of the law of that country be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. Such service should be in close contact :

(a) With the police authorities of the country;

(b) With the corresponding services in other countries.

3. It should furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3 and 13 and should, as far as possible, keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 14.

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[1]

Strike out paragraph 2.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) maintained that paragraph 2 overlapped with Article 15 and especially with sub-paragraph *(b)* of that article, in which the obligations concerned were specified.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the Soviet delegation wished to omit sub-paragraph *(a)* of paragraph 2 of Article 14 which, in his view, was essential.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was in favour of omitting paragraph 2 and adding the words " *and police* " after " *judicial authorities* " in paragraph 3.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, understood that the Soviet amendment referred merely to the wording of the text, and that it was not M. Hirschfeld's intention to prevent the police authorities of different countries from remaining in contact. Articles 14 and 15 had been taken from other international agreements, and had merely been adapted to the requirements of the present Convention. Article 14 stipulated that the police authorities of the different countries should remain in contact, and Article 15 said how that contact was to be established. While he had no objection to Article 14 being reconsidered by the Drafting Committee, he thought it preferable to retain its present wording so as to keep it in harmony with similar articles in previous Conventions.

Article 14 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 15.

Each service, so far as it considers it desirable to do so, should notify to the services of the other countries, giving all necessary particulars :

(a) Any act mentioned in Articles 2 and 3, even if it has not been carried into effect, such notification to be accompanied by descriptions, copies and photographs;

(b) Any search for, any prosecution, arrest, conviction or expulsion of persons guilty of acts dealt with in the present Convention, the movements of such persons and any pertinent information with regard to them, as well as their description, finger-prints and photographs;

(c) Discovery of documents, arms, appliances or other objects connected with acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 12 and 13.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 15.

Amendment proposed by the Netherlands Delegation.[2]

In the French text of the article replace the words " *où il le jugera utile* " by the words " *où il le jugera désirable* ".[3]

The Netherlands amendment was adopted.

Article 15 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 16.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request in accordance with their domestic law and practice.

2. The transmission of letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention should be effected :

(a) By direct communication between the judicial authorities; or

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries, or by direct communication from the authority of the country making the request to the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made; or

(c) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request direct to the competent judicial authority, or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made, and shall receive direct from such authority the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.15.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.16.
[3] The proposed amendment is intended to make the French and English texts correspond more exactly.

3. In cases (a) and (c), a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the superior authority of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letters of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority making the request, provided always that the country to which the request is made may require a translation in its own language, certified correct by the authority making the request.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method or methods of transmission mentioned above which he will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, his existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. Execution of letters of request shall not give rise to a claim for reimbursement of charges or expenses of any nature whatever other than expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present Article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws.

AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 16.

Amendment proposed by the Netherlands Delegation.[1]

In paragraph 1, substitute for the words " *in accordance with their domestic law and practice* " the words " *to the extent provided for by their domestic law and practice* ".

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[2]

In sub-paragraph *(c)* of paragraph 2, add, after the words " *direct from such authority* " the words " *or by the diplomatic channel through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs* ".

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) proposed to refer the Netherlands amendment to the Drafting Committee.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) said that the expression in the Netherlands amendment " dans les limites de " (" to the extent provided for by ") seemed to him objective, while the original wording " conformément à " (" in accordance with ") was subjective.

After some discussion, in which a number of delegates took part, M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) agreed to replace the words " conformément à " [3] by " *selon* " [3], on the understanding that it was specified by the Rapporteur that the expression " selon " was to be understood as taking into account both subjective and objective considerations.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that all the delegates were in favour of interpreting the expression " selon " in the sense indicated by M. van Hamel.

The Conference decided to replace the words " conformément à " *in paragragh* 1 *of Article* 16 *by* " selon ", *on the understanding that the expression was to be interpreted in the sense indicated by M. van Hamel.*

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) thought it better not to combine in a single item the two methods of transmission of letters of request, for which sub-paragraph *(b)* of paragraph 2 provided. He also maintained that sub-paragraph *(a)* was not sufficiently clear, on the ground that it did not indicate to whom the judicial authorities applied to should send the papers constituting the execution of the letter of request. While he had no objection to the transmission of letters of request through the diplomatic channel, as proposed by the Soviet delegation, he considered it unnecessary to specify that such transmission must take place through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought M. Bekerman's remark well-founded. He suggested accordingly that sub-paragraph *(a)* should be retained, and sub-paragraph *(b)* divided into two parts, of which the second would become sub-paragraph *(c)*. The present sub-paragraph *(c)* would then become sub-paragraph *(d)*. There would therefore be the following four sub-paragraphs :

" *(a)* (As in the present text);

" *(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries;*

" *(c) By direct correspondence between the authority of the country making the request and the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made;*

" *(d)* (As sub-paragraph *(c)* in the present text)."

The question was merely one of form, and he felt sure delegates would easily be able to agree.

M. Pella added that he failed to see the practical utility of the Soviet proposal, since it was the usual practice for communications addressed through the diplomatic channel to be handled by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.17.
[2] Document Conf. R.T.17*(a)*.
[3] The English translation " in accordance with " remains unchanged.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the Soviet amendment was merely intended to make it clear that letters of request should be sent either *(a)* directly to the competent judicial authority or *(b)* through the diplomatic channel—that was to say, through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the same point should be made in connection with the sending of the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, remarked that the Soviet amendment merely confirmed current practice. There was therefore no reason why it should not be adopted, and he proposed to leave it to the Drafting Committee to find a suitable formula in which to embody that idea.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

Article 16 *was referred to the Drafting Committee.*

ARTICLE 17.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the question of the limits of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 17 *was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.*

ARTICLE 18.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment, the characterisation of the various acts dealt with in the present Convention and the determination of the applicable penalties and of the methods of prosecution and trial depend in each country upon the general rules of the domestic law. It, further, does not impair the right of the High Contracting Parties to make such rules as they consider proper regarding the effect of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 18.

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[1]

Strike out the second sentence reading : " *It, further, does not impair the right of the High Contracting Parties to make such rules as they consider proper regarding the effect of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty* ".

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that Article 18 provided, in the first sentence, that the contracting parties should be free to follow the general rules of their domestic law for the purpose of enforcing the Convention, subject to the proviso that the acts covered by the Convention should not be allowed to escape punishment. The second sentence, however, greatly weakened the scope of the article and of the Convention as a whole. The stipulation that the Convention did not impair the right of the contracting parties to make such rules as they considered proper regarding the effect of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty might mean that the acts in question would escape punishment, contrary to the spirit of the Convention. The Soviet delegation, therefore, asked for the deletion of the second sentence of Article 18.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that the first sentence of Article 18 restricted the scope of application of the Convention; it seemed to imply that the contracting States were obliged to enforce the general rules of their domestic law, a situation which would appear to preclude the application of special rules. He proposed the deletion of the words, " *the general rules of* ".

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, replying to the Czechoslovak delegate, explained that by the words " general rules " was meant the general legislative system of the country, and that the use of those words was no impediment to the operation of the special systems in force in some countries in which certain categories of offences were tried by special courts.

Referring to the Soviet proposal, he said that the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency was the first Convention in which a text similar to the one now under consideration had been adopted. Article 18 of that instrument read : " The present Convention does not affect the principle that the offences referred to in Article 3 should in each country, without ever being allowed impunity, be defined, prosecuted and punished in conformity with the general rules of its domestic law." In the 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, the same formula had again been employed, with one slight difference, Article 15 containing the words " législation nationale " (" domestic law ") instead of " législation interne " (" domestic law "). Those two Conventions did not include the second sentence now appearing in Article 18 of the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, as it had been felt that it might have led the contracting parties to make too frequent a use of their right of pardon and right of amnesty. The Rapporteur saw no objection to the deletion of the second sentence of Article 18; the meaning of the article could be made the subject of an interpretation, as had been done in the case of the 1936 Opium Convention.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.18.

The PRESIDENT said that the intention underlying Article 18 was to leave the contracting parties free to punish the acts dealt with by the Convention in conformity with their domestic law. The only question was whether the expression " general rules " was adequate.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) supported the Czechoslovak delegate's proposal to omit the reference to " general rules ".

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) suggested that that was simply a question of drafting. He believed that he had been responsible for the use of the expression " general rules ". He thought that the Drafting Committee might be left to settle the question.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) was in favour of deleting the word " *general* ". He could not, however, support the Soviet amendment. The right of pardon and the right of amnesty were constitutional prerogatives of the Head of the State, and the adoption of the Soviet amendment would make it necessary for the contracting parties to amend their Constitutions. Moreover, pardon and amnesty would certainly not be lightly granted to terrorists. He did not think, therefore, that the last sentence of Article 18 would in any way weaken the efficacy of the Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, replying to the Hungarian delegate's observation, said that the text framed by the Committee of Experts did not affect the right of amnesty and the right of pardon in the different countries. At the same time, the question whether a country possessed unlimited rights when it had entered into an undertaking to ensure the effective repression of certain acts, was a very delicate problem. In certain cases, the contracting parties would be justified in considering the unlimited exercise by another party of its right of amnesty and pardon as a refusal of justice. Although such cases might hitherto have been rare, it was impossible to deny the principle that States were entitled to criticise the abuse by another State of the right of amnesty and pardon, when such abuse directly affected their interests or those of their nationals. That principle was recognised by international law.

M. BASDEVANT (France) thought that one point was quite clear and definite. No one dreamed of interfering with the statutory provisions of any country determining what authority possessed the right of pardon or the right of amnesty, and specifying the circumstances in which either right might be exercised. That point was governed by the Constitution in some countries, and by the laws in others. It was a purely domestic matter, and there was no need for the Conference to discuss it. The text of Article 18 was all that was required from the point of view of the right of pardon and amnesty and the authority possessing competence in those matters. The Conference was not concerned with that purely domestic issue.

There was, however, another aspect of the matter. Supposing that the right of pardon and the right of amnesty had been exercised by the competent authority, it was quite immaterial, from an international point of view, who that competent authority was. The point to be decided, from an international point of view, was whether the right of pardon and the right of amnesty could be exercised freely and arbitrarily, without the possibility of appeal by the foreign State concerned, whatever the provisions of the domestic law might happen to be.

That question, considered simply as a matter of ordinary international law and setting aside all conventional obligations for the moment, could not be settled by a mere statement that the exercise of the right of pardon and amnesty could in no circumstances be criticised by a foreign Government. A foreign Government would be justified in saying : " You have made an abusive use of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty; you have gone too far. In what sense? In the sense that, by granting a pardon or amnesty, you have gone so far as to refuse justice to those who were entitled to it. You have been guilty of a denial of justice."

That idea had been embodied in several international arbitral awards in recent years. It was, of course, extremely difficult to prove that there had been an abuse, a denial of justice. Such cases were extremely rare, but the principle might be regarded as having been recognised by international law.

That was a point that the Conference should bear in mind and should not lose sight of by adopting a formula in the matter of the repression of terrorism which would appear to recognise a purely arbitrary right of pardon or right of amnesty. The Conference must weigh the terms it used in this respect most scrupulously; it must scrutinise the formula in the text now under discussion with due reference to the various observations which had been submitted. The purpose of the Soviet proposal appeared to be to avoid the use of too radical, too absolute a formula, to avoid conflicting with ordinary international law, which would be both improper and out of place in a Convention such as that which the Conference was discussing.

If those various considerations were taken into account, it should be possible to find some common ground.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) pointed out that Article 18 as it stood—that was to say, as framed by the Committee of Experts—satisfied the United Kingdom delegation and that any changes that might be suggested would have to be very carefully examined.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the Drafting Committee should endeavour to find a more precise formula, on the lines of the Soviet amendment.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the various speakers—the Rapporteur and the delegate of France in particular—for the light which they had thrown on the Soviet amendment. It was quite clear, he thought, that the Soviet delegation had had no intention of abolishing the exercise of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty, for which provision was made in the Constitution of the different countries. The point at issue, however, was not merely the existence of that right, which was incontestable, but the degree of elasticity with which it might be exercised. The future Convention would possess, in addition to its legal value, political, moral and psychological value. Article 18 contained one clause which was a fundamental feature of the Convention: " subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment ". But the sentence which followed, in that same article, laid far too much stress on the power of the contracting parties to exercise their right of pardon and right of amnesty. That was not merely a matter of form, but affected the general tendency of the Convention. M. Hirschfeld asked the Conference to give most careful consideration to the Soviet proposal, which aimed at reinforcing international action in the prevention and punishment of terrorism.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) suggested deleting the phrase " *the effect of mitigating circumstances* " and keeping only " *the right of pardon and the right of amnesty* ".

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) thought that, as no one had objected to the first sentence of Article 18, there was no need to refer in the second to the effect of mitigating circumstances in the application of penalties. No one wished to restrict the exercise of the right of pardon or the right of amnesty. The French delegate had pointed out, however, that the injured party was allowed, in international law, to protest against any abusive use of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty in connection with international crimes. It would accordingly be better to delete the second sentence of Article 18. The article would then stipulate only what was universally admitted—namely, that States were free to apply the general rules of their domestic law as regards the characterisation of the various acts, the penalties applicable and the methods of prosecution and trial, on the understanding that the injured party was entitled by international usage to criticise any abusive use of such powers. If the second sentence of Article 18 were allowed to stand, M. Sasserath did not see how it could avoid conflicting with the principles which the Convention was intended to lay down.

The PRESIDENT agreed that it would be difficult to find a satisfactory formula. The Conference might perhaps have to rely on the report and the Minutes to make its intentions clear.

M. STOYKOVITCH (Yugoslavia) proposed that Article 18 should be referred to the Drafting Committee so that the latter might find a more satisfactory formula. The weakness of Article 18 was due, in his opinion, to the fact that the first part, which concerned the characterisation of the various acts, the penalties applicable, the methods of prosecution and so forth, contained the phrase " subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment ", whereas the second part, which dealt chiefly with the exercise of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty, left the contracting parties free to make such rules as they considered proper regarding that right and the effect of mitigating circumstances. The clause " *subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment* " might perhaps come at the very end of the article.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) said that the question of the responsibility of Governments towards one another was now in process of evolution, but that the lines on which it was shaping were not yet very clearly defined. The wisest course would be to avoid any categorical statement and not to lay down a definite rule in one sense or the other. The Conference would be exceeding its powers if it tried to settle a question in process of evolution. The arbitral awards which had been given in the matter referred to particular cases. He agreed with what had been said by the Yugoslav delegate and thought that it would be best to delete all mention of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty.

Article 18 was referred to the Drafting Committee together with the proposals made during the discussion.

The continuation of the discussion was adjourned to a later meeting.

21. Appointment of the Drafting Committee.

The Conference decided to set up a Drafting Committee consisting of the representatives of the following countries: United Kingdom, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Netherlands and Spain, together with the Rapporteur.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom), while expressing his appreciation of the honour shown him, said that the fact of serving on the Drafting Committee must not be understood as prejudicing in any way the reserved attitude which the United Kingdom had adopted towards the Convention.

TWELFTH MEETING.

Held on Monday, November 8th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

22. Question of the Participation in the Work of the Conference of the International Criminal Police Commission (continuation).

The PRESIDENT read a letter from the Secretary of the International Criminal Police Commission in reply to the telegram sent to the Commission by the Conference.[1] The Secretary of the Commission expressed regret that the Commission was unable to accept the invitation of the Conference owing to the fact that, on the one hand, the Conference had already been in session for some days past at Geneva and, on the other hand, there had been no time to consult the members of the Commission as to the desirability of sending a representative to attend the Conference.

23. Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court :[2] General Discussion (continuation).

The PRESIDENT proposed to begin the examination, at a first reading, of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.[2] As the underlying principles of the Convention had already been debated in the general discussion of the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism,[3] he presumed that the Conference would be able to dispense with a general discussion on the draft Convention concerning the Criminal Court, unless any delegate desired to speak on the Convention as a whole.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) had the impression that there was a lack of precision about the provisions of the Convention in regard to the sending of guilty parties by the signatory States for trial before the proposed International Criminal Court. Article 3 contained a provision to say that they could be so sent; but there was no single article dealing with the acceptance of such sending by the other injured States—that was to say, the State on the territory of which the act of terrorism was prepared, the State against which the act was directed and the State entitled to demand the extradition of the guilty party.

The first paragraph of Article 3 did not, in fact, do more than record the existence of powers conferred on every State in virtue of its domestic law. The Convention ought to make it clear that the intention of the article was very different. The idea to be expressed was, first, that the exercise by States of those powers arising out of their domestic law did not conflict with the obligations assumed under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and, secondly, that the exercise of those powers did not involve any injury to the States on the territory of which the act of terrorism was prepared or against which it was directed, or again to the States demanding the extradition of the guilty party, or anything conflicting with the obligations undertaken for the purpose of international collaboration. That was the idea he wanted to see expressed, whether in Article 3 or in a separate article.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, admitted the force of M. Polychroniadis' general remark as to there being a certain lack of assurance about the wording of the Convention as a whole. That lack of assurance was inevitable in presence of the necessity for dispelling the apprehensions of States which did not propose to accede to the Convention.

As to the particular case mentioned by M. Polychroniadis, the Rapporteur recognised that the idea which he wished to have expressed was not quite clear from the text of the Convention as a whole; but he hoped to be able to explain the position to M. Polychroniadis' satisfaction.

The Greek delegate had pointed out that the powers of a State to send a guilty party for trial before the International Criminal Court instead of itself bringing him to trial or extraditing him were powers inherent in the State's own sovereignty and not a product of the Convention. That was of course quite correct.

A distinction must be made from the outset between the States signatories of the Convention and the non-signatory States, no matter whether the latter were States against which the act was directed or States of which the offending party was a national. Relations with the second category of States would not be affected by the Convention. The Convention was applicable only to those who were parties to it. Nevertheless, that, of course, was not an absolute principle. M. Pella thought there might well be cases where a State not a signatory of the Convention might have an interest in sending a guilty party for trial before the International Criminal Court rather than that he should remain unpunished.

A second case that might arise was where the States concerned were all parties to the Convention, the offence being directed against one of them or the offender being a national of one of them. Suppose, for instance, that a crime directed against France had been committed

---

[1] See page 69.
[2] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 191.
[3] See pages 52 to 69. See also page 146.

on Yugoslav territory, the offender taking refuge in Roumania. Roumania would then be able either to bring the offender to trial or extradite him : but she could also exercise the powers referred to in Article 3 and send the offender for trial before the International Criminal Court. Neither Yugoslavia nor France would be entitled to object to such a decision. The position would be more complicated if, on Roumania deciding to send the offender for trial before the Court, France were to claim that the offence did not come within the category of the acts covered by the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. There would then be a difference of opinion between France and Roumania in regard to the applicability of the Convention on Terrorism. Clearly, if the offence did not come under that Convention, Roumania could not exercise her powers under Article 3 of the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. But, in such a case, the difficulty would be dealt with under Article 45 of the latter Convention.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations, but pointed out that the text of the Convention was not sufficiently clear. States were asked to divest themselves of important contractual rights : the right to leave certain crimes unpunished and the right, which was far more important, to demand the offender's extradition. Such important points as those should be explicitly stated. There must be a definite text stipulating that such rights were to be renounced. He repeated that the right laid down in Article 3 came within the scope of the domestic law and could not form the subject of an international convention. What the Convention should make clear was that injured States—the State on the territory of which the act had been committed, or the State against which the act had been committed, or the State entitled to demand extradition—would not raise any objection to the exercise of that right, but would regard it as coming within the scope of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, understood the Greek delegation's point that the Convention should state explicitly that once a contracting party to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court had availed itself of the right to bring the accused person before that Court, instead of extraditing or trying him, the contracting party in question had fulfilled its obligations towards the other contracting parties, in conformity with the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. M. Pella agreed that that idea was not very clearly expressed in the text of the Convention for the Creation of a Criminal Court. It ought perhaps to be stated at the very beginning; if that were done, the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 3, which were too restrictive, could be deleted. M. Pella was not prepared to submit a text immediately, but was quite willing to give effect to the Greek delegate's proposal.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that a State could hand over the author of a crime to the International Criminal Court by a unilateral act, without any need for agreement between the parties concerned.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) said that what he wanted was not that States should be given the right to send anyone for trial before the International Criminal Court, but that it should be stipulated that the other States would not raise any objection to the exercise of that right, that they would not say, for example: "By what right have you sent the accused to The Hague, instead of trying him yourself or extraditing him? "

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that there must surely be some misunderstanding. He thought that what the Czechoslovak delegate meant was that there was no need for agreement between the States concerned in each individual case, but that such agreement would ensue from the mere fact that the States in question were parties to the Convention.

The PRESIDENT thought that the matter was sufficiently clear, and suggested that it could be settled when the Conference came to examine Article 3. Some formula could be found then which would admit of no doubt whatsoever.

24. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937).[1]

ARTICLE 1.

An International Criminal Court for the trial, as hereinafter provided, of persons accused of an offence dealt with in the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is hereby established.

Article 1 *was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.*

ARTICLE 2.

The Court shall be a permanent body, but shall sit only when it is seized of proceedings for an offence within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDENT noted that the text had taken duly into account certain general objections which had been raised to international courts of the type proposed. Article 2, in its present

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 191.

form, made it clear that the Court would not be a permanent body, that it would sit only intermittently and perhaps indeed only on rare occasions.

Article 2 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 3.

1. In the cases referred to in Articles 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, each High Contracting Party to the present Convention shall be entitled, instead of prosecuting before his own tribunal, to send the accused for trial before the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party shall further be entitled in the cases mentioned in Article 7 of the said Convention, instead of extraditing, to send the accused for trial before the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a Party to the present Convention.

3. The provisions of the present Article shall be applicable only if the accused is a national of a State which is a Party to the present Convention and if the offence is directed against the interests of a High Contracting Party to the present Convention.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 3.

Amendment proposed by the Czechoslovak Delegation.[1]

Paragraph 3 :

(a) Strike out the words : " *if the accused is a national of a State which is a Party to the present Convention and* " ;

(b) Replace the words : " *against the interests of a High Contracting Party* " by the words " *against one of the High Contracting Parties* ".

M. BASDEVANT (France) said that the expression " au lieu de juger elle-même " in paragraph 1 was not quite correct. It would be more accurate to say " au lieu de faire juger par ses propres tribunaux ". That would correspond more closely to the English text, which read : " instead of prosecuting before his own tribunal ".

Again, the drafting of paragraph 3 was not, in M. Basdevant's view, satisfactory. The present text might perhaps be redrafted so as to take into account the idea expressed by the Greek delegate in his observations.[2]

The PRESIDENT suggested the following formula : " *The use that may be made by one of the High Contracting Parties of the right laid down in paragraphs* 1 *and* 2 *above shall be recognised by the other High Contracting Parties as being in conformity with the obligations ensuing from the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.*"

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) understood that the result of the Czechoslovak amendment was to suppress one of the conditions determining the exercise of the right of sending the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court. If the amendment were adopted, it would be possible to send for trial before the Court nationals of States which were not parties to the Convention for the creation of that Court. It seemed to him that the omission of that condition would mean interfering with the first Convention and might lead to difficulties and disputes. The parties to the first Convention would have the right to insist that their own nationals should not be sent for trial before the International Criminal Court.

M. Sebestyén submitted those observations simply from the point of view of ensuring harmony between the two Conventions. He did not propose to go into the question whether, or to what extent, States which had not recognised the International Criminal Court could recognise the right to have one of their nationals tried by that Court.

M. MOMTCHILOFF (Bulgaria) said that, without wishing to prejudice his Government's attitude towards the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, he fully endorsed the objections and observations submitted by the Hungarian delegate. He thought that the acceptance of the Greek amendment would probably facilitate the Bulgarian Government's accession to the Convention.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that one of the amendments which he had submitted was purely formal in character. The substitution of the words " against one of the High Contracting Parties " for the words " against the interests of a High Contracting Party " would bring the text of Article 3 into line with the text of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Reverting to the suggestion he had made on a question of substance, M. Koukal directed attention to the question of plurality of prosecutions, a matter which had not been settled in either of the draft Conventions. As a jurist, he saw in the provisions of Article 3 a special form of the competence of the courts of each State party to the Convention for the creation of an International Criminal Court. Instead of itself prosecuting or extraditing, a State could avail itself of the right laid down in Article 3. In the exercise of its full and sovereign rights, it was entitled itself to try the accused, or to extradite him or send him for trial before the Court, irrespective of his nationality. The only possible restriction of that right of jurisdiction arose out of the consideration due to another State whose interests had suffered injury. If the injured State were not a party

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.22.

[2] See pages 117 and 118.

to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, it might insist that the accused should not be sent for trial before the Court, but the nationality of the accused could not be deemed to be a factor in the case.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that he had not expected to take part in the debate, as his Government had already declared its intention of not signing the Convention under discussion. In view, however, of the suggestion made by the Czechoslovak delegation to extend the jurisdiction of the Court to persons other than the nationals of the contracting parties, he desired to mention one objection which was, perhaps, an objection of principle, but which was strongly felt. He thought that a State was entitled to take the view that, when any new international organ was created, its nationals should—on a matter of international comity—only be subjected to the jurisdiction of that organ if the State itself were prepared to acquiesce in the new institution.

After that explanation, he trusted that the Czechoslovak delegate would not press an amendment against which the United Kingdom delegation was not in a position to vote, as the United Kingdom did not intend to accede to the Convention, but to which—on grounds of international comity, at any rate—it was entitled to take objection.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought that Article 3 should be left as it stood. The words " juger elle-même " seemed to him very expressive, as they brought out the exceptional character of the procedure of sending the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court.

The Czechoslovak proposal was, he thought, open to objections, the most important of which had already been mentioned by the United Kingdom delegate. He asked the Czechoslovak delegation not to insist on its proposal.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that he realised the scope of the Czechoslovak amendment, just as he appreciated the United Kingdom delegate's objections. But if he rightly understood the purport of the French delegate's proposal for giving effect to the suggestion put forward by the Greek delegation, paragraph 3 of Article 3 should be deleted. Did M. Basdevant agree?

M. BASDEVANT (France) thought that, if the Greek delegation's suggestion were taken up on the lines he had suggested, paragraph 3 would be superfluous. The question as a whole presented itself, in his view, as follows :

Was it or was it not necessary to include in the Convention a clause precluding the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, if the accused were a national of a State which was not a party to the second Convention, and again if the act in question were directed against such a State?

To appreciate the full scope of that issue, he would ask the Conference to ignore for the moment the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court and to suppose that there was only the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. Under the terms of the last-named Convention, if a terrorist act were committed in France against a foreign State, France was obliged to punish that act irrespective of the nationality of the author. She must take the necessary measures, in conformity with the principles laid down in her own legislation : she organised her criminal courts in the way she considered appropriate, the only condition being that the organisation and functioning of every court should be satisfactory. Hence, whatever the nationality of the accused, France was entitled to commit him for trial by jury or to send him for trial before a court composed of five judges of foreign nationality. France was fully entitled to choose that second solution and, in doing so, could not be deemed guilty of failure to fulfil the obligations ensuing from the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

That was the situation from the point of view of international law. Such being the case, it was difficult to see what objection there could be to certain States signatories to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism agreeing between themselves to constitute an International Criminal Court before which they would have the right to send accused persons for trial. Precedents already existed. About a century ago certain German duchies had constituted a common Court of Appeal, without any objection on the part of foreign States. M. Basdevant did not see, then, what objection there could be to a State which was a signatory to the second Convention sending for trial before the International Criminal Court any individual, of no matter what nationality, whom it had the right to prosecute before its own tribunals.

There remained the question of expediency. It was quite conceivable of course that States which were not signatories to the second Convention might not be inclined to accept any extension of the competence of the International Criminal Court which would include their nationals. In law it was self-evident that a State which could prosecute an individual before its own tribunals could also send the accused for trial before any international court that it might select. The question was whether it was expedient to go so far. The Greek delegation's suggestion was extremely interesting from that point of view. If the text simply declared that States signatories to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court recognised, in so far as it concerned them, that every signatory State which sent an accused person for trial before the Court was fulfilling its obligations towards them under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, there would be no reference to the situation of third-party States under the Convention for the Creation of a Criminal Court. That would allay any doubts that might be felt by States which did not intend to sign the Convention, and the situation so far as they were concerned would still be governed exclusively by international law.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that, in deference to the doubts expressed by the United Kingdom delegate, he was prepared to withdraw his amendment.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) thanked the Czechoslovak delegate for the concession he had made on that point. It was understood, he took it, that, although the new text of the Convention did not in so many words contain an actual undertaking that subjects of States not parties to it should not be brought before the International Criminal Court, that would in practice be the effect. He had understood what the delegate of France had said as implying that, in practice, although there was no legal obligation, no attempt would be made to bring nationals of States not parties to the second Convention before the tribunal, and that there was what was sometimes called a " gentlemen's agreement " on the subject.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) asked whether the United Kingdom delegate did not think that a State might be acting as much in accordance with the principles of international law if it sent a foreigner for trial before a recognised and well-established International Criminal Court as if it prosecuted him before the national courts.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) hoped that the Netherlands delegate was not going to call upon him to answer points of international law of a rather problematical character. He had not wished to lay down any proposition of international law. He had simply suggested that it was a matter of international comity that the jurisdiction of the Court under discussion should not be extended beyond the nationals of consenting States.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) said that he had not received any instructions from his Government on the subject, but that he was personally of opinion that a Government was free to send any foreigner guilty of having committed an act of terrorism on its territory before any court which it considered to be just and properly organised. He did not see why it should be contrary to international law or courtesy to send a foreigner for trial before such an international court, if the latter appeared to be equitable.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that the French delegate's suggestion had the merit of eliminating any possibility of dispute as to the connection between the two Conventions. The solution proposed was not, however, capable of settling all the difficulties that might arise. In matters of international penal law, the recognition of the right of States to try foreign nationals was based on a knowledge of the judicial institutions of those States. The situation was different in the case of a new judicial institution. There was no need to recall the cases in which refusal to grant extradition had been determined by the fact that special tribunals were functioning in the applicant countries. Again, it was not at all certain that the verdicts of the new Court would have the same value as those of the ordinary State tribunals. M. Sebestyén did not claim to be able to settle that problem. He simply wished to reserve his Government's right to decide whether it should consider the new Court equivalent to the ordinary courts, or whether it should regard the point as doubtful.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that when he had put his question to the delegate of France his own impression had been that, if Article 3 were amended in accordance with the Greek delegation's proposal, paragraph 3 would be found to be unnecessary. The French delegate's statements had confirmed that view.

After hearing the various observations which had been submitted, M. Pella had come to the conclusion that the adoption of the new formula now proposed would settle the question as regards States parties to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. There remained the problem of the attitude of the States which were not parties to that instrument. In their case, the problem was simplified, since relations with them were governed by the rules of international law concerning the right of a State to send a foreign national for trial before whatever court it thought fit. That was the advantage of the French delegate's proposal.

Supposing a Hungarian national—assuming that Hungary was not a party to the Convention—committed a terrorist crime in Roumania, Roumania might propose to send the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court. Obviously, from the point of view of the rights arising directly from Roumanian sovereignty, Roumania could cause to be tried, in any way that she thought fit, persons who had committed crimes within her territory.

Even though Hungary had not acceded to the Convention for the Creation of an International Court, the question of the extent of the right of other States to submit its nationals to international jurisdiction depended exclusively on international law. The question would be decided, if a difference of opinion arose, through diplomatic channels or by arbitration or judicial proceedings.

Moreover, the Roumanian Code contained provisions embodying the principle of the universality of repression. If an individual guilty of an offence abroad connected, for instance, with traffic in women or traffic in dangerous drugs, were arrested on Roumanian territory, he could be tried by the Roumanian courts, whatever his nationality. It might be objected, by reference to certain doctrines based on the principle of territoriality, that Roumania was not entitled to try that individual unless the offence had been committed on her territory or unless the individual was a Roumanian national. Roumania might thus be exposed at any moment to a protest on the part of a State which did not admit the doctrine of universality. In practice, however, that contingency would not occur, since it was to the interest of all States that repression should be effective in the case of crimes which threatened the interests of the whole of mankind.

If no objection had hitherto been made to the principle of universality, which applied also to terrorist crimes, M. Pella thought that States which were not parties to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court would have no cause to object to their nationals being tried, not by the national court of another State, but by an international tribunal.

All States had an interest in ensuring that terrorism was effectively and impartially repressed. If States realised that in certain particularly delicate cases such repression could only be ensured by bringing the accused before the International Criminal Court, it was inadmissible that such States should raise difficulties which would be likely to hinder such repression and enable the guilty person to go unpunished. In any case, the matter at issue could always be settled by means of diplomatic negotiations.

The system proposed by the delegate of France simply made the text of the Convention more elastic, without, however, extending its scope. Under the old text it would not have been possible in any circumstances to send for trial before the International Criminal Court an individual who had committed an act of terrorism against a State which had not recognised that Court or who was a national of a State which had not acceded to the Convention for its creation, whereas, according to the new text, there was the possibility, in complicated cases—for instance, when there were several delinquents or accomplices of different nationalities or when a State met with difficulties regarding trial or extradition—to institute direct negotiations, with a view to obtaining the express or tacit consent of all the States concerned to the handing over of those individuals for trial to the International Criminal Court.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) said that, as between the contracting parties, the competence of the International Criminal Court mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 3 extended only to acts committed on the territory of the contracting party in question and to extraditable offences. If a Government had not the right to grant extradition owing to the political character of the offence, it would not be entitled either to send the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court.

Again, a State might introduce the principle of the universality of repression into its legislation, in order to make acts of terrorism punishable, not only if they were committed on its territory or by its own nationals, but even if they were committed abroad by foreigners. M. van Hamel wondered whether the State in question would have the right, in such a case, to send the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court. Would it perhaps be necessary to make provision for that contingency in a special article?

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, referring to the first hypothesis put forward by the Netherlands delegate, explained that, if a Government were bound by the national laws to regard a given act as a non-extraditable political offence, the author of the offence could clearly not be sent for trial before the International Criminal Court if the offence were purely political in character. Some countries, however, now adopted quite a different attitude in regard to the nature of political offences : they no longer distinguished between political offences and offences against the ordinary law, from the point of view of extradition. Some countries went even further and took the view that, considering the gravity of offences directed against a State, the duty of international co-operation was more imperative in that sphere than in the case of offences against the ordinary law. It was therefore difficult to arrive at a decision which would be universally accepted. The only point definitely established was that, under Article 7 of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, States had the right to refuse extradition, but it was not specified that they were obliged to refuse extradition in the case of political offences. States could, moreover, conclude bilateral Conventions and interpret Article 7 in the widest possible manner. At the time when the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency was concluded, certain States had also concluded a Protocol undertaking that they would in no case regard offences in the matter of counterfeiting currency as political offences. Every country was thus free to decide whether, in the case of a given offence, the political or terrorist character predominated, and it could on its own responsibility send the delinquent for trial before the International Criminal Court.

As regards the second hypothesis, it was clear that if a State had the right under its national laws to judge a terrorist offence committed by a foreigner on foreign territory, it also had the right to send the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court. That last-named right followed simply from the fact that it had power itself to try the case. The Rapporteur took the view that the text as it stood conferred on States which recognised the principle of *judex deprehensionis* the right to send for trial before the International Criminal Court the author of an act committed abroad.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations, which satisfied him as regards the second part of his question. The Rapporteur had clearly shown, by his reference to Article 7 of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, to which paragraph 1 of Article 3 of the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court referred, that it was not necessary to introduce a further special article, in order that Governments should have the right mentioned by M. Van Hamel in his second hypothesis. That right was already implied, according to the very lucid explanation given by the Rapporteur, in the present text.

Concerning the first part, however, the Rapporteur had been somewhat categorical. The Netherlands Government was obliged by treaty to regard certain offences as political offences for which it could not grant extradition. If extradition were refused by reason of the political character of the offence, there must be no question of the State being required to send the delinquent for trial before the International Criminal Court.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, repeated that the question whether the Netherlands Government would send the offender before the Court instead of granting extradition would arise only if that Government were in a position to grant the extradition for which application was made. There might indeed be cases where a Government, whilst well aware of the terrorist character of the offence, and realising that extradition was justifiable, nevertheless found it difficult to hand the accused person over to the State demanding extradition, because of certain currents of opinion which would be hostile to such an act. It would be an easier solution in such cases to bring the individual concerned before the International Criminal Court.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanation, with which he was entirely satisfied. If, then, a Government were not in a position in certain cases to grant extradition, the question of sending the criminal before the International Criminal Court would not arise as far as it was concerned.

Article 3 was referred to the Drafting Committee for amendment in the sense of the suggestions made by M. Polychroniadis and M. Basdevant.

ARTICLE 4.

The Court shall be composed of judges chosen from among jurists who are acknowledged authorities on criminal law and who are or have been members of courts of criminal jurisdiction or possess the qualifications required for such appointments in their own countries.

Article 4 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 5.

The Court shall consist of five regular judges and five deputy judges, each belonging to a different nationality, but so that the regular judges and deputy judges shall be nationals of the High Contracting Parties.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, proposed to refer Article 5 to the Drafting Committee for such modifications as might seem desirable in view of the number of States ratifying or acceding to the Convention. As it stood, the text could not be applied until ten States had ratified or acceded to it. A transitional text should be drawn up stipulating that, pending the ratification of or accession to the Convention by ten States, deputy judges of the same nationality as the regular judges could be appointed, subject to the understanding that, in the absence of a regular judge, he would be replaced by a deputy judge whose nationality was different from that of any of the other judges sitting.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

ARTICLE 6.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State in respect of which the present Convention is in force may nominate not more than two candidates for appointment as judges of the Court.

2. The Council of the League of Nations shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6.

Amendment proposed by the Czechoslovak Delegation.[1]

To substitute in the French text of paragraph 1 the words "*à l'égard desquels*" for the words "*à l'égard duquel*".

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) pointed out that no indication was given as to how the Council was to be approached. Was it to be through the diplomatic channel?

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that paragraph 2 followed the more or less traditional form in matters of procedure. The Hungarian delegate would note that Article 44 laid down that the contracting parties should meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning the election of judges, etc.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thought it might be useful to include a provision similar to that contained in Article 9 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, by which a majority in the Council and the Assembly was required for the election of judges.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that Article 6 placed the Conference in the presence of one of the major issues arising in connection with the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom had already indicated that it did not wish to oppose the formation of an International Criminal Court by such States as were prepared to support it. It wished the Court every success. But His Majesty's Government was opposed to the Court's fortunes being linked up with those of the League.

In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, the League should only take action when at least a great majority, if not the whole, of its Members intended to participate. Speaking from

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.23.

the point of view of a Government whose ardent belief in the League had never been challenged, he urged that it would be in the nature of a gamble if the League's fortunes were attached to an institution which had not yet been proved.

Sir John Fischer Williams had been struck by the remark of the Rapporteur that he contemplated that, at the outset, only ten States or less would be parties to the Convention. How could it be proposed to put under the auspices of the League an institution which had the support of less than one-fifth of its Members?

Again, to take the proposal exclusively from the point of view of the functioning of the Court, the question arose whether the Council of the League was the best body to choose the members of a criminal court. Had the Council the necessary knowledge for that purpose? It would not be dealing with anything like the Permanent Court of International Justice, the candidates for which were persons of universal reputation. In the present case, it would have to choose specialists in criminal law, whose reputations must necessarily be confined to their own States. The proposal that the members of the Assembly should also be called in to take part in the election of members of the Criminal Court was, in his view, calculated to confuse the matter even more. There would be some fifty delegations voting who could not possibly be acquainted with the merits of the particular candidates.

Sir John Fischer Williams noticed that the League had not yet been approached. He took it that unanimity would be required for the League's assent to a proposal of that kind.

He observed that Article 44 as drafted contained indications as to the method of election of judges. Only a very small change would be required in the text of the Convention to confer the right of electing judges upon the States which were parties to the creation of the Court.

The only other reference to the Council of the League was in Article 7, where it said : " For the first period of ten years, the order of retirement shall be determined under the authority of the Council of the League of Nations by drawing lots ". He could not help thinking that the Council of the League had more important matters to attend to than the drawing of lots.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, wished to avoid any misunderstanding. He did not think it was accurate to say that it was proposed to link the fortunes of the League with those of the International Criminal Court. The reports adopted by the Council of the League at its private meetings showed that it was not exclusively concerned with questions of first rate importance : indeed, it dealt with matters some of which were of far less moment than the election of judges of the International Criminal Court. A glance through the Convention as a whole would, moreover, show that the sole association of the Council with the Court was in this matter of the election of judges.

Obviously, there was no analogy between the International Criminal Court and the Permanent Court of International Justice. There was an organic connection between the latter and the League of Nations in the provisions of the Covenant itself. Even in that case, however, the Council intervened only from time to time to appoint judges; and it could not be said to assume any specific responsibility by so doing. Moreover, numerous agreements provided for the appointment by the Council of arbitrators and judges. Must it be assumed that the responsibility of the Council was thereby engaged?

In any case, M. Pella was willing to discuss any proposal for entrusting the appointment of judges of the International Criminal Court to an institution other than the Council of the League of Nations. He thought that the task might, if necessary, be entrusted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

M. BASDEVANT (France) said that he approached the question in no doctrinaire spirit, but solely from the practical point of view. What was the most convenient method of electing judges of the International Criminal Court? In principle, his Government had no objection to the Netherlands delegate's proposal for election by the Council and the Assembly : but would it meet the requirements of the case? A Court set up under a Convention signed in the beginning by a small number of States could hardly be appointed by an Assembly in which more than fifty States were represented. That was a very important objection against participation by the Assembly. It was doubtful, moreover, if the Assembly would be prepared to act in the matter. M. Basdevant, for his part, would prefer not to run the risk of a rebuff by asking it to do so.

On the other hand, resort to the Council was open to the objection that the majority of the signatory States might not be represented on it. M. Basdevant wondered whether the Council might, in that case, invite the States concerned to sit *ad hoc* for the purpose of the election.

The Council had not infrequently been called upon to take action similar to that contemplated in the draft Convention. It had appointed M. Eugène Borel, under a provision of the Treaty of Lausanne, to arbitrate on the allocation of the Ottoman Debt. It had appointed M. Undén to settle a dispute between Greece and Bulgaria under Article 180 of the Treaty of Neuilly. Again, it had been asked to appoint an arbitrator in a railways dispute under a clause in the Treaty of Saint Germain. The Secretariat might perhaps study the precedents for an invitation by the Council to the States concerned to sit *ad hoc* when members of the Court were being elected.

In any case, the election of members of the Court by the Council would not be a proceeding without precedent. M. Basdevant did not say it was the only possible solution. The French Government would be quite willing for the choice of judges to be entrusted to the Permanent Court of International Justice. That arrangement would, in its opinion, offer many advantages. The point was a difficult one, involving delicate issues and calling for reflection. It could not be settled hurriedly at the close of a meeting.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) was ready to withdraw his suggestion concerning the participation of the Assembly, if that would help toward a rapid solution whereby the choice of judges would be entrusted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) preferred to postpone the decision until the next meeting.

Sir John Fischer Williams' proposal was adopted.

ARTICLE 7.

1. Judges shall hold office for ten years.

2. Every two years, one regular and one deputy judge shall retire.

3. For the first period of ten years, the order of retirement shall be determined under the authority of the Council of the League of Nations by drawing lots.

4. Judges may be re-appointed.

5. Judges shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled.

6. Nevertheless, judges, though replaced, shall finish any cases which they have begun.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) observed that paragraph 3 of Article 7 provided for action by the Council of the League and the proposed drawing of lots. As such, it must be postponed for the same reasons as Article 6.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, proposed the provisional adoption of Article 7, reserving paragraph 3.

Article 7 was referred to the Drafting Committee, paragraph 3 being reserved.

ARTICLE 8.

A judge appointed in place of a judge whose period of appointment has not expired shall hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 8 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 9.

1. Deputy judges shall be called upon to sit in the order laid down in a list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly, to age.

Article 9 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 10.

1. Members of the Court may not participate in the settlement of any case on which they have previously been engaged in any capacity whatsoever. In case of doubt, the Court shall decide.

2. Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, give a solemn undertaking in open Court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 10.

Amendment proposed by the Czechoslovak Delegation.[1]

Make a *special article* of *paragraph 2.*

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, supported the proposal of the Czechoslovak delegation to make a special article of paragraph 2 of Article 10.

Article 10 was referred to the Drafting Committee together with the proposal of the Czechoslovak delegation.

ARTICLE 11.

1. Any vacancy, whether occurring through the expiration of a judge's term of office or for any other cause, shall be filled as provided in Article 6.

2. In the event of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall take effect on notification being received by the Registrar.

ARTICLE 12.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of the other members he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

ARTICLE 13.

The High Contracting Parties shall grant the members of the Court diplomatic privileges and immunities when engaged on the business of the Court.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.24.

ARTICLE 14.

1. The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for two years; they may be re-elected.

2. The work of the Registry of the Court shall be performed by the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice, if that Court consents.

ARTICLE 15.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. For any particular case, the President may take the opinion of the Court and the Court may decide to meet elsewhere.

ARTICLE 16.

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to send a person for trial before the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Articles 11 *to* 16 *were referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.*

ARTICLE 17.

The Court shall apply the substantive criminal law of the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. Any dispute as to what substantive criminal law is applicable shall be decided by the Court.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) observed that Article 17 raised the much debated question of the place where the offence was committed. Did the territory on which the offence was committed mean the place where the act was committed, or the place where the results of the act occurred, or both?

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, agreed that the point was a controversial one. The difficulty was met, however, by the second part of Article 17, which provided that if there were any dispute as to what substantive law was applicable, the Court would decide. Even if there were not a difference of opinion, but the Court was uncertain about the question, it must state its opinion. It was necessary to have confidence in the Court. It would certainly be capable of solving difficulties of that sort.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) recalled that several national codes, such as the Yugoslav Code and the Italian Code, had already decided the matter. The Court might be given an indication in that sense.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, observed that the Drafting Committee would, in any case, have to revise the text. Perhaps M. Givanovitch would draw up a proposal in writing to assist the Drafting Committee in deciding whether to amend the text itself or to leave it to the Court to settle the matter in particular cases.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said he would be satisfied by a reference in the records of the Conference to the fact that the point had been raised.

Article 17 *was referred to the Drafting Committee.*

ARTICLE 18.

If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not sit to hear a particular case, he shall so notify the President as soon as he has been informed that the Court is seized of that case.

ARTICLE 19.

1. The presence of five members shall be necessary to enable the Court to sit.

2. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

ARTICLE 20.

If the Court has to apply, in accordance with Article 17, the law of a State of which no sitting judge is a national, the Court may invite a jurist who is an acknowledged authority on such law to sit with it in a consultative capacity as a legal assessor.

Articles 18 *to* 20 *were referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.*

ARTICLES 21 AND 22.

Article 21.

As soon as the Court is seized of a case, the President of the Court shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, and the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. These States, and any other States, may put before the Court the results of their investigations and any evidence and objects connected with the crime which they have in their possession; these shall be included in the file of the case.

Article 22.

1. The Court shall be seized of a case by an indictment issuing from a High Contracting Party.

2. The right to conduct the prosecution shall rest with the State against which the offence was committed. Failing that State, it shall belong to the State on the territory of which the offence was committed, and failing also that latter State, then to the State by which the Court was seized.

3. The State which seizes the Court shall at the same time name the agent by whom it will be represented.

4. The Court must not proceed further with the case if the charge is withdrawn.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that Articles 21 and 22 must be referred to the Drafting Committee for redrafting in more precise form. It was not clear whether the Court was seized merely by the reference of a case to it, or whether it could only be seized by an indictment. It was true that Article 22 stated that the Court was seized of a case by an indictment issuing from a contracting party : but the two articles were contradictory, as the indictment could issue either from the State which decided to send the accused for trial before the Court or from the State against which the offence was committed. The contradiction could be eliminated by amending Articles 21 and 22 as follows :

Article 21 to read :

> *" The President of the Court, on being informed by a High Contracting Party of its decision to commit an accused person for trial before the Court, shall notify the State against which the offence was directed and the State on the territory of which the offence was committed."*

Paragraph 2 of Article 22 would be amended by the substitution at the end of the paragraph of the words " *which committed the accused person to the Court* " for the words " *by which the Court was seized* ".

A new paragraph, numbered 4, to be inserted, reading as follows :

> *" The States mentioned in the aforesaid paragraph 2 may inform the Court of the results of their investigations and of any evidence or objects connected with the crime which they have in their possession. These shall be included in the file of the case."*

The present *paragraph* 4 to become *paragraph* 5.

M. Pella added that the proposed amendments were of a purely technical nature, and he proposed to refer them to the Drafting Committee.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) suggested that the Drafting Committee should also take into account the possibility of informing the State of which the accused person was a national.

Articles 21 and 22 were referred to the Drafting Committee, it being understood that the proposals of the Rapporteur and of the delegate for Hungary would be taken into consideration.

ARTICLE 23.

Any State or person injured by an offence may constitute itself or himself " partie civile " before the Court, inspect the file, submit a statement of its or his case to the Court, and take part in the debates.

ARTICLE 24.

The file of the case and the statement of the " partie civile " shall be communicated to the person who is before the Court for trial.

ARTICLE 25.

The parties may propose the hearing of witnesses and experts by the Court, which shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts.

Articles 23 to 25 were referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

THIRTEENTH MEETING.

Held on Tuesday, November 9th, 1937, at 11.30 a.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

25. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937) [1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 19.

If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 186.

If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 19.

Amendment proposed by the Polish Delegation.[1]

Add at the end of the article a new paragraph reading as follows :

The above provisions of the present Article shall not prevent High Contracting Parties, if they are Members of the League of Nations, from bringing the dispute before the Council or the Assembly of the League in virtue of the Covenant.

M. KULSKI (Poland) said that Article 19 reproduced a formal clause which appeared in all the multilateral conventions concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations. The Polish delegation was doubtful, however, whether the insertion of that clause, as it stood, was sufficient. The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism was of a particular character and presented certain political features. Article 19, as framed by the Committee of Experts, might give rise to delicate questions in the future, owing to the fact that only one authority was made competent to settle disputes—namely, the Permanent Court of International Justice. For example, if a dispute arose concerning the Convention which one party wished to submit to the Council, how would the question of the interpretation of Article 19 be decided? Legal practice and doctrine offered no categorical reply. There was therefore a danger that the second party might be unwilling to lay the matter before the Council and might insist on the dispute being referred to the Court. The latter would find itself in an embarrassing situation if it had to deal with a dispute which was political rather than legal in character. Provision must therefore be made to allow of the dispute being submitted to the Council. To that end, the Polish delegation proposed that a new paragraph should be added at the end of Article 19 providing that the contracting parties should not be prevented " from bringing the dispute before the Council or the Assembly of the League in virtue of the Covenant ".

The PRESIDENT asked whether the Conference thought that the first paragraph of Article 19 precluded the possibility of recourse to the Council.

M. KULSKI (Poland) reminded the Conference that the provisions of earlier conventions, reproduced in the first paragraph of Article 19, had in the past been the subject of divergent interpretations. It was to avoid all possibility of misunderstanding that the Polish delegation now asked that Article 19 should provide explicitly for recourse to the Council.

The PRESIDENT observed that the Polish amendment appeared to be in the nature of an interpretation.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that the impression he had received from the Polish delegate's remarks was that the Polish amendment would mean establishing two jurisdictions : that of the Permanent Court of International Justice for disputes relating to the interpretation of the Convention and that of the Council or the Assembly for disputes of any kind relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention. The amendment appeared to confer on the Council and the Assembly powers which they did not possess under the Covenant.

The competence of the Council and Assembly was very clearly defined in the Covenant. Article 11, paragraph 1, for instance, provided for recourse to the Council in case of " war " or " threat of war " and paragraph 2 of that same article provided for recourse to the Assembly or the Council in the case of " any circumstance whatever . . . , which threatens to disturb international peace ". Articles 15 and 16 defined with no less precision the cases in which the Assembly or the Council was competent. The fact of a dispute having arisen regarding the interpretation or application of a treaty was not in itself sufficient to justify laying the matter before the Council or the Assembly. The Polish amendment would tend to create a situation that was not quite in keeping with the provisions of the Covenant.

The Hungarian delegate therefore urged the Conference to examine the question very carefully and said that he would be interested to hear his colleagues' views thereon.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) thought that the Polish amendment should be very carefully examined. Its relation to the Covenant of the League needed closer scrutiny than appeared to have been given to it. As the Hungarian delegate had pointed out, there were several articles of the Covenant which dealt with questions of the same kind, particularly questions relating to the solution of difficulties.

Article 13 provided that if what might be described generally as a legal dispute arose, particularly a dispute as to the interpretation of a treaty, the dispute was to be solved by reference to an arbitral or judicial tribunal.

Article 15 on the other hand—the Polish delegate appeared to think that the clause concerning disputes was related to that article—provided for reference to the Council and possibly to the Assembly in the case of any dispute which was described as " likely to lead to a rupture ".

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.19.

The only right which the Polish amendment was meant to reserve was the right to proceed under Article 15, and it was thus important to observe that Article 15 provided only for a particular class of disputes, whereas the Polish amendment provided for reference to the Council or the Assembly in all cases—that was to say, whether the dispute was likely to lead to a rupture or simply concerned the interpretation of the Convention.

He did not see any objection to reserving the over-ruling provisions of the Covenant, but thought that the text needed more careful consideration and suggested that the Drafting Committee might be asked to decide exactly how the reference to the Covenant should be formulated. He did not think that it was a very good precedent to reserve special rights which were already safeguarded in the Covenant. The Covenant was the over-ruling law and, if expressions such as "this is not to prejudice the Covenant" were introduced into conventions, people would begin to point out that no such provision occurred in other cases and to suggest that, unless a special reservation existed, the rules of the Covenant might be over-ruled. That was a danger. The whole question was one of considerable delicacy, and he thought that the Conference ought to consider it a little further before accepting the amendment, at any rate in its present form.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thought perhaps the difficulty which the Polish amendment was intended to meet was covered already by the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 19, which stipulated that, if a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention had not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it should be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the parties concerning the settlement of international disputes. Did not that clause enable Members of the League to submit their disputes, if they happened to be of a political character, to the Council for settlement? If so, the Polish amendment was unnecessary, as the substance of the proposal existed already in the first paragraph of Article 19. That should avoid the danger—a by no means negligible danger—mentioned by the United Kingdom delegate.

The adoption of the Polish amendment might lead to difficulties. For example, those parties which had accepted the Optional Clause relating to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice had thereby agreed to submit to the Court's jurisdiction all legal questions concerning the application of treaties. Members of the Conference would surely not be prepared to admit an exception to the obligation which had been assumed by acceding to the Optional Clause. The Polish amendment might indeed be interpreted to mean that, even in the case of a legal dispute, seeing that Article 19 spoke of disputes relating to the interpretation of the Convention, any such dispute might be brought before the Council, whereas by acceding to the Optional Clause States had recognised the exclusive jurisdiction of the Permanent Court in such matters. M. van Hamel suggested that the first paragraph of Article 19 already met the Polish delegation's requirements, since it provided implicitly that the parties could refer to the Council.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, supported the proposal that the matter dealt with in the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation should be referred to the Drafting Committee so that the possibility should be examined of making Article 19 clearer. In any case, he agreed, in principle, with the Polish amendment.

As to the problem of unilateral applications to the Court, the second paragraph of Article 19 contained the words: "If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice". He would not have raised the question had it not been for the fact that the 1936 Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs stipulated that the contracting parties should submit the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice "at the request of any one of the Parties". The text of the 1936 Convention thus provided explicitly for the hypothesis of a unilateral request. Article 19 of the present draft could, of course, be interpreted as not precluding unilateral requests. But the text of that article read: "If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice". Must there be agreement on the choice of the Permanent Court? M. Pella did not think so. He thought that the idea of a unilateral request was already embodied in the text of Article 19 of the draft. Since, however, a recent Convention—the 1936 Opium Convention—made explicit provision for unilateral requests, the Conference should make known its views on the subject.

M. KULSKI (Poland) agreed to the suggestion that the Polish amendment should be referred to the Drafting Committee. He wished, however, to dispel a misunderstanding. The Polish delegation had had no intention of extending the competence of the Council; its purpose had been to safeguard it. The Polish amendment, moreover, was not an innovation in international practice. Political agreements, such as the Locarno Treaty, contained an article safeguarding the rights and duties of the parties under the Covenant. The wording of the Polish amendment perhaps needed to be improved, but the Polish delegation urged that the Conference should agree to adopt a text which was designed to safeguard the competence of the Council.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) considered that the various aspects of the interpretation of the Convention should be dealt with in a uniform manner and that that could only be done by the Council. He therefore supported the Polish amendment.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) made a general reservation on behalf of his Government concerning the application of Article 19.

His personal opinion regarding the Polish amendment was that it was very desirable that it should be adopted in some form which the Drafting Committee might decide. It seemed expedient to stress the connection between the Convention and the Covenant—that was to say, between international co-operation for the repression of terrorism and international co-operation in general. He thought that the explanations which the Polish delegate had given should allay the fears of certain delegations.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Polish amendment should be referred to the Drafting Committee and that the latter should be asked to consider it with due reference to what had been said in the course of the discussion.

The President's proposal was adopted.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to discuss the Rapporteur's proposal to introduce, in the second paragraph of Article 19, a clause providing for unilateral requests.

M. BASDEVANT (France) thought that it was unnecessary to introduce in paragraph 2 of Article 19 a clause providing explicitly for unilateral requests. Paragraph 2 embodied a rule of compulsory jurisdiction. It instituted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice for disputes that might arise in any of the various hypotheses contemplated. Once the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court was established, the way in which it functioned and, in the first instance, the methods by which disputes should be referred to the Court, would be fixed not by the Treaties containing the Clause relating to compulsory jurisdiction, but by the Statute, Rules and practice of the Court itself.

According to the Statute of the Court and its Rules and practice, there were two ways of seizing the Court—namely, by means of a special agreement, a way which was always open, whether a clause relating to compulsory jurisdiction existed or not, and by means of a written application, a course which was possible only when there was a clause relating to compulsory jurisdiction: either the clause laid down in Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court or a clause in some particular treaty. Therefore, in the absence of any specific provision, it would mean that, according to the Statute, Rules and practice of the Court, the latter could be seized either by means of a special agreement between the parties to the dispute—and that method might have much to recommend it, as it would give the parties to the dispute an opportunity, before referring to the Court, of defining the subject and terms of the dispute, and circumscribing the issue, which might be extremely useful—or, in the absence of a special agreement, by means of a written application.

The legal position was thus quite clear. That being so, it seemed preferable not to add the parenthetical clause appearing in the 1936 Opium Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that he was already in agreement—by anticipation—with the delegate of France as to the inadvisability of inserting the clause which appeared in the 1936 Opium Convention. He had raised the point simply in order that the Minutes might show why the Conference had adopted Article 19 as it stood, and how it had interpreted the provisions of that article.

Article 19 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 20.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall be both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and on behalf of any non-member State represented at the Conference which drew up the present Convention or to which a copy thereof is communicated for this purpose by the Council of the League of Nations.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Article 20 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 21.

1. After the . . . , the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 20 on whose behalf the Convention has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

Article 21 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 22.

Any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State which is prepared to ratify the Convention under the second paragraph of Article 20, or to accede to the Convention under Article 21, but desires to be allowed to make reservations with regard to the application of the Convention, may so inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall forthwith communicate such reservations to all the Members of the League and non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited and enquire whether they have any objection thereto.

Should the reservation be formulated within two years from the entry into force of the Convention, the same enquiry shall be addressed to Members of the League and non-member States whose signature of the Convention has not yet been followed by ratification. If, within six months from the date of the Secretary-General's communication, no objection to the reservation has been made, it shall be treated as accepted by the High Contracting Parties.

Amendment to Article 22.

Amendment proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation.[1]

At the end of the article, insert the words:

In the event of any objection being received, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall inform the Government of the Member or non-member State which desired to make the reservation and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to ratify or accede without the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification or accession.

Sir John Fischer Williams (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom amendment was designed to remedy, both in the present Convention and probably in other conventions, an omission which was apparent in Article 22 as it stood. As drafted, the text did not state what was to happen if an objection to a reservation was received. The United Kingdom amendment made it clear that, in that event, the State which had submitted the reservation had to choose between dropping the reservation or not ratifying the particular convention. The United Kingdom amendment was merely a useful piece of legislation relating to the general clauses of conventions concluded under the auspices of the League.

M. Sebestyén (Hungary) said that Article 22, as it stood, differed slightly from the corresponding provisions in conventions previously concluded under the auspices of the League. Experience of reservations made by Governments to conventions signed by them had led to the insertion of the stipulation in Article 22 to the effect that the absence of objection to a reservation was tantamount to acceptance of the same. The innovation was welcome as making it easier to ascertain, in the case of any particular convention, in what countries it was in force, and subject to what conditions. M. Sebestyén congratulated the Secretariat on the form given to Article 22, which would facilitate the application of the Convention. He also supported the United Kingdom amendment as a useful addition to the effectiveness of Article 22.

M. Podesta Costa, Secretary-General of the Conference, explained the origins of the provision in Article 22. Before 1927, no international conventions or treaties contained any provision in regard to reservations; and the position in the matter had been chaotic. But certain reservations made in the case of the Convention of February 19th, 1925, for the control of the international traffic in narcotic drugs had led the Council to adopt a resolution, on June 17th, 1927,[2] to the effect that reservations were not binding unless accepted by the other contracting parties.

In the light of that resolution, a clause was inserted in the Convention of November 8th, 1927, for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, providing for the collective consultation of all signatories on all reservations—a somewhat cumbrous proceeding. The 1928 Convention on Economic Statistics, the 1929 International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, and the 1930 Convention on Stamp Duties on Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, provided that all States ratifying those Conventions, or definitively acceding thereto, were to be consulted by the communication in writing of all reservations made. In the absence of any objection to a reservation within six months of the date of its communication, the reservation was to be regarded as adopted.

In the present Convention, while the six months time-limit had been maintained, the experts had introduced a slight modification by extending the list of States consulted to include those which had only signed the Convention, provided that the delay in ratification did not exceed a relatively considerable period of time. It was felt that the action of States in allowing a number of years to pass without ratifying was proof of absence of interest, and that such absence of interest disqualified the States in question from debarring third States which desired to accede with reservations. The effect of the United Kingdom amendment was to strengthen the operation of the article should objections to a reservation be raised.

M. Pella (Roumania), Rapporteur, had no observations to offer on the United Kingdom amendment. It was a logical deduction from the text proposed by the experts.

In connection with the statement just made by the Secretary-General of the Conference, M. Pella pointed out that the ratification of conventions dealing with matters of criminal law frequently involved fundamental changes in national legislation. For example, Roumania had been obliged to await the promulgation of its new Criminal Code before it could take the necessary steps to ratify the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency. On the other hand, Roumania had ratified the Optional Protocol, which went further, but which did not involve any change in the existing Roumanian law.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.20.

[2] See *Official Journal*, July 1927, page 800.

The Secretariat's proposal to limit the communication of reservations to States which had signed, but had not ratified, the Convention within two years from its entry into force, excluded, because they had not ratified within that period, countries which obviously intended to do so and which might have everything to gain from an international solution of the problem. Those countries, however, might have observations to make on certain reservations.

While he accepted both Article 22 and the United Kingdom amendment, M. Pella thought both texts should be referred to the Drafting Committee for reconsideration in the light of the Convention as a whole, as well as for the solution of the specific case to which he had drawn attention.

M. BASDEVANT (France) thanked M. Podesta Costa for the information he had supplied in regard to the development of existing practice in the matter of reservations. The whole Conference would be grateful to the Secretariat for the valuable assistance it had given in this matter, a contribution to the work of the Conference which only the Secretariat could have made. The text of Article 22, as prepared by the Secretariat, should facilitate the conclusion of international conventions of a collective character.

M. Basdevant was happy to be able to accept the United Kingdom amendment, which completed Article 22; he would like, however, to propose a formal amendment—namely, to omit the words "*of the Member or non-member State*" so that the text would read "*the Government which desired . . .*"

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) had no objection to M. Basdevant's proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT noted that the Conference was prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation, as amended by M. Basdevant. Article 22 would accordingly be referred to the Drafting Committee for reconsideration in the light of the Rapporteur's observations on the two-year time-limit.

M. PODESTA COSTA, Secretary-General of the Conference, pointed out that the two-year time-limit began not from the date of signature of the Convention, but from the date of its coming into force. The period might therefore be in practice four of five years from the date of signature. In order to meet the Rapporteur's objection, however, he proposed to extend the period to three years.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, agreed that the period in question should be three years.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what was to be done if objections were raised that did not take account of the reasons for which reservations had been made. The United Kingdom amendment provided for objections to be communicated by the Secretary-General of the League to the Governments concerned, but gave no indication of their being considered by the League or any other organisation.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) thought there was a misunderstanding. He would describe the situation as follows. An agreement had been signed in a settled form. If a State wished to accede to it with a certain difference, the assent of the other signatory States was necessary. If any one of the other States did not accept the reservation, they obviously could not change the whole Convention. States which wanted to make reservations on an accepted text were, to put it plainly, at the mercy of any one State which had signed the Convention and did not accept the reservation. The question of the reasonableness of the exception to the reservation did not arise for decision. That question would have to be negotiated between the two States concerned, and the State which objected to the reservation might press the other State to withdraw it. That was a matter for negotiation between them, and not for discussion by the Conference or by a superior body.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the United Kingdom delegate for his explanations.

The PRESIDENT proposed to refer Article 22 and the United Kingdom amendment to the Drafting Committee, subject to the conditions already agreed.

The President's proposal was adopted.

ARTICLE 23.

Ratification of or accession to the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation are in conformity with the rules contained in the Convention.

Article 23 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 24.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories

in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may at any time declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 24.

Amendment proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation.[1]

Replace the last sentence of paragraph 2 by the following text:

In making such notification, the High Contracting Party concerned may state that the application of the Convention to any of such territories shall be subject to any reservations which have been accepted in respect of that High Contracting Party under Article 22. The Convention shall then apply, with any such reservations, to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Should it be desired as regards any such territories to make reservations other than those already made under Article 22 by the High Contracting Party concerned, the procedure set out in that Article shall be followed.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom amendment was really one of style and form, intended to make clear the effect of the introduction of reservations when a colony was introduced as a territory to which the Convention was to apply.

Article 24 was referred to the Drafting Committee, together with the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

ARTICLE 25.

The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the . . . ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration.

ARTICLE 26.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 27.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by means of a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

ARTICLE 28.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 20. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, ... in a single copy, which will be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

The PRESIDENT noted that the articles which remained to be considered were similar to those in other conventions concluded under the auspices of the League.

In regard to Articles 25 and 26, the only question which remained open was that of the number of instruments of ratification or accession required for the Convention to take effect.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.21.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the number was really dependent on the possibilities which might exist of speedy ratification by the States. The problem must also be examined from the standpoint of the difficulties which certain States might experience in undertaking the immediate modification of their criminal legislation. M. Pella therefore suggested that the Bureau or the Drafting Committee might be asked to make proposals as to the number.

Articles 25 to 28 were referred to the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT declared closed the examination, at a first reading, of the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

FOURTEENTH MEETING.

Held on Tuesday, November 9th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m.

President : Count CARTON DE WIART.

26. Examination, at a First Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : Text prepared by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its Third Session (1937)[1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 22[2] (continuation).

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, reverting to Article 22 (already referred to the Drafting Committee) drew attention to the fact that the State against which an offence was directed might also be the author of the indictment. Many countries, however, allowed private criminal proceedings, in which the party against whom the offence was directed was the party bringing the charge. Although it might appear somewhat strange that form of proceedings was sanctioned by a number of criminal procedure codes.

ARTICLE 26.

1. The Court shall decide whether a person who has been sent before it for trial shall be placed or remain under arrest. Where necessary, it shall determine on what conditions he may be provisionally set at liberty.

2. The State on the territory of which the Court is sitting shall place at the Court's disposal a suitable place of internment and the necessary staff of warders for the custody of the accused.

Article 26 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 27.

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall at its demand be addressed by the High Contracting Party on the territory of which the Court is sitting to the State competent to give effect to such letters of request.

Article 27 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 28.

No examination of the person sent to the Court for trial, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for that person, the representatives of the State against which the offence was directed or on the territory of which the offence was committed or which laid the case before the Court and the representatives of the " parties civiles ", or after due summons to such persons to be present.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought that a reference to paragraph 2 of Article 22 should be inserted in Article 28.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, supported the suggestion as making the text of Article 28 clearer and linking it up with Article 22. He proposed that Article 28 should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

ARTICLE 29.

1. Accused persons may be defended by advocates belonging to a Bar and approved by the Court.

2. If provision is not made for the conduct of the defence by a barrister chosen by the accused, the Court shall assign to each accused person a counsel selected from advocates belonging to a Bar.

Article 29 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

---

[1] For the text of the draft Convention, see Annex 3, page 191.
[2] See page 127.

ARTICLE 30.

1. The hearings before the Court shall be public.

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned and unanimous judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place " in camera ". Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) pointed out that decisions to hear cases *in camera* were usually taken by a majority vote. For what special reasons was unanimity required in the case of the International Criminal Court? He proposed that the question should be referred to the Drafting Committee.

The PRESIDENT asked whether M. Polychroniadis thought a simple majority sufficient in the case of decisions to hear cases *in camera*, or whether he thought some specific majority was necessary in such cases.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) replied that, in his opinion, a simple majority was sufficient.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, agreed that a simple majority was sufficient. He pointed out that the question would usually arise in connection with serious cases involving important interests of States. The International Criminal Court should not be transformed into a tribune for purposes other than those mentioned in the Convention.

Article 30 *was referred to the Drafting Committee.*

ARTICLE 31.

The Court shall sit in private to consider its judgment.

ARTICLE 32.

The decisions of the Court shall be by majority of the judges.

ARTICLE 33.

Every judgment or order of the Court shall state the reasons therefor and be read at a public hearing by the President.

Articles 31 *to* 33 *were referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.*

ARTICLE 34.

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person sent before it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been sent for trial.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, observed that no objection had been raised to Article 34; but the problem with which Article 34 dealt raised another question. It was obvious that the Court could only try persons sent before it : but what persons could be sent before it? Suppose a State arrested some, but not all, of those known to be guilty of an act of terrorism : could it, in sending before the Court the persons whom it had arrested, at the same time indict the perpetrators of the crime it had not been able to arrest? That problem was connected with the question of judgment by default. Would it not create a deplorable impression for the Court to sentence some of the authors of an act of terrorism to ten or fifteen years of penal servitude, while others whose guilt was also established were not sentenced even by default, for the sole reason that the State bringing the matter before the Court had not been in a position to arrest them? The case would be even worse, if the State which decided to bring a matter before the Court was only able to arrest an accomplice, the chief author of the crime having taken refuge in the territory of a third State.

A search for solutions to cover such cases might lead to the inclusion of some provision for sentences *in contumaciam*. M. Pella was also aware of the arguments that could be adduced in favour of the theory that sentences *in contumaciam* should be excluded, especially when such sentences were to be rendered by an International Court. He therefore made no specific proposals in that connection; he merely drew attention to the point, which might be studied by the Drafting Committee.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) said that the problem raised by the Rapporteur was simply that of the jurisdiction of States. Since States were only entitled to indict before the International Court persons over whom they had themselves jurisdiction, the point to be settled was how far their jurisdiction extended.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) observed that the Rapporteur had not proposed any amendment to Article 34. He had merely raised the question whether the International Criminal Court should have powers to pass judgments *in contumaciam*. It was obvious that the Court had the power to try any parties indicted before it, whether present or absent. That was clear from Article 34, though the point might perhaps be made more explicit by a specific reference to the possibility of judgment by default.

There was, however, another question of a more delicate nature; and that was whether countries which decided to indict an accused person before the Court could at the same time indict a joint author or accomplice whom they had been unable to arrest and must therefore indict by default. In municipal law, the problem would of course give rise to no difficulty; but in

international jurisdiction delicate situations might arise. It would be much more difficult for the Court to try an individual by default than it would be for a national court of the country instituting proceedings.

But these difficulties were difficulties of practice only. Legally, M. Sasserath could not see that there was anything to prevent a country which had fully investigated a crime from indicting all parties to the crime. After the Marseilles outrage, a number of the accused were tried by default. Was it arguable that, if the International Criminal Court had been in existence at that time, it would have been unable to try the parties concerned by default, merely because it had not been possible to arrest them, or because the countries in which they had taken refuge were unwilling to extradite them?

M. Sasserath proposed that it should be explicitly stated in Article 34 that the Court had power to try accused persons even by default; and it might perhaps be added—if that point was not thought obvious of itself—that the State which seized the Court of a case could also indict before it any parties to the crime whom it had not been able to arrest.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) wondered whether the point could not be settled by giving the Court power to apply for the extradition of any parties to a crime, when it had been duly seized of the case by the indictment of one of the parties.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the right to send accused parties before the Court was covered by Articles 2, 3, 8 and 9, as well as by Article 7, of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. All the cases covered by those articles assumed the presence of the author of the crime in the territory of the State concerned, or the jurisdiction of the State concerned derived from the fact that the offence had been committed within its territory. In the latter case, the State could indict the guilty parties before the Court, even though they were absent.

M. BASDEVANT (France) observed that the discussion had gone a long way beyond the scope of Article 34. Article 34 laid down a simple rule to which no one could object. But in connection with that article a very important issue had just arisen, for which it would seem that no adequate solution was provided in the texts before the Conference.

What parties could a signatory State indict before the International Criminal Court? That was the question; and the answer was relatively simple. It could indict before the Court any parties coming within its own jurisdiction in respect of any of the acts enumerated in the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism; and the scope of the State's own jurisdiction was determined by its national law.

But, in practice, delicate situations might arise. Take the case of a crime directed against France, which was committed in France by three individuals, two of whom took refuge in Roumania. Roumania might considered herself competent to prosecute the two individuals in question and she might also consider herself competent to include the third in the proceedings. But if Roumania decided to send the three before the International Criminal Court, the third of the three being in France, what would be the position if France decided to bring the last-named before the French courts? In the absence of an International Criminal Court, the Roumanian courts might try the three perpetrators of the crime; but their decisions regarding the third, who was in France, would be of no effect, so far as the French courts were concerned. The position would be different if there were an International Criminal Court, to which both Roumania and France had acceded. The decisions of that Court would not of course be on the same footing as those of the Roumanian courts. M. Basdevant regretted that he did not, for the moment, see a solution of the difficulty. The problem might be one for which there was no judicial solution, and which must be solved by the most appropriate methods.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that M. Basdevant had just raised a new problem. It was clear that, under paragraph 1 of Article 3 of the Convention for the Creation of a Criminal Court, a State could send before the Court any persons arrested on its territory who had been guilty of acts of terrorism covered by the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, provided that under its own law that State possessed the right to have those persons tried by its own courts.

There was, however a second possibility provided for under paragraph 2 of Article 3—namely, the case of persons who had taken refuge within the territory of a State who were not judiciable by that State under its own national law. If Belgium, for example, were a party to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, she would be competent, under her own law, to try both an individual who had committed a crime in Belgium, a Belgian national who had committed an offence abroad, or, lastly, a person who had committed abroad any of the crimes punished by Belgium under the system of real protection. In all three cases, she could, instead of exercising that right through her own courts, send the individual before the International Criminal Court. But there was yet another case where she would be able to send the individual before the Court, even though not herself competent to try him; that was the case of a foreigner committing an offence abroad, who had entered Belgian territory, and for whose extradition application had been made. Belgium could then send him before the Court instead of extraditing him. It was clear therefore, that the Greek delegate's conception of the problem as a problem of the jurisdiction of States applied to a large number of cases, though not to all.

M. Pella would give a few examples. If three Roumanians committed an offence in France against France, and two of them entered Roumanian territory, while the third remained in Yugoslavia, Roumania would not only be entitled to send before the Court the two individuals

who had taken refuge in Roumanian territory : she would also be entitled to indict the third individual in virtue of her individual competence, because he was a Roumanian national (principle of active personality).

Suppose, again, that three individuals committed in French territory an offence directed against Yugoslavia, and France considered that they should be sent before the Criminal Court. Suppose also that two only of them were in France, while the third was not. In that case, since the offence had been committed in French territory, France would be entitled to indict before the Criminal Court the third, and absent, party as well, because the French courts were competent to try all three parties seeing that they had committed an offence in French territory (principle of territoriality).

In the case of the examples he had just given, there was, M. Pella thought, no objection to trying by default parties whom the State had been unable to arrest. The Conference must, however, take a decision on the actual principle of judgment by default.

The problem became more complicated where a State, having arrested in its territory a foreigner who had committed an act of terrorism in a foreign country against a foreign State, decided to send him before the Court. Could it in such case also indict before the Court the other parties whom it had been unable to arrest? Except for the few countries whose legislation admitted the principle of universal jurisdiction, most countries held that the foreigner was sent before the Criminal Court, not in virtue of the State's competence to try him, but solely in virtue of the fact that he had taken refuge in its territory and that it had the right to extradite him.

Then there was the hypothetical case put forward by M. Basdevant, which was altogether different, though interesting because of its bearing on the attitude of the different States parties to the Convention. M. Basdevant asked what would happen where one of the authors or accomplices in an offence was in the territory of one State, and the rest were arrested by another State and sent before the Court. The issues involved in that event were so intricate and varied so greatly in each particular case that, in the Rapporteur's opinion, there was only one possible solution; and that was to ascertain whether or not it was possible to extend the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 43 on the subject of possible disputes as to the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of the national courts.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) had the impression, from the discussion, that it would greatly complicate the work of the Court to introduce the conception of jurisdiction *in contumaciam*. The prestige even of old and well-established international organisations had been known to suffer from attempts to solve problems beyond their powers. The functions of the Court should be specified in language as simple and clear as possible. Complication of those functions by the introduction of judgments *in contumaciam* would necessitate recourse by the Court to platonic judgments, which would not tend to enhance its prestige. Later, perhaps, it might be possible to extend the proposed system in order to provide for more complicated jurisdiction; but, for the present, the Court's task should be confined to the normal functions of a criminal court.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) did not share the Hungarian delegate's misgivings as regards the possibility of allowing the Court to try cases by default. He failed to see why it should be better not to try an accused person at all than to do so in his absence. The highest judicial institutions were frequently called upon to try cases by default, and judgments thus delivered by the International Criminal Court, in exceptional cases only, would not diminish its prestige.

M. Sasserath agreed with the Rapporteur that, in 80% or 90% of cases, no difficulty could arise. Where all the countries concerned were parties to the Convention, the possibility of dispute could be almost ruled out. It was otherwise, where one of the States concerned was a non-signatory State : but there was nothing to prevent the latter from exercising its own sovereign jurisdiction in the case without reference to the indictment of particular authors of the crime before the International Court.

As regards the case put by M. Basdevant, M. Sasserath recognised that the problem that arose was difficult to solve. In any event, no solution in general terms was possible. As, however, the text would be referred in any event to the Drafting Committee, delegates would have time for reflection on what was undoubtedly a difficult and delicate problem.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece), in reply to the Hungarian delegate's observations, drew attention to the fact that Article 3 automatically transferred to the International Criminal Court the competence of the State in the matter of sentences *in contumaciam*.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) could not refrain, in view of the Belgian and Greek delegates' observations, from once more drawing attention to the dangers which might result, if the International Criminal Court were allowed to try cases by default. Suppose that a State which was a party to both Conventions indicted before the Court a person who was not distrainable, and that the Court acquitted him. Suppose that, after his acquittal, the person in question was arrested in a country which was not a party to either Convention. Or again, take the case of a person convicted by the Court *in contumaciam* who was arrested in a State which was not a party to the Convention. The latter, not feeling bound by the judgment of the Court, might acquit the individual in question. The exercise by the International Criminal Court of jurisdiction *in contumaciam* would inevitably result in situations which were better avoided.

M. BASDEVANT (France) agreed with M. Sasserath that the problem was not one to be disposed of in a hurry. M. Sasserath's own proposal to introduce the idea of jurisdiction by default into Article 34 should itself, in M. Basdevant's opinion, be carefully weighed before it was adopted.

It was quite normal for criminal courts to try cases by default. Where the convicted party was arrested later, the judgment lapsed, and a fresh trial took place. The position as regards national courts was perfectly simple: but it would be otherwise with the International Criminal Court. A party tried in his absence and convicted *in contumaciam* might afterwards be arrested in the territory of a signatory State having jurisdiction over him. Was that State obliged to bring him before the International Criminal Court in order for the judgment by default to lapse? What would be the position if the State refused to bring the case before the International Court, preferring to retain the accused in its possession? A State arresting such a person in its own territory, a person, it might be, who was its own national, could not be obliged to bring him before the International Criminal Court; and, should it refuse to do so, the finding of its courts might differ from that pronounced by the International Court. The position would be even more deplorable than if the State were not a signatory of the Convention.

In view of the above difficulties, M. Basdevant wondered if it would not be wiser to ignore certain traditional practices of national courts, and to make it a rule that the International Criminal Court should not try cases by default. Only such accused parties as were actually brought before the Court would then be tried by it. No proceedings would be taken against the others, the national courts retaining their jurisdiction over such persons. He agreed that the solution was not ideal; but it would, he felt, serve to avert some of the difficulties that might otherwise arise. M. Basdevant added that he had only made a suggestion: he was not prepared to define his attitude in the matter.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that no one could fail, especially after hearing M. Basdevant's remarks, to realise the difficult and delicate nature of the problem. But would not the disagreement which might arise between a judgment *in contumaciam* of the International Criminal Court and the decisions of a national court of a signatory State, occur also in connection with the judgment of the International Criminal Court in an ordinary trial and the decisions of a national court of a non-signatory State?

So far as the signatory States were concerned, M. Hirschfeld could not see how a State which recognised the competence of the International Criminal Court could, in spite of a judgment *in contumaciam* by that Court, try the accused on the same charge in its own courts.

M. Hirschfeld did not claim to throw any light on the point: he would himself be grateful for enlightenment.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium) said that he had not proposed any formal amendment. He had merely suggested a solution which might be considered by the Drafting Committee. He did not claim that his solution was the best.

In reply to M. Basdevant, who had referred to the difficulties which would arise should a State which was a party to the Convention reject a judgment given by default in the International Criminal Court, M. Sasserath pointed out that the same difficulty might arise in an ordinary trial by the Court. Take the case of a Frenchman who committed an act of terrorism in Belgium, and afterwards fled to Roumania for refuge, the latter country and France having signed the Convention and Belgium not having done so. Suppose that Belgium asked Roumania to extradite or punish the offender, and that Roumania, not wishing to extradite him, and preferring for practical reasons not to try him in the Roumanian courts, handed him over to the International Criminal Court. Belgium, being a country which did not admit the latter's jurisdiction, might not be satisfied with such a solution. That was a difficulty which could not be removed by the Convention. On the other hand, if it were necessary to provide against every potential difficulty, it would he better not to draw up a Convention at all.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that he was glad to have started the discussion, if only for the assistance which the record of it in the Minutes would afford in the solution of the problem. In his view, provision should in any event be made for some form of judgment by default, however limited. If three persons accused before the Court escaped to Netherlands territory, ought not the possibility of trying those persons by default be admitted? Judgment by default must be retained at any rate in specified cases, even if it could not be more generally applied. M. Pella proposed to refer the suggestion to the Drafting Committee.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) said that M. Sasserath's point that difficulties might arise even in ordinary cases before the Court seemed to him an additional reason for not complicating the problem still further by introducing the notion of default. He did not regard judgment by default as an essential element in criminal proceedings. There were several legislations in which provision was not made for it, and it was not in any way missed.

In the particular case before the Conference, if a signatory State brought an offender before the Court while a non-signatory State refused to hand over other offenders in its custody, a judgment by default would offer no solution.

Article 34 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 35.

1. The Court may sentence the persons sent before it to restore property or to pay damages.

2. The Court shall decide whether any restitution or confiscation of any object is to be made.

3. High Contracting Parties in whose territory objects to be restored or property belonging to convicted persons is situated shall be bound to take all the measures provided by their own laws to ensure the execution of the sentences.

4. The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply to cases in which pecuniary penalties imposed by the Court or costs of proceedings have to be recovered.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) noted that both paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 of Article 35 referred to restitution. He asked whether it was a case of overlapping or whether the two paragraphs dealt with different matters.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, proposed that the article should be referred to the Drafting Committee, which, in the light of the Minutes of the Committee of Jurists, would be able to see whether there was any special reason for drafting the text in that way.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

ARTICLE 36.

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by the High Contracting Party which shall be designated by the Court.

2. The Court shall determine the way in which any fines shall be dealt with.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) wondered whether the Government which had sent the accused for trial before the Court should not have the right to ask that the execution of the sentence should be entrusted to it. The following clause might be added at the end of paragraph 1 of Article 36 : " *If the State which has sent the accused for trial before the Court so requests, the Court shall entrust the execution of the sentence to it* ".

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) said that Article 17 laid down what substantive criminal law was applicable in fixing the penalty. The law of the State entrusted with the execution of the sentence might conceivably not make provision for the penalty inflicted. To supply that deficiency, it might be stipulated in Article 36 that penalties would be executed in conformity with the law of the country entrusted with the execution of the penalty. The same formula would have to be adopted for fines, in paragraph 2.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, saw no objection to adopting the Netherlands delegate's suggestion, if that was the Conference's wish. He would, however, have preferred to allow the Court the right to select the State which was to carry out a penalty involving loss of liberty. In any case, if the State which had indicted the accused before the Court were chosen by the latter to carry out the penalty, that State should be obliged to undertake that duty.

As to M. Koukal's proposal, the Rapporteur did not think it was possible to do more than specify that the State entrusted with the execution of the sentence should, in cases where its own national law had not been applied, enforce the penalty which under its own law approximated most closely, from the point of view of gravity and conditions, to the penalty inflicted by the Court.

Under certain codes, that same solution was provided for in a few cases in respect of persons who had committed offences abroad and in regard to whom a penalty laid down by foreign criminal law had to be applied.

Turning to the question of the execution of pecuniary sentences, M. Pella thought that it was quite clear from Article 35, paragraph 4, that those sentences would be carried out in accordance with the national law of the country responsible for collecting the fines.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) recalled that the present text had been established with due reference to the observations submitted by the Hungarian Government on the first draft framed by the experts in 1936.[1] The Hungarian Government had said on that occasion that it was desirable to leave it to the Court itself to decide in what State sentences involving loss of liberty should be carried out, in order to avoid the execution of the sentence being entrusted to a State which was prejudiced against the accused and against which the presumption existed that it would not accord to the latter impartial and humane treatment. Those same doubts might arise if the Netherlands delegate's proposal were adopted. M. Sebestyén would prefer to keep to the text as it stood; he thought that the Court would possess all the information necessary to enable it to designate a State offering the requisite guarantees in that respect.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that there was some misunderstanding. He too had considered the hypothesis mentioned by the Hungarian delegate. It was obviously desirable that the execution of the penalty should not be entrusted to the State against which the crime was directed, since, in such a case, the penalty might be carried out under conditions tantamount to an aggravation of the penalty. If, on the other hand, the State against which the act was directed was also the State which, instead of trying the accused, had sent him for trial before the Court, that was in itself a guarantee as to the proper execution of the penalty, seeing that the State in question had the right to prosecute the accused before its own courts and to execute the sentence.

The Rapporteur proposed that Article 36 should be referred to the Drafting Committee and that the latter should be requested to consider the different opinions which had been expressed.

The Rapporteur's proposal was adopted.

---

[1] See document A.24.1936.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1936.V.6), page 6.

ARTICLE 37.

If sentence of death has been pronounced, the State designated by the Court to execute the sentence shall be entitled to substitute therefor the most severe penalty in its national legislation involving loss of liberty.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) interpreted Article 37 as referring to States in which the death penalty existed.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that in the first place there were two possibilities to be considered : (1) cases in which the death penalty was provided for in the law of a certain State but was not enforced, as was the case in Belgium in peace-time, and (2) cases in which the death penalty did not exist in the legislation of a State. In either case, the State entrusted with the execution of the sentence would, in the absence of the death penalty, enforce the most serious sentence involving loss of liberty for which provision was made in its national law.

There was, however, a third case : that of States in which the death penalty existed in law and in fact. For instance, if France were asked to carry out the death penalty, she would have the right to substitute for the death penalty the most serious penalty involving loss of liberty, just as she could substitute for the death penalty imposed by a French court, imprisonment for life.

Article 37 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 38.

The right of pardon shall be exercised by the State which has to enforce the penalty. It shall first consult the President of the Court.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 38.

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[1]

Replace the text of Article 38 by the following :

The State which has to execute the sentence shall have the right to ask the Court to grant a pardon.

M. KOUKAL (Czechoslovakia) proposed *the deletion of Article* 38. It concerned what he regarded as a fundamental aspect of the Convention—namely, the effects which would ensue from the fact of seizing the Court and from the latter's verdict. If the Court were seized, the right of prosecution would be suspended in all other countries parties to the Convention, and the effects of the conviction would be recognised also in those countries.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out, in support of the Soviet proposal, that it would be illogical for the right of pardon to be exercised by the State which had to execute the sentence. It seemed to him far more logical that it should be exercised by the Court itself. On the other hand, it must be stated who was entitled to ask that free pardon should be granted. That was why the Soviet delegation had proposed its amendment, but it did not intend to insist on that second point. The essential point so far as it was concerned, was that the right of pardon should be exercised by the Court.

The PRESIDENT observed that the Soviet proposal would have the effect of conferring on the judiciary a prerogative which was normally exercised by the executive.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that his suggestion might appear revolutionary from the point of view of domestic legislation, but pointed out that the Conference was setting up a new international institution on which somewhat special powers were to be conferred.

M. JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA (Spain) supported the Soviet proposal, observing that, under Spanish law, the right of pardon was vested in the Court of Cassation, whereas the right of amnesty was vested in Parliament. Legislations did exist, therefore, in which the right of pardon was not vested in the executive.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) recognised that the problem which had just been raised was a difficult one. There was, in the first place, the factor of tradition, according to which the right of pardon was a prerogative of the executive. It was true that, in Spain, as the Spanish delegate had just stated, the right of pardon was vested in the Court of Cassation, but there could be no analogy between that situation and the situation which would arise if the right of pardon were conferred on the International Criminal Court. In the first case, the right of pardon was exercised by a Court other than the Court which had pronounced the sentence. The Court of Cassation was never called upon to give judgment on the substance of a question; its functions were confined to scrutinising the juridical aspect of the affair. In the second case, on the other hand, one and the same Court would give sentence and exercise the right of pardon. It would be in the better interests of justice, in his view, to confer the right of pardon on the State which had sent the accused for trial before the International Criminal Court.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.25.

As regards the second point of the Soviet amendment, M. Bekerman said there was a misunderstanding, and observed that the right to ask for pardon lay normally with the prisoner and his family.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thought it preferable not to vest the right of pardon in the State which had to execute the sentence. He agreed with the Soviet delegate on that point. Such a procedure would impose too great a responsibility on the head of the State which had execut the sentence. The mere fact of being entrusted with the execution of the sentence could not to justify such a responsibility, which might have serious political consequences.

On the other hand, M. van Hamel did not think it would be expedient to vest the right of pardon in the Court. It seemed to him more logical to confer it on the State which had set the judicial machinery in motion and which should still have the chief say in the matter.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought that the Soviet amendment might be accepted in the form of an additional provision, to be embodied in a separate article. The obligation to consult the Court would then have to be stipulated in both cases.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that there were four proposals before the Conference : (1) a Czechoslovak proposal to delete Article 38; (2) a Soviet proposal that the right of pardon should be vested in the Court; (3) a Polish proposal, supported by the Netherlands delegation, that that right should be conferred on the State which had brought the case before the International Criminal Court; and, lastly, (4) a Yugoslav proposal to confer the right of pardon both on the State which had executed the sentence and on the State which had indicted the accused before the Court. In both cases, the President of the Court should be consulted.

He did not propose to discuss the first proposal. It involved a question of principle on which it was not desirable to open a long discussion.

With regard to the Soviet proposal, the Rapporteur would not repeat the arguments advanced by the Polish delegate when referring to the Spanish delegate's support of the Soviet proposal. Clearly, the adoption of the proposal would mean a confusion of powers. It would be quite irregular, according to the principles now recognised by the large majority of countries, to confer the right of pardon on the Court which had pronounced sentence. The Conference could not accept such an idea.

The Polish delegation maintained that it was more logical that the State which had sent the accused before the Court should exercise the right of pardon. If logic were pushed a little farther, that right should rather be vested in the State against which the crime had been directed, seeing that the fundamental interests of that State were affected. The injured State might come to the conclusion, in the light of certain circumstances, and after the lapse of a certain interval, that it was expedient, for internal reasons, to exercise the right of pardon in favour of the individual concerned. The Conference might ponder that question.

Two different conceptions could be admitted concerning the legal situation of the State responsible for executing the sentence, namely : *(a)* the conception of the sovereign rights of the State which executed a sentence in its territory; *(b)* the conception that the State which executed the sentence was merely an agent.

As regarded the first conception, the point should be emphasised that the right of pardon ensued from the principle of the sovereignty of the State. It seemed hardly conceivable, therefore, that a State—the State which had sent the accused for trial before the Court—should have power to intervene with a view to preventing the execution of a sentence under the responsibility of another State.

The Rapporteur thought, therefore, that only one point should be considered—namely, whether the right of pardon should be conferred also on the State against which the crime had been directed, in view of the fact that that State might wish for certain special reasons—in the interests, for example, of social calm—that the right of pardon should be exercised. It was clear that, if the conception of the sovereign rights of the State were admitted, the same objections of principle might be raised in that case also.

It was therefore only possible to allow the State against which the offence had been directed the right to ask for pardon, it being clearly understood that the State entrusted with the execution of the sentence would have the exclusive right of granting pardon. The Rapporteur realised that such a stipulation would have a purely moral value, as every State had the right to ask for pardon. The convicted person and his family also possessed that right.

Lastly, there was the second conception—namely, that the State which carried out the penalty imposed by the International Criminal Court was merely an agent. There could thus be no question of the execution of a sentence in virtue of the sovereign rights of the State, a right which would exclude the interference of another State in the execution of that penalty. If that second conception were admitted, the right of pardon could of course also be conferred on the State against which the offence had been directed.

The PRESIDENT said that five different proposals had now been laid before the Conference. The work of the Drafting Committee would be greatly facilitated if the authors of those various proposals would send them in in writing.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was not entirely convinced by the arguments advanced against the exercise of the right of pardon by the Court, but that he would not insist on that part of his proposal, as he felt that the majority of the Conference was not in favour of such a solution. On the other hand, he could not agree to the right of pardon

being exercised by the State which would have to execute the sentence. That State, he pointed out, would be acting not in the exercise of its own sovereign powers but simply as the mandatory of the Court. If the State in question were executing a sentence pronounced in the exercise of its sovereign rights, it would be at liberty to decide what penalty should be inflicted.

M. Hirschfeld added that no analogy was possible between the case which the Conference was discussing and the usual standards determining the division of powers between the legislature and the executive. In the case now under consideration, there were internal and external political arguments in favour of the abolition of the right of pardon. The Soviet delegation's chief anxiety was that the right of pardon should not be accorded to the State which would have to execute the sentence. It considered, on the contrary, that it would be far more logical, as the Rapporteur had suggested, to vest that right in the injured State. The Soviet delegation would be prepared to accept that solution.

The PRESIDENT noted that the different points of view were beginning to approximate more closely to one another. He added that it seemed only logical that the right of mercy should bear some relation to the injury suffered and that it should not be exercised by any non-interested third party. He emphasised the argument concerning political expediency mentioned by the Rapporteur, who had pointed out that it might be to the interest of the injured State, in certain circumstances, to grant a pardon as a measure of appeasement.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) suggested that the injured State might even be given the right to object to the granting of a pardon.

Article 38 was referred to the Drafting Committee, which should take into account, as far as possible, the suggestion that the right of pardon should be vested in the injured State, on the understanding that provision should be made for the consultation of the President of the Court in every case.

ARTICLE 39.

1. Against convictions pronounced by the Court, no proceedings other than an application or revision shall be allowable.

2. The Court shall determine in its rules the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

3. The States mentioned in Article 22, and the persons mentioned in Article 29, shall have the right to ask for a revision.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 39.

Amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[1]

Provide in the text that an application for revision may only be made if new circumstances have arisen.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, observed that the Soviet proposal was framed in rather vague terms. He understood, however, that the proposal covered only new circumstances which might have affected the verdict had they been known when the judgment was given. If that were the Soviet delegate's intention, such a case would, the Rapporteur thought, necessarily be provided for in the rules to be drawn up in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 39 of the draft.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that he had had in mind new circumstances such as to affect the verdict.

The PRESIDENT quoted Article 61 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice concerning the cases in which an application for revision of a judgment could be made. He proposed that Article 39 should be referred to the Drafting Committee, and that the latter should be asked to consider the suggestions which had just been put forward.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) noted the reference in paragraph 3 to Article 29; he interpreted that as applying also to the accused. If that were so, it might perhaps be necessary to mention it specifically, since Article 29 appeared from the drafting to concern only the counsel.

The PRESIDENT said that it was understood that the accused also had the right to apply for the revision of a judgment.

Article 39 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 40.

1. The salaries of the judges shall be payable by the States of which they are nationals on a scale fixed by the High Contracting Parties.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.26.

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) proposed that Article 40 should be inserted after Article 43.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, accepted the proposal. He also mentioned that provision would have to be made in Article 40 for expenditure in connection with officially selected counsel.

Article 40 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 41.

The Court's archives shall be in the charge of the Registrar.

Article 41 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 42.

The Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure.

Article 42 was referred to the Drafting Committee without observations.

ARTICLE 43.

1. The Court shall decide any questions as to its own jurisdiction arising during the hearing of a case; it shall for this purpose apply the provisions of the present Convention and of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the general principles of law.

2. Should a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, dispute the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts, this issue shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 45.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, pointed out that the Drafting Committee would have to consider the possibility of extending the scope of paragraph 2 of Article 43 so as to take into account the point mentioned by the delegate of France during the discussion on Article 34.[1] The question was whether the decision rested with the Permanent Court of International Justice or with the International Criminal Court itself.

The Rapporteur also thought it desirable that the disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 43 should be settled by the International Criminal Court, but, in order that the Court might be competent to do so, the States parties to the dispute would of course have to give their consent, failing which, the dispute would be settled in accordance with Article 45.

Article 43 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

ARTICLE 44.

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning :

(a) The election of judges;
(b) The organisation of the Registry;
(c) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all financial and administrative questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;
(d) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

2. The Government of the Netherlands shall be requested to convene this meeting as soon as possible after the present Convention enters into force.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. On all questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3, decisions shall be taken by a majority of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, pointed out that it would be necessary to extend the scope of paragraph 1, sub-paragraph *(c)*, of Article 44. As now drafted, that clause provided only for the discussion of financial and administrative questions by the representatives of the contracting parties. It should also be possible for the meetings referred to in Article 44 to discuss the adaptations necessary to ensure the operation of the Court and to take decisions on the matter. A more comprehensive formula would cover any unforeseen difficulties that might arise.

Article 44 was referred to the Drafting Committee.

---

[1] See page 136.

ARTICLE 45.

If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the Parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

ARTICLE 46.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State on whose behalf the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism has been signed.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League. The Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The deposit of an instrument of ratification of the present Convention shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of or accession to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

ARTICLE 47.

1. After . . . , the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State which has not signed this Convention. Nevertheless, the deposit of an instrument of accession shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of or accession to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 46 and the first paragraph of the present article.

ARTICLE 48.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates or oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may, at any time, declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in Articles 46 and 47 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present article.

ARTICLE 49.

The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day following the receipt by the Secretary-General of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration. Nevertheless, its entry into force shall be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

ARTICLE 50.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 51.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

ARTICLE 52.

1. The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 46 and 47. Such

denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

2. Denunciation of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism shall "ipso facto" involve denunciation of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 53.

A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 48, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, ... in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States represented at the Conference.

The PRESIDENT said that the remaining articles contained formal clauses which had already been discussed at the first reading of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Repression of Terrorism.[1]

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, wished to state his views on the question of reservations. While reservations were conceivable in the case of an international convention of a more general character, that did not apply to the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. In the present case, reservations might have the effect of hampering or even preventing the functioning of the Court.

He begged the delegates to give very careful consideration to the question of reservations; the circumstances of the present draft were quite different from those applying to other international conventions.

M. BASDEVANT (France) did not think that the arrangements contemplated in Article 49 for the entry into force of the Convention were appropriate to the kind of convention that was now contemplated. A more practical solution of the problem must be envisaged. It should be laid down in the second paragraph of Article 49 that, when the requisite number of ratifications had been obtained, the signatory States would meet, at the suggestion of the most active of their number, in order to decide by agreement the date for the entry into force of the Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, agreed with the delegate of France. He thought that his suggestion might be linked up with Article 44, which provided for meetings of representatives of the contracting parties. The Government of the Netherlands might convene a meeting of the Powers that had ratified or acceded to the Convention, when the necessary number of ratifications or accessions had been obtained.

Articles 45 to 53 were referred to the Drafting Committee together with the French delegate's proposal.

The PRESIDENT declared closed the examination, at a first reading, of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

FIFTEENTH MEETING.

Held on Friday, November 12th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m.

President: M. BASDEVANT (France), *Vice-President.*

27. Absence of Count Carton de Wiart, President of the Conference : Communication by M. Basdevant, Vice-President.

M. BASDEVANT (France), Vice-President, read the following letter, dated November 10th, 1937, from Count Carton de Wiart to the Secretary-General of the Conference:

> "As I have been recalled to Brussels on urgent business, I shall, to my great regret, be unable to discharge my duties as President of the Conference. Will you please accept my apologies and convey them to my colleagues? I shall retain a happy memory of the few days of our collaboration in a legal undertaking of great international importance.

---

[1] See pages 127 to 134.

"I hope that the Vice-Presidents will agree to replace me and I sincerely thank them for doing so.

"I feel convinced that our work will lead to new achievements in the fields of law and good international relations.

(Signed) CARTON DE WIART.

"*P. S.*—I should be grateful if you would convey my thanks to all those working with you in the Secretariat for their invaluable help, which I have much appreciated."

M. Basdevant added that Count Carton de Wiart was still President of the Conference and would, he hoped, be able to resume his duties; in his absence, the Vice-Presidents would preside over the discussions.

28. Draft Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court : General Discussion (continuation) : Declaration by the Delegate of Uruguay.

The PRESIDENT said that M. Guani, delegate of Uruguay, who had been absent during the general discussion and had not had an opportunity of expressing his Government's views, desired to make a declaration.

M. GUANI (Uruguay) said that the Uruguayan Government was not able to give its entire approval to the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, but that it accepted the general lines of the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. It was in full agreement with the spirit of that draft Convention. As he had so often had occasion to say at League meetings, his Government and his country were keenly desirous that a system of international relations should be established and extended which would ensure internal and external peace for all the peoples. The draft on terrorism now submitted to the Conference represented a valuable contribution towards the realisation of those aspirations. Consequently, although the Uruguayan legislation already contained certain penal provisions for the repression of similar offences, the Uruguayan Government was quite prepared to accede to an international instrument for the prevention and punishment of acts of terrorism as defined in the present Convention.

As regards the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, it had seemed to the Uruguayan Government necessary that the provisions of that instrument, which were of interest from several points of view, should first be studied by its experts. There was one point to which the Uruguayan Government attached the greatest importance—namely, that agreement should first be reached, in regard to that delicate matter, between the Governments of the American continent. That would take a certain time. In any case, the Government of Uruguay had no objection in principle to the procedure contemplated by the creation of the Court being adopted by a larger or smaller group of States—that was to say, by those States which had declared their willingness to have recourse to the institution in question for affairs of mutual concern to them.

29. Examination, at a Second Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Drafting Committee.[1]

M. KOMARNICKI (Poland) said that the Polish delegation's attitude during the second reading of the draft Convention would depend on the nature of that examination. The Polish delegation considered that during the second reading only the general structure of the draft Convention should be examined. It would not therefore again submit those of its amendments which had not been accepted by the Drafting Committee. The Polish representatives had taken an active part in the work of the Drafting Committee, whose task was clearly defined by the decisions taken during the first reading. Nevertheless, the Polish delegation could not regard as satisfactory the text prepared by the Drafting Committee. It would confine itself, therefore, during the second reading, to submitting its observations on the general structure of the draft Convention.

TITLE OF THE CONVENTION.

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed the wording "*international terrorism*".

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, suggested that the expression proposed was inadequate and heavy. Again, the expression "*terrorism having an international character*" was too long. He pointed out that the international character of the terrorism envisaged was indicated in the preamble.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) suggested that "*international repression of terrorism*" might meet the Soviet delegate's views.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.27. (See Annex 4, page 196). For the final text of the Convention, see page 5.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that that formula was not suitable, as repression was to be exercised by national bodies. True, the title of the Conference was " Conference on the International Repression of Terrorism ", but that title had simply been chosen for the benefit of the public and could not be used in legal texts.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations and said that he would not press his suggestion.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) pointed out that the title of the Conference ought to be changed to " International Conference for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism ".

The PRESIDENT said that the Venezuelan delegate's observation would be duly taken into account when drafting the records of the Conference.

The title of the Convention was adopted without modification.

PREAMBLE.

. . . . . .

Being desirous of making more effective the prevention and punishment of terrorism of an nt ernational character,

Have appointed as their plenipotentiaries :

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions :

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that, in the text prepared by the Committee of Experts,[1] the word " international " had appeared in paragraph 2 of Article 1 (". . . prevention and punishment of such acts when they are of an international character "). In the text prepared by the Drafting Committee, it had been put in the preamble instead for the following reasons : as Article 1 defined only acts of terrorism, and as their international character appeared from Articles 2, 3 and 10, it was better to mention the international character of the acts in the preamble, since the original definition given in Article 1 did not give any information with regard to it.

Anticipating a remark by the Yugoslav delegate, M. Pella reminded the Conference of the Yugoslav suggestion that the preamble should read : " Désireux de rendre de plus en plus efficaces la prévention et la répression du terrorisme *présentant un caractère international* "[2] instead of " lorsqu'il présente un caractère international "[2]. M. Pella would be prepared to accept that amendment if no objection were raised by other members of the Conference.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) thought that the text suggested by the Yugoslav delegate might be interpreted as meaning that every act of terrorism was international in character. In his view, the text submitted by the Drafting Committee was perfectly clear.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) reminded the Conference that it had decided in plenary session[3] to delete the definition of acts of terrorism of an international character. The Drafting Committee, however, had introduced the idea " of an international character " into the preamble. This might give rise, at some future date, in connection with the execution of the Convention, to the question whether an act of terrorism was or was not of an international character. He therefore proposed the deletion of the words " *of an international character* ". His proposal was, he said, in conformity with the decision taken at the first reading of the draft Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that he would be prepared to give full explanations concerning the international character of acts of terrorism when the Conference was examining Article 1.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that he would not press his proposal. He had simply wished to emphasise the difficulties that might arise at some future date in deciding whether acts of terrorism were or were not of an international character.

The preamble was adopted without modification.

ARTICLE 1.[4]

1. The High Contracting Parties, reaffirming the principle of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against another State and to prevent the acts in which such activities take shape, undertake as hereinafter provided to prevent and punish activities of this nature and to collaborate for this purpose.

---

[1] See document C.222.M.162.1937.V (Ser. L.o.N. P. 1937.V.1), page 3. (See page 186.)
[2] No change in the English text : " terrorism of an international character ".
[3] See the discussion, at a first reading, of Article 1 (pages 71 to 83).
[4] Throughout the second reading of the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism the number of the Article in heavy type corresponds with that given in the text of the draft Convention prepared by the Committee of Experts (See pages 186 to 191).

2. In the present Convention the expression " acts of terrorism " means criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons, or a group of persons, or the general public.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the Drafting Committee, in framing the text of Article 1, had taken as a basis the amendment proposed by the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Roumania, Turkey and Yugoslavia.[1] Paragraph 1 reaffirmed an unwritten principle of international law and then indicated the international obligations ensuing from that principle for the parties to the Convention. Paragraph 2 did not define acts of terrorism of an international character, but indicated the features which must characterise the acts referred to in the following articles if they were to come within the scope of the Convention. The reason that the international character of the acts was not defined in Article 1 was that the articles following stipulated the conditions which must be fulfilled for the acts to come within the scope of the Convention. Under the terms of Article 2, it was the fact of being directed against another State that made the acts in question international offences. The international character of the offence was therefore due to the nature of the injured interests.

In Article 3, the international character of the offence also resulted from the fact that the acts referred to in that article (combination or conspiracy, incitement, complicity, etc.) must be committed with a view to a terrorist offence directed against another State. Such acts were often committed in a territory other than that in which the offence was to be carried out or that in which it was to produce its effects. In certain cases, therefore, criminal activities for the purpose of committing a terrorist offence came to light in or extended to the territory of several States, so that, in such cases too, the offence assumed an international character.

Finally, in Article 10, even if the offence were directed against the State in the territory of which it had been committed, the international significance of repression resulted from the fact that the offender had taken refuge abroad. Consequently, all the cases liable to arise in practice were sufficiently defined in Articles 2, 3 and 10. The Rapporteur thought that his explanations would satisfy the Yugoslav delegate.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) insisted on the importance of inserting in paragraph 2 the words " *of an international character* ". He thought that all the features characteristic of an act of international terrorism should appear in one and the same clause. It was true that the international character of the acts of terrorism covered by the Convention was dealt with in the preamble, as the Rapporteur had pointed out. There was, however, a difference between the preamble and the provisions of the Convention; the preamble simply indicated its purpose. In order to avoid all misunderstanding, it was preferable to insert, in paragraph 2 of Article 1, a reference to the international character of the acts of terrorism to which the Convention applied. In that connection, M. Hirschfeld pointed out that the first paragraph of Article 2 alluded to the conception of acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1.

The PRESIDENT explained that paragraph 1 of Article 1 reaffirmed a principle of international law and then went on to indicate the general purpose of the Convention, stipulating that the parties undertook to prevent and punish terrorist activities directed against another State.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, pointed out the consequences which would ensue if the Soviet amendment were adopted. If the idea of " the international character of acts of terrorism " were introduced in Article 1, how were the words " if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 ", at the end of the first paragraph of Article 2 to be interpreted? Paragraph 2 of Article 1 must be regarded either as overlapping with Article 2 or as introducing a supplementary condition concerning the international character of the act of terrorism. If such a condition must be considered as existing, difficulties of interpretation might arise, since one would be inclined to think that the international character of the act referred to in Article 1 implied something else. The same applied to Articles 3 and 10. M. Pella hoped, therefore, that the Soviet delegate would not insist on his proposal, since the addition which he had suggested was unnecessary in certain cases and might give rise to controversy, seeing that it could be interpreted as introducing an international element other than those resulting from Articles 2, 3 and 10.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thanked the Rapporteur and said that he was quite satisfied with his statement. The Rapporteur had given a technical explanation of the international character of acts of terrorism. M. Givanovitch hoped that the explanation would be fully reported in the Minutes of the Conference to serve as an interpretation of the Convention.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Rapporteur for his statement, but said that he was not quite satisfied by his explanations. He pointed out that Article 2 was restrictive in scope in that it limited the application of the Convention to cases in which the acts in question were directed against a contracting party. He said, however, that he would not insist on the insertion of the words which he had proposed.

Article 1 was adopted without modification.

---

[1] See page 108.

ARTICLE 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall, if this has not already been done, make the following acts committed on his own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 :

(1) Any wilful act causing death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to :

(a) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(b) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity;

(2) Wilful destruction of, or damage to, public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party;

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public;

(4) Any attempt to commit an offence falling within the foregoing provisions of the present article;

(5) The manufacture, obtaining, possession or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the substance of the article had been left unchanged, and that only a few slight formal changes had been made in deference to the decisions taken by the Conference at the first reading.[1]

Article 2 was adopted.

ARTICLE 3.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall make the following acts criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to an act of terrorism falling within Article 2 and directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the act of terrorism is to be carried out :

(1) Conspiracy to commit any such act;

(2) Any incitement to any such act, if successful;

(3) Direct public incitement to any act mentioned under heads (1), (2) or (3) of Article 2, whether the incitement be successful or not;

(4) Wilful participation in any such act;

(5) Assistance, knowingly given, towards the commission of any such act.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that no changes had been made in the article beyond those decided upon at the first reading.[2]

He directed attention to sub-paragraph (5), in which the word " knowingly " had been added in order to make it clear that help should not be deemed to be a criminal offence unless it was known that it was being given towards the commission of an act of terrorism.

Anticipating that the Norwegian delegation might wish to submit observations concerning sub-paragraph (1), M. Pella explained that, whereas the former text had read " Any agreement to commit any of the acts mentioned in Article 2 (Nos. (1) to (4)) ", the new text read : " Conspiracy to commit any such act ". That amendment might give the impression that the scope of the text had been extended. In point of fact, the Committee of Experts had had undue scruples which were not justified from a scientific point of view. It had wished to exclude attempts to commit the offences mentioned in Article 2. Scientifically, however, that hypothesis was inconceivable. According to certain more restrictive conceptions, an " attempt " to commit an offence was the beginning of the execution of an offence interrupted by circumstances independent of the author's will. According to other conceptions, an attempt was an application of the means for committing the offence which had been interrupted or had failed owing to circumstances completely independent of the author's will.

Whatever the definition of an attempt might be, conspiracy for the purpose of committing an attempt was inconceivable, as the very notion of an attempt presupposed the intervention of circumstances completely independent of the author's will.

By explicitly excluding attempts, the impression would therefore be given that the legal significance of the term was not understood. That was why the Drafting Committee had decided on the formula " to commit any such act ".

M. BACHKE (Norway) said that he was satisfied by the Rapporteur's explanations concerning the expression " any such act ".

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations, but thought that the text of the Convention should be sufficiently clear to be understood and applied without recourse to such explanations. For that reason, he would prefer to see the expression " *any such act* " *in sub-paragraph* 1 *of the article under discussion replaced by an enumeration of sub-paragraphs* (1), (2) *and* (3) *of Article 2.* In order not to prolong the debate on a question of secondary importance, M. Sebestyén raised a point of order, in the sense that the Conference should take a decision, without discussion, concerning the expression " any such act ".

---

[1] See pages 83 to 86.
[2] See pages 87 to 91.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, thought that the adoption of the formula " acts mentioned in Article 2 (sub-paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (5)) ", which would expressly exclude sub-paragraph (4) of Article 2—that was to say, any attempt to commit an offence, was tantamount to disregarding the elementary principles of criminal law. The Rapporteur was convinced that the professors of criminal law taking part in the Conference would agree with him that the provision in question could not apply to an attempt to commit an offence.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) and M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that they were in full agreement with the Rapporteur.

The PRESIDENT understood that the Hungarian delegate's suggestion was that sub-paragraph (1) of Article 3 instead of merely referring to " any such act " should contain a reference to sub-paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (5) of Article 2.

M. DELAQUIS (Switzerland) said that, if that list were inserted, he would ask that it should not include any reference to sub-paragraph (5).

The PRESIDENT noted that the Conference was prepared to adopt sub-paragraph (1) of Article 3 as it stood.

Article 3 *was adopted without modification.*

ARTICLE 3bis (Article 4 of the Final Text).

Each of the offences mentioned in Article 3 shall be treated by the law as a distinct offence in all cases where this is necessary in order to prevent an offender escaping punishment.

The PRESIDENT said that Article 3*bis*, if adopted, would become Article 4, the remaining articles of the Convention being re-numbered accordingly.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the explanations which he had given at the first reading concerning Article 3, sub-paragraph (2),[1] applied also to Article 3*bis*. The substance of Article 3, sub-paragraph (2), had remained the same. The new wording was in keeping with the proposals made by M. Pella during the discussion at the first reading of the draft.

Article 3bis *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 4 (Article 5 of the Final Text).

Subject to any special provisions of national law for the protection of the persons mentioned under head (1) of Article 2, or of the property mentioned under head (2) of Article 2, each High Contracting Party shall provide the same punishment for the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 whether they be directed against that or another High Contracting Party.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that only drafting amendments had been made in Article 4. He explained that the "special provisions of the national law" referred to the protection of Heads of States and their wives or husbands, persons charged with public functions, etc., and public property or property devoted to a public purpose. Those persons and that property were enumerated in sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) of Article 2. In such cases, special protection would be afforded. The Drafting Committee had followed the suggestions made by the Swiss delegate at the first reading,[2] in order to avoid controversy.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) asked whether by "special provisions" were meant only those already in force or those which might be adopted in future.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the phrase in question covered existing and future provisions.

Article 4 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 5 (Article 6 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 5 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 6 (Article 7 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 6 *was adopted.*

---

[1] See pages 92 and 93.
[2] See page 96.

ARTICLE 6bis (deleted).

A High Contracting Party shall not derive from the provisions of Articles 5 and 6 of the present Convention any right to ask another Contracting Party to adopt in a particular case an attitude which the High Contracting Party himself could not under his own law adopt in a corresponding case.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) said that Article 6*bis* concerned the general principles of the Convention. He reminded the Conference that the Polish delegation had submitted an amendment proposing the deletion of Articles 5 and 6.[1] The Polish delegation's view was that a State whose legislation did not permit of its fulfilling the obligations laid down in Articles 5 and 6 could not demand that another State possessing the necessary legislation should fulfil the obligations in question in regard to itself. It had been suggested that the objection raised by the Polish delegation concerning Articles 5 and 6 might be met by inserting in the Convention a clause stipulating that a State whose legislation was restricted in character could not require of another State with more comprehensive legislation the execution of undertakings which the first-named State was unable to fulfil: by that means, the inequality in the matter of obligations would be removed.

The Drafting Committee had discussed the above suggestion and had framed Article 6*bis*, which referred, however, only to the provisions of Articles 5 and 6. The scope of the new article was thus very limited. It did not satisfy the Polish delegation; the fact that Article 6*bis* did not refer to the other articles of the Convention made the situation even more uncertain than before.

Even in cases in which the general principles of international law might have been adduced in order to do away with inequality in the matter of obligations, that course was no longer possible owing to the provisions of Article 6*bis*. M. Bekerman added that the Polish delegation had raised that point concerning the inequality of obligations with the object of making the provisions of the Convention more explicit and creating an effective instrument in the campaign against international terrorism.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the Polish delegate had emphasised several points. One of them, moreover, had been mentioned by M. Komarnicki during the general discussion.[2] The Polish delegation considered that the Convention should imply equal rights and equal duties as between the contracting parties. M. Pella understood the Polish delegation's view to be that if certain countries were able, by reason of their legislation or practice, to do more than certain other countries in giving effect to the Convention, the first-named countries were under no international obligation to take such action, but could do so if they wished. In other words, the fact that a State's legislation was more advanced did not imply any obligation in relation to the other contracting parties which were not in a position to fulfil the same responsibilities.

Article 6*bis* had been inserted by the Drafting Committee in order to meet the Polish delegation's view, but had not achieved that object. M. Pella pointed out, moreover, that since the international recognition of previous convictions was optional under Polish law, any international obligation that Poland might accept in the matter would also be purely optional. Article 6*bis* was, therefore, unnecessary and he asked for its deletion.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations. He said that he would support the proposal to delete Article 6*bis* on condition that that clause was inserted in some other part of the Convention as a general rule applicable to the Convention as a whole.

The PRESIDENT noted that Article 6*bis* did not satisfy the Polish delegation, which considered it inadequate and even open to objections. The Rapporteur had accordingly asked for the deletion of the article, a suggestion which was supported by the Polish delegation. The latter, however, reserved the right to submit later a general clause embodying the substance of Article 6*bis*. If no one wished Article 6*bis* to stand, it would be deleted.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that he did not insist on Article 6*bis* being maintained. That, however, must not be understood as meaning that he thought it ought to be introduced in a general form. He would regard such a suggestion as unfortunate.

Article 6bis *was deleted.*

ARTICLE 7 (Article 8 of the Final Text).

Paragraph 1.

(No change.)

Paragraph 2.

(No change.)

Paragraph 3.

(No change.)

---

[1] See page 94.
[2] See page 57.

Paragraph 4.

The obligation to grant extradition under the present article shall be subject to any conditions and limitations recognised by the law or the practice of the country to which application is made.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, referred to the slight modification introduced in paragraph 4 of Article 7—namely, the insertion of the words " or the practice "—in deference to the Netherlands delegation's observation.[1] He explained that the term " practice " referred not only to administrative practice, but also to the system followed in countries in which extradition was not governed by legislative provisions but was left to the discretion of the Government. The Drafting Committee had also inserted in paragraph 4 the word " conditions "; that amendment did not affect the substance of the clause, the word having been introduced simply to indicate that the law of the country to which the request for extradition was made did not only involve limitations.

Article 7 was adopted.

ARTICLE 8 (Article 9 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 8 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 9 (Article 10 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the observations which he had made at the first reading [2] applied also to the text of Article 9. The latter was unchanged.

Article 9 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 10 (Article 11 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) reminded the Conference that he had submitted an amendment [3] which had been held over by the Drafting Committee. He announced that he would withdraw the amendment, since Article 18 allowed of the Hungarian Government adapting its legislation.

Article 10 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 11 (Article 12 of the Final Text).

Each High Contracting Party shall take on his own territory and within the limits of his own law and administrative organisation the measures which he considers appropriate for the effective prevention of all activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the original text of Article 11 had been redrafted in deference to the Netherlands delegation's views.[4] The purpose of the article was the effective prevention of any activity contrary to the purpose of the Convention. To that end, each of the contracting parties was required to take, on its own territory, whatever measures it deemed appropriate. The contracting parties were thus free to decide on the nature of the measures which should be taken, but those measures must be such as effectively to prevent terrorist activities. A second point had arisen : Must those measures necessarily be of a legislative or administrative character? Article 11 simply said that the measures must be taken within the limits of the law and administrative organisation of each country. The text had not been weakened, but had been made to correspond with the existing possibilities, which varied in the different countries.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) thought that the expression " effective prevention of all activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention " was too loose. Countries which had to pass new legislative measures to give effect to the Convention would not know exactly what was meant, as the obligation laid on Governments was not sufficiently explicit.

The PRESIDENT said that Article 11 was a fundamental provision, which it was difficult to draft. It had to state, in general terms, what Governments were expected to do, while leaving them free to decide what methods they should adopt. The article stated the object in view—namely, the effective prevention of all activities contrary to the purpose of the Convention. That purpose was shown by the preamble and by Article 1 and the other provisions of the Convention. The Governments were to use to that end the means available to them and to take whatever measures they considered appropriate. For example, during a period of difficulty, they might insist on passports for all travellers or only for certain individuals. The provisions of Article 11 were thus very elastic as regards the means of carrying out the obligation laid down in that article. As to the meaning of the expression " all activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention ", that purpose was clear from the whole structure of the Convention.

---

[1] See pages 99 and 102.
[2] See pages 104 to 106.
[3] See page 106.
[4] See page 107.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) thought that the force of the expression " activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention " was attenuated by the fact that the contracting parties were left free to decide what measures should be taken.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that although the choice of measures was left to the contracting parties, the international obligation to take appropriate and effective measures remained intact. It was impossible to refer to all the various objects of the Convention. He thought that the explanations given by the President and by himself would reassure the delegate of Greece.

Article 11 *was adopted without modification.*

ARTICLE 12 (Article 13 of the Final Text).

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of head (5) of Article 2 the carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition shall be subjected to regulation. It shall be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute such arms or munitions to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles; this shall apply also to the transfer, sale or distribution of explosives.

2. Manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, shall be required to mark each arm with a serial number or other distinctive mark permitting it to be identified; both manufacturers and retailers shall be obliged to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

PARAGRAPH 1.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that two amendments had been made in Paragraph 1. The words " Without prejudice to the provisions of head (5) of Article 2 ", had been introduced at the beginning of the paragraph in order that there might be no suggestion—as at the first reading [1]—that there was overlapping between paragraph 1 of Article 12 and the provisions of Article 2 concerning the criminal character of preparatory acts.

The Rapporteur also recalled that most of the provisions of Article 12 were based on the resolution concerning the carrying of arms (point 4), adopted by the Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Penal Law, which had met at Madrid in 1933. The discussions at the Madrid Conference were of great interest for the study of this question.

Paragraph 1 *was adopted.*

PARAGRAPH 2.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the clause whereby retailers were obliged to keep a register had been introduced, on the Indian delegation's proposal,[2] in order to ensure the more effective prevention and punishment of terrorism. The addition would help to strengthen the preventive and repressive measures directed to that end.

When an attempt with a view to a terrorist act had been made and if the arm used by the author were found, it was almost impossible to identify that author if all that was done was to compel manufacturers of fire-arms to keep a register of the names and addresses of the buyers. Those buyers were wholesale or retail dealers. Even if their names were known, this would prove of little use, for the retail dealer, while confirming that he had sold the weapon in question, would in many cases be unable to designate the person who had bought it.

M. Pella had, on several occasions, asked the Committee of Jurists that it should be made compulsory for retail dealers to keep a register of the names and addresses of the buyers. The Committee had been unable to adopt that suggestion, as it considered that the introduction of such an obligation would necessitate certain modifications in national legislations.

The Rapporteur was happy to note that the Drafting Committee had recognised the need for making provision for such an obligation.

Paragraph 2 was adopted.

Article 12 *was adopted.*

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

---

[1] See pages 84 and 85.
[2] See page 109.

SIXTEENTH MEETING.

Held on Saturday, November 13th, 1937, at 10.30 a.m.

President : M. BASDEVANT (France), *Vice-President.*

30. Examination, at a Second Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism : Text prepared by the Drafting Committee [1] (continuation).

ARTICLE 13 (Article 14 of the Final Text).

1. . . . (a) (No change.)

(b) (No change.)

(c) (No change.)

(d) **Wilfully using any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.**

2. (No change.)

3. (No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that a few small changes had been made in the text. Sub-paragraph *(d)* of paragraph 1 stipulated that the fact of wilfully using forged or falsified documents was punishable under the terms of the Convention. In paragraph 2, the word " réprimé " [2] had been substituted for the word " puni ".

Article 13 was adopted.

ARTICLE 14 (Article 15 of the Final Text).

1. Results of the investigation of offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 13 shall in each country, subject to the provisions of its law, be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. (No change.)

3. It shall furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 13 ; it shall, as far as possible, keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the Drafting Committee had thought it useful to define the scope of Article 14, so as to restrict its application, as regards Article 13, to offences connected with preparations for committing acts of terrorism.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that the wording of the French text was defective; it implied that the offences in question were offences against Article 13, whereas what was meant was the offences provided for in Article 13.

Article 14 was adopted, subject to the modification proposed by the Yugoslav delegate.

ARTICLE 15 (Article 16 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 15 was adopted.

ARTICLE 16 (Article 17 of the Final Text).

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request in accordance with their domestic law and practice.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.27. (See Annex 4, page 196.) For the final text of the Convention, see page 5.
[2] English text : " punishable " (unchanged).

2. The transmission of letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention should be effected :

(a) By direct communication between the judicial authorities;

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries;

(c) By direct correspondence between the authority of the country making the request and the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made;

(d) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request, either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the competent judicial authority or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made and shall receive the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request from this authority either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. In cases (a) **and** (b), **a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the Minister of Justice of the country to which application is made.**

4. (No change.)

5. (No change.)

6. (No change.)

7. (No change.)

8. (No change.)

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

Amendment proposed by the Egyptian Delegation.[1]

Add, at the end of paragraph 1, the following words : " *and Conventions already on subsequently concluded by them* ".

Aly SHAMSY Pasha (Egypt) explained the scope of the Egyptian amendment, which was in keeping with the spirit of Article 16. The Egyptian delegation wished to make it clear that the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 16 would apply only in the absence of *ad hoc* conventions and that they would not conflict with conventions already or subsequently concluded concerning judicial assistance between States. It should therefore be explicitly stated that letters of request would be executed in accordance, not only with the domestic law and practice of the contracting parties, but also in accordance with conventions already or subsequently concluded in the matter.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, accepted the Egyptian amendment. It had been suggested to him also that it would be more logical to include in paragraph 1 the words " *relating to offences referred to in the present Convention* ". With the Egyptian amendment and the proposed formal modification, the text of the beginning of Article 16 would read :

" 1. *The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention in accordance with their domestic law and practice and any Conventions concluded or to be concluded by them.*

" 2. *The transmission of letters of request shall be effected :*

. . . . . .

The Rapporteur pointed out that the Drafting Committee had inserted a new clause in paragraph 2—sub-paragraph *(c)*—to cover a fourth case which might occur in connection with the transmission of letters of request.

Lastly, in sub-paragraph *(d)* of paragraph 2, the formula " through the Minister for Foreign Affairs " had been employed twice, in deference to a proposal by the Soviet delegate,[2] who had pointed out that, according to the existing practice, both the request and the reply often passed through the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Article 16 *was adopted, with the amendments proposed by the Egyptian delegation and the Rapporteur.*

ARTICLE 17 (Article 18 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 17 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 18 (Article 19 of the Final Text).

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment owing to gaps in the law, the characterisation of the various offences dealt with in the present Convention, the imposition of sentences, the methods of prosecution and trial, and the rules as to mitigating circumstances, pardon and amnesty are determined in each country by the provisions of domestic law.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled the discussions at the first reading.[3] There had been a Soviet amendment proposing the deletion of the second sentence, which might give

---

[1] Document Conf.R.T.30.

[2] See page 113.

[3] See page 114.

rise to misunderstanding. In the new text it was even more clearly stated that questions relating to the characterisation of the various acts, the imposition of sentences, the methods of prosecution and trial and the rules as to mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty were determined by the provisions of the law of each contracting party.

He assured the delegate of Norway that the principle of the expediency of prosecuting offenders was in no way affected. A distinction must, however, be made between the principle that such questions depended exclusively upon the rules of internal legislation and the exercise, in concrete cases, of the right of pardon or amnesty. If a State exercised that right in such a way as to make the repression of terrorism impossible, the other contracting parties would obviously be entitled to consider such action a violation of the obligations of the Convention, and might have recourse to the procedure described in Article 19.

M. Pella recalled that the former text had read " subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment ". That expression might have led to difficulties of interpretation. The authors of the text had assumed that the acts in question should not be allowed to escape punishment owing to gaps in the law. The contracting parties must therefore take the necessary measures to fill such gaps in the law as would enable those acts to escape punishment. The text had accordingly been amended to read " subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment owing to gaps in the law ".

M. BACHKE (Norway) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations. The Norwegian delegation wished also to thank the Drafting Committee for having given effect to its wishes.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) regretted that he could not accept the Drafting Committee's text, even after hearing the Rapporteur's explanations. Article 18, as drafted, contained an obvious and manifest contradiction. It declared, on the one hand, that the exercise of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty depended in each country upon the rules of the domestic law, and, on the other, that the acts in question must never be allowed to escape punishment. No process of interpretation could disguise the contradiction between those two propositions. Nor did M. Sebestyén see how the difficulty could be eliminated by using the phrase " owing to gaps in the law ". That was a vague term, unsuited to such an important convention.

His objections were directed chiefly against the reasons for the amendment of the original text. If the Conference were anticipating the possibility of any abuse of the right of pardon such as to render the provisions of the Convention inoperative, it was wasting its time. The Convention was being concluded between States acting in good faith, none of which would dream of trying to shirk its responsibilities by making abusive use of the supreme rights vested in the highest representative organs of the State.

For those various reasons, M. Sebestyén *asked the Conference to revert to the original text of Article* 18. If it adopted the new text, he would be obliged to refer to his Government's right under Article 22 to make reservations, if necessary, at the moment of signing, ratifying, or acceding to the Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the expression " gaps in the law " was not meant to apply to the right of pardon or the right of amnesty. The reason for introducing it was simply to indicate that every country that signed the Convention must take steps towards achieving its objects. The rights of pardon and amnesty, far from being gaps in the law, formed part of the series of institutions intended to ensure the operation and the elasticity of repression. In M. Pella's view, therefore, the term " gaps in the law " would therefore avoid any misunderstanding such as might have arisen with the original text.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) suggested that it might meet some of the Hungarian delegate's difficulties if, instead of saying " *d'une lacune de la loi* " the Conference adopted the phrase " *d'une lacune dans le texte (ou les textes) de la loi* ". That change would make it clear that the Conference was anxious that there might be a perfect code or set of legislations in which there were no gaps. It would make it clear also that the text was not directed against gaps resulting from administration, but against gaps resulting from the actual terms of the legislation.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that if such precision were considered necessary, he would be prepared to accept the United Kingdom delegate's amendment, which exactly expressed the Conference's views.

The PRESIDENT asked whether the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegate met the Hungarian delegate's objection.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that the United Kingdom delegate's proposal certainly improved the text. Seeing, however, that Article 23 laid down that ratification or accession by any contracting party implied an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation enabled him to give effect to the provisions of the Convention, the text now proposed would not serve any useful purpose. He would be prepared to accept the following formula :

> " . . . *subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment by reason of a fact other than the normal operation of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon or the right of amnesty* ".

The use of the word " normal " would be a precaution against any abuse of the right of pardon or the right of amnesty.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that it was a matter for the Conference to decide. He would consider it regrettable, however, if, by accepting that text, States were deemed to have relinquished the rights acknowledged to be theirs by international law. Moreover, the expression " normal operation " was too vague. When the infringements were of an international character and affected the interests of another State than that exercising the right of pardon or of amnesty, there might obviously be serious differences of opinion between the States as to the normality or abnormality of the exercise of such a right. What, for one State, was the normal operation of the right of pardon or of amnesty might be regarded by another as a denial of justice.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) understood the Rapporteur's objection. He thought that it might be met by adding a provision stipulating that Article 18 did not in any way affect the rights of the contracting parties, under the recognised rules of international law, in the case of a denial of justice. The text would thereby be comprehensible to the judges without any need for explanations or interpretations, which would not always be available.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation had proposed the deletion of the second sentence in Article 18,[1] on the grounds that it was ambiguous and might induce States to commit acts contrary to the spirit and purpose of the Convention. He was satisfied with the text submitted by the Drafting Committee, which reflected very much the same idea but in a more satisfactory form. He could not accept the Hungarian delegate's amendment, which would appreciably weaken the scope, not only of Article 18, but of the Convention as a whole. It was not enough to declare that the contracting parties were inspired by the best intentions and were prepared to safeguard the principles ensuing from unwritten international law. The Convention must contain something more positive and concrete in that particular sphere of international co-operation. He was in favour of the Drafting Committee's text, with the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegate.

M. MOMTCHILOFF (Bulgaria) suggested that the Conference might get over the difficulty by inserting in the text the words " *in criminal matters* ". That would restrict the idea of " gaps in the law " to criminal legislation without encroaching on constitutional matters.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, saw no objection to accepting the Bulgarian delegate's proposal. He wished it to be made perfectly clear, however, that the right of pardon and the right of amnesty could not be regarded as " gaps in the law ". On the contrary, the exercise of the right of pardon and the right of amnesty was perfectly in keeping with the legal system of any State.

M. MOMTCHILOFF (Bulgaria) agreed with the Rapporteur. He pointed out, nevertheless, that his suggestion would leave constitutional matters intact.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) supported what he described as the very happy suggestion made by the Bulgarian delegate. He did not share the Rapporteur's difficulty, as he had never envisaged the right of pardon or amnesty as constituting a gap in the law. The point of the amended text was to show that the right of pardon or amnesty belonged not to criminal law but to a wholly different sphere.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, maintained that, for the very reasons brought forward by the United Kingdom delegate, further precision was unnecessary. Nevertheless, he had no objection to the addition of the word " criminal ", although, from a legal point of view, he considered it unnecessary.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) thought the Hungarian delegate's objection unfounded; the expression " gaps in the law " could not be meant to apply to the right of pardon or the right of amnesty. He was not prepared to support the Bulgarian amendment, since he considered that provision was made for the punishment of offences in all the laws and even in administrative regulations.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that, if the Conference rejected his proposal to revert to the former text of Article 18, he was prepared as a secondary solution to accept the Bulgarian delegate's suggestion, which satisfied him to some extent. Its adoption would make it clearer that the expression " gaps in the law " did not apply to provisions concerning the right of pardon or the right of amnesty. Moreover, the records of the Conference and the Rapporteur's explanations would confirm that interpretation.

M. MOMTCHILOFF (Bulgaria) proposed the following formula :

" . . . *provided the offender is not allowed to escape punishment owing to an omission in the criminal law* ".

Article 18 *was adopted together with the amendment proposed by the Bulgarian delegate.*

---

[1] See page 114.

ARTICLE 18bis : New Article proposed by the Polish Delegation.[1]

A High Contracting Party shall not derive from the provisions of the present Convention any right to ask another High Contracting Party to adopt in a particular case an attitude which the High Contracting Party himself could not under his own law adopt in a corresponding case.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) recalled that he had explained the reasons underlying the Polish proposal during the discussion, at the first reading, of Articles 5 and 6.[2] He had also explained his point of view in the Drafting Committee. There was no need, therefore, for him to repeat his arguments. The Rapporteur had explained how he interpreted the Polish point of view, and M. Bekerman agreed with his interpretation. The Polish delegation insisted on its amendment because it was convinced that it would introduce greater clearness and precision as regards the obligations of the signatory States to other States. Without such a clause States might find themselves in a difficult position owing to differences in their laws.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) said that the amendment which the Polish delegate had urged with so much persistence seemed to him to be of rather dangerous a character. He did not think that it would facilitate the working of the Convention, but felt rather that it would raise difficulties at every turn. That had been the point of view of the original Expert Committee, where the amendment had been moved but had not found favour, and also of the Drafting Committee, where the amendment had been discussed very fully.

As he understood it, the purpose of the amendment was as follows : any State when asked by another State to take some action under the Convention would have the right to refuse on the ground that the law of the second State was inferior to its own and that it would not be able to take similar measures in a similar case. That would appear to be a very unfortunate position and would certainly give rise to difficult questions between States. It would do precisely what the Conference had been engaged in avoiding : it would ensure immunity in a great number of cases.

If he were expressing the views of the man in the street with regard to the consequences of the proposed amendment, he might put them in the following form : If the amendment were adopted, the States would be somewhat in the position of people engaged in a tiger shoot, some mounted on elephants and armed with all the apparatus of modern science, while others had come with ancient or antiquated weapons. The tiger attacked one of the less fortunate individuals who made an appeal to his colleagues, and they replied : " We deeply sympathise with you, but regret that there is nothing we can do because, unfortunately, if we were being attacked by the tiger you would not be in a position to help us with arms of modern precision ". That situation was likely to result in the triumph of the tiger—in the present case terrorism—over the unfortunate member of the hunt who had not provided himself with sufficient weapons.

Surely, on reconsideration, the Polish delegate would realise that that rough and crude and possibly inaccurate view was one which might obtain a certain sympathy in uninstructed circles. Surely it would be possible to go back to the compromise which at one time the United Kingdom delegation had been ready to accept—namely, that the provision in question should apply to Articles 5 and 6. Personally, he would not welcome that solution. But Articles 5 and 6 were of comparatively little importance, and its introduction there could do no possible harm.

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) wished to dispel a misunderstanding, which might make it seem as if the Polish delegation were trying to weaken the scope of the Convention. On the contrary, it had from the outset done everything in its power to improve the Convention and ensure its efficacy. It had throughout been trying consistently to strengthen the measures for suppressing political terrorism. If a State found that its legislation were inferior to that of another State, it could modify it. If it did not modify it, that was because it was satisfied with it. The United Kingdom delegate's argument was not convincing, because the moment had not yet come to go tiger-hunting : the hunters had just reached the point where they were trying to collect weapons suitable for the purpose in view.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece) reminded the Conference that he had said, during the discussion, at a first reading, of the draft Convention,[3] that he was adverse to the over-strict application of the principle of reciprocity. He was accordingly opposed to the Polish delegation's proposal, which would appear to generalise the application of that principle.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, considered that if, as it seemed to him, the Conference did not share the point of view of the Polish delegation, the latter might perhaps consider bringing up the question again at a suitable moment. A text such as that which the Polish delegation had just proposed must, of course, be accepted by the majority of the Conference. Could not the Polish delegation consider another formula which would convert that text into a safeguarding clause simply to cover the case of Poland?

M. BEKERMAN (Poland) said that the majority of the Conference was, of course, under no obligation to accept the text which had been proposed; the Polish delegation's point of view remained unchanged.

---

[1] Document Conf. R.T.31.
[2] See pages 94 to 98.
[3] See page 98.

The PRESIDENT, interpreting the feeling of the Conference, which was reflected in the opinions expressed and by the fact that the Polish proposal had not been supported by any other delegation, assumed that the Conference did not accept that proposal. He paid a tribute to the Polish delegation for its whole-hearted efforts to perfect the text of the Convention and for the moderation with which it had presented and defended its own point of view.

Article 18bis was not adopted.

ARTICLE 19 (Article 20 of the Final Text).

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. The above provisions of the present article shall not prevent High Contracting Parties, if they are Members of the League of Nations, from bringing the dispute before the Council or the Assembly of the League if the Covenant gives them the power to do so.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the declaration which he had made during the discussion on Article 19.[1] That declaration applied also to the corresponding article in the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.[2]

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that a new paragraph—paragraph 3—had been inserted in Article 19 at the request of the Polish delegation,[3] which was satisfied with its provisions.

Article 19 was adopted.

ARTICLE 20 (Article 21 of the Final Text).

Insert the date of *May 31st*, 1938.

ARTICLE 21 (Article 22 of the Final Text).

Insert the date of *June 1st*, 1938.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Drafting Committee had inserted dates in Articles 20 and 21 in the spaces left blank in the original draft. In providing for time-limits which were rather longer than usual, both for signature and for accession, the Drafting Committee had been mindful of the fact that the Convention was an important one dealing with delicate points, and had thought it wiser not to fix the dates too early.

Articles 20 and 21 were adopted.

ARTICLE 22 (Article 23 of the Final Text).

1. (No change, except the substitution of "*three years*" for "*two years*".)

2. In the event of any objection being received, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall inform the Government which desired to make the reservation and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to ratify or accede without the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification or accession.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, commented on the change in the time-limit for communicating reservations. After hearing the explanations of the Secretary-General of the Conference[4] on the scope of that innovation, it had been decided to consider extending the time-limit, and the Drafting Committee, at M. Pella's suggestion, had substituted three years for the period originally fixed at two years.

As regards the second paragraph of Article 22, the Rapporteur explained that the Drafting Committee had used the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom delegation which had been unanimously accepted, at the first reading, by the Conference.[5]

Article 22 was adopted.

ARTICLE 23 (Article 24 of the Final Text).

Ratification of or accession to the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation enable him to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that the Drafting Committee had amended the text in order to make it less rigid. The phrase "his legislation and his administrative organi-

---

[1] See page 129.
[2] See Article 48 of the Convention (page 29).
[3] See page 128.
[4] See pages 131 and 132.
[5] See page 131.

sation are in conformity with the rules contained in the Convention " was too categorical. The signatory States might have some doubts as to whether the whole of their legislative and administrative organisation was in conformity with those rules.

He felt sure that if a less rigid formula had been adopted for the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency there would have been more ratifications and accessions.

Article 23 was adopted.

ARTICLE 24 (Article 25 of the Final Text).

1. (No change.)

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. In making such notification, the High Contracting Party concerned may state that the application of the Convention to any of such territories shall be subject to any reservations which have been accepted in respect of that High Contracting Party under Article 22. The Convention shall then apply, with any such reservations, to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Should it be desired as regards any such territories to make reservations other than those already made under Article 22 by the High Contracting Party concerned, the procedure set out in that article shall be followed.

3. (No change.)

4. (No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the two new sentences introduced in paragraph 2 of Article 24 were based on a proposal by the United Kingdom delegation,[1] which had been unanimously accepted by the Conference. Its purpose was to define more precisely the method envisaged for reservations. The proposal had encountered no opposition at a first reading.

Article 24 was adopted.

ARTICLE 25 (Article 26 of the Final Text).

Insert the word " *third* " before " *instrument of ratification or accession* ".

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) did not propose to submit an amendment to the text of Article 25. He simply wished to make a general remark, which might perhaps be borne in mind by the Section of the Secretariat which dealt with the formal clauses of international treaties. The formal clauses of all the Conventions concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations contained the text which appeared in Article 25 of the present draft. That text, in his view, was not quite logical.

The contracting parties to a convention were free to fix the methods and the date of its entry into force, subject, of course, to the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant. Thus the entry into force of a convention depended, in the first place, on the will of the contracting parties, and not on the material fact of registration. It would therefore be more logical to begin by saying that the Convention would enter into force on the ninetieth day following the receipt of the third instrument of ratification or accession, and then to say that it would be registered on the day of its entry into force as thus fixed.

Article 25 was adopted.

ARTICLE 26 (Article 27 of the Final Text).

Insert the word " *third* " after the words " *after the deposit of* ".

Article 26 was adopted.

ARTICLE 27 (Article 28 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 27 was adopted.

ARTICLE 28 (Article 29 of the Final Text).

(No change.)

Article 28 was adopted.

---

[1] See page 133.

The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism was adopted as a whole.[1]

DECLARATION BY THE POLISH DELEGATION.

M. KOMARNICKI (Poland) read the following declaration :

" The Polish delegation has, throughout this Conference, offered its sincere and active collaboration, in the belief that the draft Convention submitted to the Conference might be improved.

" The Polish delegation has accordingly submitted amendments with the object of remedying defects in the draft Convention, in order to ensure the effective repression of terrorist activities whether by extradition or trial.

" These proposals have not been adopted, although sympathetic consideration has been given to the reasons which prompted them. The text, as finally framed, unfortunately, does not, in the Polish delegation's opinion, represent any real advance on the present situation as determined by bilateral Conventions and the practice of States.

" The Polish delegation, while refraining from signing the Convention, for the reasons which I have just stated, desires to express the Polish Government's deep attachment to the principle of the real and effective repression of terrorist activities."

31. Second Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Credentials of the Delegates.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela), Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee on Credentials, read the following report :

" The Committee appointed by the Conference on the International Repression of Terrorism to verify the credentials of delegates met again at 3 p.m. on November 12th, 1937, at the Secretariat of the League of Nations to examine the further documents communicated to the Secretary-General by the delegations.

" The delegates of the following countries submitted full powers from the head of the State authorising them to take part in negotiations and sign any instruments which might be adopted by the Conference :

" Albania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Bulgaria, Egypt, France, Yugoslavia.

" The delegates of Ecuador and Norway have informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations by letter that their Governments have just authorised them to sign the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

" The delegates of Turkey and Belgium have also informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations by letter that they have been authorised by their Governments to sign any Conventions adopted by the Conference.

" The Hungarian delegation has communicated credentials sent by the Royal Minister for Foreign Affairs authorising the delegation to take part in the Conference's proceedings.

" As regards the other delegations mentioned in Points II and IV of this Committee's first report, [2] they are requested to provide themselves with the necessary documents authorising them to sign, if they so desire, the Conventions which the Conference proposes to adopt."

M. BACHKE (Norway) said that his instructions would permit him to sign the Convention for the Repression of Terrorism *ad referendum*, but not definitively.

The Conference took note of the second report of the Committee on the Credentials of the delegates.

SEVENTEENTH MEETING.

Held on Saturday, November 13th, 1937, at 3.30 p.m.

President : M. BASDEVANT (France), *Vice-President.*

32. Examination, at a Second Reading, of the Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court: Text prepared by the Drafting Committee.[3]

TITLE OF THE CONVENTION.

Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.

The title of the Convention was adopted.

---

[1] For the final text of the Convention, see page 5.

[2] See pages 51 and 52.

[3] Documents Conf. R.T.28 and 28*(a)*. (See Annex 5, page 200.) For the final text of the Convention, see page 19.

PREAMBLE.

. . . . . .

Being desirous, on the occasion of concluding the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, which bears to-day's date, of creating an International Criminal Court with a view to making progress in the struggle against offences of an international character,

Have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

The preamble was adopted.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the numbering of the articles of the draft Convention had been changed to make the order more logical.

ARTICLE 1 (former Article 1).[1]

(No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that, in the French text of the Convention drafted by the Experts, the terms " inculpé " or " individu ", had been used in referring to persons sent for trial before the Court. The Drafting Committee had thought it preferable, if the Conference agreed, to use throughout the one term " accusé ", understood in the general sense of any person accused of any offence whatever its nature. It applied therefore to acts ranking as " crimes " or " offences ".

The Drafting Committee's proposal was adopted.

Article 1 was adopted.

ARTICLE 2 (former Article 3).

1. (No change in English text except that " tribunal " is replaced by " courts ").

2. A High Contracting Party shall further, in cases where he is able to grant extradition in accordance with Article 8 of the said Convention, be entitled to commit the accused for trial before the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a party to the present Convention.

3. The High Contracting Parties recognise that other Parties discharge their obligations towards them under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism by making use of the right given them by the present article.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that certain changes had been made in Article 2 to make the meaning clearer.

Paragraph 1.—The words " au lieu de juger elle-même " had been replaced by the words " au lieu de faire juger par ses propres juridictions " in the French text, on the ground that it was not the contracting parties themselves which tried the accused, but the courts of the contracting parties. This was a merely formal change. The word " inculpé " in the French text had also been altered to " accusé " for the reasons above stated.

Paragraph 2.—The Netherlands delegation had pointed out to the Drafting Committee that a contracting party could only exercise the right to send the accused before the Court in cases where it considered it possible to grant extradition. Since it was not the intention of the Committee of Experts, nor of the Drafting Committee, indirectly to modify the character of extradition under Article 8 of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, the former text had been modified so as to make it quite clear that a State would only send the accused before the Court if it were able to grant his extradition. The scope of the text remained the same; the change was purely formal.

Article 2 was adopted.

ARTICLE 3 (former Article 2).

(No change.)

Article 3 was adopted.

ARTICLE 4 (former Article 15).

(No change.)

M PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, was happy to note that the seat of the Court was to be at The Hague, in the Netherlands, the country which had been the very centre of international justice. He felt sure that he was voicing the sentiments of all the members of the Conference in thanking the Netherlands delegate for the attitude he had adopted in regard to the text of this article.

Article 4 was adopted.

---

[1] Throughout the second reading of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, the number of the article in heavy type corresponds with that of the final text of the Convention.

ARTICLE 5 (former Article 4).

(No change.)

Article 5 was adopted.

ARTICLE 6 (former Article 5).

(No change.)

Article 6 was adopted.

ARTICLE 7 (former Article 6).

1. (No change.)

2. The Permanent Court of International Justice shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said there was a purely formal change in the French text of paragraph 1. In paragraph 2, the Permanent Court of International Justice had been substituted for the Council of the League, which, in the earlier text, had been deputed to appoint the regular and deputy judges. The reasons for this change were to be found in the Conference's discussion on Article 6 during the first reading of the draft Convention.[1]

Article 7 was adopted.

ARTICLE 8 (former Article 10, paragraph 2).

(No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that, owing to the solemn nature of the oath, the Czechoslovak delegation had urged that a special article should be devoted to it.[2] The present provision met the wishes of the Czechoslovak delegation.

Article 8 was adopted.

ARTICLE 9 (former Article 13).

(No change.)

Article 9 was adopted.

ARTICLE 10 (former Article 7).

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. The order of retirement for the first period of ten years, shall be determined by lot when the first election takes place.

4. (No change.)

5. (No change.)

6. (No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, proposed that the last phrase in the third paragraph should be transposed, so as to make the paragraph read as follows:

"3. *For the first period of ten years and at the time when the first election takes place, the order of retirement shall be determined by lot.*"

Article 10 was adopted as amended.

ARTICLE 11 (former Article 11).

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. If a seat on the Court becomes vacant more than eight months before the date at which a new election to that seat would normally take place, the High Contracting Parties shall, within two months, nominate candidates for the seat in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that it had been necessary to complete the earlier text of the article by specifying the time-limit within which contracting parties must nominate their candidates for seats falling vacant before the normal date of new elections.

Article 11 was adopted.

---

[1] See pages 123 to 125.

[2] See page 125.

ARTICLE 12 (former Article 12).

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of all the other members, including both regular and deputy judges, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the previous text might give the impression that, where a regular member of the Court was to be relieved of his functions, the vote was confined to the four other regular members, whereas the intention of the Experts was that a member of the Court should not be relieved of his functions except by an unanimous decision of all the other regular and deputy members. To make that intention quite clear, the new text read : " in the unanimous opinion of all the other members, including both regular and deputy judges ".

Article 12 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 13 (former Article 8).

(No change.)

Article 13 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 14 (former Article 14, paragraph 1).

(No change.)

Article 14 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 15 (former Article 42).

(No change.)

Article 15 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 16 (former Article 14, paragraph 2).

(No change.)

Article 16 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 17 (former Article 41).

(No change.)

Article 17 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 18 (former Article 19, paragraph 1).

The number of members who shall sit to constitute the Court shall be five.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, observed that the previous text might give the impression that the number of five members constituted a minimum which could be exceeded. As it was the intention of the authors of the draft Convention that the Court should not sit with more than five members, the Drafting Committee had adopted the text now before the Conference.

Article 18 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 19 (former Article 10, paragraph 1, and former Article 18).

1. (No change, except for the substitution of the words " *in trying* " for the words " *in the settlement of* ".)

2. (No change, except for the substitution of the word " *try* " for the word " *hear* ".)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that the words " in the settlement of " in paragraph 1 had been replaced by the words " in trying " as the more appropriate in criminal matters.

Article 19 *was adopted.*

ARTICLE 20 (former Article 9 and Article 19, paragraph 2).

1. Deputy judges shall be called upon to sit in the order laid down in a list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly, to age.

3. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) did not think that the present disposition of the provisions of the previous texts was satisfactory. *It would, in his view, be more logical to put the present third paragraph first, and, after it, the second paragraph. That would render unnecessary the former first paragraph which should be omitted.*

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, accepted the Hungarian delegate's suggestion.

Article 20, *as amended, was adopted.*

ARTICLE 21 (former Article 17).

(No change.)

Article 21 was reserved.[1]

ARTICLE 22 (former Article 20).

(No change.)

Article 22 was adopted.

ARTICLE 23 (former Article 16).

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to send an accused person for trial to the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 23 was adopted.

ARTICLE 24 (former Article 21) and ARTICLE 25 (former Article 22).

Article 24.

The President of the Court, on being informed by a High Contracting Party of his decision to send the accused persons for trial before the Court in accordance with Article 2 shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, the State on whose territory the offence was committed and the State of which the accused persons are nationals.

Article 25.

1. The Court is seized so soon as a High Contracting Party has committed an accused person to it for trial.

2. The document committing an accused person to the Court for trial shall contain a statement of the principal charges against him and the allegations on which they are based, and shall name the agent by whom the State will be represented.

3. The State which committed the accused person to the Court shall conduct the prosecution unless the State against which the offence was directed or, failing that State, the State on whose territory the offence was committed, expresses a wish to prosecute.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, asked the Conference to discuss Articles 24 and 25 together, as they dealt with the same question. He pointed out that the text drawn up by the experts was not sufficiently clear; it was uncertain whether the Court was seized of a case in virtue of the fact of the individual being sent before it by a State or in virtue of the indictment. The Drafting Committee had considered it necessary to amend the provisions of the former Articles 21 and 22 to make it clear exactly when, and how, the Court was seized of a case.

Article 24 had been revised accordingly; and the Committee had added the stipulation that the State of which the accused persons were nationals should be notified as soon as another State intimated its intention to send them for trial before the Court.

In short, two points had been made clear—first, that as soon as a State had sent the accused persons before the Court, the President was required to notify the interested States mentioned in Article 24, and, secondly, that, in virtue of Article 25 (paragraph 1), the Court was seized of the case by the fact that a contracting party had sent the accused person before it. Consequently, the Court was not seized of the case in virtue of the indictment, but in virtue of the sending of the individual before the Court.

Article 25 contained a second paragraph, which provided that a State sending an individual before the Court must briefly specify the grounds on which the case was based, so that the Court might know what other States were interested in the case, and might be in a position to take the necessary steps required by the Convention.

The former text of the provisions corresponding to the last paragraph of Article 25 (former Article 22, paragraph 2) was incomplete. A State might send an individual before the Court without assuming responsibility for the indictment. The individual could thus have been sent before the Court without a formal indictment. In order to provide for such cases, the Drafting Committee had stipulated that the State which sent the individual before the Court should conduct the prosecution. Obviously, if the States chiefly concerned—that was to say, the State against which the offence was directed and the State on whose territory it was committed—expressed the desire to do so, they could conduct the prosecution. The order of priority was as follows : the State against which the offence was directed; the State in whose territory the offence was committed; and, lastly, the State sending the accused before the Court. Accordingly, the State seizing the Court of the case would not conduct the prosecution, unless the other two States expressed no desire to do so. In the latter case, the State seizing the Court of the case would be obliged to conduct the prosecution.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) said that the use of the plural in the text of Article 24 gave the impression that all the accused persons were nationals of the same State. It would be better to use the singular. He proposed that the last phrase should be worded as follows : " *and the State of which the accused person is a national* ".

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, accepted the Hungarian proposal.

Article 24 was adopted with the amendment proposed by the Hungarian delegation.

Article 25 was adopted without modification.

---

[1] See page 171.

ARTICLE 26 (former Article 23).

1. Any State entitled to seize the Court may intervene, inspect the file, submit a statement of its case to the Court and take part in the oral proceedings.

2. Any person directly injured by the offence may, if authorised by the Court, and subject to any conditions which it may impose, constitute himself *partie civile* before the Court; such person shall not take part in the oral proceedings except when the Court is dealing with the damages.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that the Drafting Committee had thought that a distinction should be made; whereas any State was entitled to intervene before the Court, inspect the file, submit a statement of its case to the Court and take part in the oral proceedings, any other juridical person or any individual directly injured by an offence coming within the competence of the Court was not entitled to take part in the oral proceedings and constitute himself *partie civile* unless authorised to do so by the Court, nor could they take part in the debates except when the actual subject of their intervention was under discussion—that was to say, when the Court was dealing with the damages. Such were the principles underlying the new text of Article 26.

It followed from the provisions of the article that the Court would first have to decide whether the accused was guilty and in that event to fix the penalty. It would then have to pronounce upon claims for damages. At that point any person directly injured could intervene. But in view of the fact that certain countries made no provision for the constitution of *parties civiles* and of the further fact that other countries might object to their constitution in certain cases, the Convention provided in a later article[1] for the possibility of reservations in regard to Article 26, paragraph 2.

Article 26 was adopted.

ARTICLE 27 (former Article 34).

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person committed to it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been committed.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, suggested that the word "*inculper*" should be replaced by "*juger*" in the French text, which would mean a slight formal amendment in the sequence of the article.[2] That would leave the Court free as regards the characterisation of the act for which the accused had been committed.

Article 27 was adopted, with the amendment to the French text proposed by the Rapporteur.

ARTICLE 28 (former Article 22, paragraph 4).

The Court shall not proceed further with the case and shall order the accused to be discharged if the prosecution is abandoned and not at once recommenced by a State entitled to prosecute.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, recalled that the former text had read: "The Court must not proceed further with the case if the charge is withdrawn". A problem had arisen in the Drafting Committee: What was to be done with the accused if the charge were withdrawn? Was he to be kept in prison or conveyed to another territory? To avoid such difficulties, the Committee had adopted the following formula: "The Court shall not proceed further with the case and shall order the accused to be discharged if the prosecution is abandoned." It might, of course, happen that, when one State abandoned the prosecution, another State duly entitled to prosecute recommenced it. The Committee had provided for that contingency by the phrase: "if the prosecution is abandoned and not at once recommenced by a State entitled to prosecute".

M. Pella added that that text did not in any way prejudice the position of an accused person who had been discharged on the territory of the country in which the case was tried; that country was free to employ such measures as it was accustomed to take in the case of certain aliens. He hoped that his explanations would satisfy the Netherlands delegation.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) thanked the Rapporteur for his explanations.

Article 28 was adopted.

ARTICLE 29 (former Article 29).

(No change.)

The PRESIDENT said that, in conformity with the decision just taken, the word "*inculpé*" would be replaced by "*accusé*" in the French text.

Article 29 was adopted.

ARTICLE 30 (former Article 24).

(No change.)

Article 30 was adopted.

ARTICLE 31 (former Article 26).

(No change.)

Article 31 was adopted.

---

[1] See Article 51, page 170.

[2] This observation affects the French text only.

ARTICLE 32 (former Article 25).

The parties may submit to the Court the names of witnesses and experts, but the Court shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts. The same rules shall apply as regards any other kind of evidence.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, pointed out that a sentence had been added at the end of the article at the request of the Yugoslav delegation.

Article 32 was adopted.

ARTICLE 33 (former Article 27).

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall be transmitted to the State competent to give effect thereto by the method prescribed by the regulations of the Court.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the former text was not sufficiently elastic. The present text made provision for a less rigid system for the despatch of letters of request and covered any cases that might arise. No fundamental changes had been made in the article.

Article 33 was adopted.

ARTICLE 34 (former Article 28).

No examination, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for the accused and of the representatives of the States which are taking part in the proceedings or after these representatives have been duly summoned.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that, in connection with Article 34, the Drafting Committee had had to consider whether provision should be made for judgment by default. It had decided that it was preferable not to make provision for judgment by default in the case of the International Criminal Court, on the grounds that to do so might impair the authority of judgments of the Court and might create difficulties in practice, and also because no provision for judgment by default was made in a number of legislations which, nevertheless, worked quite satisfactorily.

Passing next to the provisions of Article 34, M. Pella said that the former text had provided for the procedure taking place in the presence of the parties, but that, owing to the distinction now introduced in the new Article 26 between States and all individuals or juridical persons entitled to constitute themselves *parties civiles*, the Drafting Committee had considered that Article 34 should be brought into line with Article 26, seeing that the individuals and persons in question were only entitled to take part in the proceedings when the Court was dealing with the damages. Consequently, all individuals and juridical persons other than the States were now excluded from the hearing.

Article 34 was adopted.

ARTICLE 35 (former Article 30).

1. (No change.)

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place *in camera*. Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, referring to paragraph 2, recalled that the Greek delegation had proposed that a majority vote should suffice for a decision that the hearing should take place *in camera;*[1] the Conference had adopted that proposal at the first reading. The reason that there was no mention of a majority vote in paragraph 2 of Article 35 was that it was stipulated elsewhere that all decisions of the Court should be taken by a majority vote, unless otherwise provided.[2]

Article 35 was adopted.

ARTICLE 36 (former Article 31).

(No change.)

Article 36 was adopted.

ARTICLE 37 (former Article 32).

(No change.)

Article 37 was adopted.

ARTICLE 38 (former Article 33).

(No change.)

Article 38 was adopted.

ARTICLE 39 (former Article 35).

1. The Court shall decide whether any object is to be confiscated or be restored to its owner.

2. The Court may sentence the persons committed to it to pay damages.

3. (No change.)

4. (No change.)

---

[1] See page 135.
[2] See Article 37, page 25.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that, in paragraph 1, in deference to a technical suggestion on the part of the Yugoslav[1] delegation, the reference to confiscation had been put first and the reference to restitution second.

Article 39 was adopted.

ARTICLE 40 (former Article 36).

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by a High Contracting Party chosen with his consent by the Court; such consent may not be refused by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court for trial. The sentence shall always be executed by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court if this State expresses the wish to do so.

2. (No change.)

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the idea which the Drafting Committee wished to express in paragraph 1 was that the Court would designate the contracting party to execute sentences involving loss of liberty, with the consent of the said contracting party,but that if the contracting party which had committed the accused person to the Court for trial wished to execute the sentence in question, the Court would be obliged to designate that party. On the other hand, if the party which had committed the accused to the Court for trial did not ask to carry out the sentence, and if the Court could not see who else could be asked to do so, it could apply to the party which had committed the accused to the Court for trial, in which case, the latter would be obliged to carry out the sentence.

Article 40 was reserved.[2]

ARTICLE 41 (former Article 37).

(No change.)

Article 41 was adopted.

ARTICLE 42 (former Article 38).

(No change.)

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Conference that, at the first reading, Article 38 had been the subject of keen discussion, that several delegations had proposed amendments and that the Soviet delegation had suggested redrafting it.[3] The impression resulting from the debate had been that the majority of the Conference supported the exercise of the right of pardon by the injured State. The Soviet delegate enquired what was the final outcome of that exchange of views.

The PRESIDENT said that the question of the right of pardon had been examined at length by the Drafting Committee, which had come to the conclusion that it could not improve on the text now before the Conference.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that he had not supported the proposal that the State injured by the offence should be entitled to exercise its right of pardon. Very strong arguments based on internal public law had been advanced against that proposal in the Drafting Committee. It had been argued that if a State were entrusted with the duty of executing a sentence, that State, which alone possessed the right of pardon, could not be required to recognise the right of pardon on the part of some outside authority. Certain members of the Drafting Committee had declined to admit any other view.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that M. Pella's arguments were not new. Reference had been made in the plenary Conference to the sovereignty of the State which had to execute the sentence. Logically, if that argument were pushed to the extreme, the State in question could refrain from executing the sentence. In the instance under consideration, however, the State was acting under a mandate from the Court. Its task was confined to the execution of the sentence and, consequently, it did not *ipso facto* possess the right of pardon. M. Hirschfeld considered that the text which had been submitted to the Conference was illogical in law and politically inexpedient.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the principles of constitutional law had been emphatically affirmed by the Czechoslovak delegate in the Drafting Committee. The Czechoslovak delegate had said that he could not agree to the exercise of the right of pardon by a country other than the State which had to execute the sentence.

M. Pella admitted that the arguments of the delegate of the Soviet Union were not without weight, but they could only be admitted if the Drafting Committee had accepted the principle that the State carrying out the penalty would be a mere mandatory.

He could not, however, agree with M. Hirschfeld's contention that the system adopted by the Drafting Committee was illogical in law and politically inexpedient.

In the vast majority of cases, the execution of the penalty would, under Article 40, be entrusted to the State which had committed the accused for trial to the Court. But that State might

---

[1] See page 139.
[2] See page 172.
[3] See pages 140 to 142.

equally well have adopted the alternative course of having him tried by its own courts. Now, if the accused were sentenced by those courts would it be open to another State—that was to say, to the State against which the offence had been directed—to exercise the right of pardon? No.

M. Pella gave another example : an act of terrorism directed against Roumania was committed in French territory by a person who subsequently took refuge in Yugoslavia. Instead of sending the accused for trial by the International Criminal Court, Yugoslavia granted extradition to France. In France, the accused was sentenced to penal servitude and served his sentence in French territory. Could Roumania exercise the right of pardon? No.

It was clear from these two examples that the present legal position would not be affected in any way by the provisions of Article 42.

Article 42 was adopted.

ARTICLE 43 (former Article 39).

(No change.)

Article 43 was adopted.

ARTICLE 44 (former Article 40).

1. (No change.)

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases, including any fees and expenses of counsel assigned to the accused by the Court, shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, drew attention to the addition concerning the fees and expenses of council assigned to the accused by the Court. The Drafting Committee had adopted a comprehensive formula to cover cases in which such counsel were not paid, cases in which they were paid, and cases in which counsel assigned to the accused by the Court gave their services free of charge but were obliged to go abroad and were thus entitled to the refund of expenditure on that account.

Article 44 was adopted.

ARTICLE 45 (former Article 43).

1. (No change.)

2. If a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, disputes the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts and does not see his way to appear in the proceedings in order that the question may be decided by the International Criminal Court, the question shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 48.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the addition introduced by the Drafting Committee in paragraph 2 was intended to facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes which might arise concerning the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the national courts of a State other than that by which the case had been referred to it; it provided that such disputes could be settled by the Court itself.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in accordance with the declaration made by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with reference to Article 19[1] of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism,[2] the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, if it should sign the instruments drawn up by the Conference, proposed with reference to Article 45 of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, to attach to its signature a declaration to the effect that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not, so far as it is concerned, intend to have recourse to the Permanent Court of International Justice. Moreover, eventual signature of, or accession to, the instruments drawn up by the Conference is not to be interpreted as modifying the point of view of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the subject of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes.

The PRESIDENT said that the Soviet delegate's declaration would be included in the Minutes.

Article 45 was adopted.

ARTICLE 46 (former Article 44).

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning:

(a) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;

(b) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

---

[1] Article 20 of the final text, see page 13.

[2] See pages 129 and 159.

2. At their first meeting, the representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall also decide what modifications are necessary in order to attain the objects of the present Convention.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. All questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in the present article shall be decided by a majority of two-thirds of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that the Drafting Committee had considered it essential to make provision for such modifications—due to unforeseen circumstances—as might be necessary to attain the objects of the Convention without recourse to the somewhat complicated procedure for the revision of international conventions. Such adaptation would be introduced under a decision taken by a two-thirds majority of the contracting parties represented at the meeting. At the first meeting of the contracting parties the Convention might therefore be modified in the manner provided in Article 46, paragraph 4, if circumstances arose making it impossible to achieve the purpose of the Convention. That purpose was the institution of an International Criminal Court to try, in the cases enumerated in Article 2 (paragraphs 1 and 2), persons accused of an offence under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. It was for that reason that the Drafting Committee had introduced the second paragraph of Article 46.

Article 46 was adopted.

ARTICLE 47 (New Article).

1. Until the present Convention is in force between twelve High Contracting Parties, it shall be possible for a judge and a deputy judge to be both nationals of the same High Contracting Party.

2. Article 18 and Article 20, paragraph 1, shall not be applied in such a manner as to cause a judge and a deputy judge of the same nationality to sit simultaneously on the Court.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that, under the proposed system, if there were to be five titular judges and five deputy judges not of the same nationality, there must be at least ten contracting parties. It was proposed that the Convention might come into force as soon as seven States had ratified or acceded to it. To provide for that eventuality, paragraph 1 of Article 47 stipulated that, until the Convention was in force between twelve contracting parties, it should be possible for a judge and a deputy judge to be both nationals of the same contracting party. The second paragraph was intended to prevent a judge and a deputy judge of the same nationality from sitting simultaneously on the Court.

Article 47 was adopted.

ARTICLE 48 (former Article 45).

(No change.)

Article 48 was adopted.

ARTICLE 49 (former Article 46).

(No change, except for the addition of the date, *May 31st*, 1938.)

Article 49 was adopted.

ARTICLE 50 (former Article 47).

(No change, except for the addition of the date, *June 1st*, 1938.)

Article 50 was adopted.

ARTICLE 51 (New Article).

Signature, ratification or accession to the present Convention may not be accompanied by any reservations except in regard to Article 26, paragraph 2.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that seeing that the purpose of the present Convention was to set up a Court and enable it to discharge its functions, there could be no reservations, since these might paralyse its working. Article 51 accordingly stipulated that no reservations might be submitted except in regard to Article 26, paragraph 2—that was to say, with reference to the constitution of *parties civiles*. The provision was simply intended to prevent reservations which might impede the actual functioning of the International Criminal Court—that was to say, reservations in regard to particular articles of the Convention, but not declarations regarding a Government's attitude to certain general questions.

Article 51 was adopted.

ARTICLE 52 (former Article 48).

(No change.)

Article 52 was adopted.

ARTICLE 53 (former Article 49).

1. The Government of the Netherlands is requested to convene a meeting of representatives of the States which ratify or accede to the present Convention. The meeting is to take place within one year after the receipt of the seventh instrument of ratification or accession by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and has for object to fix the date at which the present Convention shall be put into force. The decision shall be taken by a majority which must be a two-thirds majority and include not less than six votes. The meeting shall also take any decisions necessary for carrying out the provisions of Article 46.

2. The entry into force of the present Convention shall, however, be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

3. The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in accordance with Article 18 of the Covenant on the day fixed by the above-mentioned meeting.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that Article 53 constituted an innovation as compared with the provisions of other Conventions. As a rule, the Conventions concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations came into force automatically, as soon as a certain number of countries had ratified or acceded. In view of the special character of the new institution which the present Convention was designed to create, it had been agreed that the entry into force of the instrument should not be automatic, but that it should be subject to the decision of the contracting parties. The decision regarding the entry into force of the Convention was to be taken by a two-thirds majority and must include not less than six votes. If, for example, seven or eight contracting parties were represented at the meeting, a valid decision could not be taken unless at least six of them voted for the entry into force of the Convention on a given date.

Article 53 was adopted.

ARTICLE 54 (former Article 50).

A ratification or accession by a State which has not taken part in the meeting mentioned in Article 53 shall take effect ninety days after its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, provided that the date at which it takes effect shall not be earlier than ninety days after the entry into force of the Convention.

Article 54 was adopted.

ARTICLE 55 (former Article 52).

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 49 and 50. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

Article 55 was adopted.

ARTICLE 56 (former Article 53).

1. A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 52, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party who before denouncing the present Convention has under the provisions thereof incurred the obligation of carrying out a sentence shall continue to be bound by such obligation.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, explained that the new clause constituting paragraph 2 provided that the fact of denouncing the Convention did not absolve a contracting party required to carry out a sentence passed prior to that denunciation from executing its obligations incurred in respect of that sentence.

Article 56 was adopted.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to examine Article 21 (former Article 17) and Article 40 (former Article 36), which had been reserved earlier in the meeting.[1]

ARTICLE 21 (former Article 17) *(continuation)*.

(No change.)

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) would have preferred that Article 21 should allow the Court to choose between different legislations, instead of providing that it should only apply the criminal law of the State on whose territory the offence had been committed. He proposed that the first sentence of Article 21 should be replaced by the following clause :

" In determining the substantive criminal law to be applied, the Court shall take into consideration the law of the territory on which the offence was committed and the law of the country which committed the accused to it for trial; it shall apply the law which is the least severe."

That text was in conformity with the usage under criminal law. It would improve the article, and the Netherlands Government would be glad if it could be adopted.

---

[1] See pages 165 and 168.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that he had no objection to the substance of the Netherlands delegate's proposal. He wished, however, to submit one small observation concerning the form, which could not affect the substance. He assumed that by the law which was least severe, the Netherlands delegate meant the law which provided for the least severe penalty. As, however, the Netherlands delegate's proposal did not make that point quite clear, he would venture to suggest the following formula :

> *" The substantive criminal law to be applied by the Court shall be that which is the least severe. In determining what that law is, the Court shall take into consideration the law of the territory on which the offence was committed and the law of the country which committed the accused to it for trial."*

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) accepted the Rapporteur's proposal.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) would have liked to suggest that the law of the delinquent's country of origin should also be taken into consideration. He realised, however, that there were difficulties in the way of such a proposal. He was in agreement with the Rapporteur's proposal, but pointed out that the expression " the law . . . which is the least severe " might give rise to difficulties of interpretation : Did that mean the law which was the least severe *in abstracto* or *in concreto*?

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur, said that as regards the order of priority in the matter of competence, the delinquent's own country came last for purposes of extradition. He asked the Yugoslav delegate not to press his suggestion that the national law of the delinquent should also be taken into consideration.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) insisted that it should be clearly laid down whether the Court was to apply the law which was most favourable in principle or most favourable in practice.

The PRESIDENT, replying to the Yugoslav delegate, said that paragraph 2 of Article 21 provided that any dispute as to what substantive criminal law was applicable should be decided by the Court.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that he did not propose to submit an amendment, but asked that his observations should be recorded in the Minutes.

Article 21 was adopted, with the amendment proposed by the Rapporteur.

ARTICLE 40 (former Article 36) [1] *(continuation)*.

Article 40 was adopted.

The Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court was adopted as a whole.[1]

33. Examination and Adoption of the Draft Final Act of the Conference.[2]

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in accordance with the declaration made by the delegation of the Soviet Union with reference to Article 20 of the final text of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and Article 48 of the final text of the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court,[3] the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, if it should sign the instruments drawn up by the Conference, proposed to attach to its signature the following declaration :

> " The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not, so far as it is concerned, intend to have recourse to the Permanent Court of International Justice. Moreover, eventual signature of, or accession to, the instruments drawn up by the Conference is not to be interpreted as modifying the point of view of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the subject of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes."

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands) suggested that the Soviet delegate might be willing simply to have that declaration inserted in the Minutes. Any unilateral declaration should appear in the Minutes. The Soviet delegation's declaration would be included in the records of the Conference where it could always be consulted.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) endorsed the remarks of the Netherlands delegate.

The PRESIDENT said that the question at issue was a matter of form. It was clear that the declaration made by the Soviet delegate would appear in full in the official Minutes of the Conference.

M. SEBESTYÉN (Hungary) supported his colleagues' observations and asked the Soviet delegate not to append any declaration to the Final Act. He added that if the Soviet delegate

---

[1] For the final text of the Convention, see page 19.
[2] The draft text is not published. For the final text, see page 35.
[3] See pages 129, 159 and 169.

insisted on doing so, he would himself be obliged to ask for the insertion in the Final Act of a declaration reserving the freedom of the Hungarian Government with reference to the consequences ensuing from the Soviet declaration.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that if the Conference considered that a declaration recorded in the Minutes was of the same legal value as a declaration recorded in the Final Act, he would not insist on his proposal, provided that only a question of form was involved. Otherwise, the fact of not inserting its declaration in the Final Act might influence the decision of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to the signing of the Convention.

The PRESIDENT said that the Final Act was simply a particularly solemn record, signed at the close of the proceedings of the Conference. The Minutes recorded what had happened at the Conference in greater detail than the Final Act. The Minutes were more lengthy and less solemn in character. At the same time, any declaration could be recorded in the Minutes. In the present instance, the Minutes would contain, instead of the summary of a speech, a declaration stating the views of a certain Government in categorical and official terms.

M. HIRSCHFELD (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the President for his explanations and said that he would not insist on the Soviet declaration being inserted in the Final Act.

The Final Act was adopted.[1]

EIGHTEENTH MEETING.

Held on Tuesday, November 16th, 1937, at 4 p.m.

President : M. BASDEVANT (France), *Vice-President.*

34. Communications from Count Carton de Wiart, President of the Conference, and from Sir Denys Bray, Delegate of India.

The PRESIDENT read the following telegram, dated November 16th, 1937, from Count Carton de Wiart, President of the Conference :

" I repeat my regrets and thanks and ask you and my other colleagues to accept my congratulations on the happy issue of the Conference."

He proposed that the following telegram should be sent in reply, in the name of the Conference :

" The Conference warmly thanks its President and expresses its appreciation of the wisdom with which he has presided over its deliberations."

The President said that the telegram would be signed by the two Vice-Presidents.

The President's proposal was adopted.

The PRESIDENT then read the following letter, dated November 16th, 1937, from the delegate of India :

" I much regret that indisposition prevents me from being present at the final meeting of the Conference. I should have welcomed the opportunity of expressing the satisfaction of the Indian delegation at the conclusion of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. It will be a particular gratification to my Government that Article 13 has been strengthened by the inclusion of a new provision to which my Government attached much importance.

" I am unfortunately unable to sign the Convention on India's behalf this afternoon, but I shall take the first opportunity of doing so.

(Signed) Denys BRAY."

35. Printing of the Records of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the records of the Conference might be printed and published in a single volume, as had frequently been done for other conferences.

Noting that the Conference approved his proposal, he asked the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who was present, whether it was possible to give effect to the Conference's wishes.

---

[1] For the text of the Final Act, see page 35.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL of the League of Nations replied that the Secretariat would be happy to comply with the wishes of the Conference, if the necessary credits were available.

The PRESIDENT thanked the Secretary-General.

36. Full Powers of the Spanish Delegate.

The PRESIDENT said that M. Jiménez de Asúa, the Spanish Government's delegate to the Conference, who had been provided with the necessary full powers, had now been obliged to leave Geneva. He read the following telegram, dated November 15th, 1937, from M. Giral, the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs :

> "I have the honour to inform you that full powers will be despatched by the next courrier, authorising M. Cipriano Rivas Cherif, Spanish Consul-General at Geneva, to sign, in the name of the Spanish Government, the instruments of the Conference of which you are President. As these full powers cannot reach Geneva before to-morrow, I would ask you to accept this telegram as conveying authority to sign.—GIRAL."

Having consulted the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, he proposed that the telegram should be regarded as entitling M. Cipriano Rivas Cherif to sign the instruments of the Conference.

The President's proposal was adopted.

37. Signature of the Instruments of the Conference: Declarations made by Certain Delegations at the moment of Signature.

The PRESIDENT invited the delegates to sign the instruments of the Conference.

When their country's name was called, the delegates came forward to sign the various Acts.[1]

The Final Act was signed by the delegates of the following countries :

Afghanistan, Albania, Argentine Republic, Belgium, United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ecuador, Spain, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Norway, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Roumania, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism was signed by the Plenipotentiaries of the following countries :

Albania *(ad referendum)*, Argentine Republic, Belgium *(ad referendum)*, Bulgaria, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ecuador, Spain, Estonia, France, Greece, Norway *(ad referendum)*, Netherlands, Peru, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court was signed by the Plenipotentiaries of the following countries :

Belgium *(ad referendum)*, Bulgaria, Spain, France, Greece, Netherlands, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

The delegations of Haiti, India, Mexico, the Republic of San Marino and Uruguay sent apologies for their absence.

At the moment of signing the instruments of the Conference, the following declarations were made :

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland :

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS : In view of the remarks which I had the honour to make on behalf of the delegation of the United Kingdom on the first day of the meeting of this Conference,[2] it will be no surprise to the members of the Conference to hear that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is not, at the moment, signing the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. In thus abstaining, His Majesty's Government has no intention or desire to indicate that it takes any exception to the aim of the Convention or to the ideals which inspire it. His Majesty's Government feels, however, that, at the present time, it is not prepared to accept an international obligation to introduce into its legislation in the very near future changes of so extensive a character, especially as, up to the present time, no difficulty has occurred in the United Kingdom in the discharge of its international duties towards other States on the matters included in the Convention. His Majesty's Government proposes, however, to give renewed and careful examination to the proposals contained in the Convention, with a view to seeing how far it may be possible for His Majesty's Government subsequently to accede to this instrument, possibly with certain reserves.

---

[1] In calling the countries, the French alphabetical order was observed.
[2] See pages 52 *et seq.*

As to the proposal for the erection of an international court with criminal jurisdiction for the trial of offences of a terrorist and international character, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will watch with great interest the progress of this institution, but it does not contemplate participating in the experiment. It wishes, however, to express its satisfaction that the Conference adopts the view that, in present conditions, it is impracticable to invite the Council of the League to assume the responsibility of electing judges of the Court or otherwise putting the Court into direct relation with the League.

Norway :

M. BACHKÉ : On signing, *ad referendum*, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, I desire to state that this form of signature does not bind my Government from the point of view either of ratification or of accession; it simply means that I consider the Convention of sufficient interest to submit it to my Government for serious consideration and subsequent decision. I would ask you to interpret this signature *ad referendum* as a proof of the intention and interest to which I refer.

Switzerland :

M. DELAQUIS : I desire to refer to the declaration which I made, on behalf of the Swiss Federal Council, at the general discussion on Tuesday, November 2nd.[1] No material modification having been made in the substance and scope of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, the attitude of the Swiss Federal Council remains unchanged. It is not able to sign that Convention, still less the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. Nevertheless, the Swiss Federal Council is prepared, as in the past, to afford such assistance as lies within its power, as regards co-operation in police matters.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

M. HIRSCHFELD : At the moment of signing the Final Act of the Conference, I have the honour to define the scope of my previous declarations, and to state as follows :

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, if it should sign or accede to the instruments drawn up by the Conference, proposes to make a declaration to the effect that, with regard to the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Conventions framed by this Conference, it will assume no obligations other than those devolving upon it as a Member of the League of Nations. It is accordingly the intention of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to append this declaration in the event of its signing the instruments of the Conference.

The Conference took note of the foregoing declarations.

38. Close of the Conference.

M. GIVANOVITCH (Yugoslavia) said that the delegation of Yugoslavia, a country whose interest in the work of the Conference was explained by her anxiety for the maintenance of international peace and the part she had played in convening the Conference, wished to make a declaration. With his authorisation that declaration would be made on behalf of the Yugoslav delegation by M. Gavrilovitch, expert.

M. GAVRILOVITCH (Yugoslavia).—The Yugoslav delegation welcomes with the keenest satisfaction the success of the Diplomatic Conference on the International Repression of Terrorism. It recalls the fact that it was in response to the action taken by the Yugoslav Government after the tragic events of Marseilles that the problem of the prevention and punishment of terrorism was first discussed on an international plane. Inspired by a feeling of respect for its great King and for the other victims of the Marseilles tragedy, the Yugoslav Government participated in the preliminary work which led to the convening of the Diplomatic Conference, and which owed its origin to the French Government's nobility of purpose and outlook. We feel that no higher tribute can be paid to the memory of the glorious victims of that terrible crime than to associate their names with the work for the prevention and punishment of terrorism which has now been achieved in the interests of the whole civilised world.

We must remember that the fact that we are in a position to-day to celebrate the success of our work in which eminent jurists, representing many countries, have taken part, is due primarily to two distinguished men who, from the outset, have directed our proceedings and guided our efforts. We can never adequately express our gratitude to our Presidents, Count Carton de Wiart and Professor Basdevant, for the unequalled authority, learning and tact with which they have presided over our discussions. Any words we could find must indeed fall short of our profound respect and admiration for them. Our sincerest thanks are due also to our Rapporteur, M. Pella, the first pioneer of the International Criminal Court, whose profound learning, powers of persuasion and infinite patience, employed in the service of those humanitarian ideals which inspire him, have enabled us to bring to a successful conclusion the important and

---

[1] See page 61.

difficult task entrusted to us. I desire also to express our sincere thanks to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, M. Avenol, to the Secretary-General of the Conference, M. Podesta Costa and to the League of Nations Secretariat, whose enthusiasm, conscientiousness and ready response in the performance of their duties we have all admired.

The value of the Conventions we have drawn up cannot be estimated in terms of the legal obligations which they impose on the contracting States. These instruments represent a prudent compromise between the long traditions of the different nations and the practical necessities of present-day international life. We regard them primarily as a moral achievement of great importance from the point of view of the future happiness of generations more fortunate than our own. The two Conventions rank essentially as a demonstration of international solidarity in the face of the most odious forms of international crime. We look to their moral force and preventive influence to achieve the most significant results. We pray that few occasions may arise on which it may be necessary to enforce either of them. But, if that day should come, we can only hope that they may be interpreted and enforced in the spirit of wide comprehension, goodwill and reciprocal loyalty in which they have been conceived.

We have concluded a task for which—to repeat the eloquent words of our President's opening speech—all honest men must be forever indebted to us. Our achievements must now stand the test of time and future events. To quote Portalis : Laws shape themselves; they are not made. In conclusion, we can only express the hope that, after the accession of Governments, the international laws which we have framed will find strong support, in the future, in the lasting approval and unanimous welcome of the civilised world.

M. SASSERATH (Belgium).—Before we part, may I be allowed, in the name of the Belgian delegation, to express our profound satisfaction at the successful outcome of our work.

The results which have been achieved are due to the enlightened contribution made by all the delegates, in a spirit of mutual concession and conciliatory understanding. We have thus been enabled to frame two Conventions in which is reaffirmed the principle of an international agreement to combat crime, in the defence of law which is our common heritage.

I shall, I feel sure, be interpreting the views of the whole Conference in acknowledging our debt to Professor Basdevant who has placed his great learning as an international jurist at our disposal, who has played an outstanding part first in the work of the Committee of Experts and now in the work of the present Conference and who, in the absence of Count Carton de Wiart, has presided over our meetings with unequalled tact and authority.

The Conventions which are the outcome of our deliberations have solved two difficult problems : that of respecting the full sovereignty of the High Contracting Parties, more particularly in the delicate matter of extradition, and that of enabling them to carry out their obligations within the framework of their national institutions and traditions.

Reservations have been expressed concerning the efficacy of the Conventions, which some countries would prefer to have framed on more radical lines.

We must not forget, however, that international law can proceed only by a wise and slow process of evolution, keeping pace with the progress of public opinion in the different countries, where ancient traditions and a variety of social conditions are reflected in the national laws. Any important innovation—such as the International Criminal Court— is naturally viewed with some hesitation, particularly in international law, but time achieves its purpose, and what is important is first to set up new institutions to safeguard good relations between the States, so that States which desire to co-operate may accede at some future date.

Those who urged the establishment, and were responsible for establishing, the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague—which has proved so admirable and effective an instrument of peace—will remember the scepticism and mistrust which that project once aroused. It was maintained in some quarters that the Permanent Court would never function. Now opinion has come round. No one questions the usefulness of that institution and States are having recourse to it increasingly for the settlement, by fair arbitration, of countless international disputes which formerly constituted a serious menace of war.

The same applies to the International Criminal Court, and the day will come when it will be universally recognised as a welcome innovation, marking an important date in the history of international relations, and as a contribution towards the safeguarding of law and of the sacred cause of peace. This achievement calls for a public tribute to our eminent colleague, M. Pella. The idea of the Court was his, and it is he who, for close upon fifteen years, has been spreading that idea, by means of his writings and speeches, both in his own country and in international circles. He has pursued his objective with the conviction and perseverance of an apostle; he has had to overcome incredulity and scepticism on the one hand and mistrust on the other. To-day his persevering efforts are rewarded. Several delegations are already prepared to sign, on behalf of their Governments, the Convention whereby the International Criminal Court will soon become a living reality.

M. Pella will, I hope, allow one of those who have followed his efforts from the beginning to convey to him this friendly testimony of sympathy and admiration.

I have been authorised to sign the two Conventions *ad referendum*. I would ask you to regard this formula, so far as my country is concerned, simply as a formal reservation due to the fact that the new Belgian Government has not yet been constituted and that it is necessary

to reserve the right of appreciation of the future Government which will have to defend the Conventions before the Legislative Chambers responsible for their ratification.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that the Conventions will be ratified by a large number of States, that our work will be productive of the happiest results, and that with God's help it may serve to protect the works of peace.

M. Ruíz Guiñazú (Argentine Republic).—On behalf of my colleagues of Latin America, I desire to express our satisfaction at the positive results achieved by this Diplomatic Conference. The work which we have just completed represents real progress in criminal law and a new trend in international co-operation.

The Latin-American delegations have adopted a waiting attitude as regards the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, but they welcome any effort directed towards the repression of crime which will ensure international co-operation and the impartial dispensing of justice.

I shall, I think, be interpreting the views of my colleagues of Latin America in expressing our sincere admiration for the work of Count Carton de Wiart, who has presided over our deliberations with such authority, of Professor Basdevant, and of M. Pella, our Rapporteur, to all of whom we are greatly indebted.

M. Koukal (Czechoslovakia).—I wish, in the name of Czechoslovakia, to associate myself entirely and unreservedly with all that my esteemed friend, M. Gavrilovitch, has said on behalf of the Yugoslav Government. I desire, also, to add a few words, in order to emphasise the legal bearing of the two Conventions which we have just signed.

It has been realised, for some time, that certain property is common to the whole of the civilised world, or rather, to the whole of mankind, and that the protection of that property is a duty devolving upon every State which is a member of the international community. A list has accordingly been established of universal crimes, or, if you prefer it, of world crimes, such as traffic in women, piracy, traffic in obscene publications, the damaging of submarine cables, counterfeiting currency, traffic in dangerous drugs, etc. Inter-State co-operation in regard to such matters has been achieved only by means of Conventions concluded with that object in view. In adopting this procedure, it has, of course, been realised that such property cannot be safeguarded simply by substituting a uniform law for the national law of the several States. On the contrary, in the work of assimilating the factual elements and harmonising even the criminal penalties in the form of contractual obligations, it has been necessary to bear in mind the peculiarities of the national laws, such as the so-called territorial principle in English law, or the principle of the expediency of prosecution in the law of certain Scandinavian countries.

When, after the tragic events at Marseilles in 1934, the French Government suggested that to the list of property enjoying universal protection should be added international inter-State co-operation for the prevention of terrorist crimes, we realised that the only way of extending the list of offences was to follow the principle and employ the form adopted in the past to meet similar contingencies. The draft Convention on Terrorism which the Committee of Experts, consisting of eminent jurists and other highly qualified persons, succeeded in framing after three years close work and careful study of the problem, is based on that same idea—namely, that the property in question should be given universal protection within the framework of the national law of each contracting State.

The Czechoslovak delegation, when informed of this project, accepted the underlying principle and offered its sincere and active co-operation in the search for a positive solution. The Convention which we have just signed reaffirms the general principle of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against another State and to refuse to tolerate such acts on its territory. In addition to this general principle, which is binding on every State, even apart from any conventional obligation, the States signatories to the present Convention have thought it useful to enter into certain contractual undertakings with a view to rendering the prevention and punishment of international terrorism more effective in their relations with one another, under conditions stipulated in the Convention.

The Czechoslovak Government considers the results thus obtained satisfactory, and undertakes, by its signature, to co-operate effectively with the contracting parties in the pursuit of this object, under the conditions laid down in the Convention.

As regards the second Convention, concerning the Creation of an International Criminal Court, I desire to make the following observations. As all of us are aware who have had anything to do, in theory or in practice, with the problem of international arbitration, the setting-up of international courts has been a difficult matter. Going back to the earliest sources, we find traces of the idea of international arbitration in the famous project of King George Podibrad in 1463 and in that of Henry IV of France in 1596. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the idea of international arbitration reappears again in various scientific works and in certain projects which, at that time, were considered premature and even chimerical. Finally, however, by restricting the main idea to the pacific settlement of disputes which might arise between States only and to violations of law committed by States only, it became possible to consider setting up certain international courts of a permanent character, having the characteristics of real courts, such as the Prize Court, the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and, lastly, the Permanent Court of International Justice.

When, in 1920, the Statute and Rules of the Permanent Court of International Justice were being framed, the question was discussed at length whether, and if so to what extent, the Court

might be called upon to exercise jurisdiction in criminal matters, possibly even in the case of certain offences committed by private individuals. At that date, however, the moment was not yet considered opportune to extend the jurisdiction of the Court to criminal affairs properly so called. Nevertheless, the idea of an International Criminal Court thus emerged from the realms of pure fantasy and entered the offices and studies of men versed in the science of law, where it began to assume a concrete form. As everyone knows, our Rapporteur, M. Pella, in particular, devoted himself heart and soul to the idea of an International Criminal Court and employed in the pursuit of that idea his eminent qualities as an international criminal jurist. When the idea was revived in connection with the international repression of terrorism, we examined it with the close attention which it deserved.

We have come to the conclusion that, in this very delicate matter of the repression of punishable acts directed against international inter-State relations, the International Criminal Court might prove a useful factor of appeasement in an embittered and envenomed atmosphere, and might serve also to re-establish confidence in the force of law and to strengthen the guarantees of objective and impartial justice for all concerned in the proceedings. It is with this in view that we have decided to sign the Convention concerning the Criminal Court.

I should like to point out also that the fact that States representing upwards of a hundred million persons have decided to accept the idea of an International Criminal Court is an historical event and landmark in the development of international criminal law.

Before concluding this brief speech, I desire to pay a tribute to the members of the Committee of Experts who, with so much care and authority, prepared the bases for our discussions. I wish also to thank our Presidents, Count Carton de Wiart and Professor Basdevant, who have presided over the work of this Conference in so tactful and conciliatory a manner.

I should like to lay particular emphasis on the contribution of our General Rapporteur, M. Pella, who has placed his profound knowledge of the problem and eminent personal qualities so unreservedly at the disposal of the cause of international justice.

M. POLYCHRONIADIS (Greece).—I desire to make the following declaration in the name of the Balkan *Entente* :

The States Members of the Balkan *Entente* attach particular importance to the signature of these two instruments. They have from the outset followed, with the deepest interest and closest attention, the long work of preparation to which so many eminent jurists have contributed and which has resulted in the successful conclusion of these two Conventions.

The countries of the Balkan *Entente* view the two instruments from two different angles. They see in them, in the first place, a posthumous tribute to the memory of the Martyr King of Yugoslavia and to the important personalities who fell the victims of an odious crime. That crime, which so cruelly deprived Yugoslavia of a great king, had its repercussions in the whole of the Balkan *Entente*, of which King Alexander was one of the founders and one of the moving spirits. But the countries of the Balkan *Entente* regard these Conventions also as a real step forward, as an effort in the sphere of international co-operation which is designed to avoid friction between States and which, notwithstanding this modest beginning, holds out infinite promise for the future. The Balkan *Entente*, whose purpose it is to maintain and serve the cause of peace, attaches particular importance to these two Conventions.

M. VAN HAMEL (Netherlands).—The Netherlands Government, which had authorised me, at the beginning of this Conference, to sign the two Conventions, will certainly be interested and happy to learn of the successful outcome of our work and will undoubtedly wish to thank the Conference for having selected The Hague, the beautiful residence of our august Sovereign, as the future seat of the International Criminal Court. The Netherlands will be deeply gratified to know that the Conference has so well realised the character our Government and people are desirous of conferring on The Hague, which is already the centre of institutions of international justice, and which will, I hope, be able to render further services to what the Netherlands Government will surely regard as an ideal of appeasement and international understanding. From both these points of view, we have from the outset recognised the usefulness of this undertaking. Our President and General Rapporteur are entitled to feel a legitimate pride in the active contribution which they have made towards the successful achievement of this task. No one, I think, will deny that, without their wise guidance, the work which we are now concluding could not have been brought to a successful conclusion, or that it is thanks to their learning and powers of co-ordination that this result has been obtained.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS (United Kingdom).—I should like very briefly to associate the United Kingdom delegation with the tributes paid to those who have contributed so much to the success of the Conference.

First, I naturally mention M. Pella, who has already received so many expressions of appreciation for the untiring energy with which he has pursued to a triumphant conclusion a hope which lay so near to his heart. Next, I should like to mention—although he is absent—the debt which we owe to the tact, experience and authority of Count Carton de Wiart; and lastly, Mr. Chairman, I should like, if I may, with all the warmth at my disposal, to express the thanks which we feel for the great services which, with your universal reputation as a jurist and the prestige which you derive as representative of your great country, you have rendered to the Conference and for the way in which you have presided over our deliberations.

M. KOMARNICKI (Poland).—I do not propose to repeat to-day the declarations which I made at one of our last meetings.[1] This is the moment for paying compliments, and Poland's voice must not be silent on this occasion. I associate myself wholeheartedly with the well-merited tribute paid to our President, Professor Basdevant, and our General Rapporteur. I desire also to thank the Secretary-General of the Conference. Every one has given proof of exceptional competence and praiseworthy zeal in the achievement of this work of international co-operation.

M. PELLA (Roumania), Rapporteur.—I will be brief. I may add that I will be frank, and I would ask you to regard my sincerity as a proof of my real belief in the future of the work we have done here.

As delegate of the Roumanian Government, I associate myself entirely with the declarations made by the delegates of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia and with that made by the delegate of Greece in the name of the Balkan *Entente*.

The conclusion of the two Conventions which we have just signed marks the completion by the League of Nations of the very complex and delicate mission entrusted to it as a result of the request submitted by the three Governments of the *Petite Entente* on November 22nd, 1934.

The strength of these two Conventions lies in the compound of the virtues and sacrifices which have gone to their making, for they are destined to prevent the repetition of activities which cost Yugoslavia the life of her Sovereign and France that of one of her most brilliant statesmen.

The common history of the States of the *Petite Entente* will enshrine the memory of the knightly king, Alexander I, whose perspicacity, practical power of appreciation and rapid decision and whose powers of intuition and genius had made him one of the outstanding personalities of our age. And how could I pass over in silence at this moment the name of Louis Barthou, that great Frenchman and great European, whose memory is destined to be always associated with that of King Alexander?

Roumania, in signing the two Conventions, which are the outcome of the need to enforce minimum rules of morality in international relations, is in a position, without any modification of her laws, at once to participate effectively in the campaign against terrorism, since the Penal Code of King Carol II, which came into force on January 1st, 1937, goes far beyond the conventional stipulations which Roumania has just accepted.

May I be allowed now to add a few words as Rapporteur-General of the Conference?

Those who have followed our discussions and those who may have occasion to read the records of the Conference cannot fail to appreciate the spirit of wide comprehension and co-operation which has prevailed throughout these debates.

You, gentlemen, have had the courage to express your opinions frankly on certain problems of criminal law and international law, many aspects of which reflect the moral and intellectual crisis through which the world is now passing. You have shown once again that jurists cannot cut themselves off from the main currents of opinion which dominate mankind, but that they must, on the contrary, be alive to these relative issues and react, as it were, against the immobility of the absolute.

Notwithstanding the difficulties attaching to any radical reform of the national laws, notwithstanding the Conference's desire to leave untouched the legal particularism of certain countries, the principles affirmed by the two Conventions and the tendencies so clearly reflected in the texts as a whole bear witness to the feeling of solidarity and co-operation which exists between the States in the campaign against the activities of terrorists, against the enemies of the human race, who must be relentlessly tracked down and prevented from injuring their fellow creatures.

In examining certain questions, we have, of course, had to cope with many prejudices, since, as has already been said, criminal law, unlike other branches of law, is not based on pure abstractions and logic but necessarily appeals to the emotional, as well as the intellectual, faculties of man.

By surmounting all these difficulties, you, gentlemen, have embodied in the first Convention the conditions for international co-operation with a view to the effective prevention and repression of terrorism. In the second Convention, dealing with the International Criminal Court, you have—by accepting newly formulated truths, made newly manifest—rendered it possible, through the creation of an international criminal jurisdiction, to achieve a work which must be carried through with due regard to practical possibilities but, at the same time, without losing sight of the final objective.

Thus the Preamble to this second Convention affirms that the creation of the Court is destined to ensure progress in the struggle against offences of an international character. The competence of the Court might be extended at some future date to cover other offences mentioned in the International Conventions. It might even—if States agreed to entrust this task to it—give judgment in certain positive conflicts, and above all in negative conflicts, of competence in criminal matters. It might, to quote the great Boullenois, contribute towards the reign of peace and harmony " in the Republic of criminal laws ".

If, in the work which has resulted in the creation of the International Criminal Court, I have been able to play my small part and have defended vigorously the ideas which I first put forward in 1919 and which I have constantly developed since then, and if some of you have been good enough to express your appreciation of my efforts, may I in my turn express my gratitude towards the League of Nations Committee which prepared the two Conventions and to the President,

[1] See page 161.

Count Carton de Wiart, whose generous conceptions and personal authority have always been there to support my efforts.

May I also express my gratitude to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee of our Conference, Professor Basdevant, whose moderation and lucidity have made his learning so effective a contribution to the progress of positive international law.

Lastly, allow me to associate with this work the Legal Section of the League of Nations, whose valuable technical assistance we have all had an opportunity of appreciating.

May I express to M. Podesta Costa my unqualified appreciation of his own work and that of his eminent collaborators, and may I, without mentioning all of them, refer to Mr. McKinnon Wood, who since 1935, so competently carried out the responsible duties of Secretary to the Committee of Jurists.

My concluding words are addressed to the members of the Conference. Whatever your views and the views of your Governments concerning the International Criminal Court, you have all contributed by your learning and experience towards the founding of an institution which opens up new and wider horizons in the matter of criminal law.

The signature of the Convention for the Creation of the International Criminal Court must be regarded as a memorable date in the history of criminal law.

Although the idea of the International Criminal Court was viewed by many with scepticism in the past, I am convinced that when once it is functioning, faith and hope will take the place of doubt.

As for myself, I regard this as a red-letter day, marking the culmination of our most disinterested hopes—allow me to thank you.

The PRESIDENT.—Our work is ended, and the results are known to you all. The Final Act has been signed in the name of thirty States, the first Convention in the name of nineteen States and the second Convention in the name of ten States.

Now, at the conclusion of our work, we naturally regret more than ever the absence from this presidential chair of Count Carton de Wiart. The nobility of his conceptions, his competence as a statesman and his own personal authority, coupled with the high moral reputation so rightly enjoyed by his country, would have enabled him on this occasion to describe in fit terms the spirit which has prevailed throughout this Conference. He himself has been our wise and trusted guide, just as he had been before the wise and trusted guide of the Committee of Experts. Throughout the various stages of our undertaking he has been our master-worker. I feel sure that I shall be expressing your unanimous feeling if I, too, reiterate—this time on behalf of all of us here present—the tributes which on every side have been paid to our President.

With no further claim than the indulgence which, at his request, you have been good enough to show me, I must now try to do as best I can what he would have done so easily, that is, to cast a retrospective glance over our work, in the hope that this may serve a useful purpose at this moment.

Our work has been permeated by the spirit which led to its inception, a methodical spirit and a spirit of good faith—a methodical spirit which has involved no dangerous haste. Allow me briefly to recall the stages of our work.

On the morrow of that grievous event just referred to in such lofty terms, we find a French proposal, its acceptance in principle by the Council of the League of Nations, two successive sessions of the Committee of Experts, preceding and following the consultation of Governments; then an important debate in the First Committee of the Assembly and a further examination by the Committee of Experts, which amended its original drafts. The Governments duly received those drafts, studied them and appointed their delegates, and the Conference has now met in its turn. It, too, has worked methodically; it has made no radical changes in the drafts submitted by the Committee of Experts. On the contrary, it has examined them with the closest attention. There was a general discussion, an examination, at a first and second reading, with an exhaustive scrutiny, between those two readings, by a committee known as the Drafting Committee, but which was, at the same time, a committee of compromise and agreement. And the whole of this methodical work has been carried on in a spirit of good faith. The drafts had previously been studied very carefully. Criminal science—I do not know if I am employing quite the correct terminology: I feel very doubtful about these questions of terminology—criminal science was represented at the Conference by jurists of world renown. The Conference declined, however, to engage in purely academic debates, for all of you realised that what was expected of you was a practical achievement, an achievement of which the political and moral implications were apparent and received affirmation from the very first day.

As was only to be expected, divergent opinions have been expressed. I note this fact, but not with any critical intention, for uniformity is not the law of this world. We have endeavoured to understand these divergent views, to appreciate and to reconcile them; the result is embodied in the two Conventions which have just been signed and one of which is held by some not to go far enough, while the second is considered by some to be over bold. But these are simply differences of degree in the appreciation of what was throughout a common effort.

International co-operation when, as in the present case, it assumes the ordered form of conventional law, is perhaps the more certain of success, because its objects, being more modest, are, for that reason, easier to realise. Moreover, it must be admitted that not every innovation is necessarily a mistaken one. The innovation introduced by the Convention for the Creation of an International Court, important though it is—I am the first to recognise that fact, just as I was the first to proclaim it at the beginning of this Conference—is nevertheless cautious in character, by reason of the essentially optional nature of the jurisdiction of that Court.

Whatever the differences of opinion between us—not as regards the substance of the problem but as regards method—we have concluded an agreement in good faith, in order to permit of a loyal trial, on the one hand, of the form of co-operation laid down in the first Convention and, on the other, of the form of jurisdiction instituted by the second.

Still guided by the methodical spirit which has presided over our work up to this point, we have decided not to fix too early a date for the signature of these two Conventions. For that purpose, we have allowed a long time, over six months. We have done this because we realised that it would be a mistake to be over-precipitate, having regard to the complex problems which may in some cases necessitate adjusting to the provisions of the Conventions the national legislation in the matter of criminal law as well as the existing legal and administrative practice. We had in mind also those not present at the Conference, and that is why we fixed the time limit for signature as far off as May 31st, 1938. Some States have already announced that, although unable to sign to-day, they hope to be able to do so a little later. Again, by adopting this procedure we have made it clear that we have no wish to precipitate matters, but that we shall pursue our undertaking wisely, methodically and without undue haste.

That is how our work has grown and taken shape. We have said what we had to say and accepted our responsibilities in the name of our Governments, and having done so we are now going to place in their hands the results we have achieved.

Our task is ended. You paid me the honour of inviting me to accept office as Vice-President, and fate has willed that I should be called upon to preside over the last stages of your work. When I took up my duties a week ago, I realised that the task which I had accepted—at first perhaps somewhat lightheartedly—was in reality no light task. It has, however, proved to be unexpectedly easy of fulfilment, and this I owe, gentlemen, to all of you who, without forgetting your own duties, have facilitated my task, thanks to the good understanding which has reigned throughout and has brought us to the successful issue on which our President congratulated us in his recent telegram. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

My duties have therefore not been exacting, and I do not really deserve the compliments so courteously addressed to me. It is you who have done everything, and my rôle has been confined, as it were, to a few ritual gestures.

I wish to thank the Bureau of the Conference, which has always been so ready to give me the benefit of its advice, and in particular my colleague and fellow Vice-President, M. Ruíz Guiñazú. I desire also to reiterate the well merited tributes which have been paid to the work of the General Rapporteur. No praise is too high for his amazing competence, which it would be a mistake to qualify by any commentary. With that competence has been coupled tireless activity, attendance at all our meetings, useful participation in all our discussions and an ingenuity of mind which has enabled us to surmount whatever difficulties we encountered on our path.

I desire on behalf of the Conference to address to the Secretary-General of the Conference and his collaborators in the League of Nations Secretariat our thanks for their valuable assistance, which we have been able to count on in connection alike with important matters and with the smallest details.

And now may I express the hope, which you will I am sure all reiterate, that our work may have as its corollary final decisions and concerted action on the part of the Governments.

I declare the Conference on the International Repression of Terrorism closed.

4. ANNEXES.

LIST OF ANNEXES.

Page

1. Resolutions adopted by the Council and by the Assembly :

I. Resolution adopted by the Council on December 10th, 1934 183

II. Resolution adopted by the Assembly on October 10th, 1936 183

III. Resolution adopted by the Council on May 27th, 1937 183

2. Rules of Procedure, adopted by the Conference on November 1st, 1937 184

3. Report adopted by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism on April 26th, 1937 185

Appendix I : Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.. 186

Appendix II : Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court 191

4. Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism :

Texts submitted to the Conference by the Drafting Committee 196

5. Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court :

Texts submitted to the Conference by the Drafting Committee 200

ANNEX 1.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL AND BY THE ASSEMBLY.

I. Resolution adopted by the Council on December 10th, 1934.

The Council, considering that the rules of international law concerning the repression of terrorist activity are not at present sufficiently precise to guarantee efficiently international co-operation in this matter :

Decides to set up a Committee of experts to study this question with a view to drawing up a preliminary draft of an international convention to assure the repression of conspiracies or crimes committed with a political and terrorist purpose;

Decides that this Committee shall be composed of eleven members, the Governments of Belgium, the United Kingdom, Chile, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Roumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Spain and Switzerland each being invited to appoint a member;

Refers to this Committee for examination the suggestions which have been presented to the Council by the French Government, and requests other Governments which may wish to present suggestions to send them to the Secretary-General, so that they may be examined by the Committee;

Invites the Committee to report to the Council so that the latter may apply the procedure laid down in the resolution of the Assembly of September 25th, 1931, concerning the drawing-up of general conventions negotiated under the auspices of the League of Nations.

II. Resolution adopted by the Assembly on October 10th, 1936.

The Assembly,

Having taken cognisance of the second report of the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism and of the two draft Conventions annexed thereto (document A.7.1936.V);

Recognising the utility for the consolidation of peace of the conclusion of a convention for the prevention and punishment of terrorism;

Considering, however, that the replies of the Governments regarding the draft drawn up by the Committee and the discussions in the First Committee have shown that certain Governments feel doubts which it is desirable to remove :

Expresses the view that the contemplated convention, founding itself upon the principle that it is the duty of every State to abstain from any intervention in the political life of a foreign State, should have as its principal objects :

(1) To prohibit any form of preparation or execution of terrorist outrages upon the life or liberty of persons taking part in the work of foreign public authorities and services;

(2) To ensure the effective prevention of such outrages and, in particular, to establish collaboration to facilitate early discovery of preparations for such outrages;

(3) To ensure punishment of outrages of a terrorist character in the strict sense of the word which have an international character either in virtue of the place in which preparations for them were made or the place in which they were carried out, or in virtue of the nationality of those participating in them or their victims;

Notes that certain Governments have disputed the advisability of creating an international criminal court, but that the trial of persons guilty of such outrages by such a court is felt by other Governments to constitute an alternative which, in certain cases, would be preferable to extradition or to prosecution, and that on this ground the second convention has been regarded by the latter Governments as valuable, even if it is not capable of securing general acceptance;

Recommends that the Committee revise its conclusions regarding its two drafts in the light of the observations to be found in the Governments' replies or formulated in the course of the debates, in order that the Council may convene a diplomatic conference in 1937.

III. Resolution adopted by the Council on May 27th, 1937.

The Council,

In view of its resolution of December 10th, 1934, concerning the international repression of terrorism;

In view of the Assembly's resolution on the same subject of October 10th, 1936 :

Decides that a conference to consider the two draft conventions drawn up by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism (document C.222.M.162.1937.V)—namely :

The draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism;
The draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court;

shall be convened at Geneva for Monday, November 1st, 1937;

Empowers its President, acting in consultation with the Secretary-General, to appoint the President of the Conference;

Directs the Secretary-General to invite the following Governments to be represented at the Conference by delegates having full powers to participate in the work of the Conference and eventually to sign such conventions as the Conference may draw up :

(1) The Governments of the Members of the League;

(2) The Governments of Germany, United States of America, Brazil, Costa Rica, Free City of Danzig, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino.

ANNEX 2.

Conf. R.T.2.(1).

RULES OF PROCEDURE, ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE ON NOVEMBER 1ST, 1937.

Article 1.

The Conference consists of the delegations appointed by the Governments invited to the Conference.

Each delegation is composed of one or several delegates who may be accompanied by supplementary delegates, advisers and secretaries.

Article 2.

The President opens, suspends and closes the meetings; he submits to the Conference all communications, the importance of which appears to justify this measure; ensures the observation of the rules of procedure, accords the right to address the Conference, pronounces the closure of discussions, puts questions to the vote and announces the result of the vote.

The Conference shall elect two Vice-Presidents, who shall replace the President when necessary.

Article 3.

The Bureau of the Conference shall consist of the President of the Conference, the two Vice-Presidents, and six other members.

Article 4.

The Conference may, at any time, decide to sit in plenary conference or constitute itself as committee or set up special committees.

Article 5.

All meetings of the Conference shall be public, unless a decision is taken to the contrary. Decisions taken at private meetings shall be announced at a public meeting. The special committees and sub-committees shall decide whether their meetings will be public or private.

Article 6.

No delegate may address the Conference without having previously obtained the authorisation of the President. The President may withdraw the permission to speak if the delegate's remarks are not relevant to the subject of the debate.

In the course of the discussion of any question, any delegate may raise a point of order, which shall immediately be decided.

The technical delegates and experts accompanying the delegates may be allowed to speak under the same conditions as the delegates.

Article 7.

Speeches in French shall be interpreted in English and *vice versa* by an interpreter belonging to the Secretariat.

A delegate speaking in another language must himself provide for a translation of his speech into French or English.

A delegate may cause to be distributed documents written in a language other than French or English, but the Secretariat is not obliged to have them translated or printed.

Article 8.

No draft resolution, amendment or motion shall be discussed or voted upon at any meeting, of which copies have not been communicated to the delegates before the meeting, except in the following cases :

(1) The Conference may at any meeting decide by a two-thirds majority to allow a draft resolution or motion proposed at the meeting to be discussed and voted upon;

(2) The President may, during the debate on any resolution or motion, allow any amendment to the resolution or motion which may be proposed during the debate to be discussed and voted upon, if the text of the amendment is communicated to him in writing.

Article 9.

A delegate may, at any time, request that the debate be closed. The President shall take the opinion of the Conference upon the motion of closure. If the majority of the Conference approves the motion, the President shall declare the closure of the debate.

Article 10.

Each Government represented shall have one vote. Delegations which abstain from voting shall be considered as absent.

Voting on resolutions to be taken by the Conference shall, unless the Conference decide otherwise, be taken by a roll call, the delegations being called in the French alphabetical order of the names of the Governments represented.

All elections shall be made by a secret ballot unless they are made by acclamation.

Article 11.

At the conclusion of each meeting, Minutes shall be prepared by the Secretariat and circulated to the delegates as soon after as possible.

The record of the meeting shall become final forty-eight hours after circulation.

ANNEX 3.

Series of Publications : 1937.V.1. *Official No. :* C.222.M.162.1937.V.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM, ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APRIL 26TH, 1937.

CONTENTS.

Page

Report 185

Appendix I.—Draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism ... 186

Appendix II.—Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court 191

The Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism, set up under the resolution adopted by the Council on December 10th, 1934, held its third session at Geneva from April 20th to 26th, 1937.

The following were present at this session of the Committee : [1]

His Excellency Count CARTON DE WIART (Belgium), Minister of State, *Chairman;*
accompanied by M. Simon SASSERATH, Advocate in the Brussels Court of Appeal, Professor in the Belgian Institute of Graduate Studies.

Sir John Fischer WILLIAMS, C.B.E., K.C. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
Substitute : Mr. L. S. BRASS, Assistant Legal Adviser, Home Office.

Mme. Matilde HUICI (Spain), Advocate;
Substitute : M. Cipriano RIVAS CHERIF, Consul-General of Spain at Geneva.

M. Jules BASDEVANT (France), Professor in the Faculty of Law of Paris, Legal Adviser to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic.

M. Paul SEBESTYÉN (Hungary), Ministerial Counsellor of Section in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
accompanied by M. Eugène ASZTALOS, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Justice.

M. Lucien BEKERMAN (Poland), Public Prosecutor in the Court of Cassation, Chief of Section in the Ministry of Justice.

His Excellency M. V. V. PELLA (Roumania), Roumanian Minister at The Hague, Professor in the Faculty of Law of the University of Bucharest;
Substitute : M. Slavko STOYKOVITCH, Chief Representative of the Yugoslav Government in the Mixed Arbitral Tribunals.

M. E. DELAQUIS (Switzerland), Professor in the University of Geneva.

M. Victor BROWN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Secretary of Embassy.

---

[1] M. E. J. GAJARDO (Chile), His Excellency M. Ugo ALOISI and Professor Tommaso PERASSI (Italy) were not present at this session.

The Committee considered the report and resolution on the international repression of terrorism (document A.72.1936.V [1]) which were adopted by the Assembly of the League on October 10th, 1936, together with the observations contained in the replies received from Governments or formulated during the discussions in the First Committee of the Assembly.[2]

In the light of the new material afforded by a study of the above-mentioned documents, the Committee proceeded to hold a general discussion on the problem of the international prevention and punishment of terrorism, and this was followed by a final review of the two draft Conventions drawn up by the Committee at its second session (January 1936).

When revising the first draft, which deals with the prevention and punishment of terrorism (Appendix I), the Committee thought it proper to define the situations in which acts of terrorism assume an international character, and which are the primary justification for international co-operation to prevent and punish such acts.

Furthermore, to meet a trend of opinion which received definite expression in the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly, the Committee embodied in the draft Convention a clause emphasising that States are under an obligation—imposed, indeed, by international law—themselves to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of any other State.

With the object of avoiding difficulties in the interpretation of the Convention and defining the exact sense and scope of some of its clauses, the Committee found it necessary to lay down in a general provision what is to be understood by " acts of terrorism " within the meaning of the proposed Convention.

With regard to the clauses providing for various forms of co-operation between States in the prevention and punishment of terrorism, the Committee came to the conclusion that certain amendments were necessary in order to make it clearer that the legal rules held by the different contracting parties as to political offences are not affected.

The Committee's attention was also drawn to the question of civil war. The Committee took the view that this is a question which is clearly outside the scope of the Convention.

The other amendments to the original draft Convention are due to the Committee's desire either to make the text clearer or to limit the scope of the Convention to those situations of which it is absolutely to take account if acts of terrorism of an international character are to be effectually prevented and punished.

In revising the second draft Convention—that for the creation of an International Criminal Court (Appendix II)—the Committee was chiefly influenced by the desire expressed by the First Committee of the 1936 Assembly. It is plain from the new amendments that States which become parties to this Convention cannot rely upon the International Criminal Court in their relations with States which are parties only to the first Convention (that for the prevention and punishment of terrorism).

The other amendments to the second Convention are mainly due to the observations made by various Governments on the organisation and working of such a Court.

In submitting the present report and the two draft Conventions appended embodying the results of its work, the Committee expresses the hope that it may have provided a useful basis for the deliberations of the Diplomatic Conference which, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League on October 10th, 1936, is to meet in 1937.

April 26th, 1937.

(Signed) H. CARTON DE WIART,
Chairman.

Appendix I.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM.

[*Translation.*]

Article 1.

1. Acts of terrorism within the meaning of the present Convention are criminal acts which are directed against a State and which are intended or calculated to create a state of terror among individuals, groups of persons or the general public.

2. The object of the present Convention is to ensure co-operation between the High Contracting Parties for the prevention and punishment of such acts when they are of an international character, it being the duty of States to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against the safety and public order of another State.

---

[1] See Minutes of the First Committee of the Seventeenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly (1936), pages 84-85.

[2] See documents A.24.1936.V, A.24(a).1936.V, C.552.M.356.1936.V and C.194.M.139.1937.V.

Article 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties should make the following acts committed on its own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 :

(1) Any act intended to cause death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to :

(a) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(b) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity.

(2) Wilful destruction of or damage to public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party.

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public.

(4) The manufacture, obtaining, or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present Article.

(5) Any attempt to commit any of the acts falling within the present Article.

Article 3.

1. Each of the High Contracting Parties should also make the following actions criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to acts of terrorism directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the acts of terrorism are to be carried into execution :

(a) Any agreement to commit any of the acts mentioned in Article 2 (Nos. (1) to (4));

(b) Any direct public incitement, whether successful or not;

(c) Any successful private incitement;

(d) Any wilful complicity;

(e) Any help given towards the commission of such an act.

2. Acts of participation in the offences falling within the present Convention shall be treated as separate offences when the persons committing them can only be brought to trial in different countries.

Article 4.

Without prejudice to the characterisation of offences and to other special provisions of national law relating to the persons and property mentioned in Article 2, no High Contracting Party shall make any distinction as regards the protection afforded by criminal law between acts, falling under Articles 2 and 3, directed against the Party itself and similar acts directed against another High Contracting Party.

Article 5.

1. In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is accepted, foreign convictions for any of the acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 will, within the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, be taken into account for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

2. Such convictions will, further, in the case of High Contracting Parties whose law recognises foreign convictions, be taken into account, with or without special proceedings, for the purpose of imposing, in the manner provided by that legislation, incapacities, disqualifications or interdictions whether in the sphere of public or of private law.

Article 6.

In so far as *parties civiles* are admitted under the domestic law, foreign *parties civiles*, including, in proper cases, a High Contracting Party, should be entitled to all rights allowed to nationals by the law of the country in which the case is tried.

Article 7.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below, the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been, or may hereafter be, concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall henceforward, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 4 below and subject to reciprocity, recognise the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 as extradition crimes as between themselves.

3. For the purposes of the present Article, any act specified in Articles 2 and 3, if committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against whom it is directed, shall also be deemed to be an extradition crime.

4. The obligation to grant extradition under the present Article shall be subject to any limitations recognised by the law of the country to which application is made.

Article 8.

1. When the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised by a High Contracting Party, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country after the commission abroad of an offence mentioned in Articles 2 or 3 should be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed in their own country, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. The provisions of the present Article shall not apply if, in similar circumstances, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 9.

Foreigners who are on the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3 should be prosecuted and punished as though the act had been committed in the territory of that High Contracting Party, if the following conditions are fulfilled—namely, that :

(a) Extradition has been demanded and could not be granted for a reason not connected with the act itself;

(b) The law of the country of refuge recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners;

(c) The foreigner is a national of a country which recognises the jurisdiction of its own courts in respect of offences committed abroad by foreigners.

Article 10.

The provisions of Articles 8 and 9 shall also apply to acts referred to in Articles 2 and 3 which have been committed in the territory of the High Contracting Party against which they were directed.

As regards the application of Articles 8 and 9, the High Contracting Parties do not undertake to pass a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed by the law of the country where the offence was committed.

Article 11.

Each High Contracting Party should take on his own territory appropriate measures to prevent any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article 12.

1. The carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition and explosives should be subjected to regulation, and it should be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute them to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by the domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles.

2. Manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, should be required to mark each arm with a serial number and factory mark permitting it to be identified, and to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

Article 13.

1. The following acts should be punishable :

(a) Any fraudulent manufacture or alteration of passports or other equivalent documents;

(b) Bringing into the country, obtaining or being in possession of such forged or falsified documents knowing them to be forged or falsified;

(c) Obtaining such documents by means of false declarations or documents;

(d) Using any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. The wilful issue of passports, other equivalent documents, or visas by competent officials to persons known not to have the right thereto under the laws or regulations applicable, with the object of assisting any activity contrary to the purpose of the present Convention, should also be punishable.

3. The provisions of the present Article shall apply irrespective of the national or foreign character of the document.

Article 14.

1. The results of the investigation of offences provided for in Articles 2, 3 and 13 should in each country and within the framework of the law of that country be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. Such service should be in close contact :

(a) With the police authorities of the country;

(b) With the corresponding services in other countries.

3. It should furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3 and 13 and should, as far as possible, keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

Article 15.

Each service, so far as it considers it desirable to do so, should notify to the services of the other countries, giving all necessary particulars:

(a) Any act mentioned in Articles 2 and 3, even if it has not been carried into effect, such notification to be accompanied by descriptions, copies and photographs;

(b) Any search for, any prosecution, arrest, conviction or expulsion of persons guilty of acts dealt with in the present Convention, the movements of such persons and any pertinent information with regard to them, as well as their description, finger-prints and photographs;

(c) Discovery of documents, arms, appliances or other objects connected with acts mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 12 and 13.

Article 16.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request in accordance with their domestic law and practice.

2. The transmission of letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention should be effected:

(a) By direct communication between the judicial authorities; or

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries, or by direct communication from the authority of the country making the request to the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made; or

(c) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request direct to the competent judicial authority, or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made, and shall receive direct from such authority the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request.

3. In cases *(a)* and *(c)*, a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the superior authority of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letters of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority making the request, provided always that the country to which the request is made may require a translation in its own language, certified correct by the authority making the request.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method or methods of transmission mentioned above which he will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, his existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. Execution of letters of request shall not give rise to a claim for reimbursement of charges or expenses of any nature whatever other than expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present Article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws.

Article 17.

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of the limits of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

Article 18.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment, the characterisation of the various acts dealt with in the present Convention and the determination of the applicable penalties and of the methods of prosecution and trial depend in each country upon the general rules of the domestic law. It, further, does not impair the right of the High Contracting Parties to make such rules as they consider proper regarding the effect of mitigating circumstances, the right of pardon and the right of amnesty.

Article 19.

If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice,

if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

Article 20.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall be both authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . . it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations and on behalf of any non-member State represented at the Conference which drew up the present Convention or to which a copy thereof is communicated for this purpose by the Council of the League of Nations.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Article 21.

1. After the . . ., the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any of the non-member States referred to in Article 20 on whose behalf the Convention has not been signed.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

Article 22.

Any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State which is prepared to ratify the Convention under the second paragraph of Article 20, or to accede to the Convention under Article 21, but desires to be allowed to make reservations with regard to the application of the Convention, may so inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall forthwith communicate such reservations to all the Members of the League and non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited and enquire whether they have any objection thereto. Should the reservation be formulated within two years from the entry into force of the Convention, the same enquiry shall be addressed to Members of the League and non-member States whose signature of the Convention has not yet been followed by ratification. If, within six months from the date of the Secretary-General's communication, no objection to the reservation has been made, it shall be treated as accepted by the High Contracting Parties.

Article 23.

Ratification of or accession to the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation are in conformity with the rules contained in the Convention.

Article 24.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may at any time declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States referred to in Article 20 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 25.

The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the . . . ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration.

Article 26.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 27.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by means of a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

Article 28.

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 20. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, ... in a single copy, which will be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States referred to in Article 20.

Appendix II.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT.

[*Translation.*]

Article 1.

An International Criminal Court for the trial, as hereinafter provided, of persons accused of an offence dealt with in the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is hereby established.

Article 2.

The Court shall be a permanent body, but shall sit only when it is seized of proceedings for an offence within its jurisdiction.

Article 3.

1. In the cases referred to in Articles 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, each High Contracting Party to the present Convention shall be entitled, instead of prosecuting before his own tribunal, to send the accused for trial before the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party shall further be entitled in the cases mentioned in Article 7 of the said Convention, instead of extraditing, to send the accused for trial before the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a Party to the present Convention.

3. The provisions of the present Article shall be applicable only if the accused is a national of a State which is a Party to the present Convention and if the offence is directed against the interests of a High Contracting Party to the present Convention.

Article 4.

The Court shall be composed of judges chosen from among jurists who are acknowledged authorities on criminal law and who are or have been members of courts of criminal jurisdiction or possess the qualifications required for such appointments in their own countries.

Article 5.

The Court shall consist of five regular judges and five deputy judges, each belonging to a different nationality, but so that the regular judges and deputy judges shall be nationals of the High Contracting Parties.

Article 6.

1. Any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State in respect of which the present Convention is in force may nominate not more than two candidates for appointment as judges of the Court.

2. The Council of the League of Nations shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

Article 7.

1. Judges shall hold office for ten years.

2. Every two years, one regular and one deputy judge shall retire.

3. For the first period of ten years, the order of retirement shall be determined under the authority of the Council of the League of Nations by drawing lots.

4. Judges may be re-appointed.

5. Judges shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled.

6. Nevertheless, judges, though replaced, shall finish any cases which they have begun.

Article 8.

A judge appointed in place of a judge whose period of appointment has not expired shall hold the appointment for the remainder of his predecessor's term.

Article 9.

1. Deputy judges shall be called upon to sit in the order laid down in a list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly, to age.

Article 10.

1. Members of the Court may not participate in the settlement of any case on which they have previously been engaged in any capacity whatsoever. In case of doubt, the Court shall decide.

2. Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, give a solemn undertaking in open Court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

Article 11.

1. Any vacancy, whether occurring through the expiration of a judge's term of office or for any other cause, shall be filled as provided in Article 6.

2. In the event of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall take effect on notification being received by the Registrar.

Article 12.

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of the other members he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Article 13.

The High Contracting Parties shall grant the members of the Court diplomatic privileges and immunities when engaged on the business of the Court.

Article 14.

1. The Court shall elect its President and Vice-President for two years; they may be re-elected.

2. The work of the Registry of the Court shall be performed by the Registry of the Permanent Court of International Justice, if that Court consents.

Article 15.

The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. For any particular case, the President may take the opinion of the Court and the Court may decide to meet elsewhere.

Article 16.

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to send a person for trial before the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 17.

The Court shall apply the substantive criminal law of the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. Any dispute as to what substantive criminal law is applicable shall be decided by the Court.

Article 18.

If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not sit to hear a particular case, he shall so notify the President as soon as he has been informed that the Court is seized of that case.

Article 19.

1. The presence of five members shall be necessary to enable the Court to sit.

2. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

Article 20.

If the Court has to apply, in accordance with Article 17, the law of a State of which no sitting judge is a national, the Court may invite a jurist who is an acknowledged authority on such law to sit with it in a consultative capacity as a legal assessor.

Article 21.

As soon as the Court is seized of a case, the President of the Court shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, and the State on the territory of which the offence was committed. These States, and any other States, may put before the Court the results of their investigations and any evidence and objects connected with the crime which they have in their possession; these shall be included in the file of the case.

Article 22.

1. The Court shall be seized of a case by an indictment issuing from a High Contracting Party.

2. The right to conduct the prosecution shall rest with the State against which the offence was committed. Failing that State, it shall belong to the State on the territory of which the offence was committed, and failing also that latter State, then to the State by which the Court was seized.

3. The State which seizes the Court shall at the same time name the agent by whom it will be represented.

4. The Court must not proceed further with the case if the charge is withdrawn.

Article 23.

Any State or person injured by an offence may constitute itself or himself *partie civile* before the Court, inspect the file, submit a statement of its or his case to the Court, and take part in the debates.

Article 24.

The file of the case and the statement of the *partie civile* shall be communicated to the person who is before the Court for trial.

Article 25.

The parties may propose the hearing of witnesses and experts by the Court, which shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts.

Article 26.

1. The Court shall decide whether a person who has been sent before it for trial shall be placed or remain under arrest. Where necessary, it shall determine on what conditions he may be provisionally set at liberty.

2. The State on the territory of which the Court is sitting shall place at the Court's disposal a suitable place of internment and the necessary staff of warders for the custody of the accused.

Article 27.

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall at its demand be addressed by the High Contracting Party on the territory of which the Court is sitting to the State competent to give effect to such letters of request.

Article 28.

No examination of the person sent to the Court for trial, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for that person, the representatives of the State against which the offence was directed or on the territory of which the offence was committed or which laid the case before the Court and the representatives of the *parties civiles*, or after due summons to such persons to be present.

Article 29.

1. Accused persons may be defended by advocates belonging to a Bar and approved by the Court.

2. If provision is not made for the conduct of the defence by a barrister chosen by the accused, the Court shall assign to each accused person a counsel selected from advocates belonging to a Bar.

Article 30.

1. The hearings before the Court shall be public.

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned and unanimous judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place *in camera*. Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

Article 31.

The Court shall sit in private to consider its judgment.

Article 32.

The decisions of the Court shall be by majority of the judges.

Article 33.

Every judgment or order of the Court shall state the reasons therefor and be read at a public hearing by the President.

Article 34.

The Court may not entertain charges against any person except the person sent before it for trial, or try any accused person for any offences other than those for which he has been sent for trial.

Article 35.

1. The Court may sentence the persons sent before it to restore property or to pay damages.

2. The Court shall decide whether any restitution or confiscation of any object is to be made.

3. High Contracting Parties in whose territory objects to be restored or property belonging to convicted persons is situated shall be bound to take all the measures provided by their own laws to ensure the execution of the sentences.

4. The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall also apply to cases in which pecuniary penalties imposed by the Court or costs of proceedings have to be recovered.

Article 36.

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by the High Contracting Party which shall be designated by the Court.

2. The Court shall determine the way in which any fines shall be dealt with.

Article 37.

If sentence of death has been pronounced, the State designated by the Court to execute the sentence shall be entitled to substitute therefor the most severe penalty in its national legislation involving loss of liberty.

Article 38.

The right of pardon shall be exercised by the State which has to enforce the penalty. It shall first consult the President of the Court.

Article 39.

1. Against convictions pronounced by the Court, no proceedings other than an application for revision shall be allowable.

2. The Court shall determine in its rules the cases in which an application for revision may be made.

3. The States mentioned in Article 22, and the persons mentioned in Article 29, shall have the right to ask for a revision.

Article 40.

1. The salaries of the judges shall be payable by the States of which they are nationals on a scale fixed by the High Contracting Parties.

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

Article 41.

The Court's archives shall be in the charge of the Registrar.

Article 42.

The Court shall establish regulations to govern its practice and procedure.

Article 43.

1. The Court shall decide any questions as to its own jurisdiction arising during the hearing of a case; it shall for this purpose apply the provisions of the present Convention and of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and the general principles of law.

2. Should a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, dispute the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts, this issue shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 45.

Article 44.

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning :

(a) The election of judges;

(b) The organisation of the Registry;

(c) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all financial and administrative questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;

(d) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

2. The Government of the Netherlands shall be requested to convene this meeting as soon as possible after the present Convention enters into force.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. On all questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3, decisions shall be taken by a majority of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

Article 45.

If any dispute should arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, and if such dispute has not been satisfactorily solved by diplomatic means, it shall be settled in conformity with the provisions in force between the Parties concerning the settlement of international disputes.

If such provisions should not exist between the parties to the dispute, the parties shall refer the dispute to an arbitral or judicial procedure. If no agreement is reached on the choice of another court, the parties shall refer the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if they are all parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Statute of that Court; and if they are not all parties to that Protocol, they shall refer the dispute to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Convention of The Hague of October 18th, 1907, for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

Article 46.

1. The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be authentic, shall bear to-day's date. Until . . ., it shall be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State on whose behalf the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism has been signed.

2. The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League. The Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The deposit of an instrument of ratification of the present Convention shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of or accession to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 47.

1. After . . ., the present Convention shall be open to accession by any Member of the League of Nations and any non-member State which has not signed this Convention. Nevertheless, the deposit of an instrument of accession shall be conditional on the deposit by the same High Contracting Party of an instrument of ratification of or accession to the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to be deposited in the archives of the League; the Secretary-General shall notify their deposit to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in Article 46 and the first paragraph of the present Article.

Article 48.

1. Any High Contracting Party may declare, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, that, in accepting the present Convention, he is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates or oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted to him; the present Convention shall, in that case, not be applicable to the territories named in such declaration.

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. The Convention shall, in that case, apply to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

3. Any High Contracting Party may, at any time, declare that he desires the present Convention to cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, oversea territories, territories under his suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been entrusted

to him. The Convention shall, in that case, cease to apply to the territories named in such declaration one year after the receipt of this declaration by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

4. The Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in Articles 46 and 47 the declarations and notifications received in virtue of the present Article.

Article 49.

The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day following the receipt by the Secretary-General of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration. Nevertheless, its entry into force shall be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Article 50.

Each ratification or accession taking place after the deposit of the . . . instrument of ratification or accession shall take effect on the ninetieth day following the date on which the instrument of ratification or accession is received by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Article 51.

A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by a notification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notification shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all the other High Contracting Parties and, if it is supported by at least a third of those Parties, the High Contracting Parties undertake to hold a conference for the revision of the Convention.

Article 52.

1. The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 46 and 47. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

2. Denunciation of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism shall *ipso facto* involve denunciation of the present Convention.

Article 53.

A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 48, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva, ... , in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States represented at the Conference.

ANNEX 4.

Conf.R.T.27.

Geneva, November 10th, 1937.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM.

TEXTS SUBMITTED TO THE CONFERENCE BY THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE.

Title.

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

Preamble.

. . . . . .

Being desirous of making more effective the prevention and punishment of terrorism of an international character;

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries :

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions :

Article 1.

1. The High Contracting Parties, reaffirming the principle of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities

directed against another State and to prevent the acts in which such activities take shape, undertake as hereinafter provided to prevent and punish activities of this nature and to collaborate for this purpose.

2. In the present Convention, the expression " acts of terrorism " means criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons, or a group of persons or the general public.

Article 2.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall, if this has not already been done, make the following acts committed on his own territory criminal offences if they are directed against another High Contracting Party and if they constitute acts of terrorism within the meaning of Article 1 :

(1) Any wilful act causing death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to :

(a) Heads of States, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;

(b) The wives or husbands of the above-mentioned persons;

(c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity;

(2) Wilful destruction of or damage to public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party;

(3) Any wilful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public;

(4) Any attempt to commit an offence falling within the foregoing provisions of the present article;

(5) The manufacture, obtaining, possession or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with a view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article.

Article 3.

Each of the High Contracting Parties shall make the following acts criminal offences when they are committed on his own territory with a view to an act of terrorism falling within Article 2 and directed against another High Contracting Party, whatever the country in which the act of terrorism is to be carried out :

(1) Conspiracy to commit any such act;

(2) Any incitement to any such act if successful;

(3) Direct public incitement to any act mentioned under heads (1), (2) or (3) of Article 2, whether the incitement be successful or not;

(4) Wilful participation in any such act;

(5) Assistance knowingly given towards the commission of any such act.

Article 3bis.

Each of the offences mentioned in Article 3 shall be treated by the law as a distinct offence in all cases where this is necessary in order to prevent an offender escaping punishment.

Article 4.

Subject to any special provisions of national law for the protection of the persons mentioned under head (1) of Article 2, or of the property mentioned under head (2) of Article 2, each High Contracting Party shall provide the same punishment for the acts set out in Articles 2 and 3, whether they be directed against that or another High Contracting Party.

Article 5.

(No change.)

Article 6.

(No change.)

Article 6bis.

A High Contracting Party shall not derive from the provisions of Articles 5 and 6 of the present Convention any right to ask another High Contracting Party to adopt in a particular case an attitude which the High Contracting Party himself could not under his own law adopt in a corresponding case.

Article 7.

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. (No change.)

4. The obligation to grant extradition under the present article shall be subject to any conditions and limitations recognised by the law or the practice of the country to which application is made.

Article 8.

(No change.)

Article 9.

(No change.)

Article 10.

(No change.)

Article 11.

Each High Contracting Party shall take on his own territory and within the limits of his own law and administrative organisation the measures which he considers appropriate for the effective prevention of all activities contrary to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article 12.

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of head (5) of Article 2, the carrying, possession and distribution of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, and of ammunition shall be subjected to regulation. It shall be a punishable offence to transfer, sell or distribute such arms or munitions to any person who does not hold such licence or make such declaration as may be required by domestic legislation concerning the possession and carrying of such articles; this shall apply also to the transfer, sale or distribution of explosives.

2. Manufacturers of fire-arms, other than smooth-bore sporting-guns, should be required to mark each arm with a serial number or other distinctive mark permitting it to be identified; both manufacturers and retailers shall be obliged to keep a register of the names and addresses of purchasers.

Article 13.

1. . . . *(a)* (No change.)

(b) (No change.)

(c) (No change.)

(d) Wilfullyu sing any such documents which are forged or falsified or were made out for a person other than the bearer.

2. (No change in English text.)

3. (No change.)

Article 14.

1. Results of the investigation of offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 13 shall in each country, subject to the provisions of its law, be centralised in an appropriate service.

2. (No change.)

3. It shall furthermore bring together all information calculated to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 and (where there may be a connection between the offence and preparations for an act of terrorism) in Article 13; it shall as far as possible keep in close contact with the judicial authorities of the country.

Article 15.

(No change in English text.)

Article 16.

1. The High Contracting Parties shall be bound to execute letters of request in accordance with their domestic law and practice.

2. The transmission of letters of request relating to offences referred to in the present Convention should be effected :

(a) By direct communication between the judicial authorities;

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries;

(c) By direct correspondence between the authority of the country making the request and the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made;

(d) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made; this representative shall send the letters of request, either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the competent judicial authority or to the authority indicated by the Government of the country to which the request is made and shall receive the papers constituting the execution of the letters of request from this authority either directly or through the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. In cases *(a)* and *(d)*, a copy of the letters of request shall always be sent simultaneously to the Minister of Justice of the country to which application is made.

4. (No change.)

5. (No change.)

6. (No change.)

7. (No change.)

8. (No change.)

Article 17.

(No change.)

Article 18.

The present Convention does not affect the principle that, subject to the acts in question not being allowed to escape punishment owing to gaps in the law, the characterisation of the various offences dealt with in the present Convention, the imposition of sentences, the methods of prosecution and trial, and the rules regarding mitigating circumstances, pardon and amnesty are determined in each country by the provisions of domestic law.

Article 19.

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. The above provisions of the present article shall not prevent High Contracting Parties, if they are Members of the League of Nations, from bringing the dispute before the Council or the Assembly of the League if the Covenant gives them the power to do so.

Article 20.

(Insert the date of May 31st, 1938.)

Article 21.

(Insert the date of June 1st, 1938.)

Article 22.

1. (Printed text of the article with the substitution of " three years " for " two years ".)

2. In the event of any objection being received, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall inform the Government which desired to make the reservation and request it to inform him whether it is prepared to ratify or accede without the reservation or whether it prefers to abstain from ratification or accession.

Article 23.

Ratification of or accession to the present Convention by any High Contracting Party implies an assurance by him that his legislation and his administrative organisation enable him to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

Article 24.

1. (No change.)

2. Any High Contracting Party may subsequently notify the Secretary-General of the League of Nations that he desires the present Convention to apply to all or any of the territories in respect of which the declaration provided for in the preceding paragraph has been made. In making such notification, the High Contracting Party concerned may state that the application of the Convention to any of such territories shall be subject to any reservations which have been accepted in respect of that High Contracting Party under Article 22. The Convention shall then apply, with any such reservations, to all the territories named in such notification ninety days after the receipt thereof by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Should it be desired as regards any such territories to make reservations other than those already made under Article 22 by the High Contracting Party concerned, the procedure set out in that article shall be followed.

3. (No change.)

4. (No change.)

Article 25.

(Read " third " ratification . . .)

Article 26.

(Read " third " instrument . . .)

Article 27.

(No change.)

Article 28.

(No change.)

ANNEX 5.

Conf.R.T.28.

Geneva, November 12th, 1937.

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT.

TEXTS SUBMITTED TO THE CONFERENCE BY THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE.

Preamble.

. . . . . .

Being desirous, on the occasion of concluding the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, which bears to-day's date, of creating an International Criminal Court with a view to making progress in the struggle against offences of an international character;

Have appointed as their plenipotentiaries :

. . . . . .

Who, having communicated their full powers, which were found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions :

Article 1 (former Article 1).

(No change in English text.)

Article 2 (former Article 3).

1. (No change in English text except that " tribunal " is replaced by " courts ".)

2. A High Contracting Party shall further, in cases where he is able to grant extradition in accordance with Article 8 of the said Convention, be entitled to send the accused for trial before the Court if the State demanding extradition is also a party to the present Convention.

3. The High Contracting Parties recognise that other Parties discharge their obligations towards them under the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism by making use of the right given them by the present article.

Article 3 (former Article 2).

(No change.)

Article 4 (former Article 15).

(No change.)

Article 5 (former Article 4).

(No change.)

Article 6 (former Article 5).

(No change.)

Article 7 (former Article 6).

1. (No change in English text.)

2. The Permanent Court of International Justice shall be requested to choose the regular and deputy judges from the persons so nominated.

Article 8 (former Article 10, paragraph 2).

(No change.)

Article 9 (former Article 13).

(No change.)

Article 10 (former Article 7).

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. The order of retirement for the first period of ten years shall be determined by lot when the first election takes place.

4. (No change.)

5. (No change.)

6. (No change.)

Article 11 (former Article 11).

1. (No change.)

2. (No change.)

3. If a seat on the Court becomes vacant more than eight months before the date at which a new election to that seat would normally take place, the High Contracting Parties shall, within two months, nominate candidates for the seat in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1.

Article 12 (former Article 12).

A member of the Court cannot be dismissed unless in the unanimous opinion of all the other members, including both regular and deputy judges, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions.

Article 13 (former Article 8).

(No change.)

Article 14 (former Article 14, paragraph 1).

(No change.)

Article 15 (former Article 42).

(No change.)

Article 16 (former Article 14, paragraph 2).

(No change.)

Article 17 (former Article 41).

(No change.)

Article 18 (former Article 19, paragraph 1).

The number of members who shall sit to constitute the Court shall be five.

Article 19 (former Article 10, paragraph 1, and former Article 18).

1. No change, except for the substitution of the words " in trying " for the words " in settlement of ".

2. No change, except for the substitution of the word " try " for the word " hear ".

Article 20 (former Article 9 and Article 19, paragraph 2).

1. Deputy judges shall be called upon to sit in the order laid down in a list.

2. The list shall be prepared by the Court and shall have regard, first, to priority of appointment and, secondly, to age.

3. If the presence of five regular judges is not secured, the necessary number shall be made up by calling upon the deputy judges in their order on the list.

Article 21 (former Article 17).

(No change.)

Article 22 (former Article 20).

(No change.)

Article 23 (former Article 16).

A High Contracting Party who avails himself of the right to send an accused person for trial to the Court shall notify the President through the Registry.

Article 24 (former Article 21).

The President of the Court, on being informed by a High Contracting Party of his decision to send the accused persons for trial before the Court in accordance with Article 2, shall notify the State against which the offence was directed, the State on whose territory the offence was committed and the State of which the accused persons are nationals.

Article 25 (former Article 22).

1. The Court is seized so soon as a High Contracting Party has committed an accused person to it for trial.

2. The document committing an accused person to the Court for trial shall contain a statement of the principal charges against him and the allegations on which they are based, and shall name the agent by whom the State will be represented.

3. The State which committed the accused person to the Court shall conduct the prosecution unless the State against which the offence was directed or, failing that State, the State on whose territory the offence was committed expresses a wish to prosecute.

Article 26 (former Article 23).

1. Any State entitled to seize the Court may intervene, inspect the file, submit a statement of its case to the Court and take part in the oral proceedings.

2. Any person directly injured by the offence may, if authorised by the Court, and subject to any conditions which it may impose, constitute himself *partie civile* before the Court; such person shall not take part in the oral proceedings except when the Court is dealing with the damages.

Article 27 (former Article 34).

(No change in English text, except the substitution of the word " committed " for the words " sent for trial ".)

Article 28 (former Article 22, paragraph 4).

The Court shall not proceed further with the case and shall order the accused to be discharged if the prosecution is abandoned and not at once recommenced by a State entitled to prosecute.

Article 29 (former Article 29).

(No change.)

Article 30 (former Article 24).

(No change.)

Article 31 (former Article 26).

(No change.)

Article 32 (former Article 25).

The parties may submit to the Court the names of witnesses and experts, but the Court shall be free to decide whether they shall be summoned and heard. The Court may always, even of its own motion, hear other witnesses and experts. The same rules shall apply as regards any other kind of evidence.

Article 33 (former Article 27).

Any letters of request which the Court considers it necessary to have despatched shall be transmitted to the State competent to give effect thereto by the method prescribed by the regulations of the Court.

Article 34 (former Article 28).

No examination, no hearing of witnesses or experts and no confrontation may take place before the Court except in the presence of the counsel for the accused and of the representatives of the States which are taking part in the proceedings or after these representatives have been duly summoned.

Article 35 (former Article 30).

1. (No change.)

2. Nevertheless, the Court may, by a reasoned judgment, decide that the hearing shall take place *in camera*. Judgment shall always be pronounced at a public hearing.

Article 36 (former Article 31).

(No change.)

Article 37 (former Article 32).

(No change.)

Article 38 (former Article 33).

(No change.)

Article 39 (former Article 35).

1. The Court shall decide whether any object is to be confiscated or be restored to its owner.

2. The Court may sentence the persons committed to it to pay damages.

3. (No change.)

4. (No change.)

Article 40 (former Article 36).

1. Sentences involving loss of liberty shall be executed by a High Contracting Party chosen with his consent by the Court; such consent may not be refused by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court for trial. The sentence shall always be executed by the State which committed the convicted person to the Court if this State expresses the wish to do so.

2. (No change.)

Article 41 (former Article 37).

(No change.)

Article 42 (former Article 38).

(No change.)

Article 43 (former Article 39).

(No change.)

Article 44 (former Article 40).

1. (No change.)

2. There shall be created by contributions from the High Contracting Parties a common fund from which the costs of the proceedings and other expenses involved in the trial of cases, including any fees and expenses of counsel assigned to the accused by the Court, shall be defrayed, subject to recovery from the accused if he is convicted. The special allowance to the Registrar and the expenses of the Registry shall be met out of this fund.

Article 45 (former Article 43).

1. (No change.)

2. If a High Contracting Party, not being the Party who sent the case in question for trial to the Court, disputes the extent of the Court's jurisdiction in relation to the jurisdiction of his own national courts and does not see his way to appear in the proceedings in order that the question

may be decided by the International Criminal Court, the question shall be treated as arising between such High Contracting Party and the High Contracting Party who sent the case for trial to the Court, and shall be settled as provided in Article 48.

Article 46 (former Article 44).

1. The representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall meet with a view to taking all necessary decisions concerning :

(a) The constitution and administration of the common fund, the division among the High Contracting Parties of the sums considered necessary to create and maintain such fund and, in general, all questions bearing on the establishment and the working of the Court;

(b) The organisation of the meetings referred to below in paragraph 3.

2. At their first meeting, the representatives of the High Contracting Parties shall also decide what modifications are necessary in order to attain the objects of the present Convention.

3. The Registrar of the Court shall convene subsequent meetings in conformity with the rules established to that effect.

4. All questions of procedure that may arise at the meetings referred to in the present article shall be decided by a majority of two-thirds of the High Contracting Parties represented at the meeting.

Article 47 (new article).

1. Until the present Convention is in force between twelve High Contracting Parties, it shall be possible for a judge and a deputy judge to be both nationals of the same High Contracting Party.

2. Article 18 and Article 20, paragraph 1, shall not be applied in such a manner as to cause a judge and a deputy judge of the same nationality to sit simultaneously on the Court.

Article 48 (former Article 45).

(No change.)

Article 49 (former Article 46).

(No change, except for the addition of the date, May 31st, 1938.)

Article 50 (former Article 47).

(No change, except for the addition of the date, June 1st, 1938.)

Article 51 (new article).

Signature, ratification or accession to the present Convention may not be accompanied by any reservations except in regard to Article 26, paragraph 2.

Article 52 (former Article 48).

(No change.)

Article 53 (former Article 49).

1. The Government of the Netherlands is requested to convene a meeting of representatives of the States which ratify or accede to the present Convention. The meeting is to take place within one year after the receipt of the seventh instrument of ratification or accession by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and has for object to fix the date at which the present Convention shall be put into force. The decision shall be taken by a majority which must be a two-thirds majority and include not less than six votes. The meeting shall also take any decisions necessary for carrying out the provisions of Article 46.

2. The entry into force of the present Convention shall, however, be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

3. The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in accordance with Article 18 of the Covenant on the day fixed by the above-mentioned meeting.

Article 54 (former Article 50).

A ratification or accession by a State which has not taken part in the meeting mentioned in Article 53 shall take effect ninety days after its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, provided that the date at which it takes effect shall not be earlier than ninety days after the entry into force of the Convention.

Article 55 (former Article 52).

The present Convention may be denounced on behalf of any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Articles 49 and 50. Such denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and shall be operative only in respect of the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it was made.

Article 56 (former Article 53).

1. A case brought before the Court before the denunciation of the present Convention, or the making of a declaration as provided in Article 52, paragraph 3, shall nevertheless continue to be heard and judgment be given by the Court.

2. A High Contracting Party who before denouncing the present Convention has under the provisions thereof incurred the obligation of carrying out a sentence shall continue to be bound by such obligation.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Geneva . . ., in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations; a certified true copy thereof shall be transmitted to all the Members of the League of Nations and all the non-member States represented at the Conference.

Part III.

LIST OF REFERENCES TO PREPARATORY DOCUMENTS NOT REPRODUCED IN THE PRESENT VOLUME.

COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE.

Debate preceding the adoption by the Council, on December 10th, 1934, of the resolution setting up the Committee of Experts.	Council Minutes, eighty-third session (*Official Journal*, 15th Year, No. 12, Part II), pages 1694, 1712-28, 1730-38, 1739-60.
Suggestions presented to the Council by the French Government as the bases for the conclusion of an international agreement with a view to the suppression of crime committed for purposes of political terrorism.	*Idem*, pages 1839-40 (these suggestions are also reproduced as an annex to document C.184.M.102. 1935.V).

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS.

First Report, adopted on May 8th, 1935.	C.184.M.102.1935.V.
Appendix I : Texts adopted by the Committee.	
Appendix II : International Criminal Court : Provisions proposed by the Belgian, French, Roumanian and Spanish members of the Committee.	
Second Report, adopted on January 15th, 1936.	A.7.1936.V.
Appendix I : Draft Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.	
Appendix II : Draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.	

ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE, 1936.

Discussions in the First Committee.	*Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 156, pages 28-33, 34-62, 72.
Report of the First Committee and resolution adopted by the Assembly on October 10th, 1936.	*Idem*, pages 84-85.

OBSERVATIONS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENTS.

I. *Observations submitted to the Committee of Experts at its sessions held in* 1935 *and* 1936.

Argentine Republic	A.7.1936.V, page 13.
Austria	C.184.M.102.1935, page 11.
China	C.184.M.102.1935, page 12.
Cuba	C.184.M.102.1935, page 12.
Denmark	C.184.M.102.1935, page 13.
Egypt	A.7.1936.V, page 13.
Estonia	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 13.
Guatemala	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 13.
Hungary	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 13.
India.	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 13.
Latvia	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 14.
Netherlands	A.7.1936.V, page 14.
Roumania	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 14.
Turkey	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 21.
United States of America	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 13.
Yugoslavia	C.184.M.102.1935.V, page 21.

II. *Observations submitted to the Assembly in* 1936.

Australia	A.24.1936.V, page 1.
Austria	A.24.1936.V, page 1.
Belgium	A.24.1936.V, page 2.
Bolivia	A.24.1936.V, page 3.
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	A.24.1936.V, page 4.

China	A.24*(b)*.1936.V, page 1.
Czechoslovakia	A.24*(b)*.1936.V, page 2.
Estonia	A.24.1936.V, page 5.
Finland	A.24.1936.V, page 5.
Hungary	A.24.1936.V, page 5.
India	A.24.1936.V, page 8.
Latvia	A.24.1936.V, page 8.
Netherlands	A.24.1936.V, page 10.
Norway	A.24.1936.V, page 9.
Poland	A.24*(a)*.1936.V, page 1.
Roumania	A.24*(a)*.1936.V, page 3.
Siam	A.24.1936.V, page 12.
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	A.24.1936.V, page 12.
Venezuela	A.24.1936.V, page 12.

INDEX

ABBREVIATIONS

Art.	=	Article
Int.	=	International
Conf.	=	Conference
Conv. C.C.	=	Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court
Conv. P.P.T.	=	Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism
Cttee.	=	Committee
Del.	=	Delegation

Note.

Unless otherwise stated, the numbers of the articles given in the index are those of the final text. The corresponding numbers of the draft articles are given in brackets under the headings " Convention, etc.".

Abandon of prosecution, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 28. — Page

Accused persons
- Committal for trial, *see that title*
- Custody during trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 31
- Defence of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 29
- Documents communicated to, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 30
- Trial for offences other than those for which they have been committed, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 27

Ackermann, Charles
- Delegate of the Dominican Republic..... 40

Addor, Alfred
- Substitute delegate of Haiti 40

Afghanistan
- Delegation 39
- Signature of the Final Act..... 36, 174

Agent by whom State committing accused for trial shall be represented, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 25

Albania
- Delegation 39
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act 16, 36, 174

American Institute of Int. law
- Political offences defined by 66-7

Ammunition, *see* Fire-arms, etc.

Amnesty, right of, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19

Archives of the Criminal Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 17

Argentine Republic
- *See also* Ruíz Guiñazú, E.
- Delegation 39
- Observations submitted by..... 205
- Penal legislation 64-5
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act..... 16, 36, 174

Arms, *see* Fire-arms, etc.

Assembly of the League
- 1st Cttee. of, 1936: discussion of principle by 58-9
- Documents of, preparatory to the Conf..... 205
- Resolution, Oct. 10, 1936, *re* preparation of convs. 57, 183

Assistance towards commission of acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3

Asztalos, Eugène
- Delegate of Hungary 40

Attempts to commit acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 2

Australia
- Observations submitted by..... 205

Austria
- Observations submitted by 205

Bachke, Halvard Huitfeldt
- Delegate of Norway 41
- Attitude of Norway 54
- Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3 149
  - Arts. 5, 6, 7 ..... 94, 98
  - Arts. 8, 9, 10 103
  - Art. 19..... 156
- Credentials 161
- Declaration on signature of instruments of Conf. 175

Balkan Entente
- Attitude towards work of the Conf... 178, 179-80

Barreto, José-Maria
- Delegate of Peru 41

Basdevant, Jules
- Delegate of France..... 40
- Attitude of France 57-60
- Closing speech 180-1
- Conv. C.C., Art. 2 ..... 119, 120
  - Art. 7 124
  - Art. 27 ..... 136, 137-8
  - Art. 53 145
- Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 78
  - Art. 3..... 89, 90
  - Arts. 5, 6, 7 96-7
  - Arts. 8, 9, 10 ..... 101, 105
  - Art. 19 115
  - Art. 20 130
  - Art. 23 132
- Vice-President of the Conf. 34, 43, 50

Bekerman, Lucien
- Delegate of Poland 41
- Conv. C.C., Art. 27 138
  - Art. 42 140
- Conv P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 71, 75, 80, 81, 82
  - Art. 2 ..... 83, 85
  - Art. 3 88
  - Arts. 5, 6, 7 ..... 94, 96, 98
  - Arts. 8, 9, 10 ..... 100, 104
  - Art. 13 ..... 85, 109
  - Art. 14 111
  - Art. 17 113
  - Art. 18*bis* (Polish Proposal)... 158
- Observations submitted by 205

Belgium
- *See also* Carton de Wiart, Count, Sasserath, S.
- Amendments to the Conv. P.P.T.
  - Art. 1 ..... 71, 75-7
  - Art. 2 ..... 83, 84
- Delegation 39
- Legislation *re* political offences..... 60
- Observations submitted by..... 205
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act 16, 32, 36, 174

Page

Bolivia
Observations submitted by 205

Brass, L. S.
Delegate of the United Kingdom 39

Bray, Sir Denys
Delegate of India 41
Attitude of India 55
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 77
Art. 13 173
Letter from, *re* his absence from the Conf... 173

Brazil
Observer at the Conf. 42, 52

Brincard, M.
Secretary to the del. of France 40

Britain, Great, and Northern Ireland, United Kingdom of
See also Williams, Sir John Fischer
Amendments and proposals *re* Conv. P.P.T.
Art. 4 93
Art. 23 131
Art. 25 ..... 133, 160
Declaration *re* the Conv. P.P.T., and Conv. C. C. 174-5
Delegation 39
Observations submitted by 205
Signature of the Final Act..... 36, 174

Bulgaria
See also Momtchiloff, N.
Amendment to Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19 157
Delegation 39
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act 16, 32, 36, 174

Bureau of the Conference 43, 52

Bustamente Code 60

Caracas Convention, 1911..... 60

Carton de Wiart, Count
Delegate of Belgium 39
Correspondence with, *re* his absence from the Conf. 145-6, 173
Opening speech 49-50
President of the Conf. 34, 43

Cassagnau, Gaston
Adviser to the del. of France 40
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3 88

Charges against person other than person committed for trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 27

Chatelain, Y.
Delegate of Haiti 40
Attitude towards draft convs. 56
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 75

Cherif, Cipriano Rivas, *see* de Rivas Cherif

China
Observations submitted by 205, 206

Colonies, Protectorates, Mandated Territories, etc.
Application of Conventions to, *see under conv. concerned*

Coming into force of Conventions, *see under Convention concerned*

Committal of accused for trial by the Int. Criminal Court
Conditions for, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 2
Documents for, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 25
Notification of President, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 23
Notification of States concerned, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 24

Committee of Experts for Int. Repression of Terrorism
Constitution and work of 49, 55, 56, 60, 178, 183 *(resol.)*
Drafts drawn up by, *see under conv. concerned*
1st Report, May 8th, 1935, reference..... 205
2nd Report, Jan. 15th, 1936, reference 205
3rd Report, April 26th, 1937, text..... 185-204

Page

Complicity, acts of, constituting separate offences, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 4

Conference on the Repression of Terrorism
Bureau, members 43, 52
Close of 175
Convocation, facts leading to and Council resolution 49-50, 183-4
Delegations, *see that title*
Participation of Int. Criminal Police Commission 69, 117
Preparatory documents, list of 205-6
Printing of records 173-4
Procedure, rules of ..... 51, 184-5 *(text)*
Rapporteur, *see* Pella, V. V.
Secretary-General, *see* Podesta Costa, L. A.
Vice-Presidents, *see* Basdevant, J. *and* Ruíz Guiñazú, E.

Confiscation of objects, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39

Conspiracy to commit acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3

Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court
Accessions
for Colonies, protectorates, etc., *see below,* Art. 52
Date of taking effect, *see below,* Art. 54
General conditions and deposit, *see below,* Art. 50
Adoption 172
Application conditional on reciprocity in respect of Conv. P.P.T. 55, 61
See also below, Art. 53
Article 1
Discussion..... 118, 162
Texts
Draft 118, 191
Final 19
Article 2 (former art. 3)
Discussion..... 117-18, 119-23
Texts
Draft 119, 191
Final 19
Prepared by Drafting Cttee..... 162, 200
Article 3 (former art. 2)
Discussion..... 118-19, 162
Texts
Draft 119, 191
Final 19
Article 4 (former art. 15)
Discussion..... 126, 162
Texts
Draft 126, 192
Final 19
Article 5 (former art. 4)
Discussion..... 123, 163
Texts
Draft 123, 191
Final 19
Article 6 (former art. 5)
Discussion..... 123, 163
Texts
Draft 123, 191
Final 19
Article 7 (former art. 6)
Discussion..... 123-5, 163
Texts
Draft 123, 191
Final 21
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 163, 200
Article 8 (former art. 10, para. 2)
Discussion..... 125, 163
Texts
Draft 125, 192
Final 21
Article 9 (former art. 13)
Discussion..... 125-6, 163
Texts
Draft 125, 192
Final 21
Article 10 (former art. 7)
Discussion..... 125, 163
Texts
Draft 125, 192
Final 21
Prepared by Drafting Cttee..... 163, 200
Article 11 (former art. 11)
Discussion..... 125-6, 163

Page

Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court *(Contd.)*
Article 11 (former art. 11) *(Contd.)*
Texts
Draft 125, 192
Final 21
Prepared by the Drafting Cttee... 163, 200
Article 12 (former art. 12)
Discussion..... 125-6, 164
Texts
Draft 125, 192
Final 21
Prepared by Drafting Cttee..... 164, 201
Article 13 (former art. 8)
Discussion..... 125, 164
Texts
Draft..... 125, 192
Final 21
Article 14 (former art. 14, para. 1)
Discussion..... 126, 164
Texts
Draft 126, 192
Final 21
Article 15 (former art. 42)
Discussion..... 143, 164
Texts
Draft 143, 194
Final 21
Article 16 (former art. 14, para. 2)
Discussion..... 126, 164
Texts
Draft 126, 192
Final 21
Article 17 (former art. 41)
Discussion..... 143, 164
Texts
Draft 143, 194
Final 23
Article 18 (former art. 19, para. 1)
Discussion..... 126, 164
Texts
Draft 126, 192
Final 23
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 164, 201
Article 19 (former art. 10, para. 1 and art. 18)
Discussion..... 125, 126, 164
Texts
Draft..... 125, 126, 192
Final 23
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 201
Article 20 (former art. 9 and art. 19, para. 2)
Discussion..... 125, 126, 164
Texts
Draft 125, 126, 192
Final 23
Prepared by the Drafting Cttee.... 164, 201
Article 21 (former art. 17)
Discussion..... 126, 165
Texts 171-2
Draft 126, 192
Final 23
Article 22 (former art. 20)
Discussion..... 126, 165
Texts
Draft 126, 193
Final 23
Article 23 (former art. 16)
Discussion..... 126, 165
Texts
Draft 126, 192
Final 23
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 165, 201
Article 24 (former art. 21)
Discussion..... 126-7, 165
Texts
Draft 126, 193
Final 23
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 165, 201
Article 25 (former art. 22)
Discussion..... 127, 134
Texts
Draft 127, 193
Final 23
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 165, 201
Article 26 (former art. 23)
Discussion..... 127, 166
Reservations to, *see below*, Art. 51
Texts
Draft 127, 193
Final 23
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 166, 201

Page

Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court *(Contd.)*
Article 27 (former art. 34)
Discussion..... 135-8, 166
Texts
Draft 135, 194
Final 25
Prepared by the Drafting Cttee. 166
Article 28 (former art. 22, para. 4)
Discussion..... 127, 166
Texts
Draft 127, 193
Final 25
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 166, 202
Article 29 (former art. 29)
Discussion..... 134, 166
Texts
Draft 134, 193
Final 25
Article 30 (former art. 24)
Discussion..... 127, 166
Texts
Draft 127, 193
Final 25
Article 31 (former art. 26)
Discussion..... 134, 166
Texts
Draft 134, 193
Final 25
Article 32 (former art. 25)
Discussion..... 127, 167
Texts
Draft 127, 193
Final 25
Prepared by the Drafting Cttee. . 167, 202
Article 33 (former art. 27)
Discussion..... 134, 167
Texts
Draft 134, 193
Final 25
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 167, 202
Article 34 (former art. 28)
Discussion..... 134, 167
Texts
Draft 134, 193
Final 25
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 167, 202
Article 35 (former art. 30)
Discussion..... 135, 167
Texts
Draft 135, 193
Final 25
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 167, 202
Article 36 (former art. 31)
Discussion..... 135, 167
Texts
Draft 135, 193
Final 25
Article 37 (former art. 32)
Discussion..... 135, 167
Texts
Draft 135, 194
Final 25
Article 38 (former art. 33)
Discussion..... 135, 167
Texts
Draft 135, 194
Final 25
Article 39 (former art. 35)
Discussion..... 138-9, 167-8
Texts
Draft 138, 194
Final 27
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 167, 202
Article 40 (former art. 36)
Discussion..... 139, 168, 172
Texts
Draft 139, 194
Final 27
Prepared by the Drafting Cttee. . 168, 202
Article 41 (former art. 37)
Discussion..... 140, 168
Texts
Draft 140, 194
Final 27
Article 42 (former art. 38)
Discussion..... 140-2, 168-9
Texts
Draft 140, 194
Final 27

Page

Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court *(Contd.)*
Article 43 (former art. 39)
Discussion 142, 169
Texts
Draft 142, 194
Final 27
Article 44 (former art. 40)
Discussion 65, 142-3, 169
Texts
Draft 142, 194
Final 27
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 169, 202
Article 45 (former art. 43)
Discussion 143, 169
Texts
Draft 143, 194
Final 27
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. ... 169, 202-3
Article 46 (former art. 44)
Discussion 65, 124, 143, 169-70
Texts
Draft 143, 195
Final 29
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. .. 169-70, 203
Article 47 (new art.)
Discussion 170
Text
Final 29
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 170, 203
Article 48 (former art. 45)
Discussion 144, 145, 170
Texts
Draft 144, 195
Final 29
Article 49 (former art. 46)
Discussion 144, 145, 170
Texts
Draft 144, 195
Final 29
Article 50 (former art. 47)
Discussion 144, 145, 170
Texts
Draft 144, 195
Final 29
Article 51 (new art.)
Discussion 170
Texts
Final 31
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 170, 203
Article 52 (former art. 48)
Discussion 144, 145, 170
Texts
Draft 144, 195-6
Final 31
Article 53 (former art. 49)
Discussion 144, 145, 171
Texts
Draft 144, 196
Final 31
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 171, 203
Article 54 (former art. 50)
Discussion 144, 145, 171
Texts
Draft 144, 196
Final 31
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 171, 203
Article 55 (former art. 52)
Discussion 144-5, 171
Texts
Draft 144, 196
Final 31
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 171, 203
Article 56 (former art. 53)
Discussion 145, 171
Texts
Draft 145, 196
Final 31
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 171, 204
Colonies, protectorates, mandated territories, etc., application to, *see above*, Art. 52
Coming into force, *see above*, Art. 53
Date, *see above*, Art. 49
Denunciation
for Colonies, etc., *see above*, Art. 52
General conditions, *see above*, Art. 55
Procedure for case brought before Court before denunciation, *see above*, Art. 56
Disputes arising out of, *see above*, Art. 48

Page

Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court *(Contd.)*
Draft prepared by Cttee. for Int. Repression of Terrorism at its 3rd Session
Article 51
Referred to Drafting Cttee. 144, 145
Text 144, 196
for other articles of this draft, see corresponding articles above
Discussion, general 52-69, 117-18
Examination at a 1st Reading 118-145
Text 191-6
Draft prepared by Drafting Cttee.
Examination at a 2nd Reading 161-72
Text 200-4
Extension of provisions to other int. offences 65
Observations of Governments 49-50
Preamble 19, 162, 200
Ratifications
for Colonies, etc., *see above*, Art. 52
Date of taking effect, *see above*, Art. 54
Deposit, *see above*, Art. 49
Registration, *see above*, Art. 53
Reservations, *see above*, Art. 51
Revision, *see above*, Draft prepared by Cttee., etc., Art. 51.
Signature
for Colonies, protectorates, etc., *see above*, Art. 52
Date and regulations, *see above*, Art. 49
List of signatures 32
Signature in Conf., and declarations... 174-5
Texts
Draft, *see that title above*
Final 19-31
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 200-4
Title 161

Convention, Model, drawn up by the Penitentiary Commission, 1931 60

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism
Accessions
for Colonies, protectorates, etc., *see below*, Art. 25
Date of taking effect, *see below*, Art. 27
General conditions and deposit of instruments, *see below*, Art. 22
Legislation, etc. of State in relation to, *see below*, Art. 24
Adoption 161
Application conditional on reciprocity in respect of Conv. C.C. 55, 61
See also Conv. C.C., Art. 53
Article 1
Discussion 61, 71-83, 108, 147-8
Texts
Draft 71, 186
Final 5
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. . 147-8, 196-7
Article 2
Discussion 55, 58, 60, 73, 83-6, 71-2, 148, 149
Texts
Draft 83, 187
Final 5
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 149, 197
Article 3 (former art. 3, para. 1)
Discussion 55, 58, 71-2, 73, 87-93 148, 149-50
Texts
Draft 87, 187
Final 5, 7
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 149, 197
Article 4 (former art. 3, para. 2)
Discussion 92-3, 150
Texts
Draft 87, 187
Final 7
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 150, 197
Article 5 (former art. 4)
Discussion 93-8, 150
Texts
Draft 93, 187
Final 7
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 150, 197
Article 6 (former art. 5)
Discussion 93-8, 150
Texts
Draft 93, 187
Final 7

Page

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism *(Contd.)*
Article 7 (former art. 6)
Discussion 93-8, 150
Texts
Draft 93, 187
Final 7
Article 8 (former art. 7)
Discussion 54, 62, 63, 99-106, 122, 151-2
Texts
Draft 99, 187
Final 7
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. ... 151-2, 197
Article 9 (former art. 8)
Discussion 54, 99-106, 152
Texts
Draft 99, 188
Final 9
Article 10 (former art. 9)
Discussion 54, 58, 99-106, 152
Texts
Draft 99, 188
Final 9
Article 11 (former art. 10)
Discussion 106, 148, 152
Texts
Draft 106, 188
Final 9
Article 12 (former art. 11)
Discussion 73, 107-8, 152-3
Texts
Draft 107, 188
Final 9
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 152, 198
Article 13 (former art. 12)
Discussion 55, 71-2, 84, 108-9, 153, 173
Texts
Draft 108-9, 188
Final 9
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 153, 198
Article 14 (former art. 13)
Discussion 55, 71-2, 110-11, 154
Texts
Draft 110, 188
Final 9, 11
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 154, 198
Article 15 (former art. 14)
Discussion 112, 154
Texts
Draft 112, 188-9
Final 11
Prepared by the Drafting Cttee. . 154, 198
Article 16 (former art. 15)
Discussion 62, 112, 154
Texts
Draft 112, 189
Final 11
Article 17 (former art. 16)
Discussion 112-14, 154-5
Texts
Draft 112-13, 189
Final 11
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. . 154-5, 198-9
Article 18 (former art. 17)
Discussion 114, 155
Texts
Draft 114, 189
Final 13
Article 19 (former art. 18)
Discussion 114-16, 155-9
Texts
Draft 114, 189
Final 11
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 155, 199
Article 20 (former art. 19)
Discussion 127-30, 159
Reservation of U.S.S.R. 129, 159
Texts
Draft 127, 189-90
Final 13
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 159, 199
Article 21 (former art. 20)
Discussion 130, 159
Texts
Draft 130, 190
Final 13
Article 22 (former art. 21)
Discussion 130, 159
Texts
Draft 130, 190
Final 13

Page

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism *(Contd.)*
Article 23 (former art. 22)
Discussion 130-132, 159
Texts
Draft 130-1, 190
Final 13
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 159, 199
Article 24 (former art. 23)
Discussion 132, 159-60
Texts
Draft 132, 190
Final 15
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 159, 199
Article 25 (former art. 24)
Discussion 132-3, 160
Texts
Draft 132, 190
Final 15
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 160, 199
Article 26 (former art. 25)
Discussion 133-4, 160
Texts
Draft 133, 190
Final 15
Article 27 (former art. 26)
Discussion 133-4, 160
Texts
Draft 133, 191
Final 15
Article 28 (former art. 27)
Discussion 133-4, 160
Texts
Draft 133, 191
Final 15
Article 29 (former art. 28)
Discussion 133-4, 160
Texts
Draft 133, 191
Final 15
Colonies, protectorates, etc., application to, *see above*, Art. 25
Coming into force, *see above*, Art. 26
Date of, *see above*, Art. 26
Declaration of Polish del. 161
Denunciation
for Colonies, etc., *see above*, Art. 25
General conditions, *see above*, Art. 29
Disputes arising out of, *see above*, Art. 20
Draft prepared by Cttee. for Int. Repression of Terrorism at first two sessions, art. 1 ..... 71 *(note)*
Draft prepared by Cttee. for Int. Repression of Terrorism at 3rd session
Discussion, general 52-69
Examination at a 1st Reading 70-116, 127-134
Text 186-91
Draft prepared by Drafting Cttee.
Examination at a 2nd Reading 146-161
Text 196-9
Observations of governments 49-50
Preamble
Discussion and proposals 72, 73, 82, 147
Texts
Final 5
Prepared by Drafting Cttee. 147, 196
Ratifications
for Colonies, etc., *see above*, Art. 25
Date of taking effect, *see above*, Art. 27
Deposit of, *see above*, Art. 21
Legislation, etc. of State in relation to, *see above*, Art. 24
Registration, *see above*, Art. 26
Reservations
for Colonies, etc., *see above*, Art. 25
General conditions, *see above*, Art. 23
Revision of, *see above*, Art. 28
Signature
for Colonies, etc., *see above*, Art. 25
General conditions for, *see above*, Art. 21
List of signatures 16-17
Signature in Conf., and declarations.. 174-5
Texts
Draft, *see that title above*
Final 5-15
Title of the Conv. 70, 146-7

Convicted persons, property of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39

Convictions
Previous, int. recognition, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 6
Revision of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 43

Page

Council of the League
Disputes arising out of Conv. P.P.T. submitted to, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 20
Documents of, preparatory to the Conf..... 205
Judges of the Int. Criminal Court to be appointed by, proposal 123-5, 174-5
Resolution, Dec. 10th, 1934, inaugurating work of the Cttee. of Experts 56, 183
Resolution, May 27th, 1937, convoking the Conf. on Terrorism 183-4

Counterfeit Currency
Extension of Conv. C.C. to..... 65

Court of Arbitration constituted in accordance with Convention of The Hague, Oct. 1907
Disputes arising out of Convs. referred to, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 48 *and* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 20

Court of International Justice, Permanent
Analogy between the proposed Int. Criminal Court and 53, 68, 124
Choice of judges of the Int. Criminal Court by, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 7
Declaration *re* non-recourse to, by the U.S.S.R..... 172-3
Disputes arising out of application of Conventions submitted to, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 20 *and* Conv. C.C., Art. 48
Registrar : duties in connection with the Int. Criminal Court
List, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 17, 23 *and* 46
Special allowance for, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 44
to act as Registry of the Int. Criminal Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 16 *and* 44

Credentials of Delegates
Constitution of Cttee. and reports 50, 51-2, 161, 174

Crimes, *see* Offences

Criminal Court, International
Analogy between the Perm. Court of Int. Justice and 53, 68, 124
Archives of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 17
Constitution, numbers for, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 6 *and* 18
Convention on the creation of, *see* Convention, etc.
Decisions, majority for, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 37
Deputy-judges
to be called upon if presence of five judges is not secured, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 20
Nationality, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 6 *and* 47
Number of which the court consists, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 6
Diplomatic privileges for members of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 9
Establishment of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 1
Finances of, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 44 *and* 46
Functions, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 1
Judgments of
in Case brought up before denunciation of Conv. C.C., *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 56
to be Considered at private sitting, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 36
to be Pronounced at a public hearing, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 35 *and* 38
Reasons therefore to be stated, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 38
Revision, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 43
Judges
Choice of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 7
Deputy judges, *see above*
Dismissal, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 12
Nationality, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 6 *and* 47
Nomination, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 7 *and* 11
Number, of which Court consists, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 6
Number to sit to constitute the Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 18 *and* 20
Participation in case on which they have previously been engaged, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 19
Qualifications, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 5
Replacing a judge whose term has not expired, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 13

Page

Criminal Court, International *(Contd.)*
Judges *(Contd.)*
Resignation, *see* Conv. C.C. Art. 11
Salaries, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 44
Term of office, retirement and re-appointment, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 10
Undertaking to be given by, *see* Conv., Art. 8
Vacancies, filling of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 11
Jurisdiction, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 45
Meetings of representatives of Contracting Parties to take decisions *re* working of Conv. C.C., *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 46
Notification of committal for trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 23
Orders of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 38
a Permanent body, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 3
Powers to pass judgments *in contumaciam* 135-8
President, election, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 14
Proceedings, *see that title*
Publicity of hearings, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 35
Reference of cases to, to be optional... 59, 63, 68
Registrar of Court of Int. Justice, duties in connection with the Int. Criminal Court, *see under* Court of Int. Justice
Registry of, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 16 *and* 44
Regulations for practice and procedure, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 15 *and* 46
Relations with the League..... 123-4
Right of States to commit accused for trial to, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 2
Seat of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 4
Seized when accused person is committed for trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 25
Sentences pronounced by
of Death, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 41
Execution of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39
involving Loss of Liberty, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 40
Revision of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 43
Sitting of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 3
Substantive criminal law to be applied by
Case where no sitting judge is a national of State whose law is being applied, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 22
Determination, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 21
Trial by, for offences other than those for which accused has been committed, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 27
Vice-President, election, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 14

Criminal jurisdiction in relation to international law, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 18

Criminal law
Substantive criminal law to be applied by Int. Criminal Court, *see under* Int. Criminal Court

Criminal Law, Int. Office for Unification of
Conferences of, 1935 ..... 54, 55
Definition of terrorism by 54

Criminal offences, acts to be considered as, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 2 *and* 3

Cuba
Observations submitted by 205

Custody of accused during trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 31

Czechoslovakia
see also Koukal, A.
Amendments to
Conv. C.C., Art. 2..... 119
Art. 7..... 123
Art. 19..... 125
Art. 42..... 140
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1..... 80-1, 82, 108, 119, 148
Art. 2..... 83, 84
Art. 7..... 123
Art. 8..... 125, 163
Art. 12..... 107
Delegation 39
Observations submitted by 206
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C. and Final Act..... 17, 32, 37, 174

Page

Damages, payment of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39

Death sentence, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 40

Decisions of Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 37

Default, judgment by 135-8

Defence of accused persons, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 29

Delaquis, Ernest
- Delegate of Switzerland 42
- Attitude of Switzerland 61
- Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 79
- Art. 3 ..... 91, 150
- Art. 4 89
- Arts. 5, 6 96
- Arts. 8, 9, 10 101
- Art. 14 110
- Preamble 147
- Credentials, member of Cttee. on 50
- Declaration *re* signature of instruments of Conf. by Switzerland 175

Delegations to the Conference
- Credentials : constitution of Cttee., and reports 50, 51-2, 161, 174
- Members 39-43

Denmark
- *See also* Schlegel, C. O. E.
- Delegation 40
- Observations submitted by 205
- Signature of the Final Act 36, 174

Denunciation of Conventions, *see under conv. concerned*

Diplomatic privileges for members of the Criminal Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 9

Disputes arising out of interpretation or application of Conventions, *see under Conv. concerned*

Documents committing an accused person for trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 25

Domestic law
- Prosecution and punishment of offences in conformity with, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19

Dominican Republic
- Delegation 40
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act 16, 36, 194

Drafting Committee
- Appointment 116

Ecuador
- Delegation 40
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act 16, 36, 174

Egypt
- *See also* Shamsy Pasha, Aly El
- Amendment to Conv. P.P.T., Art. 17 155
- Delegation 40
- Observations submitted by 205
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act 16, 36, 174

Encouragement of terrorist acts, obligation of States to refrain from 72, 74

Estonia
- Delegation 40
- Observations submitted by 205, 206
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act 16, 36, 174

Evidence, hearing of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 32

Experts, hearing of, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 32 *and* 34

Page

Extradition
- Attitude of the United Kingdom 53, 101
- " Belgian clause " in treaties *re* 60, 100
- Case where State can refer accused to Criminal Court instead of extraditing, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 2
- Definition 63
- Discussion 55, 56, 57, 58, 62, 69, 99-106
- of Nationals : punishment of offence by States which do not admit principle, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 9 *and* 11
- Offences to be considered as extradition crimes, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 8
- for Political offences, discussion of principle 66, 99-106
- Rules drawn up by the Institut de Droit int. 66
- Treaties in force 60

Fabela, Isidoro
- Delegate of Mexico 41

Feldmans, Jules
- Delegate of Latvia 41

File of case submitted to the Int. Criminal Court
- Communication to accused, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 30
- Inspection by States, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26

Final Act of the Conference
- Examination and adoption 172-3
- Signature 36, 174
- Text 35

Fines, payment of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 40

Finland
- *See also* Nyyssönen, J.
- Delegation 40
- Observations submitted by 206
- Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

Fire-arms, ammunition and explosives
- Export regulations in the United Kingdom .. 53
- Manufacture, possession, etc., *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 2 *and* 13

Foreigners, punishment of, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 10

France
- *See also* Basdevant, J., Cassagnau, G.
- Delegation 40
- Extradition legislation 60
- Proposal for Int. collaboration against Terrorism 57, 60
- Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act 16, 32, 37, 174

Garda, Enrico
- Delegate of San Marino 42
- Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 74

Gastelú, Alejandro
- Delegate of Ecuador 40

Gavrilovitch, Stoyau
- Legal Adviser to the del. of Yugoslavia ... 42
- Work accomplished by the Conf. 175-6

Germany
- Extradition legislation 60

Givanovitch, Dr. Thomas
- Delegate of Yugoslavia 42
- Conv. C.C., Art. 2 120
- Art. 17 172
- Art. 21 126
- Art. 25 134
- Art. 27 136
- Art. 34 134
- Art. 39 139
- Art. 41 140
- Art. 42 ..... 141, 142
- Art. 44 143
- Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 71-2, 77, 79, 80, 82, 148
- Art. 2 86
- Art. 3 ..... 88, 89, 91
- Art. 4 93

Page

Givanovitch, Dr. Thomas *(Contd.)*
Conv. P.P.T., *(Contd.)* Arts. 5, 6, 7 95-6
Arts. 8, 9, 10 100
Art. 15 154
Art. 19 .....115, 116, 157
Art. 20 129
Preamble 147
Title of Conv... 70, 146, 147
Definition of " Terrorism " and " Terrorist " 54-5
Work achieved by the Conf. 175

Greece
See also Polychroniadis, S.
Amendments to
Conv. C.C., Art. 35 167
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 72, 74, 108, 148
Delegation 40
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C. and Final Act 16, 32, 37, 174

Guani, Alberto
Delegate of Uruguay..... 42
Absence from meetings..... 56
Attitude of Uruguay 146
Welcome to 108

Guatemala
Observations submitted by 205

Haïdar Khan, Mohammed
Delegate of Afghanistan..... 39

Haiti
See also Chatelain, Y.
Delegation 40

van Hamel, J. A.
Delegate of the Netherlands..... 41
Attitude of the Netherlands 55
Conv. C.C., Art. 2..... 121, 122, 123
Art. 7..... 123, 125
Art. 21 ..... 171, 172
Art. 40..... 139
Art. 42 ..... 140, 141, 142
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 73, 77, 79, 82
Arts. 8, 9, 10..... 102, 104
Art. 12..... 73, 107
Art. 17 113
Art. 19 116
Art. 20 129
Declaration of U.S.S.R. to be attached to signature of instruments of the Conf.... 172
Member of the Bureau..... 43, 52
Work accomplished by the Conf..... 178

Hiorthöy, Finn
Adviser-Expert : delegation of Norway..... 41
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3 88
Art. 6 96

Hirschfeld, Eugène
Delegate of the U.S.S.R. 42
Attitude of U.S.S.R. 61
Conv. C.C., Art.27 138
Art. 42 168
Art. 43 142
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 75, 79, 80, 148
Art. 3 88
Arts. 5, 6, 7 94
Arts. 8, 9, 10 ..... 100, 105
Art. 12 107
Art. 15 112
Art. 17 114
Art. 19 ..... 114, 116, 151
Art. 20 *(reservation)* 129
Art. 23 132
Title of Conv..... 70, 146, 147
Credentials of delegates 52
Declaration of U.S.S.R. to be attached to signature of instruments of the Conf. 172, 173, 175
Member of the Bureau 43, 52
Procedure of the Conf. 51

Page

Hungary
See also Sebestyén, P.
Amendments to
Conv. C.C., Art. 24 165
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 11 106
Art. 19 156
Delegation 40
Observations submitted by 205, 206
Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

Hurtado Marti, Victor
Substitute delegate of Spain 42

Incitement to commit acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3

India
See also Bray, Sir Denys
Amendment to Conv. P.T.T., Art. 13.... 109, 153
Delegation 41
Observations submitted by 205, 206
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act..... 16, 37

Inequality in the matter of obligations
Draft art. 151, 197

Institut de Droit international
Rules *re* extradition drawn up by..... 66

" International character " of acts of terrorism 58, 61, 65-6, 71, 78, 80, 81-2, 148

International Criminal Police Commission,
Participation in work of Conf. 69, 117

International Law
Criminal jurisdiction in relation to, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 18

Intervention in proceedings by States, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26

Jiménez de Asua, Luis
Delegate of Spain 42
Attitude of Spain 63
Conv. C.C., Art. 42 140
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 76, 78, 80
Art. 2 ..... 84, 86
Art. 3 90
Art. 12 84

Judges of the International Criminal Court, *see under* Criminal Court, Int.

Judgment of the International Criminal Court, *see under* Criminal Court, International

Judicial authorities
Collaboration with services centralising results of investigation of offences, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 15

Kader Khan, Abdul
Secretary to the del. of Afghanistan..... 39

Kôdar, Johannes
Delegate of Estonia 40
Credentials, member of Cttee. on 50

Komarnicki, Tytus
Delegate of Poland 41
Attitude of Poland 56-7
Conv. P.T.T., 2nd reading of the draft : attitude of del. 146
Member of the Bureau 43, 52
Work accomplished by the Conf. 179

Koukal, Antonín
Delegate of Czechoslovakia 39
Attitude of Czechoslovakia 60
Conv. C.C., Art.2 ..... 118, 119
Art. 27 136
Art. 40 139
Art. 42 140
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 78, 79, 80
Art. 2 84
Art. 3 87

Page

Koukal, Antonín *(Contd.)*
Conv. P.P.T., *(Contd.)* Art. 4 ..... 92, 93
Arts. 8, 9, 10 100
Art. 12 107
Art. 19 114
Title of Conv. 70
Member of the Bureau 43, 52
Work accomplished by the Conf. 177-8

Kulski, Wladyslaw
Delegate of Poland 41
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 20 ..... 128, 129

Latvia
Delegation 41
Observations submitted by 205, 206
Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

Letters of request
See also Conv. C.C., Art. 33 *and* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 17
Discussion 55, 62

Lithuania
Delegation 41
Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

Luarassi, Thomas
Delegate of Albania 39

Meetings of representatives of Contracting Parties to take decisions *re* working of Conv. C.C., *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 46

Mentes, Vasfi
Delegate of Turkey 42
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 76

Mexico
See also Fabela, I.
Delegation 41

Militch, Milenko
Secretary to del. of Yugoslavia 42

Mitigating circumstances, rules as to determined by domestic law, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19

Momtchiloff, Nicolas
Delegate of Bulgaria 39
Conv. C.C., Art. 2 119
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19 157

Monaco
Delegation 41
Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

Montevideo Convention 60

Nationals
Nationals taking refuge in own country after committing offence abroad, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 9
State of which accused is a national, notification, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 24

Netherlands
See also van Hamel, J. A.
Amendments to
Conv. C.C., Art. 21 171
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 8 99-105
Art. 16 112
Art. 17 113
Delegation 41
Observations submitted by 205, 206
Proposal that application of Conv. P.P.T., be conditional on reciprocity in respect of Conv. C.C. 55, 61
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C. and Final Act 16, 32, 37, 174

Non-intervention of States in affairs of other States
Proposal that principle be stated in Preamble 72-3

Norway
See also Bachke, H. H., Hiorthöy, F.
Amendment to Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3 ..... 88, 149

Page

Norway *(Contd.)*
Delegation 41
Observations submitted by 206
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., and Final Act 16, 37, 174, 175 *(declaration)*

Notification of decision to commit an accused person for trial, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 23

Nyyssönen, Johannes
Delegate of Finland 40
Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 8, 9, 10 103
Art. 12 107

Oath to be taken by Judges, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 8

Obligations of States
Inequality in the matter of (draft art.) ... 151, 197
to Other States under the Conv. P.P.T., Polish proposal 158-9
to Prevent and punish acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 1 *and* 12

Observations submitted by Governments 205

Offences
to be considered as Criminal, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 2 *and* 3
to be treated as Distinct offence when necessary, to prevent escaping punishment, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 4
Distinction between offences committed against High Contracting Party itself, or against another state, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 5
Extradition crimes, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 8
Person directly injured by, participation in proceedings, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26
Political
Definition 66-7
Extradition for, principle 66, 99-106
State against which offence was directed, notification, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 24
committed in Territory of High Contracting Party against whom they are directed, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 11

de Oliveira, G. Olintó
Observer from Brazil 42

Orkus, Mehmet Ali
Adviser to the del. of Turkey 42

Ortega-Martinez, José-Maria
Delegate of Venezuela 42

Outrages
Clause relating to inserted in various extradition convs. 66

Pardon, right of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 42 *and* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19

Parra-Pérez, C.
Delegate of Venezuela 42
Attitude of Venezuela 64
Conv. P.P.T., title of Conv. 70, 147
Credentials, member of Cttee. and report 50, 51-2, 161
Declaration of U.S.S.R. to be attached to signature of Instruments of Conf. 172

Participation in acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3

" Parties civiles "
Foreign, rights of, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 7
Persons directly injured by offence may constitute, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26
Statement of, communication to the accused, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 30

Passports, fraudulent manufacture, alteration, etc., *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 14

Pella, Vespasien V.
Delegate of Roumania 41
Attitude of Roumania 65-9

Page

Pella, Vespasien V. *(Contd.)*
Committal of persons for trial 117, 118
See also below, Conv. C.C., Art. 2
Conv. C.C., Art. 1 162
Art. 2 ..... 120, 121, 122, 123, 162
Art. 4 162
Art. 6 123
Art. 7 ..... 123, 124, 163
Art. 8 163
Art. 10 ..... 125, 163
Art. 11 163
Art. 12 164
Art. 17 172
Art. 18 164
Art. 19 ..... 125, 165
Art. 20 164
Art. 21 126
Art. 24 ..... 127, 165
Art. 25 ..... 127, 134, 165
Art. 26 166
Art. 27 ..... 135, 136, 138, 166
Art. 28 166
Arts. 32, 33, 34 167
Art. 35 ..... 134, 135, 167
Arts. 39, 40 ..... 139, 168
Art. 41 140
Art. 42 ..... 141, 168
Art. 43 142
Art. 44 169
Art. 45 143
Art. 46 ..... 143, 170
Art. 47 170
Art. 51 ..... 145, 170
Arts. 53, 56 171
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 72, 73, 74, 75, 76-7, 78, 79, 80, 108, 148
Art. 2 ..... 83, 84, 85, 86, 148, 149
Art. 3 ..... 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 148, 149, 150
Art. 4 ..... 92-3, 150
Art. 5 ..... 94-5, 96, 98, 150
Arts. 6, 7 ..... 94-5, 96, 98
Arts. 8, 9 ..... 99, 100, 103, 104, 105, 152
Art. 10 ..... 99, 100, 103, 104, 105, 148, 152
Art. 11 106
Art. 12 ..... 107, 108, 152, 153
Art. 13 ..... 84, 85, 109, 153
Art. 14 ..... 110, 111, 154
Art. 15 ..... 112, 154
Art. 17 ..... 113, 114, 155
Art. 18*bis* (Polish proposal) ... 158
Art. 19 .. 114, 115, 155, 156, 157, 159
Art. 20 ..... 129, 130
Art. 23 ..... 131-2, 159
Art. 24 159
Art. 25 160
Arts. 26, 27, 28, 29 133
Preamble 147
Title of Conv. 70, 146, 147
Definitions of terrorism, political crimes, etc. 66-9
Rapporteur of the Conf. ... 34, 43, 51 *(elected)*

Persons against whom offences committed constitute acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 2

Peru
Delegation 41
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T. and Final Act 17, 37, 174

Piracy
Extension of Conv. C.C. to 65

Podesta Costa, L. A.
Secretary-General of the Conf. 34, 43, 51
Reservations, provisions in regard to ... 131, 132

Poland
See also Bekerman, L., Komarnicki, T., Kulski, W.
Amendments to
Conv. C.C., Art. 42 140
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ..... 71, 81-2, 108, 148
Art. 3 87
Arts. 5, 6, 7 ..... 93, 94
Arts. 8, 9, 10 99
Art. 18*bis* (new article proposed) 158-9
Art. 20 128

Page

Poland *(Contd.)*
Declaration concerning Conv. P.P.T. 161
Delegation 41
Observations submitted by 200
Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

Police authorities
Collaboration with services centralising information *re* offences under Arts. 2, 3 *and* 14, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 15
Reports by, discussion 55

Political offences
Definition 66-7
Extradition for, principle 66, 99-106

Polychroniadis, S.
Delegate of Greece 40
Committal of persons for trial: acceptance by injured states 117, 118
Conv. C.C., Art. 2 117
Art. 27 ..... 135, 137
Art. 35 135
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 72
Art. 5 ..... 98, 150
Arts. 6, 7 98
Art. 12 ..... 152, 153
Art. 18*bis* (Polish proposal) ... 158
Statement on behalf of the Balkan *Entente re* work accomplished by the Conf. 178

Preparatory acts, to acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3

Preparatory documents, list of 205-6

President of the Conference, *see* Carton de Wiart, Count

Prevention of terrorism
Obligation of States to take measures for, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 1 *and* 12

Procedure, rules of ..... 51, 184-5 *(text)*

Proceedings of Criminal Court
Costs, recovery of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39
Participation of persons directly injured by the offence, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26
Participation of States, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26

Property
of Convicted persons, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39
Damage to which constitutes acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 2

Prosecution
Abandon, case of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 28
Conducting of, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 25
Methods determined by provisions of domestic law, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19

Public
Acts calculated to endanger lives of, to constitute acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 2

Public opinion
Freedom, in the United Kingdom 53

" Public order ", definition 79, 80

Punishment
for Acts set out in Arts. 2 *and* 3, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 5
of Foreigners, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 10
Obligation of States to punish acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1

" Purpose " of acts of terrorism 73

Raisin, Xavier-John
Delegate of Monaco 41

Register of purchasers of fire-arms, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 13

Registration of Conventions, *see under conv. concerned*

Page

Restitution of property, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 39

Revision of conventions, *see under conv. concerned*

Revision of judgments of the Criminal Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 43

de Rivas Cherif, Cipriano
Full powers to sign instruments of Conf. for Spain ... 174

Rogatory Commissions, *see* Letters of Request

Roumania
See also Pella, V. V.
Amendment to Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ... 108, 148
Delegation ... 41
Observations submitted by ... 205, 206
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act

Ruíz Guiñazú, Enrique
Delegate of the Argentine Republic ... 39
Penal legislation in Argentine ... 64-5
Vice-President of the Conf. ... 34, 43, 50
Work achieved by the Conf. ... 177

San Marino
See also Garda, E.
Delegation ... 42

Sasserath, Simon
Delegate of Belgium ... 39
Attitude of Belgium ... 61-2
Conv. C. C., Art. 27 ... 135-6, 137, 138
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ... 71, 75, 76, 77, 80
Art. 2 ... 83, 84, 86
Art. 3 ... 87, 90
Arts. 5, 6, 7 ... 97-8
Arts. 8, 9, 10 ... 102
Arts. 13, 14 ... 85
Art. 19 ... 116
Work accomplished by the Conf. ... 176

van Schelven, C. M. E.
Secretary of the Netherlands ... 41

Schlegel, Carl Otto Emil
Delegate of Denmark ... 40
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 3 ... 91

Sebestyén, Paul
Delegate of Hungary ... 40
Attitude of Hungary ... 55-6
Conv. C.C., Art. 2 ... 119, 121
Art. 7 ... 123
Art. 20 ... 164
Arts. 24, 25 ... 127, 165
Art. 27 ... 137
Art. 40 ... 139
Art. 43 ... 142
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ... 72-3, 74, 75, 81-2
Art. 3 ... 91, 149
Arts. 8, 9, 10 ... 102, 103
Art. 11 ... 106, 152
Art. 19 ... 115, 156, 157
Art. 20 ... 128
Art. 23 ... 131
Art. 26 ... 160
Declaration of U.S.S.R. to be attached to signature of Instruments of Conf. ... 172

Sentences
in Case of offences committed in territory of High Contracting Parties against whom they were directed, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 11
Imposition of, determined by provisions of domestic law, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 19
Pronounced by the Int. Criminal Court, *see* under Criminal Court

Separate offences, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Art. 4

Services to centralise information to facilitate prevention and punishment of acts of terrorism, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 15 *and* 16

Page

Shamsy Pacha, Aly El
Delegate of Egypt ... 40
Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 8, 9, 10 ... 103
Art. 14 ... 110
Art. 17 ... 155

Siam
Observations submitted by ... 206

Silianoff, Evguèni
Substitute-delegate of Bulgaria ... 39

Skirpa, Kazys
Delegate of Lithuania ... 41

Solnar, Vladimír
Expert on delegation of Czechoslovakia ... 39

Sovereignty of States
Provisions of Conv. C.C. not to infringe ... 63, 68

Spain
See also Jiménez de Asua, L.
Delegation ... 42, 174
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act ... 16, 32, 36, 174

Statement of case by States, submission to Court, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 26

Stoykovitch, Slavko
Delegate of Yugoslavia ... 42
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ... 74, 81
Arts. 8, 9, 10 ... 104
Art. 19 ... 116

Sweden
Extradition legislation ... 60

Switzerland
See also Delaquis, E.
Declaration *re* signature of Conv. P.P.T., and Conv. C.C. ... 175
Delegation ... 42
Extradition legislation ... 60, 61
Signature of the Final Act ... 37, 174

Talaat Bey, Abdel Latif
Delegate of Egypt ... 40

Tello, Manuel
Substitute delegate of Mexico ... 41

Territory on which offence was committed, notification of State, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 24

Terrorism
Definition ... 54-5, 63, 65-7
See also Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1
Distinction between political and non-political terrorism ... 100, 101
Legislation in various states and int. convs. 60
Prevention and punishment, obligation of states, *see* Conv. P.P.T., Arts. 1 *and* 12

Terrorist
Definition ... 55

Trujillo, Alejandro E.
Delegate of Venezuela ... 42

Turkey
See also Mentes, V.
Amendment to Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ... 108, 148
Delegation ... 42
Observations submitted by ... 205
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act ... 17, 33, 37, 174

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
See also Hirschfeld, E.
Amendments to
Conv. C.C., Art. 42 ... 140
Art. 43 ... 142
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 ... 148
Art. 10 ... 99
Arts. 12, 13, 14 ... 107, 110
Art. 15 ... 112

Page

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *(Contd.)*
Amendments to *(Contd.)*
Conv. P.P.T., *(Contd.)*
Art. 17 113
Art. 19 ..... 114, 155
Declaration to be attached to signature of instruments of the Conf. 172, 175
Delegation 42
Observations submitted by 206
Reservation to Art. 20 of Conv. P.P.T. 129
Signature of the Final Act 37, 174

United Kingdom, *see* Britain, Great, etc.

United States of America
Observations submitted by 205

Uruguay
See also Guani, A.
Delegation 42, 56

Venezuela
See also Parra-Pérez, C.
Delegation 42
Observations submitted by 206
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., and Final Act 17, 37, 174

Williams, Sir John Fischer
Delegate of the United Kingdom 39
Conv. C.C., Art. 2 ..... 120, 121
Art. 7 ..... 123-4, 125
Art. 10 125
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 75
Art. 2 84
Art. 3 ..... 88, 90, 91
Art. 4 93
Arts. 8, 9, 10 ..... 101, 105
Arts. 11, 12 111
Art. 13 ..... 109, 111
Art. 14 111
Art. 19*bis* (Polish proposal) ... 158

Page

Williams, Sir John Fischer *(Contd.)*
Conv. P.P.T. *(Contd.)*
Art. 19 ..... 115, 116, 156, 157
Art. 20 128-9
Art. 23 ..... 131, 132
Art. 25 133
Declaration *re* the Conv. P.P.T., and Conv. C.C. 174-5
Legislation in the United Kingdom, and attitude of the Government 52-4
Member of the Bureau 43, 52
Member of the Drafting Cttee. 116
Work accomplished by the Conf. 178

Witnesses, hearing of, *see* Conv. C.C., Arts. 32 *and* 34

Withdrawal of charge, *see* Conv. C.C., Art. 28

Women and children, traffic in
Extension of Conv. C.C. to 65

Worsaae, Carl Gustave
Delegate of Denmark 40

Yugoslavia
See also Gavrilovitch, S.;
Givanovitch, T.;
Stoykovitch, S.
Amendments and observations
Conv. C.C., Art. 42 141
Conv. P.P.T., Art. 1 .... 71-2, 77-80, 108, 148
Arts. 2, 3, 13 71-2
Art. 14 ..... 71-2, 110
Art. 15 154
Preamble 147
Delegation 42
Observations submitted by 205
Signature of the Conv. P.P.T., Conv. C.C., and Final Act 17, 33, 37, 174

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]
[Also distributed as Special Supplement No. 181 to the *Official Journal.*]

Official No.: **A. 6 (a).** 1938. Annex I. V.

Geneva, September 1st, 1938.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Annex to the Report[1] on the Work of the League for the Year 1937/3

to the Nineteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS AND CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NINETEENTH LIST

Note by the Secretary-General.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the report adopted by the Council of the League of Nations during its forty-third session on December 6th, 1926, the Secretary-General has the honour to submit herewith to the Members of the Council a list, in chronological order, of the international agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League. The list shows the States which have become parties to these agreements by ratification or accession or definitive signature, the States which have signed but have not yet ratified them, and, finally, the States which have neither signed nor acceded, although they took part in the conferences at which the agreements were drawn up or have been invited to become parties thereto.

According to the decision taken by the Council at its forty-ninth session on March 6th, 1928, the present list contains in addition the reservations affixed or declarations formulated either in signing or in ratifying or in acceding to the agreements which have been concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The International Labour Conventions have been grouped at the end of this document.

---

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) Protection of Racial, Religious and Linguistic Minorities:

1. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Austria, of September 10th, 1919.
2. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Bulgaria, of November 27th, 1919.
3. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Hungary, of June 4th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 187).
4. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey, of July 24th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 11).
5. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Poland, of June 28th, 1919.
6. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Czechoslovakia, of September 10th, 1919.
7. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, of September 10th, 1919.
8. Treaty between the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and Roumania, of December 9th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 335).
9. Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, of May 15th, 1922.
10. Declaration by Albania, of October 2nd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 173).
11. Declaration by Finland as to the Aaland Islands, of June 27th, 1921.
12. Declaration by Latvia, of July 7th, 1923.
13. Convention between Bulgaria and Greece respecting Reciprocal Emigration, Neuilly-sur-Seine, November 27th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. I, p. 67).
14. Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, of January 30th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXII, p. 75).

(*b*) Traffic in Liquor: Convention relating to the Liquor Traffic in Africa, St.-Germain-en-Laye, September 10th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 11).

(*c*) Aerial Navigation: Convention relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation, Paris, October 13th, 1919 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XI, p. 173).

3674 — S.d.N. 1.710 (F.) 1.440 (A.) 9/38. Imp. Kundig.

Series of League of Nations Publications
V. LEGAL
1938. V. 4.

N.B. — States which have signed, ratified or acceded to particular agreements or conventions since the date of the last list submitted to the Council and Assembly (document A.6(*a*).1937. Annex I. V, of August 31st, 1937) are indicated in italics.

The letter "*a*" placed immediately after a date signifies an accession.

The letter "*s*" placed immediately after a date signifies a definitive signature.

The ratifications or accessions given by India as from April 1st, 1937, do not render the instruments mentioned in the present list applicable to Burma.

(*d*) HEALTH:

1. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Roumania, Warsaw, December 20th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XVIII, p. 103).
2. Sanitary Convention between Poland and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Warsaw, February 17th, 1923.
3. Sanitary Convention between Germany and Poland, Dresden, December 18th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 301).
4. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Czechoslovakia, Warsaw, 1922.
5. Sanitary Convention between Poland and Latvia, Warsaw, July 7th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 317).
6. Sanitary Convention between Estonia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 25th, 1922.
7. Sanitary Convention between Latvia and the Federal Soviet Republic of Russia and Soviet Republics of Ukraine and of White Russia, Tartu, June 24th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 9).
8. Sanitary Convention between Bulgaria and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, April 1923.

(*e*) AALAND ISLANDS: Convention relating to the Non-Fortification and Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands, Geneva, October 20th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 211).

(*f*) UPPER SILESIA: Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, Geneva, May 15th, 1922.

(*g*) FINANCIAL RESTORATION OF AUSTRIA:

1. Protocol No. I (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
2. Protocol No. II and Annexes and Explanatory Note, Geneva, October 4th, 1922.
3. Protocol No. III (Declaration), Geneva, October 4th, 1922.

(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XII, pp. 385, 391 and 405.)

(*h*) SAAR: Protocol between the German Government and the Governing Commission of the Territory of the Saar Basin, Berlin, June 3rd, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. V, p. 189).

(*i*) DANZIG:

1. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).
2. Treaty between Germany and Poland concerning the Regulation of Option Questions, Danzig, November 8th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 323).
3. Treaty between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, Warsaw, October 24th, 1921 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXVI).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1924 (A.8(*a*).1924, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) MINORITIES:

1. Declaration concerning the Protection of Minorities in Lithuania, Geneva, May 12th, 1923.
2. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, signed at Paris, November 9th, 1920 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VI, p. 189).

(*b*) TRAFFIC IN ARMS: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva, September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*c*) REVISION OF BERLIN AND BRUSSELS ACTS RELATING TO AFRICAN TERRITORIES: Engagement undertaken by Ethiopia on signing the Protocol done at Geneva on September 27th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, p. 179).

(*d*) REFUGEES:

1. Arrangement with regard to the Issue of Certificates of Identity to Russian Refugees, Geneva, July 5th, 1922 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XIII, p. 237).
2. Protocol relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 29).
3. Declaration relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this Purpose of a Refugees Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29th, 1923 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XX, p. 41).

(*e*) FINANCIAL RECONSTRUCTION OF HUNGARY: Protocols on the Financial Reconstruction of Hungary, March 14th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXV, pp. 423 and 427).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1925 (A.7(*a*).1925, Annex contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES:

1. Proposal relating to the Protection of Greek Minorities in Bulgaria.
2. Proposal relating to the Protection of Bulgarian Minorities in Greece (Geneva, September 29th, 1924) (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 117 and 123).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) CURRENCY AND BANKING REFORM:

1. Protocol regarding Currency and Banking Reform in Estonia, signed at Geneva, December 10th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXII, p. 277).
2. Protocol regarding the Bulgarian Stabilisation Loan, signed at Geneva, March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 165).
3. Additional Act to the Protocol of March 10th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 210).
4. Protocol for the stabilisation of the currency and liquidating the budget arrears of the Hellenic State and for further settlement of Greek Refugees, signed at Geneva, September 15th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 9).
5. Declaration concerning the above Protocol on behalf of France, Great Britain and Italy, signed at Geneva, December 8th, 1927 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXX, p. 73).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

(*c*) REFUGEES:

1. Additional Act to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, relating to the Settlement of Greek Refugees. signed at Geneva, September 19th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 413).
2. Declaration relating to the modifications made to the Protocol of September 29th, 1923, with regard to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece, by the Additional Act of September 19th, 1924, Geneva, September 25th, 1924 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 421).
3. Protocol concerning the Settlement of Refugees in Bulgaria, signed at Geneva, September 8th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 245).
4. Arrangement relating to the issue of identity certificates to Russian and Armenian Refugees, supplementing and amending the previous Arrangements dated July 5th, 1922, and May 31st, 1924, signed at Geneva, May 12th, 1926 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 47).
5. Arrangement concerning the legal status of Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 53).
6. Arrangement concerning the extension to other categories of Refugees of certain measures taken to assist Russian and Armenian Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXIX, p. 63).
7. Agreement concerning the functions of the representatives of the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, signed at Geneva, June 30th, 1928 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 377).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1931 (A.6(*a*).1931, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) REFUGEES:

Convention between the Hellenic Government and the Refugee Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, January 24th, 1930 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CVIII, p. 349).

(*b*) CONCERTED ECONOMIC ACTION:

1. Commercial Convention and Protocol, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.
2. Protocol regarding the Programme of Future Negotiations, signed at Geneva, March 24th, 1930.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1933 (A.6(*a*).1933, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) ROUMANIA:

Agreement establishing technical advisory co-operation in Roumania, signed at Geneva, January 28th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 271).

(*b*) PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES:

Agreement between Colombia and Peru relating to the procedure for putting into effect the recommendations proposed by the Council of the League of Nations in the report which it adopted on March 18th, 1933, in order to avoid any incident that might aggravate the relations between the two countries, with Annexes, signed at Geneva, May 25th, 1933 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 251, and Vol. CLII, p. 314).

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for the year 1934 (A.6(*a*).1934, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

(*a*) AUSTRIA:

Austrian Protocol, signed at Geneva, July 15th, 1932 (*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 285; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 469; and Vol. CXLII, p. 392).

(*b*) ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS:

International Convention for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927.
Protocol of the above Convention, signed at Geneva, November 8th, 1927.
Supplementary Agreement to the Convention of November 8th, 1927, for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.
Protocol of the Supplementary Agreement, signed at Geneva, July 11th, 1928.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCVII, p. 391; Vol. C, p. 264; Vol. CVII, p. 538; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 411; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 447; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 336.)

The Annex to the Report on the Work of the League for the year 1935/1936 (A.6(*a*).1936. Annex I. (V)) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

Final Act of the Conference of Wheat Exporting and Importing Countries, with Appendices and Minutes of Final Meeting, open for signature at Geneva on August 25th, 1933.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLI, p. 91.)

Protocol concerning the Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva, September 14th, 1929.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXV, p. 353.)

The Annex to the Report on the Work of the League for the year 1936/1937 (A.6(*a*).1937. Annex I. (V)) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

The Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium-Smoking, signed at Bangkok, November 27th, 1931.
(*Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXVII, p. 373.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT.
Chapter XXXI.
Creation of an International Agricultural Mortgage Credit Company (Convention for the), with Charter and Statutes. Geneva, May 21st, 1931 92

ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.
Chapters VI and XVI.
Awards (Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral). Geneva, September 26th, 1927 53
Clauses (Protocol on Arbitration). Geneva, September 24th, 1923 28

ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR (SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN).
Chapter XI.
Gases (asphyxiating, poisonous and other), and Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 46
Ifni (Declaration regarding the Territory of). Geneva, June 17th, 1925. 46
Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War (Convention for the). Geneva, June 17th, 1925 45

ASSISTANCE (FINANCIAL).
Chapter XXV.
Assistance (Convention on Financial). Geneva, October 2nd, 1930 79

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES (UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON).
Chapters XXIV and XXIX.
Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930. 76
Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention for the Settlement of certain), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931. 87
Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 77
Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques (Convention on the), and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 88
Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, June 7th, 1930 75
Uniform Law for Cheques (Convention providing a), with Annexes and Protocol. Geneva, March 19th, 1931 84

BROADCASTING.
Chapter XLIII.
Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace (International Convention concerning the Use of). Geneva, September 23rd, 1936 113

COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY (SUPPRESSION OF).
Chapter XX.
Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency (International Convention for the). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 . 68
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, April 20th, 1929 69
Protocol (Optional). Geneva, April 20th, 1929 69

COURT (PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE).
Chapters I and XXII.
Accession of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (Protocol relating to the). Geneva, September 14th, 1929 70
Court (Protocol of Signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 9
Clause (Optional). Geneva, December 16th, 1920 10

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (AMENDMENTS TO THE).
Chapters IV, IX and XII.
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 22
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Third paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 23
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). First paragraph amended. Geneva, October 5th, 1921 . . 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. 24
Amendment to Article 26 (Protocol of an). Third and fourth paragraphs of Article 26 amended, replacing the original second paragraph. Geneva, October 5th, 1921. 25
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16. Geneva, September 27th, 1924 39
Amendment to Article 16 (Protocol of an). Second paragraph of the original text. Geneva, September 21st, 1925 49

CUSTOMS.
Chapter VII.
Simplification of Customs Formalities (International Convention relating to the), and Protocol. Geneva, November 3rd, 1923. 31

DANUBE (DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE).
Chapter XXVII.
Declaration by the Governments of the Powers which are Parties to the Convention instituting the Definitive Statute of the Danube. Geneva, December 5th, 1930 82

DISPUTES (PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XVIII.
General Act. Geneva, September 26th, 1928 58

Page

ELECTRIC (QUESTIONS).
Chapter VIII.
Electric Power (Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 36
Hydraulic Power affecting more than One State (Convention relating to the Development of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 37

EMIGRANTS (TRANSIT CARD FOR).
Chapter XXI.
Preparation of a Transit Card for Emigrants (Agreement concerning the). Geneva, June 14th, 1929 . . 70

EXPORTATION.
Chapter XVII.
Bones (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 56
Protocol to the International Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928. 57
Hides and Skins (International Agreement relating to the Exportation of). Geneva, July 11th, 1928 . 54
Protocol to the International Agreement. Geneva, July 11th, 1928 55

FILMS (OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER).
Chapter XXXV.
International Circulation of Films of an Educational Character (Convention for facilitating the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 101

HISTORY.
Chapter XLIV.
History (Declaration regarding the Teaching of) (Revision of School Text-Books). Geneva, October 2nd, 1937 114

LAW (PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XXIII.
Conflict of Nationality Laws (Convention on Certain Questions relating to the). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 71
Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality (Protocol relating to). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 72
Statelessness (Protocol relating to a Certain Case of). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 73
Statelessness (Special Protocol concerning). The Hague, April 12th, 1930 74

NAVIGATION (INLAND).
Chapters II, XIII and XXVIII.
Collisions in Inland Navigation (Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules concerning), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 83
Flag (Convention on Administrative Measures for attesting the Right of Inland Navigation Vessels to a), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 84
Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation (Convention regarding the), and Protocol of Signature. Paris, November 27th, 1925 49
Registration of Inland Navigation Vessels, Rights *in rem* over such Vessels and Other Cognate Questions (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, December 9th, 1930 83
Waterways of International Concern (Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 16
Waterways of International Concern (Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 17

NAVIGATION (MARITIME).
Chapters II, VIII, XXVI and XXXIX.
Buoyage (Agreement for a Uniform System of Maritime), and Rules annexed thereto. Geneva, May 13th, 1936. 109
Flag (Declaration recognising the right to a) of States having no Sea-coast. Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 19
Lightships (Manned) not on their Stations (Agreement concerning). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 81
Maritime Ports (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 34
Signals (Agreement concerning Maritime). Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930 80

OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS (TRAFFIC IN).
Chapters X, XXXII, XL and XLI.
Drugs (Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous). Geneva, June 26th, 1936. 110
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, June 26th, 1936 110
Narcotic Drugs (Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, July 13th, 1931 93
Protocol of Signature of the Convention. Geneva, July 13th, 1931 96
Narcotic Drugs (Procès-verbal to alter the latest date of issue of the annual statement of the estimated world requirements of dangerous drugs, drawn up by the Supervisory Body, as provided for by the International Convention of July 13th, 1931, for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of). Geneva, June 26th, 1936 111
Opium Convention (International). The Hague, January 23rd, 1912. 40
Opium (Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of Prepared), Protocol and Final Act. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 11th, 1925 42
Opium Convention (International). Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 42
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, February 19th, 1925 44

PUBLICATIONS (OBSCENE).
Chapter V.
Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications (International Convention for the). Geneva, September 12th, 1923 26

RAILWAYS.
Chapter VIII.
Railways (Convention and Statute on the International Regime of), and Protocol of Signature. Geneva, December 9th, 1923 32

RELIEF UNION (INTERNATIONAL).
Chapter XV.
Relief Union (Convention and Statute establishing an International). Geneva, July 12th 1927 52

Page

REFUGEES.
Chapters XXXVII, XLII and XLVI.
International Status of Refugees (Convention relating to the). Geneva, October 28th, 1933 104
Status of Refugees coming from Germany (Provisional Arrangement concerning the). Geneva, July 4th, 1936. 112
Status of Refugees coming from Germany (Convention concerning the). Geneva, February 10th, 1938 . 117

ROAD TRAFFIC.
Chapter XXX.
Signals (Convention concerning the Unification of Road). Geneva, March 30th, 1931 89
Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles (Convention on the), with Protocol-Annex. Geneva, March 30th, 1931 90
Triptychs (Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost). Geneva, March 28th, 1931. 91

SLAVERY.
Chapter XIV.
Slavery Convention. Geneva, September 25th, 1926 50

STATISTICS (ECONOMIC).
Chapter XIX.
Statistics (International Convention relating to Economic). Geneva, December 14th, 1928 65
Protocol of the International Convention. Geneva, December 14th, 1928 67

TERRORISM.
Chapter XLV.
Terrorism (Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of). Geneva, November 16th, 1937 115
Criminal Court (Convention for the Creation of an International). Geneva, November 16th, 1937 . . . 116

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.
Chapters III and XXXVI.
Traffic in Women and Children (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, September 30th, 1921 19
Traffic in Women of Full Age (International Convention for the Suppression of the). Geneva, October 11th, 1933 103

TRANSIT.
Chapter II.
Freedom of Transit (Convention and Statute on). Barcelona, April 20th, 1921 15

VETERINARY (QUESTIONS).
Chapter XXXVIII.
Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals (International Convention for the), with Declaration attached. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 106
Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products) (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 108
Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin (International Convention concerning the), with Annex. Geneva, February 20th, 1935 107

WAR (MEANS OF PREVENTING).
Chapter XXXIV.
Means of preventing War (General Convention to improve the). Geneva, September 26th, 1931 101

WHALING.
Chapter XXXIII.
Regulation of Whaling (Convention for the). Geneva, September 24th, 1931 99

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) adopted as Draft Conventions by the International Labour Conference at its various Sessions.
Chapter XLVII.
(*a*) First Session (Washington, October 29th-November 29th, 1919):
Age for admission of children to industrial employment (Convention fixing the minimum) 121
Employment of Women before and after childbirth (Convention concerning the) 120
Hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week (Convention limiting the) 119
Night (Convention concerning the employment of women during the) 120
Night Work of young persons employed in Industry (Convention concerning the) 121
Unemployment (Convention concerning) 119
(*b*) Second Session (Genoa, June 15th-July 10th, 1920):
Age for admission of children to employment at sea (Convention fixing the minimum) 122
Employment for seamen (Convention for establishing facilities for finding) 123
Unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship (Convention concerning) 122
(*c*) Third Session (Geneva, October 25th-November 19th, 1921):
Age for admission of children to employment in agriculture (Convention concerning the) 123
Age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers and stokers (Convention fixing the minimum) 126
Association and combination of agricultural workers (Convention concerning the rights of) 124
Compensation in agriculture (Convention concerning workmen's) 124
Medical Examination of children and young persons employed at sea (Convention concerning the compulsory) 126
Weekly rest in Industrial Undertakings (Convention concerning the application of the) 125
White Lead in painting (Convention concerning the use of) 125
(*d*) Seventh Session (Geneva, May 19th-June 10th, 1925):
Accidents (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for) 127
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational) 127
Equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents (Convention concerning) 128
Night work in Bakeries (Convention concerning) 128

Page

LABOUR CONVENTIONS (INTERNATIONAL) *(continued)*.

(*e*) Eighth Session (Geneva, May 26th-June 5th, 1926):
Simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship (Convention concerning the) 128

(*f*) Ninth Session (Geneva, June 7th-24th, 1926):
Articles of Agreement (Convention concerning Seamen's) 129
Repatriation of seamen (Convention concerning the) 129

(*g*) Tenth Session (Geneva, May 25th-June 16th, 1927):
Sickness insurance for agricultural workers (Convention concerning) 130
Sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants (Convention concerning) 130

(*h*) Eleventh Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 16th, 1928):
Minimum-wage-fixing machinery (Convention concerning the creation of) 130

(*i*) Twelfth Session (Geneva, May 30th-June 21st, 1929):
Heavy Packages transported by vessels (Convention concerning the marking of the weight on) . . 131
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the) 131

(*j*) Fourteenth Session (Geneva, June 10th-28th, 1930):
Forced or compulsory labour (Convention concerning). 132
Hours of work in commerce and offices (Convention concerning the regulation of) 133

(*k*) Fifteenth Session (Geneva, May 28th-June 18th, 1931):
Hours of work in coal-mines (Convention limiting) 133

(*l*) Sixteenth Session (Geneva, April 12th-30th, 1932):
Age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (Convention concerning the) 134
Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (Convention concerning the). Revised 1932 133

(*m*) Seventeenth Session (Geneva, June 8th-30th, 1933):
Agencies (Convention concerning fee-charging employment) 134
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity). 134
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory invalidity) 135
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 134
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory old-age) 134
Insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans'). 135
Insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings (Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans') 135

(*n*) Eighteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-23rd, 1934):
Automatic sheet-glass works (Convention for the regulation of hours of work in) 136
Diseases (Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational). Revised 1934 . . . 135
Night (Convention concerning employment of women during the). Revised 1934 135
Unemployed (Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily) 136

(*o*) Nineteenth Session (Geneva, June 4th-25th, 1935):
Hours of work to forty a week (Convention concerning the reduction of) 137
Hours of work in coal mines (Convention limiting). Revised 1935 136
Hours of work in glass-bottle works (Convention concerning the reduction of) 137
Employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (Convention concerning the) . . 136
Scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance (Convention concerning the establishment of an international) 137

(*p*) Twentieth Session (Geneva, June 4th-24th, 1936):
Holidays with pay (Convention concerning annual) 137
Reduction of hours of work on public works (Convention concerning the) 137
Regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers (Convention concerning the) 137

(*q*) Twenty-first Session (Geneva, October 6th-24th, 1936):
Professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant ships (Convention concerning the minimum requirement of). 138
Holidays with pay for seamen (Convention concerning annual). 138
Liability of the shipowner in case of sickness, injury or death of seamen (Convention concerning the) 138
Sickness insurance for seamen (Convention concerning) 138
Hours of work on board ship and manning (Convention concerning) 138

(*r*) Twenty-second Session (Geneva, October 22nd-24th, 1936):
Age for admission of children to employment at sea (Convention fixing the minimum). Revised 1936 138

(*s*) Twenty-third Session (Geneva, June 3rd-23rd, 1937):
Age for admission of children to industrial employment (Convention fixing the minimum). Revised 1937 139
Age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (Convention concerning the). Revised 1937 139
Hours of work in the textile industry (Convention concerning the reduction of) 139
Safety provisions in the building industry (Convention concerning). 139

(*t*) Twenty-fourth Session (Geneva, June 2nd-22nd, 1938):
Statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture (Convention concerning) 139

I. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

1. Protocol of Signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice.[1]

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members or States which may sign the Protocol*
Union of South Africa (August 4th, 1921)	United States of America	Afghanistan
Albania (July 13th, 1921)	Argentine Republic	Sa'udi Arabia
Australia (August 4th, 1921)	Costa Rica	Egypt
Belgium (August 29th, 1921)	Guatemala	Ecuador
Bolivia (July 7th, 1936)	Liberia	Honduras
Brazil (November 1st, 1921)	Nicaragua	Iraq
British Empire (August 4th, 1921)	Turkey	Mexico
Bulgaria (August 12th, 1921)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Canada (August 4th, 1921)		
Chile (July 20th, 1928)		
China (May 13th, 1922)		
Colombia (January 6th, 1932)		
Cuba (January 12th, 1922)		
Czechoslovakia (September 2nd, 1921)		
Denmark (June 13th, 1921)		
Dominican Republic (February 4th, 1933)		
Estonia (May 2nd, 1923)		
Ethiopia (July 16th, 1926)		
Finland (April 6th, 1922)		
France (August 7th, 1921)		
Germany (March 11th, 1927)		
Greece (October 3rd, 1921)		
Haiti (September 7th, 1921)		
Hungary (November 20th, 1925)		
India (August 4th, 1921)		
Iran (April 25th, 1931)		
Ireland		
Italy (June 20th, 1921)		
Japan, (November 16th, 1921)		
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)		
Lithuania (May 16th, 1922)		
Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)		
The Netherlands (August 6th, 1921)		
New Zealand (August 4th, 1921)		
Norway (August 20th, 1921)		
Panama (June 14th, 1929)		
Paraguay (May 11th, 1933)		
Peru (March 29th, 1932)		
Poland (August 26th, 1921)		
Portugal (October 8th, 1921)		
Roumania (August 8th, 1921)		
Salvador (August 29th, 1930)		
Siam (February 27th, 1922)		
Spain (August 30th, 1921)		
Sweden (February 21st, 1921)		
Switzerland (July 25th, 1921)		
Uruguay (September 27th, 1921)		
Venezuela (December 2nd, 1921)		
Yugoslavia (August 12th, 1921)		

---

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VI, p. 379; Vol. XI, p. 404; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XXIV, p. 152; Vol. XXVII, p. 416; Vol. XXXIX, p. 165; Vol. XLV, p. 96; Vol. L, p. 159; Vol. LIV, p. 387; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 435; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 272; Vol. XCII, p. 362; Vol. XCVI, p. 180; Vol. C, p. 153; Vol. CIV, p. 492; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXI, p. 402; Vol. CXVII, p. 46; Vol. CXXVI, p. 430; Vol. CXXX, p. 440; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 392; Vol. CXLVII, p. 318; Vol. CLII, p. 282; Vol. CLVI, p. 176; Vol. CLX, p. 325; Vol. CLXIV, p. 352; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 228; Vol. CLXXII, p. 388; Vol. CLXXVII, p. 382; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 346.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Final Act of the Conference of States signatories of the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Geneva, September 23rd, 1926.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (April 7th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

***Albania (November 7th, 1935)**

Reciprocity, 5 years as from September 17th, 1935, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 of the Statute arising after September 17th, 1930 (the date of the previous acceptance of Albania which is being renewed by the present declaration), with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, other than:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Albania;

(*b*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Albania;

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Argentine Republic

Reciprocity, 10 years, from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration does not apply:

(1) To questions already settled;

(2) To questions which, by international law, fall within the local jurisdiction or the constitutional regime of each State.

Costa Rica

Reciprocity.

Czechoslovakia

Reciprocity, 10 years from the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, in any dispute arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement, and subject to the right, for either of the parties to the dispute, to submit the dispute, before any recourse to the Court, to the Council of the League of Nations.

Guatemala

Reciprocity.

Liberia

Reciprocity.

Nicaragua

Unconditional.

Poland

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any future disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to such ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of peaceful settlement.

The present declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) With regard to matters which, by international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; or,

(2) Arising between Poland and States which refuse to establish or maintain normal diplomatic relations with Poland; or,

(3) Connected directly or indirectly with the world war or with the Polono-Sovietic war; or,

Other Members or States which may sign the Clause.

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Chile
China
Cuba
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Germany
Honduras
Iraq
Italy
Japan
Mexico
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

(c) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by the Kingdom of Albania and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

AUSTRALIA (August 18th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Australia,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

BELGIUM (March 10th, 1926)

Reciprocity, 15 years, in any disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this ratification, except cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

BOLIVIA (July 7th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 10 years.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

(4) Resulting directly or indirectly from the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed at Riga, on March 18th, 1921; or,

(5) Relating to provisions of internal law connected with points (3) and (4).

TURKEY

Reciprocity, 5 years, in any of the disputes enumerated in Article 36 arising after the signature of the present declaration, with the exception of disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions concluded by Turkey and providing for another method of peaceful settlement.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

BRAZIL (January 26th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 10 years, with the exception of questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Brazilian courts of law or which belong to the constitutional regime of each State.

UNITED KINGDOM (February 5th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*BULGARIA (August 12th, 1921)

Reciprocity.

CANADA (July 28th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all disputes arising after ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to said ratification, other than:

Disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in Canada reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

**Colombia* (October 30th, 1937)

Reciprocity, as regards disputes arising out of facts subsequent to January 6th, 1932.

DENMARK (May 24th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from June 13th, 1936.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)

Reciprocity.

**Estonia* (May 2nd, 1938)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any future dispute in respect of which the parties have not agreed to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*FINLAND (April 9th, 1937)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from April 6th, 1937.

*FRANCE (April 11th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 5 years, as from April 25th, 1936, in any disputes arising with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the engagement assumed by France, and which could not have been settled by a procedure of conciliation or by the Council according to the terms of Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant, with reservation as to the case where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*Greece (July 19th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years, as from September 12th, 1934.

For the classes of disputes mentioned in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication;

(*b*) Disputes relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Greece and providing for another procedure.

This acceptance is effective as from the date of signature of the present declaration.

*Haiti (September 7th, 1921)

Unconditional.

Hungary (August 9th, 1934)

Reciprocity, 5 years, with effect as from August 13th, 1934.

India (February 5th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree; and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of India,

And subject to the condition that the Government of India reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

Iran (September 19th, 1932)

Reciprocity in any disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts relating directly or indirectly to the application of treaties or conventions accepted by Iran and subsequent to the ratification of this declaration, with the exception of:

(*a*) Disputes relating to the territorial status of Iran, including those concerning the rights of sovereignty of Iran over its islands and ports;

(*b*) Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*c*) Disputes with regard to questions which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Persia.

However, the Imperial Government of Iran reserves the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

The present declaration is made for a period of six years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effects until notification is given of its abrogation.

Ireland (July 11th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 20 years.

Latvia (February 26th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years, over all disputes which might have arisen after February 26th, 1930, date of deposit of the ratification of the declaration made at Geneva on September 10th, 1929, or to disputes arising in future with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said date, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

The present declaration is made for a period of five years. At the expiration of that period, it shall continue to bear its full effect until notification is given of its abrogation.

*Lithuania (January 14th, 1935)

Reciprocity, 5 years.

*Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)

Reciprocity, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

2. Optional Clause recognising the Court's Jurisdiction, as described in Article 36 of the Statute *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

*The Netherlands (August 5th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from August 6th, 1936, in any future disputes, excepting those in regard to which the parties would have agreed after the coming into force of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

New Zealand (March 29th, 1930)

Reciprocity, 10 years, and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the ratification of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the said ratification,

Other than disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement, and

Disputes with the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree, and

Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion of New Zealand,

And subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government in New Zealand reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

*Norway (May 29th, 1936)

Reciprocity, 10 years, as from October 3rd, 1936.

*Panama (June 14th, 1929)

Reciprocity.

*Paraguay[1] (May 11th, 1933)

Unconditional.

Peru (March 29th, 1932)

Reciprocity, 10 years, in any dispute arising with regard to situations and facts subsequent to ratification, except in cases where the parties have agreed either to have recourse to another method of settlement by arbitration, or to submit the dispute previously to the Council of the League of Nations.

*Portugal (October 8th, 1921)

Reciprocity.

*Roumania (June 4th, 1936)

Renewal for 5 years, as from June 9th, 1936, of the declaration of October 8th, 1930, within the limits and subject to the conditions and reservations laid down in the said declaration.

The declaration of October 8th, 1930, read as follows:

" Reciprocity, 5 years, in respect of the Governments recognised by Roumania and on condition of reciprocity in regard to legal disputes arising out of situations or facts subsequent to the ratification by the Roumanian Parliament of this accession and with the exception of matters for which a special procedure has been or may be established and subject to the right of Roumania to submit the dispute to the Council of the League of Nations before having recourse to the Court.

" The following are, however, excepted:

"(*a*) Any question of substance or of procedure which might directly or indirectly cause the existing territorial integrity of Roumania and her sovereign rights, including her rights over her ports and communications, to be brought into question;

"(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which, according to international law, fall under the domestic jurisdiction of Roumania."

*Salvador (August 29th, 1930)

The provisions of this Statute do not apply to any disputes or differences concerning points or questions which cannot be submitted to arbitration in accordance with the political Constitution of this Republic.

The provisions of this Statute also do not apply to disputes which arose before that date or to pecuniary claims made against the Nation, it being further understood that Article 36 binds Salvador only in regard to States which accept the arbitration in that form.

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

[1] By a communication dated May 27th, 1938, the Minister of Paraguay in France transmitted to the Secretary-General a Decree of the Acting President of the Republic of Paraguay, by which Paraguay has withdrawn its declaration recognising the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

This communication was notified to the States Parties to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute and to the Members of the League of Nations.

2. OPTIONAL CLAUSE RECOGNISING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION, AS DESCRIBED IN ARTICLE 36 OF THE STATUTE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 16th, 1920.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

SIAM (May 7th, 1930)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in all disputes as to which no other means of pacific settlement is agreed upon between the parties.

*SPAIN (September 21st, 1928)
Reciprocity, 10 years, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

*SWEDEN (April 18th, 1936)
Reciprocity, 10 years, as from August 16th, 1936.

SWITZERLAND (April 17th, 1937)
Reciprocity, 10 years.

*URUGUAY (September 27th, 1921)
Reciprocity.

State having accepted the Optional Clause in virtue of the Council Resolution of May 17th, 1922.

MONACO (April 22nd, 1937)
Acceptance for a period of 5 years in any disputes arising after April 22nd, 1937, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this declaration, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.
(This declaration was transmitted to the Secretariat by the Registrar of the Permanent Court of International Justice.)

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

1. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON FREEDOM OF TRANSIT.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
ALBANIA (October 8th, 1921)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (May 16th, 1927)	CHINA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BRITISH EMPIRE, including	ETHIOPIA (*a*)	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
NEWFOUNDLAND (August 2nd, 1922)	GUATEMALA	AUSTRALIA
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.	LITHUANIA	BRAZIL
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	PANAMA	CANADA
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)	PERU (*a*)	COLOMBIA
Palestine (January 28th, 1924 *a*)	PORTUGAL	COSTA RICA
NEW ZEALAND (August 2nd, 1922)	URUGUAY	CUBA
INDIA (August 2nd, 1922)		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		ECUADOR
		EGYPT
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		IRELAND
		LIBERIA
		MEXICO
		NICARAGUA
		PARAGUAY
		SALVADOR
		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
		VENEZUELA

---

* Declaration not subject to ratification.

[1] This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 11; Vol. XI, p. 407; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XIX, p. 279; Vol. XXIV, p. 155; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 166; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 70; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 181; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393; and Vol. CXLII, p. 340.

1. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit *(continued)*.
(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia (October 29th, 1923)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 3rd, 1925 *a*)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Estonia (June 6th, 1925)
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (September 19th, 1924)
Syria and Lebanon (February 7th, 1929 *a*)
Germany (April 9th, 1924 *a*)
Greece (February 18th, 1924)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Iran (January 29th, 1931)
Iraq (March 1st, 1930 *a*)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (February 20th, 1924)
Latvia (September 29th, 1923)
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (April 17th, 1924)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Poland (October 8th, 1924)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
Spain (December 17th, 1929)
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)
Switzerland (July 14th, 1924)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]
(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
British Empire, including Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Palestine (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
India (August 2nd, 1922)
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
Bolivia
China
Colombia *(a)*
Estonia
Guatemala
Lithuania
Panama
Peru *(a)*
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Argentine Republic
Australia
Brazil
Canada
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Germany
Haiti
Honduras
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Mexico
The Netherlands
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Salvador

[1] This Convention came into force on October 31st, 1922. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 35; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 306; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIX, p. 344; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. XCVI, p. 182; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 393.

2. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)	Switzerland
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Finland (January 29th, 1923)	Venezuela.
France (December 31st, 1926)	Yugoslavia
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)	
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)	
Italy (August 5th, 1922)	
Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930)	
Norway (September 4th, 1923)	
Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*) In so far as its provisions are not in conflict with the principles of the new Danube Statute drawn up by the International Commission which was appointed in accordance with Articles 349 of the Treaty of Versailles, 304 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, 232 of the Treaty of Neuilly and 288 of the Treaty of Trianon.	
Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)	
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)	
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)	

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Belgium Accepting paragraph (*a*).	Afghanistan
British Empire (August 2nd, 1922) In respect of the United Kingdom only accepting paragraph (*a*).	Peru *(a)*	Union of South Africa
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).	Portugal	Argentine Republic
Nyasaland Protectorate and Tanganyika Territory (August 2nd, 1922) To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*b*).	Spain Accepting paragraph (*a*).	Australia
Bahamas Barbados British Guiana Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands) Leeward Islands Trinidad and Tobago Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent) Gibraltar Malta (August 2nd, 1922 *a*.) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).		Bolivia
		Brazil
		Bulgaria
		Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Costa Rica
		Cuba
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		France
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Iran
		Iraq
		Ireland
		Italy
		Japan

[1] The Convention being in force, this Protocol became operative after it had been ratified by two Powers. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 65; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 280; Vol. XXIV, p. 156; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 71; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 437; Vol. XCVI, p. 182; and Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394.

3. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern *(continued)*.

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Cyprus
Gambia Colony and Protectorate
Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate
Nigeria Colony and Protectorate
Gold Coast: Ashanti and northern territories
Kenya Colony and Protectorate
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar
St. Helena
Ceylon
Mauritius
Seychelles
Hong-Kong
Straits Settlements
Fiji
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
British Solomon Islands
Tonga Islands

Federated Malay States:

Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Non-Federated Malay States:

Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Palestine (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*) of the Protocol.

Bermuda (December 27th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

India (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of India only accepting paragraph (*a*).

Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Finland (January 29th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Greece (January 3rd, 1928)

Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Luxemburg (March 19th, 1930 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (*a*).

Roumania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
Is unable to accept any restriction of her liberty in administrative matters on the waterways which are not of international concern, that is to say, on purely national rivers, while at the same time accepting the principles of liberty in accordance with the laws of the country.

Siam (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Sweden (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
Accepting paragraph (*b*).

Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (*a*).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

(August 2nd, 1922 *a*.) To the full extent indicated under paragraph (*a*).

Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
The Netherlands
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Poland
Salvador
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

4. Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast.[1]

(Barcelona, April 20th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Declaration is open to Accession by:*
Albania (October 8th, 1921)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)	China	Argentine Republic
British Empire, including Newfoundland (October 9th, 1922)	Guatemala	Brazil
Canada (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Iran	Colombia
Australia (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Lithuania	Costa Rica
New Zealand (October 9th, 1922)	Panama	Cuba
Union of South Africa (October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Peru (*a*)	Dominican Republic
India (October 9th, 1922)	Portugal	Ecuador
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)	Uruguay	Egypt
Chile (March 19th, 1928)		Ethiopia
Czechoslovakia (September 8th, 1924)		Haiti
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (January 10th, 1933 *a*)		Honduras
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)		Ireland
*Estonia		Liberia
Finland (September 22nd, 1922 *a*)		Luxemburg
*France		Nicaragua
Germany (November 10th, 1931 *a*)		Paraguay
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)		Salvador
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)		Venezuela
Iraq (April 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*Italy		
Japan (February 20th, 1924)		
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)		
Mexico (October 17th, 1935 *a*)		
*The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (November 28th, 1921)		
Norway (September 4th, 1923)		
Poland (December 20th, 1924)		
Roumania (Feb. 22nd, 1923 *a*)		
Siam (November 29th, 1922)		
Spain (July 1st, 1929)		
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)		
*Switzerland		
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)		
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (May 16th, 1935 *a*)		
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)		

III. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN.[2]

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children.[3]

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935 *a*)	Argentine Republic (*a*)	United States of America
Albania (October 13th, 1924)	Costa Rica	Sa'udi Arabia
Belgium (June 15th, 1922)	Panama (*a*)	Bolivia
	Peru (*a*)	Dominican Republic

* Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VII, p. 73; Vol. XI, p. 411; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 281; Vol. XXIV, p. 159; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. LIX, p. 345; Vol. LXIX, p. 72; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 283; Vol. XCII, p. 363; Vol. XCVI, p. 183; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; Vol. CXXX, p. 441; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 394; Vol. CLVI, p. 177; and Vol. CLX, p. 327.

[2] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, details concerning:

1. The Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 18th, 1904.
2. The Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, Paris, May 4th, 1910.

[3] "The present Convention shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date of the deposit of its ratification or act of accession" (Article 11). See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. IX, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXVII, p. 419; Vol. XXXV, p. 301; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol. XLV, p. 99; Vol. L, p. 160; Vol. LIV, p. 388; Vol. LXIII, p. 378; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 373; Vol. XCII, p. 367; Vol. C, p. 156; Vol. CVII, p. 462; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 49; Vol. CXXII, p. 322; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 399; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 417; Vol. CXLVII, p. 319; Vol. CLVI, p. 182; Vol. CLX, p. 330; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 391.

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.		*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Brazil (August 18th, 1933)		Ecuador
British Empire (June 28th, 1922)		Ethiopia
Does not include the Island of Newfoundland, the British Colonies and Protectorates, the Island of Nauru, or any territories administered under mandates by Great Britain.		Guatemala
Bahamas,	(September 18th, 1922 *a*)	Haiti
Trinidad and Tobago		Honduras
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate),		Iceland
Nyasaland,		Liberia
Ceylon,		Liechtenstein
Hong-Kong,		Paraguay
Straits Settlements,		San Marino
Gibraltar,		Salvador
Malta,		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Cyprus,		Venezuela
Southern Rhodesia,		
Barbados,		
Grenada,		
St. Lucia,		
St. Vincent,		
Seychelles,		
Northern Rhodesia,		
British Honduras		
British Guiana and Fiji (October 24th, 1922 *a*)		
Leeward Islands (March 7th, 1924 *a*)		
Jamaica and Mauritius (March 7th, 1924 *a*)		
Falkland Islands and Dependencies (May 8th, 1924 *a*)		
Gold Coast Colony (July 3rd, 1924 *a*)		
Iraq (May 15th, 1925 *a*)		
The Government of Iraq desire to reserve to themselves the right to fix an age-limit lower than that specified in Article 5 of the Convention.		
Colony of Sierra Leone (November 16th, 1927 *a*)		
Colony and Protectorate of Gambia	(April 10th, 1931 *a*)	
Protectorate of Uganda		
Territory of Tanganyika		
Palestine (including Trans-Jordan)	(November 2nd, 1931 *a*)	
Protected State of Sarawak		
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony		
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		
Zanzibar Protectorate (January 14th, 1932 *a*)		
Canada (June 28th, 1922)		
Australia (June 28th, 1922)		
Does not include Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territory of New Guinea.		
Papua	September 2nd, 1936	
Norfolk Island		
New Guinea		
Nauru		

1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

New Zealand (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

Union of South Africa (June 28th, 1922)

Ireland (May 18th, 1934 *a*)

India (June 28th, 1922)
Reserves the right at its discretion to substitute the age of sixteen years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limits prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and in Article 5 of the present Convention.

Bulgaria (April 29th, 1925 *a*)

Chile (January 15th, 1929)

China (February 24th, 1926)

Colombia (November 8th, 1934)

Cuba (May 7th, 1923)

Czechoslovakia (September 29th, 1923)

Denmark (April 23rd, 1931 *a*) [1]
This ratification does not include Greenland, the Convention, in view of the special circumstances, being of no interest for that possession.

Egypt (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Estonia (February 28th, 1930)

Finland (August 16th, 1926 *a*)

France (March 1st, 1926 *a*)
Does not include the French Colonies, the countries in the French Protectorate or the territories under French mandate.
Syria and Lebanon (June 2nd, 1930 *a*)

Germany (July 8th, 1924)

Greece (April 9th, 1923)

Hungary (April 25th, 1925)

Iran (March 28th, 1933)

Italy (June 30th, 1924)
Italian Colonies (July 27th, 1922 *a*)
Subject to the age-limit for native women and children, referred to in Article 5, being reduced from twenty-one to sixteen years.

Japan (December 15th, 1925)
Does not include Chosen, Taiwan, the leased Territory of Kwantung, the Japanese portion of Saghalien Island and Japan's mandated territory in the South Seas.

Latvia (February 12th, 1924)

Lithuania (September 14th, 1931)

Luxemburg (December 31st, 1929 *a*)

Mexico (May 10th, 1932 *a*)

Monaco (July 18th, 1931 *a*)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 19th, 1923)

Nicaragua (December 12th, 1935 *a*)

Norway (August 16th, 1922)

Poland and Free City of Danzig (October 8th, 1924)

Portugal (December 1st, 1923)

Roumania (September 5th, 1923)

Siam (July 13th, 1922)
With reservation as to the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of 1910 and Article 5 of this Convention, in so far as concerns the nationals of Siam.

Spain (May 12th, 1924 *a*)
Does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

Sudan (June 1st, 1932 *a*)

Sweden (June 9th, 1925)

Switzerland (January 20th, 1926)

Turkey (April 15th, 1937 *a*)

Uruguay (October 21st, 1924 *a*)

Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929 *a*)

---

[1] According to a reservation made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE.[1]

(Geneva, October 5th, 1921.)

9. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.[2]

(First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th,1924)	COSTA RICA	ALBANIA
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	CUBA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (August 13th, 1924)	HAITI	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	LIBERIA	ECUADOR
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	PANAMA	EGYPT
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PARAGUAY	ETHIOPIA
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	PERU	FRANCE
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)	VENEZUELA	IRAN
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		IRAQ
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)		IRELAND
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)		LUXEMBURG
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)		MEXICO
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)		POLAND
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)		SALVADOR
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)		SPAIN
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)		TURKEY
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923)		YUGOSLAVIA
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)		
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)		
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th,1923)		
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)		
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)		
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)		
ROUMANIA (September 5th, 1923)		
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)		
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)		
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)		
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)		

10. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th, 1924)	COSTA RICA	ALBANIA
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	CUBA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (August 13th, 1924)	HAITI	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	LIBERIA	ECUADOR
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	PANAMA	EGYPT
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	PARAGUAY	ETHIOPIA
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	PERU	FRANCE
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)	VENEZUELA	IRAN
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		IRAQ
		IRELAND
		LUXEMBURG

---

[1] Article 26 of the Covenant provides: " Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose representatives compose the Assembly ".

The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (document A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the amendments to Articles 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 of the Covenant. These amendments being now in force, no reference is made to them in the present document.

[2] The Assembly adopted at its fifth ordinary session (1924) a resolution according to which it is no longer opportune to ratify the first amendment to Article 16 of the Covenant adopted in 1921. As a consequence of this resolution, the first amendment to Article 16 adopted by the Assembly at its second ordinary session does not appear in the present report. See under No. IX the new amendment adopted in 1924.

10. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16 *(continued)*.

(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)	MEXICO
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)	POLAND
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)	SALVADOR
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)	SPAIN
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)	TURKEY
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)	YUGOSLAVIA
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)	
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923)	
LATVIA (February 12th, 1924)	
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)	
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th, 1923)	
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)	
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)	
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)	
ROUMANIA (Sept. 5th, 1923)	
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)	
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)	
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)	
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)	

11. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Third paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12th, 1924)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
AUSTRALIA (August 12th, 1924)	BOLIVIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BELGIUM (Sept. 28th, 1923)	COSTA RICA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
BRAZIL (July 7th, 1923)	CUBA	ECUADOR
BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12th, 1924)	HAITI	EGYPT
BULGARIA (October 4th, 1922)	LATVIA	ETHIOPIA
CANADA (August 12th, 1924)	LIBERIA	FRANCE
CHILE (August 1st, 1928)	PANAMA	IRAN
CHINA (July 4th, 1923)	PARAGUAY	IRAQ
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)	PERU	IRELAND
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1st, 1923)	VENEZUELA	LUXEMBURG
DENMARK (August 11th, 1922)		MEXICO
ESTONIA (September 7th, 1923)		POLAND
FINLAND (June 25th, 1923)		SALVADOR
GREECE (January 20th, 1925)		SPAIN
HUNGARY (June 22nd, 1923)		TURKEY
INDIA (August 12th, 1924)		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
ITALY (August 5th, 1922)		YUGOSLAVIA
JAPAN (June 13th, 1923)		
LITHUANIA (March 13th, 1925)		
THE NETHERLANDS (April 4th, 1923)		
NEW ZEALAND (August 12th, 1924)		
NORWAY (March 29th, 1922)		
PORTUGAL (October 5th, 1923)		
ROUMANIA (Sept. 5th, 1923)		
SIAM (September 12th, 1922)		
SWEDEN (August 24th, 1922)		
SWITZERLAND (March 29th, 1923)		
URUGUAY (January 12th, 1924)		

12. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(First paragraph amended.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)	Albania	Afghanistan
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)	Bolivia	Argentine Republic
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)	Costa Rica	Dominican Republic
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)	Iran	Ecuador
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)	Liberia	Egypt
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Panama	Ethiopia
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)	Paraguay	Iraq
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Peru	Ireland
China (July 4th, 1923)		Luxemburg
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)		Mexico
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)		Salvador
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)		Turkey
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)		Yugoslavia
Finland (June 25th, 1923)		
France (August 2nd, 1923)		
Greece (August 20th, 1923)		
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)		
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)		
India (February 3rd, 1923)		
Italy (August 5th, 1922)		
Japan (June 13th, 1923)		
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)		
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)		
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)		
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)		
Norway (March 29th, 1922)		
Poland (December 15th, 1922)		
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)		
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)		
Siam (September 12th, 1922)		
Spain (January 15th, 1930)		
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)		
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)		
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)		
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)		

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)	Bolivia	Afghanistan
Australia (Febr. 3rd, 1923)	Costa Rica	Albania
Belgium (Sept. 28th, 1923)	Iran	Argentine Republic
Brazil (August 13th, 1924)	Liberia	Dominican Republic
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)	Panama	Ecuador
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)	Paraguay	Egypt
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)	Peru	Ethiopia
Chile (August 1st, 1928)		Iraq
China (July 4th, 1923)		Ireland
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)		Luxemburg
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)		Mexico
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)		Salvador
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)		Turkey
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Finland (June 25th, 1923)		Yugoslavia
France (August 2nd, 1923)		
Greece (August 20th, 1923)		
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)		

13. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26 *(continued)*.

(New paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

14. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 26.

(Third and fourth paragraphs of Article 26 amended, replacing the original second paragraph.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (February 3rd, 1923)
Australia (February 3rd, 1923)
Belgium (September 28th, 1923)
Brazil (July 7th, 1923)
British Empire (February 3rd, 1923)
Bulgaria (October 4th, 1922)
Canada (February 3rd, 1923)
Chile (August 1st, 1928)
China (July 4th, 1923)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia (September 1st, 1923)
Denmark (August 11th, 1922)
Estonia (September 7th, 1923)
Finland (June 25th, 1923)
France (August 2nd, 1923)
Greece (August 20th, 1923)
Haiti (November 2nd, 1925)
Hungary (June 22nd, 1923)
India (February 3rd, 1923)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (June 13th, 1923)
Latvia (December 10th, 1923)
Lithuania (March 13th, 1925)
The Netherlands (April 4th, 1923)
New Zealand (February 3rd, 1923)
Norway (March 29th, 1922)
Poland (December 15th, 1922)
Portugal (October 5th, 1923)
Roumania (September 5th, 1923)
Siam (September 12th, 1922)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (August 24th, 1922)
Switzerland (March 29th, 1923)
Uruguay (January 12th, 1924)
Venezuela (March 24th, 1925)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bolivia
Costa Rica
Iran
Liberia
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentine Republic
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Iraq
Ireland
Luxemburg
Mexico
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Yugoslavia

V. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications.[1]

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Afghanistan (May 10th, 1937 *a*)	Argentine Republic (*a*)	United States of America
Albania (October 13th, 1924)	Costa Rica	Sa'udi Arabia
Belgium (July 31st, 1926) Includes also the Belgian Congo and the mandated territory of Ruanda-Urundi.	France	Bolivia
	Haiti	Chile
	Honduras	Dominican Republic
Brazil (September 19th, 1931)	Lithuania	Ecuador
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (December 11th, 1925) Does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions, Protectorates or Territories under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority.	Panama	Ethiopia
	Peru (*a*)	Iceland
	Uruguay	Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Mexico
		Nicaragua
		Sweden
		Venezuela
Newfoundland (December 31st, 1925 *a*)		
Southern Rhodesia (December 31st, 1935 *a*)		
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate.		
Seychelles		
British Honduras		
Ceylon		
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		
Mauritius		
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		
Gilbert and Ellice Islands		
Fiji		
Uganda		
Trinidad and Tobago		
Zanzibar		
Tanganyika Territory		
Leeward Islands		
Windward Islands		
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		
Nyasaland		
Straits Settlements		
Federated Malay States		
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei Johore Kedah Kelantan Trengganu		

(November 3rd, 1926 *a*)

[1] The present Convention came into force on August 7th, 1924. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVII, p. 213; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 122; Vol. LIV, p. 391; Vol. LIX, p. 357; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 313; Vol. XCII, p. 368; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXXVI, p. 433; Vol. CXLII, p. 341; Vol. CLII, p. 294; Vol. CLVI, p. 186; Vol. CLX, p. 335; Vol. CLXIV, p. 361; Vol. CLXXII, p. 398; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 357.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Northern Rhodesia
Barbados
Gold Coast
Cyprus
Gibraltar
Malta
Somaliland
Basutoland
Bechuanaland
Swaziland
Hong-Kong
(November 3rd, 1926 *a*)

Bermuda
Bahamas
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
St. Helena
Palestine
Trans-Jordan
(May 23rd, 1927 *a*)

Jamaica (August 22nd, 1927 *a*)
British Guiana (September 23rd, 1929 *a*)

CANADA (May 23rd, 1924 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (June 29th, 1935 *a*)
Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

NEW ZEALAND, including the Mandated Territory of Western Samoa (December 11th, 1925)

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, including the Mandated Territory of South West Africa (December 11th, 1925)

IRELAND (September 15th, 1930)

INDIA (December 11th, 1925)

BULGARIA (July 1st, 1924)

CHINA (February 24th, 1926)

COLOMBIA (November 8th, 1934)

CUBA (September 20th, 1934)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 11th, 1927)

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 31st, 1926)

DENMARK (May 6th, 1930)
With regard to Article IV, see also Article I. The acts mentioned in Article I are punishable under the rules of Danish law only if they fall within the provisions of Article 184 of the Danish Penal Code, which inflicts penalties upon any person publishing obscene writings, or placing on sale, distributing, or otherwise circulating or publicly exposing obscene images. Further, it is to be observed that the Danish legislation relating to the Press contains special provisions on the subject of the persons who may be prosecuted for Press offences. The latter provisions apply to the acts covered by Article 184 in so far as these acts can be considered as Press offences. The modification of Danish legislation on these points must await the revision of the Danish Penal Code, which is likely to be effected in the near future.

EGYPT (October 29th, 1924 *a*)

ESTONIA (March 10th, 1936 *a*)

FINLAND (June 29th, 1925)

GERMANY (May 11th, 1925)

GREECE (October 9th, 1929)

GUATEMALA (October 25th, 1933 *a*)

HUNGARY (February 12th, 1929)

IRAN (September 28th, 1932)

IRAQ (April 26th, 1929 *a*)

ITALY (July 8th, 1924)

JAPAN (May 13th, 1936)
The provisions of Article 15 of the Convention are in no way derogatory to the acts of the Japanese judicial authorities in the application of Japanese laws and decrees.[1]

LATVIA (October 7th, 1925)

---

[1] By a communication dated February 14th, 1936, the Japanese Government withdrew the declaration regarding Taiwan, Chosen, the leased territory of Kwantung, Karafuto and the territories under Japanese mandate, expressed at the time of signing the Convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF AND TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*LUXEMBURG (August 10th, 1927)
Subject to reservation " that, in the application of the penal clauses of the Convention, the Luxemburg authorities will observe the closing paragraph of Article 24 of the Constitution of the Grand-Duchy, which provides that proceedings may not be taken against the publisher, printer or distributor if the author is known and if he is a Luxemburg subject residing in the Grand-Duchy ".
SAN MARINO (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
MONACO (May 11th, 1925)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 13th, 1927)
NORWAY (May 8th, 1929 *a*)
PARAGUAY (October 21st, 1933 *a*)
POLAND (March 8th, 1927)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 7th, 1926)
SALVADOR (July 2nd, 1937)
SIAM (July 28th, 1924)
The Siamese Government reserve full right to enforce the provisions of the present Convention against foreigners in Siam in accordance with the principles prevailing for applying Siamese legislation to such foreigners.
SPAIN (December 19th, 1924)
SWITZERLAND (January 20th, 1926)
TURKEY (September 12th, 1929)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929)

VI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

1. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES.[1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications

ALBANIA (August 29th, 1924)
BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1924)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
BRAZIL (February 5th, 1932)
Subject to the condition that the arbitral agreement or the arbitration clause mentioned in Article 1 of this Protocol should be limited to contracts which are considered as commercial by the Brazilian legislation.
BRITISH EMPIRE (September 27th, 1924)
Applies only to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and consequently does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority or any territory in respect of which His Majesty's Government exercises a mandate.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA
CHILE
LATVIA
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
LIECHTENSTEIN
Subject to the following reservation:
Agreements which are the subject of a special contract, or of clauses embodied in other contracts, attributing competence to a foreign tribunal, if they are concluded between nationals and foreigners or between nationals in the country, shall henceforth be valid only when they have been drawn up in due legal form.
This provision shall apply also to stipulations in articles of association, deeds of partnership and similar instruments and also to agreements for the submission of a dispute to an arbitral tribunal sitting in a foreign country.

The Protocol is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
IRAN
IRELAND
LIBERIA
MEXICO

---

* This ratification, given subject to reservation, has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

[1] The present Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1924. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXVII, p. 157; Vol. XXXI, p. 260; Vol. XXXV, p. 314; Vol. XXXIX, p. 190; Vol. XLV, p. 116; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 355; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXII, p. 452; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 393; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 312; Vol. XCVI, p. 190; Vol. C, p. 211; Vol. CIV, p. 499; Vol. CVII, p. 470; Vol. CXI, p. 403; Vol. CXVII, p. 55; Vol. CLVI, p. 185; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 356.

I. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Southern Rhodesia (December 18th, 1924 *a*)
NEWFOUNDLAND (June 22nd, 1925 *a*)
British Guiana
British Honduras
Jamaica:
Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands
Leeward Islands
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gold Coast (including Ashanti and the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast and Togoland)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Zanzibar
Northern Rhodesia
Ceylon
Mauritius
Gibraltar
Malta
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
IRAQ
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Trans-Jordan
Tanganyika (June 17th, 1926 *a*)
St. Helena (July 29th, 1926 *a*)
Uganda (June 28th, 1929 *a*)
Bahamas (January 23rd, 1931 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (June 9th, 1926)
India (October 23rd, 1937)

Is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Protocol upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic will regard itself as being bound only in relation to States which will have ratified the Convention of September 26th, 1927, on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, and the Czechoslovak Republic does not intend by this signature to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it which regulate the questions referred to in the present Protocol by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Protocol.

(March 12th, 1926 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Any agreement which submits to a foreign tribunal or to an arbitral tribunal a dispute relating to insurance contracts shall be null and void if the person insured is domiciled in the country or if the interest insured is situated in the country.

It shall be the duty of the tribunal to ensure as a matter of routine that this provision is observed even during procedure for distraint or during bankruptcy proceedings.[1]

LITHUANIA
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Signature by:

TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] This reservation has been submitted to the States parties to the Protocol for acceptance.

1. Protocol on Arbitration Clauses *(continued.)*

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Denmark (April 6th, 1925)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary courts of law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.

Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 26th, 1938)

Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Limits, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of this Protocol, the obligation mentioned in paragraph 1 of the said article to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Finland (July 10th, 1924)

France (June 7th, 1928)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its own national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates or Territories in respect of which France exercises a mandate.

Germany (November 5th, 1924)

Greece (May 26th, 1926)

Italy (July 28th, 1924) (excluding Colonies)

Japan (June 4th, 1928)
Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the leased territory of Kwantung, and the territories in respect of which Japan exercises a mandate (February 26th, 1929 *a*).

Luxemburg (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Monaco (February 8th, 1927)
Reserves the right to limit its obligation to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Netherlands (August 6th, 1925)
The Government of the Netherlands declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 6th, 1925)
The Government of the Netherlands reserves its right to restrict the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under Netherlands law.

Further, it declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.

Norway (September 2nd, 1927)

Poland (June 26th, 1931)
Under reservation that in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 1, the undertaking contemplated in the said Article will apply only to contracts which are declared as commercial in accordance with national Polish law.

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)
(1) In accordance with the second paragraph of Article 1, the Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
(2) According to the terms of the first paragraph of Article 8, the Portuguese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include its colonies.

Roumania (March 12th, 1925)
Subject to the reservation that the Royal Government may in all circumstances limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Siam (September 3rd, 1930)

Spain (July 29th, 1926)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa, or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (May 14th, 1928)

VII. CUSTOMS.

International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (October 4th, 1924)
Brazil (July 10th, 1929)
British Empire (August 29th, 1924)
It is stated in the instrument of ratification that this ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia (or any territory under its authority) or the Irish Free State or in the case of India, and that in pursuance of the power reserved in Article XXIX of the Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Island of Newfoundland or of the territories of Iraq and Nauru, in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate. It does not apply to the Sudan.
Australia (March 13th, 1925)
Excluding Papua, Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea.
New Zealand (August 29th, 1924)
Includes the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
Union of South Africa (August 29th, 1924)
India (March 13th, 1925)
Bulgaria (December 10th, 1926)
China (February 23rd, 1926)
Czechoslovakia (February 10th, 1927)
Denmark (May 17th, 1924)
Egypt (March 23rd, 1925)
Estonia (February 28th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (May 23rd, 1928)
France (September 13th, 1926)
Does not apply to the Colonies under its sovereignty.
Syria and Lebanon (March 9th, 1933 *a*)
Germany (August 1st, 1925)
Greece (July 6th, 1927)
Hungary (February 23rd, 1926)
Iran (May 8th, 1925 *a*)
Iraq (May 3rd, 1934 *a*)
Italy (June 13th, 1924)
Latvia (September 28th, 1931 *a*)
Luxemburg (June 10th, 1927)
Morocco (French Protectorate) (November 8th, 1926)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Chile
Japan
Lithuania
Paraguay
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Canada
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Ireland
Liberia
Mexico
Nicaragua
Panama
Peru
Salvador
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on November 27th, 1924. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXX, p. 371; Vol. XXXV, p. 324; Vol. XXXIX, p. 208; Vol. XLV, p. 140; Vol. L, p. 161; Vol. LIV, p. 398; Vol. LIX, p. 365; Vol. LXIX, p. 79; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 394; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 319; Vol. XCII, p. 370; Vol. CXI, p. 404; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 401; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 322.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO THE SIMPLIFICATION OF CUSTOMS FORMALITIES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1925)
NORWAY (September 7th, 1926)
POLAND (September 4th, 1931)
ROUMANIA (December 23rd, 1925).

Under the same reservations as those formulated by the other Governments and inserted in Article 6 of the Protocol, the Royal Government understands that Article 22 of the Convention confers the right to have recourse to the procedure provided for in this Article for questions of a general nature solely on the High Contracting Parties, private persons being only entitled to appeal to their own judicial authorities in case any dispute arises with the authorities of the Kingdom.

SIAM (May 19th, 1925)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1926)
SWITZERLAND (January 3rd, 1927)
REGENCY OF TUNIS (French Protectorate)(November 8th, 1926)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 2nd, 1929)

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

5. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BELGIUM (May 16th, 1927)

Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.

BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29th, 1924)

This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate ; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or territories.

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
NEWFOUNDLAND (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CHILE
CHINA *(a)*

The Chinese Government, subject to the declarations made in its name by the delegates whom it instructed to take part in the discussions on this Convention, confirms the said declarations regarding:

(1) The whole of Part III: " Relations between the railway and its users ", Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17;
(2) In Part VI: " General Regulations ", Article 37, relating to the conclusion of special agreements for the purpose of putting the provisions of the Statute into force in cases where existing agreements are not adequate for this purpose.

COLOMBIA *(a)*
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
LITHUANIA
PANAMA *(a)*
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
LIBERIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on March 23rd, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XLVII, page 55; Vol. L, p. 180; Vol. LIX, p. 383; Vol. LXIII, p. 417; Vol. LXIX, p. 92; Vol. LXXVIII, p. 472; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 403; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 336; Vol. XCII, p. 381; Vol. XCVI, p. 191; Vol. CLVI, p. 192; Vol. CLX, p. 338; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 389.

5. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Railways, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Guiana
British Honduras
Brunei
Federated Malay States:
  Perak
  Selangor
  Negri Sembilan
  Pahang
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gold Coast:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Ashanti
  (*c*) Northern Territories
  (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Non-Federated Malay States:
  Johore
  Kedah
  Perlis
  Kelantan
  Trengganu
Nigeria:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Protectorate
  (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
} (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)
Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Estonia (September 21st, 1929)
Ethiopia (September 20th, 1928 *a*)
Finland (February 11th, 1937)
France (August 28th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation contained in Article 9 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany (December 5th, 1927)
Greece (March 6th, 1929)
Hungary (March 21st, 1929)
Italy (December 10th, 1934)
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.

Japan (September 30th, 1926)
Latvia (October 8th, 1934)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (February 22nd, 1928)
Norway (February 24th, 1926)
Poland and Free City of Danzig (January 7th, 1928)
Roumania (December 23rd, 1925)
Siam (January 9th, 1925)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Switzerland (October 23rd, 1926)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
With regard to Article 12 of the Statute, the Belgian Government declares that legislation exists in Belgium on the transport of emigrants, and that this legislation, whilst it does not distinguish between flags and consequently does not affect the principle of equality of treatment of flags, imposes special obligations on all vessels engaged in the transport of emigrants.

British Empire (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and that, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Brunei
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang
(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Brazil
Bulgaria
Chile
Lithuania
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
Panama *(a)*
Salvador
Spain
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
Uruguay

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Canada
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Free City of Danzig
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Finland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iran
Ireland
Latvia
Liberia
Luxemburg
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Roumania
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 285; Vol. LXIX, p. 102; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXVII, p. 184; Vol. CXXII, p. 349; Vol. CXLII, p. 342; and Vol. CXLVII, p. 332.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Grenada
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (excluding Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
  Antigua
  Dominica
  Montserrat
  St. Christopher-Nevis
  Virgin Islands
Non-Federated Malay States:
  Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu
Mauritius
Nigeria:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Protectorate
  (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
St. Helena
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Trans-Jordan
Somaliland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Zanzibar

(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Malta (November 7th, 1925 *a*)

Australia (June 29th, 1925 *a*)
Does not apply in the case of Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Czechoslovakia (July 10th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Excluding Greenland, the maritime ports of which are subject to a separate regime.

Estonia (November 4th, 1931)
The Estonian Government reserves the right regarding emigration provided for in Article 12 of the Statute.

France (August 2nd, 1932)
Shall have the power, in conformity with Article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.
Does not include any of the Protectorates, Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany (May 1st, 1928)
In conformity with Article 12 of the Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, the German Government declares that it reserves the right of limiting the transport of emigrants, in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, to vessels which have been granted special authorisation as fulfilling the requirements of the said legislation.
In exercising this right, the German Government will continue to be guided as far as possible by the principles of this Statute.

6. Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREECE (January 24th, 1927)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

HUNGARY (March 21st, 1929)
With reservation as to the right regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

IRAQ (May 1st, 1929 *a*)
With reservation as to all the rights regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

ITALY (October 16th, 1933)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
This ratification cannot be interpreted as implying the admission or the recognition of any reservation or declaration made with a view to limiting in any way the rights granted by Article 12 of the Statute to the High Contracting Parties.

JAPAN (September 30th, 1926)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

MEXICO (March 5th, 1934 *a*)

THE NETHERLANDS (February 22nd, 1928)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (February 22nd, 1928 *a*)
The Netherlands Government reserves the right mentioned in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Statute annexed to the Convention, it being understood that no discrimination shall be made against the flag of any contracting State which in regard to the transport of emigrants does not discriminate against the Netherlands flag.

NORWAY (June 21st, 1928)

SIAM (January 9th, 1925)

SWEDEN (September 15th, 1927)

SWITZERLAND (October 23rd, 1926)

YUGOSLAVIA (November 20th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

7. Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of Electric Power, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1st, 1925)
This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. It shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions, or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates, or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.

NEWFOUNDLAND (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
BULGARIA
CHILE
FRANCE
Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.
HUNGARY
ITALY
LITHUANIA
POLAND
URUGUAY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA
IRAN
IRELAND
JAPAN

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on July 26th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LVIII, p. 315; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. XCII, p. 399; Vol. CXLVII, p. 333; and Vol. CLX, p. 342.

7. Convention relating to the Transmission in Transit of Electric Power, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.		*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
British Guiana British Honduras Brunei Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate Hong-Kong Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate Northern Rhodesia Nyasaland Palestine Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*) New Zealand (April 1st, 1925) Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. Czechoslovakia (November 30th, 1926) Denmark (April 27th, 1926) Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934) Greece (February 15th, 1929) Iraq (August 2nd, 1935 *a*) Panama (July 7th, 1934 *a*) Spain (January 15th, 1930)	(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)	Latvia Liberia Luxemburg Mexico The Netherlands Nicaragua Norway Paraguay Peru Portugal Roumania Salvador Siam Sweden Switzerland Turkey Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Venezuela

8. Convention relating to the Development of Hydraulic Power affecting more than One State, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
British Empire (April 1st, 1925) This ratification has been given on behalf of the British Empire and New Zealand, including the mandated territory of Western Samoa. This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority)	Belgium Bulgaria Chile France Subject to the reservation contained in Article 21 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.	Afghanistan Union of South Africa Albania United States of America Argentine Republic Australia Bolivia Brazil Canada China Colombia

[1] The Convention and the Protocol came into force on June 30th, 1925. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 75; Vol. XLV, p. 170; Vol. L, p. 166; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 395; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 405; Vol. CXLVII, p. 322; Vol. CLII, p. 295; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 367.

8. Convention relating to the Development of Hydraulic Power affecting more than One State, and Protocol of Signature *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1923.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
or in the case of India, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 21 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate other than the territory mentioned above; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories. This ratification does not apply to the Sudan.	Italy.	Costa Rica
Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Lithuania	Cuba
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)	Poland	Czechoslovakia
British Guiana	Uruguay	Dominican Republic
British Honduras	Yugoslavia	Ecuador
Brunei		Egypt
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang		Estonia
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		Ethiopia
Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Ashanti (*c*) Northern Territories (*d*) Togoland under British mandate		Finland
Hong-Kong		Germany
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		Guatemala
Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu		Haiti
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British mandate		Honduras
Northern Rhodesia		India
Nyasaland		Iran
Palestine		Ireland
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)		Japan
Straits Settlements		Latvia
Tanganyika Territory		Liberia
Uganda Protectorate (January 12th, 1927 *a*)		Luxemburg
New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)		Mexico
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.		The Netherlands
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (May 17th, 1934)		Nicaragua
Denmark (April 27th, 1926)		Norway
Greece (March 14th, 1929)		Paraguay
Hungary (March 20th, 1933)		Peru
Iraq (January 28th, 1936 *a*)		Portugal
Panama (July 7th, 1934 *a*)		Roumania
Siam (January 9th, 1925)		Salvador
(September 22nd, 1925 *a*)		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

15. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Latter part of first paragraph of Article 16.)

(Geneva, September 27th, 1924.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Estonia (September 18th, 1926)	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
The Netherlands (February 8th, 1926)	Albania	Argentine Republic
Roumania (March 12th, 1925)	Bolivia	Australia
Salvador (June 4th, 1925)	Brazil	Belgium
Siam (September 30th, 1925)	Bulgaria	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Canada	China
	Chile	Colombia
	Cuba	Czechoslovakia
	Greece	Denmark
	New Zealand	Dominican Republic
	Peru	Ecuador
	Poland	Egypt
	Uruguay	Ethiopia
		Finland
		France
		Haiti
		Hungary
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Ireland
		Italy
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		Norway
		Panama
		Portugal
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

X. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

1. INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION. THE HAGUE, JANUARY 23RD, 1912. [1]

Schedule [2] containing the signatures of the Convention, the signatures of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the First Opium Conference, provided for in the penultimate paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention, the ratifications of the Convention, and the signatures of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention provided under "B" of the Final Protocol of the Third International Opium Conference.

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
ALBANIA	—	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925	Feb. 3, 1925
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	Feb. 11, 1915
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	—	Oct. 17, 1912	—	—
BELGIUM [3]	—	June 18, 1912	June 16, 1914	May 14, 1919
BOLIVIA	—	June 4, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
BRAZIL	—	Oct. 16, 1912	Dec. 23, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
GREAT BRITAIN [4]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 15, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
BULGARIA	—	March 2, 1914	Aug. 9, 1920*	Aug. 9, 1920*
CHILE	—	July 2, 1913	Jan. 16, 1923	May 18, 1923
CHINA	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Feb. 9, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
COLOMBIA [5]	—	Jan. 15, 1913	June 26, 1924	June 30, 1924
COSTA RICA	—	April 25, 1912	August 1, 1924	July 29, 1925
CUBA	—	May 8, 1913	March 8, 1920*	March 8, 1920*
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	—	Nov. 8, 1921	April 18, 1922	March 5, 1931
DENMARK [6]	—	Dec. 17, 1912	July 10, 1913	Oct. 21, 1921
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	—	Nov. 12, 1912	June 7, 1923	April 14, 1931
ECUADOR	—	July 2, 1912	Feb. 25, 1915	August 23, 1923
ESTONIA	—	Jan. 9, 1923	April 20, 1923	January 21, 1931
FINLAND	—	April 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec. 1, 1922
FRANCE [7]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
GERMANY	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
GREECE	—	—	March 30, 1920*	March 30, 1920*

---

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. VIII, p. 187; Vol. XI, p. 415; Vol. XV, p. 311; Vol. XIX, p. 283; Vol. XXIV, p. 163; Vol. XXXI, p. 245; Vol. XXXV, p. 299; Vol. XXXIX, p. 167; Vol.. LIX, p. 346; Vol. CIV, p. 495; Vol. CVII, p. 461; Vol. CXVII, p. 48; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 416; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 390.

[2] This Schedule which appeared in the Annexes to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League is reproduced here for purposes of information.

[3] Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards the Belgian Congo.

[4] In accordance with the following reservation:

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Wei-hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said Convention in the name of any Dominion, Colony, Dependency, or Protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

In virtue of the above-mentioned reservation, Great Britain signed the Convention for the following Dominions, Colonies, Dependencies, and Protectorates:

On December 17th, 1912, for Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Brunei, Cyprus, the East Africa Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Malay Protectorates, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, Malta, Northern Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Somaliland, Southern Nigeria, Trinidad, Uganda; on February 27th, 1913, for the Colony of Fiji; on April 22nd, 1913, for the Colony of Sierra Leone, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate and the Solomon Islands Protectorate; on June 25th, 1913, for the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Bahamas Islands and for the three Colonies of the Windward Islands, that is to say, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent; on January 30th, 1914, for the Leeward Islands; on February 11th, 1914, for British Guiana as well as for British Honduras; on March 11th, 1914, for the Government of the Union of South Africa; on March 28th, 1914, for Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland; on April 4th, 1914, for the Colony of Barbados; on April 8th, 1914, for Mauritius and its dependencies; on July 11th, 1914, for the Bermuda Islands; on August 21st, 1924, for Palestine and together with France for the New Hebrides; on October 20th, 1924, for Iraq.

[5] Subject to the approval of the Colombian Parliament.

[6] The signature of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the Conference as well as its ratification were given by Denmark for Iceland and the Danish Antilles; the signature of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention was given separately by Denmark and Iceland.

[7] With the reservation that a separate and special ratification or denunciation may subsequently be obtained for the French Protectorates. France and Great Britain signed the Convention for the New Hebrides, August 21st, 1924.

1. INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION. THE HAGUE, JANUARY 23RD, 1912 *(continued)*.

(The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked *.)

States	Signatures of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference	Ratifications of the Convention	Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)
GUATEMALA	—	June 17, 1912	Aug. 27, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
HAITI	—	Aug. 21, 1912	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
HONDURAS	—	July 5, 1912	Aug. 29, 1913	April 3, 1915
HUNGARY	—	—	July 26, 1921*	July 26, 1921*
IRAN [1]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	—	—
ITALY	Jan. 23, 1912	—	June 28, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
JAPAN	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
LATVIA	—	Feb. 6, 1922	March 25, 1924	Jan. 18, 1932.
LIBERIA	—	—	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*
LIECHTENSTEIN [2]	—	—	—	—
LITHUANIA	—	April 7, 1922	—	—
LUXEMBURG	—	June 18, 1912	Aug. 21, 1922	Aug. 21, 1922
MEXICO	—	May 15, 1912	April 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
MONACO	—	May 1, 1923	Feb. 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
THE NETHERLANDS	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 28, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
NICARAGUA	—	July 18, 1913	Nov. 10, 1914	Nov. 3, 1920
NORWAY	—	Sept. 2, 1913	Nov. 12, 1914	Sept. 20, 1915
PANAMA	—	June 19, 1912	Nov. 25, 1920*	Nov. 25, 1920*
PARAGUAY	—	Dec. 14, 1912	—	—
PERU	—	July 24, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
POLAND	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
PORTUGAL	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	April 8, 1920*
ROUMANIA	—	Dec. 27, 1913	Sept. 14, 1920*	Sept. 14, 1920*
RUSSIA	Jan. 23,1912	—	—	—
SALVADOR	—	July 30, 1912	Sept. 19, 1922	May 29, 1931
SIAM [3]	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 10, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
SPAIN	—	Oct. 23, 1912	Jan. 25, 1919	Feb. 11, 1921
SWEDEN [4]	—	Aug. 27, 1913	April 17, 1914	Jan. 13, 1921
SWITZERLAND [5]	—	Dec. 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1925	Jan. 15, 1925
TURKEY	Sept. 15, 1933	—	Sept. 15, 1933	Sept. 15, 1933
URUGUAY	—	March 9, 1914	April 3, 1916	Jan. 10, 1920*
VENEZUELA	—	Sept. 10, 1912	Oct. 28, 1913	July 12, 1927
YUGOSLAVIA	—	—	Feb. 10, 1920*	Feb. 10, 1920*

[1] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Iran having no treaty with China) and paragraph (*a*) of Article 3.

[2] The Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs, by a letter dated October 14th, 1936, transmitted to the Secretariat, at the request of the Swiss Legation at The Hague, the following declaration:

> " Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[3] With the reservation of Articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Siam having no treaty with China).

[4] Subject to the following declaration: " Opium not being manufactured in Sweden, the Swedish Government will for the moment confine themselves to prohibiting the importation of prepared opium, but they declare at the same time that they are ready to take the measures indicated in Article 8 of the Convention if experience proves their expediency."

[5] Subject to ratification and with the declaration that the Swiss Government will be unable to issue the necessary legal enactments within the terms fixed by the Convention.

2. First Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium, Protocol and Final Act.[1]

(Geneva, February 11th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
The signature of this Protocol is subject, in respect of British Protectorates, to the conditions contained in Article XIII of the Agreement.

India (February 17th, 1926)

France (April 29th, 1926)

Japan (October 10th, 1928)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (March 1st, 1927)

Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
While accepting the principle of a monopoly as formulated in Article I, does so, as regards the moment at which the measures provided for in the first paragraph thereof shall come into force, subject to the limitation contained in the second paragraph of the article.
The Portuguese Government, being bound by a contract consistent with the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1912, will not be able to put into operation the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article VI of the present Agreement so long as its obligations under this contract are in force.

Siam (May 6th, 1927)
Under reservation of Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), with regard to the time when this provision shall come into force, and of Article V. The reason for these reservations had been stated by the First Delegate of Siam on November 14th, 1924. The Siamese Government is hoping to put into force the system of registration and rationing within the period of three years. After that date, the reservation in regard to Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), will fall to the ground.

Other State to whose Signature the Agreement is open:

China

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations.

International Opium Convention.[2]

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (August 24th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.

Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*)
1. Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population.
2. The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the Bolivian Government, by means of export certificates.
3. The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported: Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.

Brazil (June 10th, 1932)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania

Argentine Republic (*a*)

Iran
Ad referendum and subject to the League of Nations complying with the request made by Iran in the Memorandum O.D.C.24.

Nicaragua

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
China
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Iceland
Liberia
Mexico
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

---

[1] The Agreement and the Protocol came into force on July 28th, 1926. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LI, p. 337; Vol. LIX, p. 401; and Vol. LXXVIII, p. 489.

[2] The Convention and the Protocol came into force September 25th, 1928. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXXXI, p. 317; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 390; Vol. XCII, p. 409; Vol. XCVI, p. 204; Vol. C, p. 249; Vol. CIV, p. 516; Vol. CVII, p. 525; Vol. CXI, p. 411; Vol. CXVII, p. 290; Vol. CXXII, p. 355; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 407; Vol. CLVI, p. 205; Vol. CLX, p. 348; and Vol. CLXVIII, p. 233.

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
His Britannic Majesty's ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada or the Irish Free State and, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 39 of the Convention, the instrument shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Colony of the Bahamas or the State of Sarawak under His Britannic Majesty's protection.

State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Canada (June 27th, 1928)
Australia (February 17th, 1926)
New Zealand, (February 17th, 1926)
Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
Union of South Africa (February 17th, 1926)
Ireland (September 1st, 1931)
India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 16th, 1927 *a*)
Denmark (April 23rd, 1930)
Dominican Republic (July 19th, 1928 *a*)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
France (July 2nd, 1927)
The French Government is compelled to make all reservation, as regards the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing, within the strictly prescribed time-limit, the quarterly statistics provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 22.

Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Subject to the reservation annexed to the Procès-verbal of the plenary meeting of February 16th, 1925. (The validity of the signature and ratification of this Convention are subject to the condition that a German expert will be appointed as a member of the Central Board.)

Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Hungary (August 27th, 1930)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Italy (for the Kingdom and Colonies) (December 11th, 1929 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Liechtenstein[1]
Lithuania (February 13th, 1931 *a*)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
Monaco (February 9th, 1927 *a*)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
New Hebrides (December 27th, 1927 *a*)
Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)
Poland (June 16th, 1927)
Portugal (September 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)

---

[1] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

3. Second Opium Conference of the League of Nations. International Opium Convention *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
San Marino (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (June 22nd, 1928)
Includes also the Spanish Colonies and the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Sweden (December 6th, 1930 *a*)
Switzerland (April 3rd, 1929)
With reference to the declaration made by the Swiss delegation at the 36th plenary meeting of the Conference concerning the forwarding of the quarterly statistics provided for in Article 22, paragraph 2.
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (September 11th, 1930)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (September 4th, 1929)

Protocol.

(Geneva, February 19th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (February 17th, 1926)
(Same reservation as for the Convention.)
Canada (June 27th, 1928)
Australia (Febr. 17th, 1926)
New Zealand (February 17th, 1926)
Union of South Africa (February 17th, 1926)
India (February 17th, 1926)
Iraq (August 8th, 1931 *a*)
State of Sarawak (March 11th, 1926 *a*)
Bahamas (October 22nd, 1926 *a*)
Bolivia (April 15th, 1932 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
Chile (April 11th, 1933)
Colombia (December 3rd, 1930 *a*)
Costa Rica (January 8th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia (April 11th, 1927)
Ecuador (October 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Egypt (March 16th, 1926 *a*)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (December 5th, 1927 *a*)
Germany (August 15th, 1929)
Greece (December 10th, 1929)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Japan (October 10th, 1928)
Latvia (October 31st, 1928)
Luxemburg (March 27th, 1928)
The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (June 4th, 1928)
Portugal (Sept. 13th, 1926)
Roumania (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Salvador (December 2nd, 1926 *a*)
Siam (October 11th, 1929)
Spain (April 19th, 1930 *a*)
Sudan (February 20th, 1926)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929*a*)
Yugoslavia (Sept. 4th, 1929)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Albania
Argentine Republic (*a*)
Iran
Nicaragua

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Belgium
Brazil
China
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ethiopia
France
Guatemala
Haiti
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Mexico
Monaco
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
San Marino
Sweden
Switzerland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay

XI. SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

I. Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War.[1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
This ratification is subject to the reservation that the Convention shall only enter into force, as far as the United States of America are concerned, when it has entered into force as regards Belgium, the British Empire, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

BRITISH EMPIRE
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Convention.
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the said Convention by all the following Powers — *i.e.*, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and United States of America — have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

CANADA

AUSTRALIA (*a*)
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

BULGARIA

CHINA

DENMARK
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Convention, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

EGYPT

FRANCE
This ratification will not become effective until the ratifications of the Convention by Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Japan, Sweden and the United States of America have become effective in accordance with Article 41 of the Convention.

IRAQ (*a*)
In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 28 of the Convention, Iraq assume with regard to its territory the undertakings set forth in paragraph I of Article 28 and the obligations of Articles 19 to 26 inclusive of that Convention, in so far as they are applicable.

LATVIA
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Latvia in Article 29.

LIBERIA (*a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
To the same extent as does the effect of the Convention apply in the States named hereafter: the United States of America, Austria, France, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

BRAZIL
Reserves, during the whole period of application of the present Convention, the right of fulfilling it, as regards the part that concerns Brazil, according to the spirit of the provisions having for their object the generalisation of control both as concerns the commerce as well as concerns the manufacture of armaments.

CHILE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ESTONIA
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Estonia in Article 29.

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Finland in Article 29.

GERMANY

HUNGARY

INDIA

ITALY

JAPAN

LUXEMBURG

NORWAY

ROUMANIA
Ad referendum with the reservation provided in Article 29 of the Convention, in virtue of which the application of Articles 6 and 9, as far as they concern exports consigned to Roumania by the High Contracting Parties and as far as they concern imports manufactured in Roumania, will be suspended until the date of the accession of Russia to the present Convention, as also to the Annex.

SALVADOR

SIAM

SWITZERLAND

URUGUAY

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

GREECE

IRAN

IRELAND

LITHUANIA

MEXICO

NICARAGUA

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

PORTUGAL

TURKEY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

---

[1] " A first *procès-verbal* of the deposit of ratifications will be drawn up by the Government of the French Republic as soon as the present Convention shall have been ratified by fourteen Powers.

" The Convention shall come into force four months after the date of the notification of this *procès-verbal* by the Government of the French Republic to all signatory Powers " (Article 41).

1. Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND
With reservation for the suspension of the application of Articles 6 and 9 in virtue of the right recognised to Poland in Article 29.

SPAIN

SWEDEN
Subject to the condition that this ratification will only take effect when the other producing States shall have ratified the convention.

VENEZUELA

2. Declaration regarding the Territory of Ifni.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRALIA *(a)*
Subject to the reservation that this accession shall not take effect until ratifications of the Convention in respect of Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America have been deposited with the French Government.

CHINA *(a)*

DENMARK
The Danish Government makes the entry into force of this Declaration, as far as Denmark is concerned, subject to its being put into force both in Sweden and in Switzerland.

EGYPT

FRANCE

LIBERIA *(a)*

THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao)

POLAND

SPAIN

VENEZUELA

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

BRAZIL

BRITISH EMPIRE:
Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Declaration.

CANADA

INDIA

BULGARIA

CHILE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

ESTONIA

ETHIOPIA

FINLAND

ITALY

JAPAN

LATVIA

LUXEMBURG

ROUMANIA

SALVADOR

SWITZERLAND

YUGOSLAVIA

The Declaration is open to Accession by:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

GERMANY

GREECE

HUNGARY

IRAN

IRELAND

LITHUANIA

MEXICO

NICARAGUA

NORWAY

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

PORTUGAL

SIAM

SWEDEN

TURKEY

URUGUAY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. [1]

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BELGIUM (December 4th, 1928)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Belgian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Belgian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose Allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BRAZIL

JAPAN

NICARAGUA

SALVADOR

URUGUAY

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

COLOMBIA

HUNGARY

PANAMA

PARAGUAY

And all other States invited to adhere to the Convention in accordance with Article 37.

---

[1] This Protocol came into force February 8th, 1928. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIV, p. 65; Vol. C, p. 262; Vol. CIV, p. 528; Vol. CVII, p. 537; Vol. CXI, p. 416; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CXXVI, p. 451; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 446; Vol. CXLVII, p. 336; Vol. CLX, p. 355; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 411.

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Empire (April 9th, 1930)

Does not bind India or any British Dominion which is a separate Member of the League of Nations and does not separately sign or adhere to the Protocol.

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Canada (May 6th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any State at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or whose allies *de jure* or in fact fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Australia (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

New Zealand (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Union of South Africa (January 22nd, 1930 *a*)

Subject to the reservations that His Majesty is bound by the said Protocol only towards those Powers and States which have both signed and ratified the Protocol or have acceded thereto, and that His Majesty shall cease to be bound by the Protocol towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, do not respect the Protocol.

Ireland (August 18th, 1930 *a*)

The Government of Ireland does not intend to assume, by this accession, any obligation except towards the States having signed and ratified this Protocol or which shall have finally acceded thereto, and

Should the armed forces of an enemy State or of the allies of such State fail to respect the said Protocol, the Government of Ireland would cease to be bound by the said Protocol in regard to such State.

India (April 9th, 1930)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on His Britannic Majesty as regards those States which have both signed and ratified it, or have finally acceded thereto;

(2) The said Protocol shall cease to be binding on His Britannic Majesty towards any Power at enmity with Him whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Iraq (September 8th, 1931 *a*)

On condition that the Iraq Government shall be bound by the provisions of the Protocol only towards those States which have both signed and ratified it or have acceded thereto; and that they shall not be bound by the Protocol towards any State at enmity with them whose armed forces, or the forces of whose allies, do not respect the dispositions of the Protocol.

Bulgaria (March 7th, 1934)

The said Protocol is only binding on the Bulgarian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.

The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Bulgarian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Chile (July 2nd, 1935)

(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Chilian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may definitely accede to it.

(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Chilian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

China (August 7th, 1929 *a*)

Czechoslovakia (August 16th, 1938)

The Czechoslovak Republic shall *ipso facto* cease to be bound by this Protocol towards any State whose armed forces, or the armed forces of whose allies, fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Denmark (May 5th, 1930)

Egypt (December 6th, 1928)

3. Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 17th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Estonia (August 28th, 1931)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Estonian Government as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Estonian Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Ethiopia (September 18th, 1935 *a*)

Finland (June 26th, 1929)

France (May 9th, 1926)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the French Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the French Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Germany (April 25th, 1929)

Greece (May 30th, 1931)

Iran (July 4th, 1929 *a*)

Italy (April 3rd, 1928)

Latvia (June 3rd, 1931)

Liberia (April 2nd, 1927 *a*)

Lithuania (June 15th, 1933)

Luxemburg (September 1st, 1936)

Mexico (March 15th, 1932 *a*)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (October 31st, 1930)
Subject to the reservation that, as regards the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, this Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Royal Netherlands Government in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Norway (July 27th, 1932)

Poland (February 4th, 1929)

Portugal (July 1st, 1930)
(1) The said Protocol is only binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic as regards States which have signed or ratified it or which may accede to it.
(2) The said Protocol shall *ipso facto* cease to be binding on the Government of the Portuguese Republic in regard to any enemy State whose armed forces or whose allies fail to respect the prohibitions laid down in the Protocol.

Roumania (August 23rd, 1929)
Subject to the reservation:
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Roumanian Government in relation to States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol;
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Roumanian Government in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect the restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.

Siam (June 6th, 1931)

Spain (August 22nd, 1929)
Declares this Protocol as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting and executing the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity.

Sweden (April 25th, 1930)

Switzerland (July 12th, 1932)

Turkey (October 5th, 1929)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (April 5th, 1928 *a*)
(1) That the said Protocol only binds the Government of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics in relation to the States which have signed and ratified or which have definitely acceded to the Protocol.
(2) That the said Protocol shall cease to be binding on the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in regard to all enemy States whose armed forces or whose allies *de jure* or in fact do not respect restrictions which are the object of this Protocol.

Venezuela (February 8th, 1928)

Yugoslavia (April 12th, 1929)

XII. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT.

16. Protocol of an Amendment to Article 16.

(Second paragraph of the original text.)

(Geneva, September 21st, 1925.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*Other Members to whose Signature the Protocol is open:*
Chile (August 1st, 1928)	Union of South Africa	Afghanistan
Denmark (March 28th, 1926)	Albania	Argentine Republic
Estonia (September 18th, 1926)	Bolivia	Australia
The Netherlands (August 20th, 1926)	Brazil	Belgium
	Bulgaria	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Canada	China
	Dominican Republic	Colombia
	Japan	Cuba
	New Zealand	Czechoslovakia
	Norway	Ecuador
	Peru	Egypt
	Portugal	Ethiopia
	Salvador	Finland
	Siam	France
	Uruguay	Greece
		Haiti
		Hungary
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Ireland
		Italy
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		Panama
		Poland
		Roumania
		Spain
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Turkey
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

XIII. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

9. Convention regarding the Measurement of Vessels employed in Inland Navigation, and Protocol of Signature. [1]

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (July 2nd, 1927)	Finland	Albania
British Empire (for Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (June 14th, 1927)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Denmark
Bulgaria (July 2nd, 1927)		Estonia
		Iran
		Ireland

[1] The Convention came into force on October 1st, 1927. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LXVII, p. 63; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 443; Vol. XCVI, p. 201; Vol. C. p. 228; Vol. CIV. p. 511; and Vol. CXXVI, p. 448.

9. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Paris, November 27th, 1925.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (January 17th, 1929)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (July 23rd, 1930 *a*)
FRANCE (July 2nd, 1927)

It being understood on behalf of the French Government, and as provided for in Article 6 of the Protocol of Signature, that in the event of a re-measurement of a vessel originally measured by its own officials the original indelible marks, when they are not intended solely to indicate that the vessel has been measured, shall have added to them an indelible cross having arms of equal length, and that this addition shall be regarded as equivalent to the removal described in Article 10 of the Annex to the Convention; that the old measurement plates shall be marked with a cross instead of being withdrawn; and that, if new plates are affixed, the old plates shall be placed at the same level and near to the new ones. In the case provided for above, the notification provided for in the third paragraph of Article 5 and in Article 6 of the Convention shall also be addressed to the original office of inscription.

GERMANY (July 2nd, 1927)
GREECE (February 6th, 1931)
HUNGARY (January 3rd, 1928)
ITALY (September 27th, 1932)
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 2nd, 1927)
POLAND (June 16th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (May 18th, 1928)
SPAIN (July 11th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (July 2nd, 1927)
YUGOSLAVIA (May 7th, 1930)

Under Clause IV of the Protocol of Signature.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

LATVIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
NORWAY
PORTUGAL
SWEDEN
TURKEY

XIV. SLAVERY.

SLAVERY CONVENTION.[1]

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (November 9th, 1935 *a*)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (March 21st, 1929 *a*)

Subject to the reservation that the Government of the United States, adhering to its policy of opposition to forced or compulsory labour except as punishment for crime of which the person concerned has been duly convicted, adheres to the Convention except as to the first sub-division of the second paragraph of Article five, which reads as follows:

"(1) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes."[2]

BELGIUM (September 23rd, 1927)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (*a*)
ETHIOPIA
IRAN

Ad referendum and interpreting Article 3 as without power to compel Iran to bind herself by any arrangement or convention which would place her ships of whatever tonnage in the category of native vessels provided for by the Convention on the Trade in Arms.

LITHUANIA
PANAMA
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CHILE
COSTA RICA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
GUATEMALA
HONDURAS
ICELAND
JAPAN
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBURG
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA

---

[1] This Convention came into force March 9th, 1927. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. LX, p. 253; Vol. LXIX, p. 114; Vol. LXXII, p. 485; Vol. LXXXIII, p. 416; Vol. LXXXVIII, p. 356; Vol. XCVI, p. 192; Vol. C, p. 221; Vol. CIV, p. 511; Vol. CVII, p. 491; Vol. CXXX, p. 444; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 440; Vol. CLII, p. 296; Vol. CLX, p. 342; Vol. CLXXII, p. 410; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 393.

[2] This accession, given subject to reservation, has been communicated to the signatory States for acceptance.

SLAVERY CONVENTION *(continued)*

(Geneva, September 25th, 1926.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 18th, 1927)
CANADA (August 6th, 1928)
AUSTRALIA (June 18th, 1927)
NEW ZEALAND (June 18th, 1927)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including South West Africa) (June 18th, 1927)
IRELAND (July 18th, 1930 *a*)
INDIA (June 18th, 1927)

The signature of the Convention is not binding in respect of Article 3 in so far as that article may require India to enter into any convention whereby vessels, by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Indians, or of the fact that one-half of the crew is Indian, are classified as native vessels, or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of such other States are not subject.

BULGARIA (March 9th, 1927)
CHINA (April 22nd, 1937)
CUBA (July 6th, 1931)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 10th, 1930)
DENMARK (May 17th, 1927)
ECUADOR (March 26th, 1928 *a*)
EGYPT (January 25th, 1928 *a*)
ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)
FINLAND (September 29th, 1927)
FRANCE (March 28th, 1931)
Syria and Lebanon (June 25th, 1931 *a*)
GERMANY (March 12th, 1929)
GREECE (July 4th, 1930)
HAITI (September 3rd, 1927 *a*)
HUNGARY [1] (February 17th, 1933 *a*)
IRAQ (January 18th, 1929 *a*)
ITALY (August 25th, 1928)
LATVIA (July 9th, 1927)
LIBERIA (May 17th, 1930)
MEXICO (September 8th, 1934 *a*)
MONACO (January 17th, 1928 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 7th, 1928)
NICARAGUA (October 3rd, 1927 *a*)
NORWAY (September 10th, 1927)
POLAND (September 17th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (October 4th, 1927)
ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)
SPAIN (September 12th, 1927)

For Spain and the Spanish Colonies, with the exception of the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.

SUDAN (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
SWEDEN (December 17th, 1927)
SWITZERLAND (November 1st, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (July 24th, 1933 *a*)
YUGOSLAVIA (September 28th, 1929)

---

[1] See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXX, p. 444

XV. INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL RELIEF UNION.[1]

(Geneva, July 12th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

ALBANIA (August 31st, 1929)
BELGIUM (May 9th, 1929)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (January 9th, 1929 *a*)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
NEW ZEALAND (December 22nd, 1928 *a*)
On the understanding that no contribution to the initial fund of the Union will fall due by New Zealand before the commencement of the next financial year in that country, viz., April 1st, 1929.
INDIA (April 2nd, 1929)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1931)
CHINA (May 29th, 1935 *a*)
CUBA (June 18th, 1934)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (August 20th, 1931)
ECUADOR (July 30th, 1928)
EGYPT (August 7th, 1928)
Subject to later acceptance by the Egyptian Government of the decisions of the Executive Committee fixing its contribution.
FINLAND (April 10th, 1929)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1932)
GERMANY (July 22nd, 1929)
GREECE (January 16th, 1931)
HUNGARY (April 17th, 1929)
It being understood that "the most extensive immunities, facilities and exemptions" mentioned in Article 10 of the present Convention shall not include exterritoriality or the other rights and immunities enjoyed in Hungary by duly accredited diplomatic agents.
IRAN (September 28th, 1932 *a*)
IRAQ (June 12th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (August 2nd, 1928)
Applies also to the Italian Colonies.
LUXEMBURG (June 27th, 1929 *a*)
MONACO (May 21st, 1929)
POLAND AND FREE CITY OF DANZIG (July 11th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (September 11th, 1928)
SAN MARINO (August 12th, 1929)
SUDAN (May 11th, 1928 *a*)
SWITZERLAND (January 2nd, 1930 *a*)
TURKEY (March 10th, 1932)
VENEZUELA (June 19th, 1929)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 28th, 1931 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
GUATEMALA
LATVIA
NICARAGUA
PERU
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRELAND
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

---

[1] The present Convention entered into force on December 27th, 1932. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXV, p. 247; Vol. CXLVII, p. 353; and Vol. CLVI, p. 256.

XVI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

2. CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications

BELGIUM (April 27th, 1929)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.
Belgian Congo, Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (June 5th, 1930 *a*)

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (July 2nd, 1930)
Bahamas
British Guiana
British Honduras
Falkland Islands
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)
Kenya
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Tanganyika Territory
Uganda Protectorate
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar
(May 26th, 1931 *a*)

Mauritius
Northern Rhodesia
(July 13th, 1931 *a*)

Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher-Nevis
Virgin Islands
(March 9th, 1932 *a*)

Malta (October 11th, 1934 *a*)

NEWFOUNDLAND (January 7th, 1931 *a*)

NEW ZEALAND (Western Samoa included) (April 9th, 1929)

India (October 23rd, 1937)
Is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BOLIVIA
NICARAGUA
PERU

The Convention is open to Signature by:

ALBANIA
BRAZIL
CHILE
IRAQ
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MONACO
NORWAY
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
POLAND
SALVADOR
URUGUAY
And all the other States which may sign the Protocol of September 24th, 1923.

---

[1] The Convention came into force July 25th, 1929. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCII, p. 301; Vol. XCVI, p. 205; Vol. C, p. 259; Vol. CIV, p. 526; Vol. CVII, p. 528; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 303; Vol. CXXX, p. 457; Vol. CLVI, p. 210; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 389.

2. CONVENTION ON THE EXECUTION OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1927.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 18th, 1931)
The Czechoslovak Republic does not intend to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it with various States, which regulate the questions referred to in the present Convention by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Convention.

DENMARK (April 25th, 1929)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary Courts of Law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such Courts without further examination as a basis for the final judgment in the affair.

Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 26th, 1938)

ESTONIA (May 16th, 1929)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

FINLAND (July 30th, 1931)

FRANCE (May 13th, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

GERMANY (September 1st, 1930)

GREECE (January 15th, 1932)
The Hellenic Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

ITALY (November 12th, 1930)

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 12th, 1931)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (January 28th, 1933 *a*)

PORTUGAL (December 10th, 1930)
(1) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.
(2) The Portuguese Government declares, according to the terms of Article 10, that the present Convention does not apply to its colonies.

ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under its national law.

SIAM (July 7th, 1931)

SPAIN (January 15th, 1930)

SWEDEN (August 8th, 1929)

SWITZERLAND (September 25th, 1930)

XVII. EXPORTATION.

1. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE EXPORTATION OF HIDES AND SKINS.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

BELGIUM (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BULGARIA
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.

TURKEY
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.[2]

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 357; Vol. C, p. 264; and Vol. CVII, p. 537.

[2] The reservation to which this signature is subject has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

1. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Hides and Skins *(cont.)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)

Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.

Finland (June 27th, 1929)

France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

Germany (June 30th, 1929)

Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement as regards Hungary is subject to its ratification by Austria, Roumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Italy (June 29th, 1929)

Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)

The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.

Norway (September 26th, 1930)

Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)

Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Sweden (June 27th, 1929)

Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)

Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

2. Protocol to the International Agreement.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)

Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures, as from October 1st, 1929.

2. Protocol to the International Agreement *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
Same reservations as for the Agreement.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones.[1]

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
The Belgian Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Colony of the Congo and the territory under Belgian mandate of Ruanda-Urundi.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
On signing the present Agreement Bulgaria declares that it shall be ratified and put into force as soon as the national currency shall be re-established in gold.
Turkey
Turkey reserves the right to maintain the "muamele vergisi" (general tax on export formalities) of two and a-half per cent *ad valorem*, and also the very low veterinary examination tax.

Denunciation.

Finland (March 4th, 1936)

The Agreement in open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala

[1] This Agreement came into force on October 1st, 1929, between the States having ratified it, in virtue of a Protocol drawn up at Geneva on September 11th, 1929. See *Treaty Series* of the *League of Nations*, Vol. XCV, p. 373; Vol. C, p. 264; Vol. CVII, p. 537; and Vol. CLXIV, p. 384.

3. International Agreement relating to the Exportation of Bones *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

France (June 30th, 1929)
By its acceptance, it does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.
The Netherlands undertake to extend, towards any other High Contracting Party accepting the same obligation, the application of the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention of November 8th, 1927, to all disputes which might arise on the subject of the interpretation or the application of the provisions of this Agreement, whether or no the dispute be of a legal character.
Norway (September 26th, 1930)
Poland [1] (August 8th, 1931)
Roumania (June 30th, 1929)
The entry into force of this Agreement in Roumania is subject to its ratification by Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.
Sweden (June 27th, 1929)
Switzerland (June 27th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (September 30th, 1929)
The obligations resulting from this Agreement shall be binding for Yugoslavia only as regards signatory States which do not render exportation impossible, either by formal prohibitions or by prohibitive duties (duties considered as prohibitive are duties imposing a tax of 5 Swiss francs or more per hundred kilogrammes).

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

4. Protocol to the International Agreement.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 9th, 1929)
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1929)
Denmark (June 14th, 1929)
The ratification does not include Greenland.
Finland (June 27th, 1929)
France (June 30th, 1929)
Subject to the reservations made on signing the Agreement.
Germany (June 30th, 1929)
Hungary (July 26th, 1929)
Italy (June 29th, 1929)
Luxemburg (June 27th, 1929)
The Netherlands (June 28th, 1929)
The Netherlands Government does not intend to assume any obligation as regards overseas territories.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.
Turkey
Subject to the reservation made on signing the Agreement.

Denunciation:

Finland (March 4th, 1936).

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Latvia

[1] The Polish Government has undertaken to put this Agreement into force by administrative measures as from October 1st, 1929.

4. PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 11th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications.	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
NORWAY (September 26th, 1930)	LIBERIA
POLAND (August 8th, 1931)	LITHUANIA
ROUMANIA (June 30th, 1929) Same reservation as for the Agreement.	MEXICO
SWEDEN (June 27th, 1929)	NEW ZEALAND
SWITZERLAND (June 27th, 1929)	NICARAGUA
YUGOSLAVIA (September 30th, 1929)	PANAMA
	PARAGUAY
	PERU
	PORTUGAL
	SALVADOR
	SIAM
	SPAIN
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
	URUGUAY
	VENEZUELA

XVIII. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.[1]

GENERAL ACT.[2]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions			*This Act is open to Accession by:*
A	B	C	
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).	All the Members of the League of Nations, with the exception of those mentioned in the preceding columns, and:
BELGIUM (May 18th, 1929) Subject to the reservation provided in Article 39 (2) (*a*), with the effect of excluding from the procedures described in this Act disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession of Belgium or prior to the accession of any other Party with whom Belgium may have a dispute.	THE NETHERLANDS (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (August 8th, 1930)	NORWAY[3] (June 11th, 1929)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (May 21st, 1931) Subject to the following conditions: 1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation: (*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of	SWEDEN (May 13th, 1929)		BRAZIL
			COSTA RICA
			GERMANY
			GUATEMALA
			HONDURAS
			JAPAN
			NICARAGUA
			PARAGUAY

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League for 1929 (A.6(*a*).1929, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Protocol for the pacific settlement of international disputes, annexed to the Resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

[2] The General Act came into force August 16th, 1929. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIII, p. 343; Vol. C, p. 260; Vol. CVII, p. 529; Vol. CXI, p. 414; Vol. CXVII, p. 304; Vol. CLII, p. 297; Vol. CLVI, p. 211; and Vol. CLX, p. 354.

[3] Norway having acceded on June 11th, 1929, to Chapters I, II and IV, and thereafter having extended its accession to Chapter III, on June 11th, 1930, has therefore accepted all the provisions of the Act. However, it has been deemed necessary to make it appear also under " B " in the present list, so as to make it clear that Norway had already accepted the provisions provided under that heading as from June 11th, 1929.

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

CANADA (July 1st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession in respect of Canada to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in Canada and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty in respect of Canada reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

AUSTRALIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

NEW ZEALAND (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in New Zealand and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

IRELAND (September 26th, 1931)

INDIA (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*i*) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(*ii*) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(*iii*) Disputes between the Government of India and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(*iv*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

(*v*) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (*i*) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(*ii*) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

DENMARK (April 14th, 1930)

ESTONIA (September 3rd, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Estonia or to the accession of another Party with whom Estonia might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

ETHIOPIA (March 15th, 1935)

FINLAND (September 6th, 1930)

FRANCE (May 21st, 1931)

The said accession concerning all disputes that may arise after the said accession with regard to situations or facts subsequent thereto, other than those which the Permanent Court of International Justice may recognise as bearing on a question left by international law to the exclusive competence of the State, it being understood that in application of Article 39 of the said Act the disputes which the parties or one of them may have referred to the Council of the League of

GENERAL ACT *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 26th, 1928.)

In Force.

Accessions

A	B	C
All the provisions of the Act.	Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV).	Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I), and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV).

Nations will not be submitted to the procedures described in this Act unless the Council has been unable to pronounce a decision under the conditions laid down in Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant.

Furthermore, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations " on the submission and recommendation of the General Act ", Article 28 of this Act is interpreted by the French Government as meaning in particular that " respect for rights established by treaty or resulting from international law " is obligatory upon arbitral tribunals constituted in application of Chapter III of the said General Act.

GREECE (September 14th, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation referred to in Chapter I:

(*a*) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Greece or to the accession of another Party with whom Greece might have a dispute;

(*b*) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States and in particular disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication.

ITALY (September 7th, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. The following disputes shall be excluded from the procedure described in the said Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which international law leaves to the sole jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Italy and any third Power.

II. It is understood that, in conformity with Article 29 of the said Act, disputes for the solution of which a special procedure is provided by other conventions shall be settled in accordance with the provisions of those conventions; and that, in particular, disputes which may be submitted to the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations in virtue of one of the provisions of the Covenant shall be settled in accordance with those provisions.

III. It is further understood that the present accession in no way affects Italy's accession to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and to the clause in that Statute concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

LATVIA (September 17th, 1935)

LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)

NORWAY (June 11th, 1930)

PERU (November 21st, 1931)

Subject to reservation (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SPAIN (September 16th, 1930)

Subject to reservations (*a*) and (*b*) provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

SWITZERLAND (December 7th, 1934)

TURKEY (June 26th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the Act:

(*a*) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession:

(*b*) Disputes relating to questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(*c*) Disputes affecting the relations between Turkey and any third Power.

XIX. ECONOMIC STATISTICS.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS. [1]

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)

Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)

[2] Returns provided for in Article 2, III (B), will not contain information with regard to areas under crops on native farms, and in native reserves, locations and mission stations.

CANADA (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Does not apply to the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island, New Guinea and Nauru.

(1) [2] The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I (*b*), for separate returns for direct transit trade shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

(2) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I, Paragraph IV, that when the quantity of goods of any kind is expressed in any unit or units of measure other than weight, an estimate of the average weight of each unit, or multiple of units, shall be shown in the annual returns, shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)

IRELAND (September 15th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM

In pursuance of Article 11 of the Convention, the Belgian Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that it cannot accept, in regard to the Colony of the Belgian Congo, the obligations arising out of the clauses of the present Convention.

BRAZIL

FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)

ESTONIA

FINLAND

GERMANY

HUNGARY

JAPAN

In virtue of Article 11 of the present Convention, the Japanese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Convention does not extend to its Territories mentioned below: Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung, the Territories under Japanese mandate.

LUXEMBURG

YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CHINA
COLOMBIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
LIBERIA
MEXICO
NICARAGUA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force December 14th, 1930. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CX, p. 171; Vol. CXVII, p. 330; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXVI, p. 454; Vol. CXXX, p. 463; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; Vol. CLVI, p. 222; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 392.

[2] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

INDIA (May 15th, 1931 *a*)

A. Under the terms of Article 11, the obligations of the Convention shall not extend to the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty the King Emperor.

B[1] (1) Article 2. I (*a*). — The provisions for returns of "transit trade" made in Annex I, Part I, 1 (*b*) shall not apply to India nor shall returns of the "land frontier trade" of India be acquired.

(2) Article 2. II (*a*). — The question whether a general census of agriculture can be held in India and, if so, on what lines and at what intervals still remains to be settled. For the present, India can assume no obligations under this article.

(3) Article 2. III (*b*). (1). — For farms in the "permanently settled" tracts in India, estimates of the cultivated areas may be used in compiling the returns.

(4) Article 2. III (*b*). (2). — The returns of quantities of crops harvested may be based on estimates of yield each year per unit area in each locality.

(5) Article 2. III (*d*). — Complete returns cannot be guaranteed from Burma, and in respect of the rest of India the returns shall refer to Government forests only.

The Government of India further declared that, with regard to the second paragraph of Article 3 of the Convention, they cannot, with the means of investigation at their disposal, usefully undertake to prepare experimentally the specified tables, and that for similar reasons they are not in a position to accept the proposal contained in Recommendation II of the Convention.

BULGARIA (November 29th, 1929)

CHILE (November 20th, 1934 *a*)

CUBA (August 17th, 1932 *a*)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (February 19th, 1931)

DENMARK (September 9th, 1929)

In pursuance of Article 11, Greenland is excepted from the provisions of this Convention. Furthermore, the Danish Government, in accepting the Convention, does not assume any obligation in respect of statistics concerning the Faroe Islands.

EGYPT (June 27th, 1930)

FRANCE (February 1st, 1933)

By its acceptance, France does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

GREECE (September 18th, 1930)

ITALY (June 11th, 1931)

In accepting the present Convention, Italy does not assume any obligation in respect of her Colonies, Protectorates and other Territories referred to in the first paragraph of Article 11.

LATVIA (July 5th, 1937)

Lithuania (April 2nd, 1938 *a*)

THE NETHERLANDS (September 13th, 1932).

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)

1. The following shall not be applicable:
   (*a*) The provisions of Article 2, III, E) and V;
   (*b*) The provisions concerning the system of valuations known as "declared values" mentioned in Annex I, Part I, § II (See Article 3);
   (*c*) Article 3, paragraph 2.
2. The returns mentioned in Article 2, IV, shall only apply to coal, petroleum, natural gas, tin, manganese, gold and silver.
3. The statistics of foreign trade mentioned in Article 3 shall not comprise tables concerning transit.[1]

NORWAY (March 20th, 1929)

In accordance with Article 11, the Bouvet Island is excepted from the provisions of the present Convention. Furthermore, in ratifying the Convention, Norway does not assume any obligation as regards statistics relating to the Svalbard.

POLAND (July 23rd, 1931)

PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1931)

In accordance with Article 11, the Portuguese Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that the present Convention does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

ROUMANIA (June 22nd, 1931)

SWEDEN (February 17th, 1930)

SWITZERLAND (July 10th, 1930)

---

[1] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention which were consulted in accordance with Article 17.

Protocol.

(Geneva, December 14th, 1928.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (May 9th, 1930)	Belgium	Afghanistan
Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)	Brazil	Albania
Canada (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)	Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)	United States of America
Australia (April 13th, 1932 *a*)	Estonia	Argentine Republic
Union of South Africa (including the mandated territory of South-West Africa) (May 1st, 1930)	Finland	Bolivia
Ireland (September 15th, 1930)	Germany	China
India (May 15th, 1931 *a*)	Hungary	Colombia
Bulgaria (November 29th, 1929)	Japan	Dominican Republic
Chile (November 20th, 1934 *a*)	Luxemburg	Ecuador
Cuba (August 17th, 1932 *a*)	Yugoslavia	Ethiopia
Czechoslovakia (February 19th, 1931)		Guatemala
Denmark (September 9th, 1929)		Haiti
Egypt (June 27th, 1930)		Honduras
France (February 1st, 1933)		Iran
Greece (September 18th, 1930)		Iraq
Italy (June 11th, 1931)		Liberia
Latvia (July 5th, 1937)		Mexico
Lithuania (April 2nd, 1938 *a*)		New Zealand
The Netherlands (September 13th, 1932)		Nicaragua
This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.		Panama
Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)		Paraguay
Norway (March 20th, 1929)		Peru
Poland (July 23rd, 1931)		Salvador
Portugal (October 23rd, 1931)		Siam
Roumania (June 22nd, 1931)		Spain
Sweden (February 17th, 1930)		Turkey
Switzerland (July 10th, 1930)		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Uruguay
		Venezuela

XX. SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERFEITING CURRENCY.[1]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)
Brazil (July 1st, 1938 *a*)
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935)

The procedure provided by Article 19 of the Convention, for the settlement of any disputes which might arise between the High Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or the application of the said Convention, shall not be applied in the case of a dispute between Poland and the Free City of Danzig.

DENMARK (February 19th, 1931) [2]
Ecuador (September 25th, 1937 *a*)
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)
FINLAND (September 25th, 1936 *a*)
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)
IRELAND (July 24th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (December 27th, 1935)
MEXICO (March 30th, 1936 *a*)
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)

In view of the provisions of Article 176, paragraph 2, of the Norwegian Ordinary Criminal Code and Article 2 of the Norwegian Law on the Extradition of Criminals, the extradition provided for in Article 10 of the present Convention may not be granted for the offence referred to in Article 3, No. 2, where the person uttering the counterfeit currency himself accepted it *bona fide* as genuine.[3]

POLAND (June 15th, 1934)
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)
TURKEY (January 21st, 1937 *a*)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[4] (July 13th, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.
INDIA

As provided in Article 24 of the Convention, this signature does not include the territories of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

CHINA
FRANCE
JAPAN
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA
ROUMANIA
SWITZERLAND

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
CANADA
CHILE
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SAN MARINO
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWEDEN
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on February 22nd, 1931. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 371; Vol. CXXII, p. 366; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 427; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 450; Vol. CXLVII, p. 351; Vol. CLII, p. 301; Vol. CLVI, p. 227; Vol. CLX, p. 380; Vol. CLXIV, p. 388; Vol. CLXXII, p. 412; Vol. CLXXVII, p. 406; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 392.

[2] According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[3] As this reservation has not given rise to any objection on the part of the States to which it was communicated in accordance with Article 22, it may be considered as accepted.

[4] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by :*
BELGIUM (June 6th, 1932)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
Brazil (July 1st, 1938 *a*)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)	GREAT BRITAIN and NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		AUSTRALIA
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)		BOLIVIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)		CANADA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (March 1st, 1935).		CHILE
DENMARK[1] (February 19th, 1931)	INDIA	COSTA RICA
Ecuador (September 25th, 1937 *a*)	CHINA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)	FRANCE	EGYPT
FINLAND (September 25th, 1936 *a*)	JAPAN	ETHIOPIA
GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)	LUXEMBURG	GUATEMALA
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)	PANAMA	HAITI
HUNGARY (June 14th, 1933)	ROUMANIA	HONDURAS
IRELAND (July 24th, 1934 *a*)	SWITZERLAND	ICELAND
ITALY (December 27th, 1935)		IRAN
MEXICO (March 30th, 1936 *a*)		IRAQ
MONACO (October 21st, 1931)		LATVIA
THE NETHERLANDS (April 30th, 1932)		LIBERIA
NORWAY (March 16th, 1931)		LIECHTENSTEIN
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		LITHUANIA
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		NEW ZEALAND
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		NICARAGUA
TURKEY (January 21st, 1937 *a*)		PARAGUAY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS[2] (July 13th, 1931)		PERU
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		SAN MARINO
		SALVADOR
		SIAM
		SWEDEN
		URUGUAY
		VENEZUELA

OPTIONAL PROTOCOL.[3]

(Geneva, April 20th, 1929.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signature not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by :*
Brazil (July 1st, 1938 *a*)	PANAMA	The Members of the League of Nations who did not sign it and the non-member States having signed or who have been invited to accede to the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency.
BULGARIA (May 22nd, 1930)		
COLOMBIA (May 9th, 1932)		
CUBA (June 13th, 1933)		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 12th, 1931)		
ESTONIA (August 30th, 1930 *a*)		
FINLAND (September 25th, 1936 *a*)		
GREECE (May 19th, 1931)		
POLAND (June 15th, 1934)		
PORTUGAL (September 18th, 1930)		
ROUMANIA (November 10th, 1930)		
SPAIN (April 28th, 1930)		
YUGOSLAVIA (November 24th, 1930)		

---

[1] Same note as for the Convention.

[2] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

[3] This Protocol came into force on August 30th, 1930. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 395; Vol. CXXII, p. 367; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 428; Vol. CXLVII, p. 351; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 412.

XXI. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE PREPARATION OF A TRANSIT CARD FOR EMIGRANTS.[1]

(Geneva, June 14th, 1929.)

In Force.

Definitive signatures.	*Signatures* ad referendum.	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
BELGIUM (June 14th, 1929)	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)	ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (June 14th, 1929)	HUNGARY	BULGARIA
FINLAND (October 9th, 1929)	SWITZERLAND	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FRANCE (June 14th, 1929)		DENMARK
GERMANY (May 12th, 1930)		ESTONIA
GREECE (June 22nd, 1931)		IRELAND
ITALY (June 14th, 1929)		LATVIA
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 3rd, 1930)		LITHUANIA
POLAND (December 23rd, 1929)		LUXEMBURG
ROUMANIA (November 26th, 1929)		NORWAY
SAAR TERRITORY GOVERNING COMMISSION (June 14th, 1929)		PORTUGAL
SPAIN (December 17th, 1929)		SWEDEN
		YUGOSLAVIA

XXII. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

3. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.[2]

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Signature by:*
ALBANIA (Sept. 12th, 1930)	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	AFGHANISTAN
BELGIUM (October 5th, 1931)	BOLIVIA	COSTA RICA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (February 12th, 1930)	BRAZIL	ECUADOR
	CHILE	EGYPT
	GUATEMALA	IRAQ
	HAITI	MEXICO
CANADA (August 28th, 1930)	LIBERIA	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
AUSTRALIA (August 28th, 1930)	NICARAGUA	
NEW ZEALAND (June 4th, 1930)	PARAGUAY	
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 17th, 1930)	PERU	
	SALVADOR	
IRELAND (August 2nd, 1930)	TURKEY	
INDIA (February 26th, 1930)		

---

[1] This Agreement is not subject to ratification. It came into force September 12th, 1929. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XCIV, p. 277; Vol. C, p. 263; and Vol. CXI, p. 416.

[2] The present Protocol shall come into force as soon as all States which have ratified the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, and also the United States, have deposited their ratifications (Article 7).

3. PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE ACCESSION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE STATUTE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 14th, 1929.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

BULGARIA (April 27th, 1931)
CHINA (October 14th, 1930)
COLOMBIA (January 6th, 1932)
CUBA (November 26th, 1930)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 30th, 1930)
DENMARK (March 11th, 1930)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (February 4th, 1933)
ESTONIA (September 8th, 1930)
ETHIOPIA (March 30th, 1935)
FINLAND (August 28th, 1930)
FRANCE (May 8th, 1931)
GERMANY (August 13th, 1930)
GREECE (August 29th, 1930)
HUNGARY (August 13th, 1930)
IRAN (April 25th, 1931)
ITALY (April 2nd, 1931)
JAPAN (November 14th, 1930)
LATVIA (August 29th, 1930)
LITHUANIA (January 23rd, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (September 15th, 1930)
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (August 8th, 1930)
NORWAY (April 10th, 1930)
PANAMA (May 2nd, 1935)
POLAND (May 13th, 1930)
PORTUGAL (June 12th, 1930)
ROUMANIA (August 4th, 1930)
SIAM (June 2nd, 1930)
SPAIN (July 15th, 1930)
SWEDEN (March 20th, 1930)
SWITZERLAND (July 5th, 1930)
URUGUAY (September 19th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 14th, 1932)
YUGOSLAVIA (August 27th, 1930)

XXIII. PROGRESSIVE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

1. CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BRAZIL (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
With reservations as regards Articles 5, 6, 7, 16 and 17, which Brazil will not adopt owing to difficulties with which it has to contend in connection with principles forming the basis of its internal legislation.
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations (April 6th, 1934)
CANADA (April 6th, 1934)
Australia (November 10th, 1937)
(Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island).

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BELGIUM
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
CHILE
COLOMBIA
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
CUBA
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 9, 10 and 11.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
DENMARK
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 5 and 11.
EGYPT
ESTONIA

The Convention is open to Accession by :

AFGHANISTAN
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
COSTA RICA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
IRAN
IRAQ
LIBERIA

[1] This Convention came into force on July 1st, 1937. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXIX, p. 89.

1. Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws *(continued)*.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

India (October 7th, 1935)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China (February 14th, 1935)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.

Monaco (April 27th, 1931 *a*)

The Netherlands (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
Excluding the provisions of Articles 8, 9 and 10 of the Convention.

Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)

Poland (June 15th, 1934)

Sweden (July 6th, 1933)
The Swedish Government declares that it does not accept to be bound by the provisions of the second sentence of Article 11, in the case where the wife referred to in the article, after recovering the nationality of her country of origin, fails to establish her ordinary residence in that country.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 4 and 10 and as regards the words "according to its law" of Article 13.
Latvia
Luxemburg
Mexico
Subject to reservation as regards paragraph 2 of Article 1.
Peru
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.
Portugal
Salvador
Spain
Switzerland
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
Uruguay
Yugoslavia

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Lithuania
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Roumania
San Marino
Siam
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

2. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

United States of America (August 3rd, 1932)

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)

Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
(Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru).

Union of South Africa (October 9th, 1935 *a*)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 2.

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 15, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
Canada
Chile
Denmark
Egypt
France
Germany
Greece
Ireland
Luxemburg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Bulgaria
China
Costa Rica
Czechoslovakia
Free City of Danzig
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
Iran
Iraq
Italy
Japan
Latvia
Liberia

[1] This Protocol came into force on May 25th, 1937. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXVIII, p. 227.

2. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality *(continued)*.

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Colombia (February 24th, 1937)

Cuba (October 22nd, 1936)

The Government of Cuba declares that it does not accept the obligation imposed by Article 2 of the Protocol when the minor referred to in that Article, although he has the right, on attaining his majority, to renounce or decline Cuban nationality, habitually resides in the territory of the State and is in fact more closely connected with the latter than with any other State whose nationality he may also possess.

The Netherlands (April 2nd, 1937)

Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.

Salvador (October 14th, 1935)

Sweden (July 6th, 1933)

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Lithuania
Monaco
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Poland
Roumania
San Marino
Siam
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

3. Protocol relating to a Certain Case of Statelessness.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)

Australia (July 8th, 1935)

(Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.)

Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)

India (September 28th, 1932)

In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

Chile (March 20th, 1935)

China (February 14th, 1935)

The Netherlands (April 2nd, 1937)

Including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.

Poland (June 15th, 1934)

Salvador (October 14th, 1935 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium

Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.

Canada
Colombia
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)
Denmark
Egypt
Estonia
France
Greece
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Luxemburg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Bulgaria
Costa Rica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Ethiopia
Finland
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
Iran
Iraq
Italy
Liberia
Lithuania
Monaco
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Roumania
San Marino
Siam
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

[1] This Protocol came into force on July 1st, 1937. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXIX, p. 115.

4. Special Protocol concerning Statelessness.[1]

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations (January 14th, 1932)

Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His Suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China (February 14th, 1935)

Salvador (October 14th, 1935)
The Republic of Salvador does not assume the obligation laid down by the Protocol where the Salvadorian nationality possessed by the person and ultimately lost by him was acquired by naturalisation.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
With the reservation that the application of this Protocol will not be extended to the Colony of the Belgian Congo or to the Territories under mandate.

Canada
Colombia
Cuba
Egypt
Greece
Ireland
Luxemburg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

The Protocol is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Bolivia
Bulgaria
Chile
Costa Rica
Czechoslovakia
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
Iran
Iraq
Italy
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Monaco
The Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Poland
Roumania
San Marino
Siam
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

---

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States have been deposited (Article 9, § 1).

The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 9 as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-Member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 10, § 1).

XXIV. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

I. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[1]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the utilisation of the rights provided in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention. As regards the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government intends to reserve all the rights provided in the Annex in question, with the exception of the right mentioned in Article 21 of that Annex.

* FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The undertaking by the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 of Annex II to the said Convention.
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Declares that Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, **6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
Subject to the following reservations with regard to Annex II:
Article 8: Paragraphs 1 and 3.
Article 9: As regards bills payable at a fixed date, or at a fixed period after date or after sight.
Article 13.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BRAZIL
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
ECUADOR
HUNGARY
LUXEMBURG
PERU
SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 257; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; Vol. CLX, p. 428; Vol. CLXIV, p. 412; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 236; Vol. CLXXVII, p. 437; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 402.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

** The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic informed the Secretary-General by a communication received at the Secretariat on October 20th, 1937, that, in consequence of certain changes introduced into French legislation regarding the maturity of commercial bills by the Decree-Law of August 31st, 1937, the holder of a bill of exchange may, in accordance with Article 38 of the Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Annex I to the Convention), present it, not only on the day on which it is payable, but either on that day or on one of the two following business days.

Consequently, the reservation made in this respect by France, on her accession to the Convention, concerning Article 5 of Annex II to the said instrument ceases to apply.

1. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, with Annexes and Protocol *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Article 15: (*a*) Proceedings against a drawer or endorser who has made an inequitable gain;

(*b*) Same proceedings against an acceptor who has made an inequitable gain.

"These proceedings shall be taken within a period of five years counting from the date of the bill of exchange."

Article 17: The provisions of Greek law relating to short-term limitations shall apply.

Article 20: The above-mentioned reservations apply equally to promissory notes.

ITALY (August 31st, 1932)

The Italian Government reserves the right to avail itself of the right granted in Articles 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the right referred to in the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention, in virtue of Article 1, paragraph 2.

MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)

NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

POLAND (December 19th, 1936 *a*)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, paragraph 2, and 22 of Annex II to the Convention.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15 and 17 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Annex II.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (November 25th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservation mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, and Protocol.[2]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)	BRAZIL	AFGHANISTAN
*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)	COLOMBIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ALBANIA
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)	ECUADOR	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	HUNGARY	SA'UDI ARABIA
	LUXEMBURG	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	PERU	AUSTRALIA
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)	SPAIN	BOLIVIA
	TURKEY	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
	YUGOSLAVIA	

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 317; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; Vol. CLX, p. 428; Vol. CLXIV, p. 412; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 237; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 438.

2. CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)	BULGARIA
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)	CANADA
GREECE (August 31st, 1931)	CHILE
ITALY (August 31st, 1932)	CHINA
JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)	COSTA RICA
MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)	CUBA
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)	EGYPT
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)	ESTONIA
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)	ETHIOPIA
POLAND (December 19th, 1936 *a*)	GUATEMALA
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.	HAITI
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)	HONDURAS
SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)[1]	ICELAND
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (November 25th, 1936 *a*)	INDIA
	IRAN
	IRAQ
	IRELAND
	LATVIA
	LIBERIA
	LIECHTENSTEIN
	LITHUANIA
	MEXICO
	NEW ZEALAND
	NICARAGUA
	PANAMA
	PARAGUAY
	ROUMANIA
	SALVADOR
	SAN MARINO
	SIAM
	SUDAN
	URUGUAY
	VENEZUELA

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL.[2]

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (August 31st, 1932)	BRAZIL	AFGHANISTAN
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 18th, 1934 *a*) His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His Colonies or Protectorates or any territories under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.	COLOMBIA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ALBANIA
	ECUADOR	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
	HUNGARY	SA'UDI ARABIA
	LUXEMBURG	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	PERU	AUSTRALIA
	SPAIN	BOLIVIA
	TURKEY	BULGARIA
	YUGOSLAVIA	CANADA
NEWFOUNDLAND (May 7th, 1934 *a*) Subject to the provision D. I. in the Protocol of the Convention.		CHILE
		CHINA

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 337; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; Vol. CLX, p. 429; Vol. CLXIV, p. 413; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 237; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 439.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Barbados (* with limitation)
Basutoland
Bechuanaland Protectorate
Bermuda (with limitation)
British Guiana (with limitation)
British Honduras
Ceylon (with limitation)
Cyprus (with limitation)
Fiji (with limitation)
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar (with limitation)
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation)
Malay States:
(*a*) Federated Malay States:
Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor (with limitation)
(*b*) Unfederated Malay States:
Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei (with limitation)
Malta
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation)
Straits Settlements (with limitation)
Swaziland
Trinidad and Tobago (with limitation)
Uganda Protectorate (with limitation)
Windward Islands:
Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent (with limitation)
**IRELAND (July 10th, 1936 *a*)
***FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
***GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
ITALY (August 31st, 1932)
JAPAN (August 31st, 1932)
MONACO (January 25th, 1934 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

(July 18th, 1936 *a*)
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

* The words "with limitation" placed after the names of certain territories indicate that the limitation contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention applies to these territories.

** The Government of Ireland having informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its desire to be allowed the limitation specified in paragraph I of Section D of the Protocol to this Convention, the Secretary-General has transmitted this desire to the interested States in application of paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned Section. No objection having been raised on the part of the said States, this limitation should be considered as accepted.

*** All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 7th, 1930.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
POLAND (December 19th, 1936 *a*)
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932)[1]
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (November 25th, 1936 *a*)

XXV. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.[2]

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
DENMARK (May 15th, 1931)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
FINLAND (July 30th, 1931)	BELGIUM	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)	BOLIVIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations	CANADA
		CHILE
		CHINA
		COLOMBIA
	AUSTRALIA	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	IRELAND	ECUADOR
	BULGARIA	GUATEMALA
	CUBA	HAITI
	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	HONDURAS
	ESTONIA	HUNGARY
	ETHIOPIA	INDIA
	FRANCE	IRAQ
	GERMANY	JAPAN
	GREECE	LIBERIA
	ITALY	LUXEMBURG
		MEXICO

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] The present Convention shall not come into force until it has received ratifications or accessions resulting in causing a sum of not less than 50 million gold francs, for the annual service of loans, to be covered by ordinary guarantees and also by the special guarantees of not less than three Governments. It shall enter into force ninety days after the date on which the conditions provided above are satisfied and subject to the provisions of Article 35.

CONVENTION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

LATVIA
LITHUANIA
THE NETHERLANDS, including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao.
NORWAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SPAIN
SWEDEN
In virtue of the constitutional laws of Sweden, loan operations are entrusted to a special authority (Riksgäldskontoret) appointed direct by Parliament.
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
SALVADOR
SIAM
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

XXVI. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.

BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932)
Belgium cannot undertake, for the present, to apply the provisions relating to "Warning of gale expected to affect the locality" which form the first chapter of the Regulations of this Agreement.
Further, the ratification by Belgium of the provisions which are the object of Chapter II (Tide and depth signals), and Chapter III (Signals concerning the movement of vessels at the entrances of harbours or important channels), will only take effect when Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Norway shall have themselves notified their effective ratifications of the provisions contained in these two chapters.
This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)
CHINA (May 29th, 1935)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
FINLAND (June 12th, 1936)
FRANCE (July 13th, 1931)
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:
French West Africa
French Equatorial Africa
(October 28th, 1933 *a*)

Signatures subject to Ratification.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
CUBA
ESTONIA
GERMANY
SWEDEN

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA
IRELAND
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on November 22nd, 1931. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXV, p. 95; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 453; Vol. CXLII, p. 379; Vol. CLVI, p. 241; Vol. CLX, p. 393; Vol. CLXIV, p. 390; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 395.

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS *(continued)*.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.	*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
Togoland, Cameroons, Madagascar, French Settlements in India, Indo-China, Reunion, French Coast of Somaliland, New Caledonia, Oceania, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guiana, St. Pierre and Miquelon (October 28th, 1933 *a*)	NORWAY
GREECE (September 14th, 1932)	PANAMA
LATVIA (September 17th, 1935 *a*)	PERU
MONACO (November 3rd, 1933)	SALVADOR
MOROCCO (September 3rd, 1931)	SIAM
THE NETHERLANDS (August 24th, 1931 *s*) Including the Netherlands Indies.	TANGIER
POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)	URUGUAY
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)	VENEZUELA
ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)	
SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)	
TUNIS (October 27th, 1931)	
TURKEY (June 27th, 1936 *a*)	
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)	
Yugoslavia (December 11th, 1937)	

2. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS.[1]

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.	*Signatures subject to Ratification.*	*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
BELGIUM (February 10th, 1932) This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.	CUBA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)	GERMANY	ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) Does not include any Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate of His Britannic Majesty.		UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
INDIA (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) Does not include any of the Indian States under British suzerainty.		ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
CHINA (May 29th, 1935)		AUSTRALIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)		BULGARIA
		CANADA
		CHILE
		COLOMBIA
		COSTA RICA
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
		EGYPT
		ECUADOR
		GUATEMALA
		HAITI
		HONDURAS
		ICELAND

[1] The present Agreement entered into force on January 21st, 1931. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXII, p. 21; Vol. CXVII, p. 331; Vol. CXXX, p. 464; Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 449; Vol. CXLII, p. 371; Vol. CXLVII, p. 350; Vol. CLVI, p. 226; Vol. CLX, p. 380; Vol. CLXIV, p. 387; and Vol. CLXXII, p. 412.

2. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS *(continued)*.

(Lisbon, October 23rd, 1930.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.		*The Agreement is open to Accession by:*
DENMARK (April 29th, 1931 *s*)		IRAN
ESTONIA (September 16th, 1936)		IRELAND
FINLAND (May 23rd, 1934)		ITALY
FRANCE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		JAPAN
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:	(October 28th, 1933 *a*)	LIBERIA
French West Africa		LITHUANIA
French Equatorial Africa		MEXICO
Togoland		NEW ZEALAND
Cameroons		NICARAGUA
Madagascar		NORWAY
French Settlements in India		PANAMA
Indo-China		PERU
Reunion		SALVADOR
French Coast of Somaliland		SIAM
New Caledonia		TANGIER
Oceania		URUGUAY
Martinique		VENEZUELA
Guadeloupe		
Guiana		
St. Pierre and Miquelon		
MOROCCO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		
TUNIS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		
GREECE (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		
IRAQ (October 15th, 1935 *a*)		
LATVIA (September 17th, 1935 *a*)		
MONACO (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		
THE NETHERLANDS (October 23rd, 1930 *s*) Including the Netherlands Indies.		
POLAND (October 2nd, 1933)		
PORTUGAL (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)		
ROUMANIA (June 1st, 1931 *s*)		
SPAIN (November 3rd, 1933)		
SWEDEN (February 3rd, 1933)		
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (April 27th, 1931 *s*)		
TURKEY (June 27th, 1936 *a*)		
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)		

XXVII. DECLARATION BY THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE POWERS WHICH ARE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION INSTITUTING THE DEFINITIVE STATUTE OF THE DANUBE.

(Geneva, December 5th, 1930.)

Signatures.	*Signatures ad referendum.*
BELGIUM	CZECHOSLOVAKIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	GERMANY
BULGARIA	GREECE
FRANCE	HUNGARY
ITALY	
ROUMANIA	
YUGOSLAVIA	

XXVIII. UNIFICATION OF RIVER LAW.

1. Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules concerning Collisions in Inland Navigation, with Protocol-Annex.[1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Accession.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Portugal (March 1st, 1932 *a*) Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.	Belgium Czechoslovakia Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland). Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. France Germany Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. Hungary Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. Italy Luxemburg The Netherlands Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. Poland Roumania Switzerland Subject to the reservation provided under III, *ad* Article 14 of the Protocol-Annex. Yugoslavia	Albania Great Britain and Northern Ireland Bulgaria Denmark Estonia Finland Greece Ireland Latvia Lithuania Norway Spain Sweden Turkey Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

2. Convention on the Registration of Inland Navigation Vessels, Rights *in rem* over such Vessels and Other Cognate Questions, with Protocol-Annex.[2]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	Belgium Czechoslovakia Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. France Germany Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. Hungary Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. Italy Luxemburg	Albania Great Britain and Northern Ireland Bulgaria Denmark Estonia Finland Greece Ireland Latvia Lithuania Norway Portugal Roumania Spain Sweden

[1] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 17).
[2] This Convention shall enter into force six months after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 53).

2. CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *in rem* OVER SUCH VESSELS AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX *(continued)*.

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
THE NETHERLANDS Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. POLAND SWITZERLAND Subject to the reservation provided under IX, *ad* Article 50, of the Protocol-Annex. YUGOSLAVIA	TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

3. CONVENTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES FOR ATTESTING THE RIGHT OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS TO A FLAG, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX. [1]

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA FRANCE HUNGARY Subject to the reservation provided under IV, *ad* Article 8, of the Protocol-Annex. ITALY LUXEMBURG POLAND YUGOSLAVIA	ALBANIA GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND BULGARIA DENMARK FREE CITY OF DANZIG ESTONIA FINLAND GERMANY GREECE IRELAND LATVIA LITHUANIA THE NETHERLANDS NORWAY PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SPAIN SWEDEN SWITZERLAND TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

XXIX. UNIFICATION OF LAWS ON BILLS OF EXCHANGE, PROMISSORY NOTES AND CHEQUES.

1. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL.[2]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935) This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, para. 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to this Convention.	BELGIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA ECUADOR HUNGARY LUXEMBURG MEXICO ROUMANIA	AFGHANISTAN UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA ALBANIA UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SA'UDI ARABIA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA

[1] This Convention shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third ratification or accession (Article 11).

[2] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 355; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; Vol. CLXIV, p. 413; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 239; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 439.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

I. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)

The undertaking of the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, par. 1, 16 (*a*), 18, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of Annex II to the said Convention.

The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*), 18 and 27 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)

Declares that Articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, ** 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to the Convention.

*GREECE (June 1st, 1934)

Subject to the following conditions:

A. The Hellenic Government does not avail itself of the reservations provided in Articles 1, 2, 5-8, 10-14, 16, paragraph 1 (*a*) and (*b*), 18, paragraph 1, 19-22, 24 and 26, paragraph 2, of Annex II.

B. The Hellenic Government avails itself of the following reservations provided in Annex II:

(1) The reservation in Article 3, paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the Uniform Law being replaced by the words: " A cheque which does not specify the place of payment shall be regarded as payable at the place where it was drawn ".

(2) The reservation in Article 4, the following paragraph being added to Article 3: " A cheque issued and payable in Greece shall not be valid as a cheque unless it is drawn on a banking Company or Greek legal person having the status of an institution of public law, engaging in banking business ".

(3) The reservation in Article 9, the following provision being added to paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Uniform Law: "But in such exceptional case the issue of the cheque to bearer is prohibited."

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

SPAIN
TURKEY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by :

BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
NEW ZEALAND
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
SUDAN
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

** The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic informed the Secretary-General, by a communication received at the Secretariat on October 20th, 1937, that, in consequence of certain changes introduced into French legislation regarding the maturity of commercial bills by the Decree-Law of August 31st, 1937, and in application of Article 27 of Annex II to the Convention and Article II of the Final Act of the Conference by which it was adopted, no payment whatsoever, in respect of a bill, draft cheque, current account, deposit of funds or securities or otherwise, may be demanded and no protest may be drawn up on Saturdays or Mondays, which, for these purposes only, are assimilated to legal holidays.

1. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, with Annexes and Protocol *(cont)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

(4) The reservation in Article 15, the following paragraph being added to Article 31 of the Uniform Law: "By presidential decree, promulgated at the instance of the Ministers of Justice and National Economy, it may be decided what institutions in Greece are to be regarded as clearing-houses."

(5) The reservation in the second paragraph of Article 16, it being laid down that "provisions with regard to the loss or theft of cheques shall be embodied in Greek law."

(6) The reservation in Article 17, the following paragraph being added at the end of Article 35: "In exceptional circumstances connected with the rate of exchange of Greek currency, the effects of the stipulation contained in paragraph 3 of the present Article may be abrogated in each case by special legislation as regards cheques payable in Greece. The above provision may also be applied as regards cheques issued in Greece."

(7) The reservation in Article 23, the following being added to No. 2 in Article 45 of the Uniform Law: "which, however, in the case of cheques issued and payable in Greece, shall be calculated in each case at the legal rate of interest in force in Greece." Similarly, the following is added to No. 2 of Article 46 of the Uniform Law: "except in the special case dealt with in No. 2 of the preceding Article."

(8) The reservation in Article 25, the following Article being added to the National Law: "In the event of forfeiture of the bearer's rights or limitation of the right of action, proceedings may be taken against the drawer or endorser on the ground of his having made an inequitable gain. The right to take such proceedings lapses after three years from the date of the issue of the cheque."

(9) The reservation in the first paragraph of Article 26, a provision being enacted to the following effect: "The causes of interruption or suspension of limitation of actions enacted in the present law shall be governed by the rules regarding limitation and short-term limitation of actions."

(10) The reservation in Article 27, a separate Article being appended in the following terms: "Legal holidays within the meaning of the present law shall be all Sundays and all full days of rest observed by public offices."

(11) The reservation in Article 28 and the reservation in Article 29.

(12) The reservation in Article 30.

ITALY (August 31st, 1933)

In accordance with Article 1 of this Convention, the Royal Italian Government intends to avail itself of the rights provided in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, para. 2, 19, 20, 21, para. 2, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

In connection with Article 15 of Annex II to this Convention, the institutions referred to in the said article are, in Italy, solely the "Stanze di compensazione".

JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)

By application of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, this ratification is subject to the benefit of the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention.

MONACO (February 9th, 1933)

*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

POLAND (December 19th, 1936 *a*)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 15, 16, paragraph 1 (*a*), 16, paragraph 2, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

* PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)

Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.

SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (*a*) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 4, 8, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

2. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
*Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)	Belgium	Afghanistan
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)	Czechoslovakia	Union of South Africa
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	Ecuador	Albania
Finland (August 31st, 1932)	Hungary	United States of America
France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)	Luxemburg	Sa'udi Arabia
*Germany (October 3rd, 1933)	Mexico	Argentine Republic
*Greece (June 1st, 1934)	Roumania	Australia
Italy (August 31st, 1933)	Spain	Bolivia
Japan (August 25th, 1933)	Turkey	Brazil
Monaco (February 9th, 1933)	Yugoslavia	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
*The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)		Bulgaria
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935*a*)		Canada
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)		Chile
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)		China
Norway (July 27th, 1932)		Colombia
Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)		Costa Rica
*Portugal (June 8th, 1934)		Cuba
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.		Dominican Republic
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)		Egypt
Switzerland (August 26th, 1932)[1]		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Ireland
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		New Zealand
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sudan
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Uruguay
		Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on January 1st, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 407; Vol. CLVI, p. 293; Vol. CLXIV, p. 413; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 239; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 440.

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques, and Protocol.[1]

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (January 13th, 1932)
This ratification does not include any British Colony or Protectorate or any mandated territory in respect of which the mandate is exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.
Barbados
Basutoland
Bechuanaland Protectorate
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
Ceylon
Cyprus
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Malay States:
(*a*) Federated Malay States:
Negri Sembilan
Pahang
Perak
Selangor
(*b*) Unfederated Malay States:
Johore
Kedah
Kelantan
Perlis
Trengganu, and
Brunei
Malta
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Straits Settlements
Swaziland
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Ireland (July 10th, 1936 *a*)

(July 18th, 1936 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
Czechoslovakia
Ecuador
Hungary
Luxemburg
Mexico
Roumania
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Bulgaria
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Latvia
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
New Zealand
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
San Marino
Siam
Sudan
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

---

[1] The Convention and Protocol came into force on November 29th, 1933. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIII, p. 7; Vol. CLVI, p. 292; Vol. CLXIV, p. 412; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 235; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 426.

3. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

*FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (June 24th, 1935)
DENMARK (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
FINLAND (August 31st, 1932)
FRANCE (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
*GERMANY (October 3rd, 1933)
*GREECE (June 1st, 1934)
ITALY (August 31st, 1933)
JAPAN (August 25th, 1933)
MONACO (February 9th, 1933)
*THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
NICARAGUA (March 16, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (July 27th, 1932)
POLAND (December 19th, 1936 *a*)
*PORTUGAL (June 8th, 1934)
Subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal.
SWEDEN (July 27th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (August 26th, 1932) [1]

XXX. ROAD TRAFFIC.

1. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS.[2]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

FRANCE (October 11th, 1934)
Does not assume any obligation in regard to Algeria, colonies, protectorates and territories under its mandate.
Algeria (July 22nd, 1935 *a*)
HUNGARY (January 8th, 1937)
ITALY (September 25th, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (April 9th, 1936)
MONACO (January 19th, 1932*a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
DENMARK
GERMANY
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA

---

* All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[1] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[2] This Convention came into force on July 16th, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CI., p. 247; Vol. CLX, p. 439; Vol. CLXIV, p. 421; Vol. CLXXII, p. 426; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 462.

1. Convention concerning the Unification of Road Signals (*continued*).

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Poland (April 5th, 1934)
Portugal (April 18th, 1932 *a*)
Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
Spain (July 18th, 1933)
Sweden (February 25th, 1938 *a*)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Turkey (October 15th, 1936)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
Siam
Uruguay
Venezuela

2. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles, with Protocol-Annex. [1]

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Belgium (November 9th, 1932)
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 20th, 1932)
Does not include any colonies, protectorates or overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Southern Rhodesia (August 6th, 1932 *a*)
Newfoundland (January 9th, 1933 *a*)
Ceylon, Cyprus, Gold Coast: Colony, Ashanti, Northern Territories, Togoland under British mandate (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Czechoslovakia
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland)

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
France
Germany
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti

[1] This Convention entered into force on May 9th, 1933. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXVIII, p. 149; Vol. CXLII, p. 393; Vol. CXLVII, p. 356; Vol. CLVI, p. 260; Vol. CLX, p. 418; Vol. CLXIV, p. 403; Vol. CLXXII, p. 426; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 397.

2. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles, with Protocol-Annex *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 30th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.		*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Hong-Kong Jamaica Malta Windward Islands: Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent	(January 3rd, 1935 *a*)	Honduras Hungary India Iran Iraq Japan Latvia Liberia Lithuania Mexico Monaco New Zealand Nicaragua Norway Panama Paraguay Peru Salvador Siam Uruguay Venezuela
Nigeria: Colony, Protectorate, Cameroons under British Mandate Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)	(March 11th, 1936 *a*)	
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (April 29th, 1936 *a*)		
Straits Settlements *Federated Malay States:* *Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor* *Unfederated Malay States:* *Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu*	(November 6th, 1937 *a*)	
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) *Uganda* *Nyasaland* *Tanganyika Territory* *Zanzibar* *Northern Rhodesia*	(May 3rd, 1938 *a*)	

Ireland (November 27th, 1933 *a*)
Bulgaria (March 5th, 1932 *a*)
Denmark (December 4th, 1931)
Finland (May 23rd, 1934 *a*)
Italy (September 25th, 1933)
Luxemburg (March 31st, 1933)
The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 16th, 1934)
Poland (June 15th, 1934)
Portugal (January 23rd, 1932)
Does not assume any obligation as regards its Colonies.
Roumania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
Spain (June 3rd, 1933)
Sweden (November 9th, 1933)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Turkey (September 25th, 1936)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 9th, 1933 *a*)

3. Agreement between Customs Authorities in order to facilitate the Procedure in the Case of Undischarged or Lost Triptychs. [1]

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.	*Signature* ad referendum.	*The Agreement is open to Signature by:*
Belgium (March 28th, 1931) Great Britain and Northern Ireland (March 28th, 1931) Ireland (May 6th, 1931) Bulgaria (February 27th, 1932) Czechoslovakia (June 28th, 1933) Denmark (March 28th, 1931)	Yugoslavia	Albania Free City of Danzig Estonia Finland Iceland Latvia Liechtenstein

[1] This Agreement entered into force on June 26th, 1931. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXIX, p. 47; Vol. CXXVI, p. 460; Vol. CXXXIV, p. 432; Vol. CLVI, p. 230; and Vol. CLX, p. 384.

3. AGREEMENT BETWEEN CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THE PROCEDURE IN THE CASE OF UNDISCHARGED OR LOST TRIPTYCHS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, March 28th, 1931.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

FRANCE (April 15th, 1931)
GERMANY (March 28th, 1931)
GREECE (August 18th, 1931)
HUNGARY (August 14th, 1931)
ITALY (May 27th, 1931)
LUXEMBURG (March 28th, 1931)
THE NETHERLANDS (June 11th, 1931)
NORWAY (September 27th, 1932)
POLAND (September 9th, 1932)
PORTUGAL (August 26th, 1931)
ROUMANIA (June 19th, 1935)
SPAIN (July 8th, 1931)
SWEDEN (February 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (March 28th, 1931)
TURKEY (May 15th, 1932)
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (September 6th, 1935)

The Agreement is open to Signature by:

LITHUANIA
MONACO
SAN MARINO

XXXI. INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY.

CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CREDIT COMPANY, WITH CHARTER AND STATUTES.[1]

(Geneva, May 21st, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications

GREECE (August 31st, 1931)
LATVIA (September 28th, 1931)
POLAND (April 22nd, 1932)
ROUMANIA (February 4th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (December 31st, 1931)
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

BELGIUM
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DENMARK

The Danish Government reserves the right to make the entry into force of this Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being ratified and also put into force by Norway and Sweden.

ESTONIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
HUNGARY
ITALY
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
THE NETHERLANDS (for the Kingdom in Europe only)
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
SWEDEN [2]

The Convention is open to Accession by:

1. The European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *a*.
2. The non-European Members of the League of Nations, within the time-limit and under the conditions provided for in Article 15, § *b*.

---

[1] The present Convention shall come into force as soon as the amount of the contributions, whether obligatory or voluntary, to the Special Reserve due from the Governments which have ratified the Convention attains the sum of twenty-five million francs. If this condition is not realised before December 31st, 1931, a Conference of the Governments which have ratified the Convention shall be called by the Council of the League of Nations. This Conference will determine new conditions for the coming into force of the Convention (Article 16).

[2] On signing this Convention, the Swedish Plenipotentiary made the following declaration:

"The Swedish Government reserves the right to make its ratification of this Convention depend on the attitude which the Governments of Denmark and Norway shall adopt towards it."

XXXII. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS. [1]

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (June 21st, 1935 *a*)
Albania (October 9th, 1937 *a*)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (April 28th, 1932)

1. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purpose of internal control and control of import into, and export from, territory under its jurisdiction, of opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures stricter than the provisions of the Convention.
2. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purposes of controlling transit through its territories of raw opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures by which the production of an import permit issued by the country of destination may be made a condition precedent to the granting of permission for transit through its territory.
3. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to send statistics of import and export to the Permanent Central Opium Board short of 60 days after the close of the three months' period to which such statistics refer.
4. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to state separately amounts of drugs purchased or imported for Government purposes.
5. Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs by them on the part of the United States of America on this date is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognises a regime or entity which signs or accedes to the Convention as the Government of a country when that regime or entity is not recognised by the Government of the United States of America as the Government of that country.
6. The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed on this date, does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country represented by a regime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognise as the Government of that country until such country has a Government recognised by the Government of the United States of America.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
ETHIOPIA
LIBERIA
PARAGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by :

ICELAND
YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The present Convention entered into force on July 9th, 1933. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXXXIX, p. 301; Vol. CXLVII, p. 361; Vol. CLII, p. 344; Vol. CLVI, p. 268; Vol. CLX, p. 419; Vol. CLXIV, p. 407; Vol. CLXVIII, p 234; Vol. CLXXII, p. 426; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 398.

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

	Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	
Sa'udi Arabia	(August 15th, 1936)	
Belgium	(April 10th, 1933)	
	This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo, nor the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.	
Brazil	(April 5th, 1933)	
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	(April 1st, 1933)	
	His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates and overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Government in the United Kingdom.	
British Honduras		(May 18th, 1936 *a*)
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		
Ceylon		
Cyprus		
Falkland Islands and Dependencies		
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		
Gibraltar		
Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony		
(*b*) Ashanti		
(*c*) Northern Territories		
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate		
Hong-Kong		
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		
Leeward Islands:		
Antigua		
Dominica		
Montserrat		
St. Christopher and Nevis		
Virgin Islands		
Mauritius		
Nigeria: (*a*) Colony		
(*b*) Protectorate		
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate		
North Borneo, State of		
Northern Rhodesia		
Nyasaland Protectorate		
Sarawak		
Seychelles		
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)		
Somaliland Protectorate		
Straits Settlements		
Tanganyika Territory		
Tonga		
Trinidad and Tobago		
Uganda Protectorate		
Zanzibar Protectorate		
Southern Rhodesia	(July 14th, 1937 *a*)	
Newfoundland	(June 28th, 1937 *a*)	
Barbados		(August 24th, 1938 *a*)
Bermuda		
British Guiana		
Fiji		
Malay States:		
(a) *Federated Malay States:*		
Negri Sembilan		
Pahang		
Perak		
Selangor		
(b) *Unfederated Malay States:*		
Kedah		
Perlis		
Brunei		
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)		
St. Helena and Ascension		
Trans-Jordan		
Windward Islands:		
Grenada		
St. Vincent		
Canada	(October 17th, 1932)	

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AUSTRALIA (January 24th, 1934 *a*)
This accession applies to Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.
NEW ZEALAND (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
Union of South Africa (January 4th, 1938 *a*)
IRELAND (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
INDIA (November 14th, 1932)
BULGARIA (March 20th, 1933 *a*)
CHILE (March 31st, 1933)
CHINA (January 10th, 1934 *a*)
COLOMBIA (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
COSTA RICA (April 5th, 1933)
CUBA (April 4th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 12th, 1933)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)
DENMARK (June 5th, 1936)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (April 8th, 1933)
EGYPT (April 10th, 1933)
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
ESTONIA (July 5th, 1935 *a*)
FINLAND (September 25th, 1936 *a*)
FRANCE (April 10th, 1933)
The French Government makes every reservation, with regard to the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated Territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.
GERMANY (April 10th, 1933)
GREECE (December 27th, 1934)
GUATEMALA (May 1st, 1933)
HAITI (May 4th, 1933 *a*)
HONDURAS (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
HUNGARY (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)
IRAQ (May 30th, 1934 *a*)
ITALY (March 21st, 1933)
JAPAN (June 3rd, 1935)
The Japanese Government declare that, in view of the necessity of close co-operation between the High Contracting Parties in order to carry out most effectively the provisions of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931, they understand that the present position of Japan, regardless of whether she be a Member of the League of Nations or not, is to be maintained in the matter of the composition of the organs and the appointment of the members thereof mentioned in the said Convention.[1]
LATVIA (August 3rd, 1937 *a*)
LIECHTENSTEIN [2]
LITHUANIA (April 10th, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (May 30th, 1936)
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
The Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory—as it has already done—measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the preparation, use, possession, importation, exportation and consumption of the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

---

[1] Before ratifying the Convention with the declaration here set out, the Japanese Government consulted the Contracting Parties, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General. A summary of the correspondence which took place was published in the League of Nations *Official Journal* for September 1935 (16th Year, No. 9).

[2] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

4. Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Monaco (February 16th, 1933)
The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
Panama (April 15th, 1935)
Peru (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
Poland (April 11th, 1933)
Portugal (June 17th, 1932)

The Portuguese Government makes every reservation with regard to its colonies as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Roumania (April 11th, 1933)
Salvador (April 7th, 1933 *a*)

(*a*) The Republic of Salvador does not agree to the provisions of Article 26, on the ground that there is no reason why the High Contracting Parties should be given the option of not applying the Convention to their colonies, protectorates, and overseas mandated territories.

(*b*) The Republic of Salvador states that it disagrees with the reservations embodied in Nos. 5 and 6 of the declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America regarding Governments not recognised by the Government of that country; in its opinion, those reservations constitute an infringement of the national sovereignty of Salvador, whose present Government, though not as yet recognised by the United States Government, has been recognised by the majority of the civilised countries of the world. Their recognition is due to their conviction that that Government is a perfectly constitutional one and affords a full and complete guarantee of the performance of its international duties, inasmuch as it enjoys the unanimous, decided and effective support of all the inhabitants of the Republic, whether citizens of the country or foreigners resident therein.

As it respects the internal regimes of other nations, the Republic of Salvador considers that the Convention in question, being of a strictly hygienic and humanitarian character, does not offer a suitable occasion to formulate such political reservations as have called forth this comment.

San Marino (June 12th, 1933)
Siam (February 22nd, 1934)

As its harmful-habit-forming drugs law goes beyond the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the present Convention on certain points, the Siamese Government reserves the right to apply its existing law.

Spain (April 7th, 1933)
Sudan (August 25th, 1932 *a*)
Sweden (August 12th, 1932)
Switzerland (April 10th, 1933)
Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (April 7th, 1933)
Venezuela (November 15th, 1933)

Protocol of Signature.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by :*
Albania (October 9th, 1937 *a*)	Argentine Republic	Afghanistan
United States of America (April 28th, 1932)	Bolivia	Bulgaria
Sa'udi Arabia (August 15th, 1936)	Ethiopia	China
Belgium (April 10th, 1933)	Guatemala	Haiti
Brazil (April 5th, 1933)	Panama	Iceland
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 1st, 1933)	Paraguay	Iraq
Same reservation as for the Convention.		Latvia
		Liberia
		Salvador
		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
		Yugoslavia

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS *(continued)*.

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

British Honduras
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Ashanti
  (*c*) Northern Territories
  (*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
  Antigua
  Dominica
  Montserrat
  St. Christopher and Nevis
  Virgin Islands
Mauritius
Nigeria:
  (*a*) Colony
  (*b*) Protectorate
  (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Zanzibar Protectorate

(May 18th, 1936 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (July 14th, 1937 *a*)

NEWFOUNDLAND (June 28th, 1937 *a*)

Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
Fiji
Malay States:
  (a) *Federated Malay States:*
    Negri Sembilan
    Pahang
    Perak
    Selangor
  (b) *Unfederated Malay States:*
    Kedah
    Perlis, and
    Brunei
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan)
St. Helena and Ascension
Trans-Jordan
Windward Islands:
  Grenada
  St. Vincent

(August 24th, 1938 *a*)

4. CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS *(continued)*.

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 13th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

CANADA (October 17th, 1932)
AUSTRALIA (January 24th, 1934 *a*)
NEW ZEALAND (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
Union of South Africa (January 4th, 1938 *a*)
IRELAND (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
INDIA (November 14th, 1932)
CHILE (November 20th, 1933)
COLOMBIA (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
COSTA RICA (April 5th, 1933)
CUBA (April 4th, 1933)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (April 12th, 1933 *a*)
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland) (April 18th, 1933)
DENMARK (June 5th, 1936)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (April 8th, 1933)
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
EGYPT (April 10th, 1933)
ESTONIA (July 5th, 1935 *a*)
FINLAND (September 25th, 1936 *a*)
FRANCE (April 10th, 1933)
GERMANY (April 10th, 1933)
GREECE (December 27th, 1934)
HONDURAS (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
HUNGARY (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
IRAN (September 28th, 1932)
ITALY (March 21st, 1933)
JAPAN (June 3rd, 1935)
LIECHTENSTEIN [1]
LITHUANIA (April 10th, 1933)
LUXEMBURG (May 30th, 1936)
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)
MONACO (March 20th, 1933)
THE NETHERLANDS [2] (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 22nd, 1933)
NICARAGUA (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
NORWAY (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
PERU (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
POLAND (April 11th, 1933)
PORTUGAL (June 17th, 1932)
ROUMANIA (April 11th, 1933)
SAN MARINO (June 12th, 1933)
SIAM (February 22nd, 1934)
SPAIN (April 7th, 1933)
SUDAN (January 18th, 1933 *a*)
SWEDEN (August 12th, 1932)
SWITZERLAND (April 10th, 1933)
TURKEY (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
URUGUAY (April 7th, 1933)
VENEZUELA (September 11th, 1934)

[1] Same note as for the Convention.
[2] The instrument of ratification specifies that the reservation relating to paragraph 2 of Article 22, as formulated by the Netherlands representative at the time of signature of the Protocol, should be considered as withdrawn.

XXXIII. WHALING.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING. [1]

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (July 7th, 1932)	ALBANIA	AFGHANISTAN
BRAZIL (November 21st, 1932 *a*)	BELGIUM	SA'UDI ARABIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 18th, 1934)	AUSTRALIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.	INDIA	BOLIVIA
Bahamas	COLOMBIA	BULGARIA
Barbados	GERMANY	CHILE
Bermuda	GREECE	CHINA
British Guiana	ROUMANIA	COSTA RICA
British Honduras		CUBA
British Solomon Islands Protectorate		FREE CITY OF DANZIG
Ceylon		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
Cyprus		ESTONIA
Falkland Islands and Dependencies		ETHIOPIA
Fiji		GUATEMALA
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)		HAITI
Gibraltar		HONDURAS
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony		HUNGARY
Gold Coast Colony		ICELAND
Hong-Kong		IRAN
Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands)		IRAQ
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)		JAPAN
Leeward Islands:		LIBERIA
Antigua		LIECHTENSTEIN
Dominica		LITHUANIA
Montserrat		LUXEMBURG
St. Christopher and Nevis		PANAMA
Virgin Islands		PARAGUAY
Malay States:		PERU
(*a*) Federated Malay States:		PORTUGAL
Negri Sembilan		SALVADOR
Pahang		SAN MARINO
Perak		SIAM
Selangor		SWEDEN
(*b*) Unfederated Malay States:		UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
Johore		URUGUAY
Kedah		VENEZUELA
Kelantan		
Perlis		
Trengganu, and Brunei		

(February 17th, 1937 *a*)

[1] This Convention came into force on January 16th, 1935. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLV, p. 349; Vol. CLXIV, p. 440; and Vol. CLXXVII, p. 465.

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING *(continued)*.

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

In Force.

	Ratifications or definitive Accessions.
Malta Mauritius Nigeria: (*a*) Colony (*b*) Protectorate (*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate North Borneo, State of Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) St. Helena and Ascension Sarawak Seychelles Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) Somaliland Protectorate Straits Settlements Tanganyika Territory Tonga Trinidad and Tobago Windward Islands: Grenada St. Lucia St. Vincent Zanzibar Protectorate	(February 17th, 1937 *a*)
NEWFOUNDLAND (February 17th, 1937 *a*)	
CANADA (December 12th, 1935)	
NEW ZEALAND (October 16th, 1935)	
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (January 11th, 1933)	
Ireland (April 9th, 1938 *a*)	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 20th, 1933)	
DENMARK (including Greenland) (June 26th, 1934)	
ECUADOR (April 13th, 1935 *a*)	
EGYPT (January 25th, 1933 *a*)	
FINLAND (March 21st, 1936)	
FRANCE (May 16th, 1935)	
ITALY (June 12th, 1933) **The accession of the Italian Government to this Convention can in no way constitute a precedent for future agreements providing for the limitation of fishing in extra-territorial sea.**	
LATVIA (September 17th, 1935 *a*)	
MEXICO (March 13th, 1933)	
MONACO (June 7th, 1932 *a*)	
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)	
NICARAGUA (April 30th, 1932 *a*)	
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)	
POLAND (September 27th, 1933)	
SUDAN (April 13th, 1932 *a*)	
SPAIN (August 2nd, 1933)	
SWITZERLAND (February 16th, 1933)	
TURKEY (May 28th, 1934)	
YUGOSLAVIA (January 16th, 1934)	

XXXIV. MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.

GENERAL CONVENTION TO IMPROVE THE MEANS OF PREVENTING WAR.[1]

(Geneva, September 26th, 1931.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (May 30th, 1933)
NICARAGUA (April 1st, 1935 *a*)
NORWAY (July 18th, 1932)
PERU (March 29th, 1932)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
BELGIUM
BULGARIA
COLOMBIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DENMARK
FRANCE

Ratification cannot take place until it has been possible for the Government of the Republic to ascertain that the regulations provided for in Article 4, and which must be elaborated in order to enter into force at the same time as the Convention, ensure the guarantees of control which are deemed necessary by the French Government.

GERMANY
GREECE
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
PANAMA

This signature does not affect in any way the provisions of the treaties of conciliation and arbitration concluded up to this date by the Republic of Panama with other Powers.

PORTUGAL
SIAM
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
MEXICO
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST [REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

XXXV. FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER.[2]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BELGIUM (June 8th, 1936)

The Belgian Government reserve the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending their market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Under the terms of Article XX of this Convention, the Government of the United States of America assume no obligation in respect of the Philippine

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHINA

---

[1] A *procès-verbal* shall be drawn up by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States have been deposited (Article 13, § 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 13. It will then enter into force as regards all Members of the League of Nations or non-member States on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the *procès-verbal* (Article 14, § 1).

[2] This Convention came into force on January 15th, 1935. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLV, p. 331; Vol. CLXIV, p. 440; Vol. CLXXVII, p. 465; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 427.

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

The Belgian Government declare that they do not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (February 26th, 1936)

His Majesty is not assuming any obligation in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories or the territories under his suzerainty, or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to him and is being exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

NEWFOUNDLAND (June 29th, 1936 *a*)

AUSTRALIA (December 23rd, 1936 *a*)

Including the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

Union of South Africa (January 4th, 1938 *a*)

IRELAND (July 24th, 1934 *a*)

INDIA (October 17th, 1934)

Under the terms of Article XX of the Convention, this signature is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of the Convention in the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

BULGARIA (July 10th, 1934 *a*)

CHILE (March 20th, 1935)

With reservation as to the right provided for in Article IX.

CUBA (June 25th, 1936 *a*)

DENMARK (July 10th, 1935)

In conformity with paragraph 1 of Article XX of the Convention, Denmark does not assume any obligation as regards Greenland.

EGYPT (February 8th, 1936)

GREECE (January 27th, 1937)

HUNGARY (May 9th, 1936)

With reservation, for the Hungarian Government, of the right provided in Article IX to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

IRAN (April 12th, 1935 *a*)

IRAQ (February 18th, 1936 *a*)

ITALY (November 21st, 1934)

LATVIA (October 21st, 1935)

MONACO (September 11th, 1934)

NICARAGUA (September 7th, 1935)

NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)

Poland (September 25th, 1937)

Subject to the reservation, provided for in Article IX, of the right to take measures to prohibit or restrict importation for reasons based on the necessity for defending its market against invasion by films of foreign origin.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Island of Guam.

FINLAND

FRANCE

Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX, and declaring that the signature of the Convention shall be effective only as regards the home territory of France.

PANAMA

URUGUAY

The Convention is open to Accession by:

COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GERMANY
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
PORTUGAL
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

CONVENTION FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF FILMS OF AN EDUCATIONAL CHARACTER *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

ROUMANIA (June 19th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Article IX.
SWEDEN (December 27th, 1936)
SWITZERLAND (April 20th, 1934)

XXXVI. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN.

2. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE. [1]

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

AFGHANISTAN (April 10th, 1935 *a*)
AUSTRALIA (September 2nd, 1936)
(Including Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.)
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (November 20th, 1935)
BELGIUM (June 11th, 1936)
With reservation as regards Article 10.
Brazil (June 24th, 1938 *a*)
BULGARIA (December 19th, 1934)
CHILE (March 20th, 1935)
CUBA (June 25th, 1936 *a*)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (July 27th, 1935)
FINLAND (December 21st, 1936 *a*)
GREECE (August 20th, 1937)
HUNGARY (August 12th, 1935)
IRAN (April 12th, 1935 *a*)
Ireland (May 25th, 1938 *a*)
LATVIA (September 17th, 1935)
Mexico (May 3rd, 1938 *a*)
THE NETHERLANDS (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (September 20th, 1935)
NICARAGUA (December 12th, 1935 *a*)
NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)
Poland (December 8th, 1937)
PORTUGAL (January 7th, 1937)
ROUMANIA (June 6th, 1935 *a*)
SUDAN (June 13th, 1934 *a*)
SWEDEN (June 25th, 1934)
SWITZERLAND (July 17th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

ALBANIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.
CHINA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (through the intermediary of Poland)
FRANCE
GERMANY
LITHUANIA
MONACO
PANAMA
SPAIN
YUGOSLAVIA

The Convention is open to Accession by:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SA'UDI ARABIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
BOLIVIA
CANADA
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
EGYPT
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
INDIA
IRAQ
ICELAND
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LUXEMBURG
NEW ZEALAND
PARAGUAY
PERU
SALVADOR
SAN MARINO
SIAM
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

---

[1] The Convention came into force on August 24th, 1934. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CL, p. 431; Vol. CLX, p. 439; Vol. CLXIV, p. 421; Vol. CLXVIII, p. 329; Vol. CLXXII, p. 427; Vol. CLXXVII, p. 464; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 423.

XXXVII. REFUGEES.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES. [1]

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BELGIUM (August 4th, 1937)

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 2, paragraph 3, relating to the right conferred on consuls to extend Nansen certificates, cannot be accepted by the Belgian Government;

(2) Article 9, in so far as it concerns the application of the provisions of the domestic legislation relating to "unemployment insurance", cannot be accepted;

(3) Article 10, concerning social insurance laws, cannot be favourably received;

(4) Article 14, which concerns the enjoyment of the rights and favours accorded to foreigners, subject to reciprocity, cannot be admitted;

(5) The Belgian Government in accepting the present Convention is not assuming any obligation as regards the colony of the Congo or the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (October 28th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the following reservations:

1. *Article 1.* His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom regard the Convention as applicable only to Russian, Armenian and assimilated refugees who at the date of the present accession no longer enjoy the protection of their country of origin.

2. *Article 3.* The first paragraph will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose. The term "public order" is deemed to include matters relating to crime and morals.

Paragraph 2 of Article 3 is not accepted.

3. *Article 7* will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose.

4. *Article 12.* Owing to the special position of schools and universities in the United Kingdom, this Article is not accepted.

5. *Article 14* is not accepted.

His Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of His colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories under His suzerainty, or territories administered under mandate by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

EGYPT

Article 1:

Apart from such modifications or amplifications as each Contracting Party may introduce in this definition, my Government reserves the right to extend or limit the said definition in any way.

Article 2:

Bearers of Nansen certificates may not be admitted into Egypt unless the said certificates contain a visa for return to the countries by which they were issued. If these refugees are authorised to sojourn in Egypt, the competent local authorities reserve the right to issue to them Egyptian travel papers.

Article 3:

These authorities reserve the right to expel such refugees at any moment for reasons of public security.

Article 4:

Moreover, as regards the acquired rights referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the draft Convention, it should be stipulated that in order to ensure respect for such rights due account must be taken of international public order and of internal public order as the latter is conceived and applied in Egyptian law. Further, in order to dispel any misunderstanding, it should be stipulated that the rights in question are only those relating to personal status.

Article 13:

This article must not in any case invalidate or impair our reservation relating to Egyptian travel papers together with the consequences involved in the application of that reservation.

Article 14:

Our signature does not apply to this Article.

Article 15:

The Egyptian Government wishes it to be understood that the committees referred to in Article 15 will not be invested with the powers laid down in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said Article in the event of its desiring to reserve the said powers for the representatives of the local authority.

* * *

The Egyptian Government reserves the right to substitute, should the case arise, and whenever it may think fit, assimilation to nationals, for the most favourable treatment granted to nationals of a foreign country, in all the provisions of the Convention in which such treatment is stipulated.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GERMANY
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
JAPAN
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
MONACO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PARAGUAY
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] This Convention came into force on June 13th, 1935. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLIX, p. 199; Vol. CLXXII, p. 432; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 429.

CONVENTION RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES *(continued)*.

(Geneva, October 28th, 1933.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

BULGARIA (December 19th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. Article 1. — The Bulgarian Government maintains the reservations made by the Bulgarian delegate on signing the Arrangement of June 30th, 1928,[1] concerning the extension to other categories of refugees of certain measures taken in favour of Russian and Armenian refugees.

II. Article 2. — The departure from the country of refugees in possession of Nansen certificates (passports) shall be governed by the general regulations in force in this respect. Bulgarian consuls will be empowered in cases of *force majeure* to extend Nansen certificates issued in Bulgaria for a period of three months. The cost of visas for Nansen certificates shall be fixed in accordance with the tariff applicable to the nationals of the country by which the certificate was issued.

III. Article 6. — Exemption from *cautio judicatum solvi* shall be at the discretion of the courts in each individual case.

IV. Article 7. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept points (*a*) and (*d*).

V. Articles 8 and 10 (formerly 7 and 9). — Disability and old-age pensions shall be paid (regard being had to the possibilities of the fund concerned) to the persons entitled, their heirs and assigns, provided always that such persons are resident in the country.

VI. Article 13. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept the first paragraph, as refugees resident in Bulgaria are subject to the same treatment in fiscal matters as other foreign nationals resident in the country.

VII. Article 15. — The Bulgarian Government cannot accept paragraphs 2 and 3.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA (May 14th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the following reservations:

"A. The Czechoslovak Government will regard as refugees within the meaning of Article 1 only such persons as formerly actually possessed Russian or Turkish nationality, lost it before January 1st, 1923, and have not acquired any other nationality.

"B. The accession of the Czechoslovak Republic does not apply to:

"(*a*) Paragraph 3 of Article 2, whereby consuls are qualified to extend Nansen certificates;

"(*b*) Paragraph 3 of Article 3, so far as it limits the power of the national authorities to expel persons who constitute a danger to the safety of the State and public order; nor, of course, do the provisions of Article 3 in any way affect expulsions by order of the courts, or obligations deriving from extradition treaties or from the Czechoslovak laws regarding the extradition of aliens;

"(*c*) The whole of Article 7, which exempts refugees from the application of the provisions of laws and decrees for the protection of the national labour market;

"(*d*) The whole of Article 14, which waives the condition of reciprocity;

"(*e*) The whole of Article 15, which deals with the creation of local committees.

"C. Articles 4 and 5, dealing with the juridical condition of refugees, and Articles 8, 9, 10 and 11, dealing with industrial accidents and welfare and relief, will be applied in Czechoslovakia only so far as the laws of the country permit."

DENMARK (December 21st, 1935 *a*)

With reservation as regards Articles 7 and 14 of the Convention.

This accession does not include Greenland.

FRANCE (November 3rd, 1936)

Subject to the following reservations:

(1) Article 7 shall not preclude the application of the laws and regulations fixing the proportion of wage-earning foreigners that employers are authorised to employ in France;

(2) The organisation, in France, of committees such as are provided for in Article 15 shall not, if it takes place, confer on them powers incompatible with the existing laws in the matter of finding employment;

(3) The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Convention, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

ITALY (January 16th, 1936 *a*)

1. Article 3 of the Convention cannot limit the right of the Italian authorities to apply measures of expulsion to refugees for reasons of national security and public order.
2. In acceding to the Convention, the Italian Government assumes no obligations in regard to its colonies and possessions.

NORWAY (June 26th, 1935)

With reservation as regards the provisions of Article 2, para. 3, and Article 14

---

[1] This reservation was worded as follows.

"On the understanding that the present Arrangement applies only to such refugees as are at the present date on Bulgarian territory."

XXXVIII. VETERINARY QUESTIONS.

1. International Convention for the Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals, with Declaration attached.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (July 21st, 1937) The Belgian Government does not regard the mere fact that in Belgium the inspection of meat, while carried out by Government veterinary surgeons or by veterinary surgeons approved by the Government, is placed under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior (Inspection of Foodstuffs), as being contrary to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 5, of the present Convention; particularly since all the requirements of the said Article are observed in Belgium.	Chile *a*)	Afghanistan
Bulgaria (August 28th, 1936)	Czechoslovakia	Union of South Africa
Iraq (December 24th, 1937 *a*)	France	Albania
Latvia (May 4th, 1937)	Greece	United States of America
Roumania (December 23rd, 1937)	Italy	Argentine Republic
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (September 20th, 1937)	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Australia
	Poland	Bolivia
	Spain	Brazil
	Switzerland	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Turkey	Canada
		China
		Colombia
		Cuba
		Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Ireland
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Convention came into force on March 23rd, 1938, in accordance with its Article 14.

2. International Convention concerning the Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin, with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications

Belgium (July 21st, 1937)
Latvia (May 4th, 1937)
Roumania (December 23rd, 1937)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.

Bulgaria
Chile *a)*
Czechoslovakia
The Czechoslovak Government does not consider that it can waive the right to make the transit of animals across its territory subject to a previous authorisation. It intends, in practice, to exercise the right so reserved in as liberal a spirit as possible, in conformity with the principles which are at the basis of the present Convention, the object of which is to facilitate the transit of animals and of animal products.
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Spain
Switzerland
Turkey

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Canada
China
Colombia
Cuba
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Japan
Liberia
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Portugal
Salvador
Siam
Sweden
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

---

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the conditions laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 18 and in paragraph 3 of Article 19 have been received (Article 20, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 20. It will come into force on that date (Article 21, paragraph 1).

3. International Convention concerning the Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products), with Annex.[1]

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (July 21st, 1937)	Bulgaria	Afghanistan
Latvia (May 4th, 1937)	Chile *a*)	Union of South Africa
Roumania (December 23rd, 1937)	Czechoslovakia	Albania
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (September 20th, 1937)	France	United States of America
	Greece	Argentine Republic
	Italy	Australia
	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)	Bolivia
	Poland	Brazil
	Spain	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Switzerland	Canada
	Turkey	China
		Colombia
		Cuba
		Free City of Danzig
		Denmark
		Dominican Republic
		Ecuador
		Egypt
		Estonia
		Ethiopia
		Finland
		Germany
		Guatemala
		Haiti
		Honduras
		Hungary
		Iceland
		India
		Iran
		Iraq
		Ireland
		Japan
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Norway
		Panama
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Portugal
		Salvador
		Siam
		Sweden
		Uruguay
		Venezuela
		Yugoslavia

[1] The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will draw up a *procès-verbal* when five ratifications or accessions complying with the condition laid down in paragraph 3 of Article 12 and in paragraph 3 of Article 13 have been received (Article 14, paragraph 1).

The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations ninety days after the date of the *procès-verbal* mentioned in Article 14. It will come into force on that date (Article 15, paragraph 1).

XXXIX. UNIFICATION OF BUOYAGE AND LIGHTING OF COASTS.

3. AGREEMENT FOR A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF MARITIME BUOYAGE, AND RULES ANNEXED THERETO.[1]

(Geneva, May 13th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures or Accessions and Ratifications.

Union of South Africa (including the Mandated Territory of South-West Africa) (December 15th, 1937 *a*)

BELGIUM (May 12th, 1937)

The Belgian Government declares that its acceptance of the present Agreement and the application thereof to the Belgian Congo are conditional on the acceptance or the application of the said Agreement by Germany, Great Britain, France and the Netherlands.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland (February 23rd, 1938)

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of the United Kingdom will be conditional on its acceptance or on its application by Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.

His Majesty's Government do not assume any obligation in respect of Newfoundland, Southern Rhodesia and the Aden Protectorate.

Egypt (April 7th, 1938 *a*)

FINLAND (May 11th, 1937)

The Finnish Government reserves the right to make the putting into force of this Agreement in respect of Finland conditional on its entry into force or simultaneous application by all the other countries bordering upon the Baltic Sea and Norway.

LATVIA (May 8th, 1937)

Signatures subject to Ratification.

INDIA

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of India will be conditional on its acceptance by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and its application to Burma.

This signature is not binding in respect of the territories in India of any prince or chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

CHINA

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Chinese Government is conditional on the acceptance or on the application of this Agreement by Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Denmark, France, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden to the said Agreement.

ESTONIA

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of Estonia will be conditional on its acceptance or on its application by Finland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Latvia.

FRANCE

Valid for France and her overseas possessions, except Indo-China, in regard to which the present accession shall take effect only in so far as China shall herself have acquiesced in the Agreement.

MOROCCO (French Protectorate)

MONACO

SWEDEN [2]

TUNIS (Regency of)

TURKEY

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The acceptance of this Agreement by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be conditional on its acceptance or on its application by Germany, Estonia, Finland, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Japan, Norway and Turkey.

The Agreement is open to Accession by:

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
COLOMBIA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
DENMARK
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
GERMANY
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
ICELAND
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
ITALY
JAPAN
LIBERIA
LITHUANIA
MEXICO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NORWAY
PANAMA
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
TANGIER
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The Agreement shall enter into force the ninetieth day following its final acceptance by ten Governments (Article 5).

[2] By a letter dated May 11th, 1937, the Permanent Delegate of Sweden to the League of Nations informed the Secretariat that the ratification of this Agreement by the Swedish Government is subject to the acceptance or application thereof by the Governments of Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Latvia, Norway, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

XL. SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.

5. CONVENTION OF 1936 FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.[1]

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (November 27th, 1937) Belgium does not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territories of Ruanda-Urundi in respect of which a mandate is being exercised by her on behalf of the League of Nations.	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	AFGHANISTAN
Brazil (July 2nd, 1938)	CANADA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
China (October 21st, 1937)	BULGARIA	ALBANIA
Greece (February 16th, 1938)	COLOMBIA	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Guatemala (August 2nd, 1938 *a*)	CUBA	SA'UDI ARABIA
INDIA (August 4th, 1937)	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
Roumania (June 28th, 1938)	DENMARK	AUSTRALIA
	ECUADOR	BOLIVIA
	EGYPT	CHILE
	ESTONIA	COSTA RICA
	FRANCE	FREE CITY OF DANZIG
	HONDURAS	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	HUNGARY	ETHIOPIA
	JAPAN	FINLAND
	MEXICO	GERMANY
	MONACO	HAITI
	THE NETHERLANDS	ICELAND
	PANAMA	IRAN
	POLAND	IRAQ
	PORTUGAL	IRELAND
	SPAIN	ITALY
	SWITZERLAND	LATVIA
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	LIBERIA
	URUGUAY	LIECHTENSTEIN
	VENEZUELA	LITHUANIA
		LUXEMBURG
		NEW ZEALAND
		NICARAGUA
		NORWAY
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
		SUDAN
		SWEDEN
		TURKEY
		YUGOSLAVIA

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
Belgium (November 27th, 1937)	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	AFGHANISTAN
Brazil (July 2nd, 1938)	CANADA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
China (October 21st, 1937)	BULGARIA	ALBANIA
Greece (February 16th, 1938)	COLOMBIA	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Guatemala (August 2nd, 1938 *a*)	CUBA	SA'UDI ARABIA
INDIA (August 4th, 1937)	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
Roumania (June 28th, 1938 *a*)	DENMARK	AUSTRALIA
	ECUADOR	BOLIVIA
		CHILE

[1] The present Convention shall come into force ninety days after the Secretary-General of the League of Nations has received the ratifications or accessions of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States. It shall be registered on that date by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations (Article 22).

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Protocol is open to Accession by:*
	EGYPT	COSTA RICA
	ESTONIA	FREE CITY OF DANZIG
	FRANCE	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	HONDURAS	ETHIOPIA
	HUNGARY	FINLAND
	JAPAN	GERMANY
	MEXICO	HAITI
	MONACO	ICELAND
	THE NETHERLANDS	IRAN
	PANAMA	IRAQ
	POLAND	IRELAND
	PORTUGAL	ITALY
	SPAIN	LATVIA
	SWITZERLAND	LIBERIA
	UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	LIECHTENSTEIN
	URUGUAY	LITHUANIA
	VENEZUELA	LUXEMBURG
		NEW ZEALAND
		NICARAGUA
		NORWAY
		PARAGUAY
		PERU
		SALVADOR
		SAN MARINO
		SIAM
		SUDAN
		SWEDEN
		TURKEY
		YUGOSLAVIA

XLI. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

6. PROCÈS-VERBAL [1]

TO ALTER THE LATEST DATE OF ISSUE OF THE ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED WORLD REQUIREMENTS OF DANGEROUS DRUGS, DRAWN UP BY THE SUPERVISORY BODY, AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF JULY 13TH, 1931, FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures.		*The* Procès-verbal *is open to Signature by:*
AFGHANISTAN	DENMARK	ALBANIA
Union of South Africa	*Dominican Republic*	SA'UDI ARABIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	ECUADOR	GERMANY
Australia	EGYPT	ITALY
BELGIUM	ESTONIA	LITHUANIA
BRAZIL	FINLAND	NICARAGUA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	FRANCE	SAN MARINO
	GREECE	
BULGARIA	*Guatemala*	
CANADA	HAITI	
Chile	*Honduras*	
CHINA	HUNGARY	
Colombia	INDIA	
COSTA RICA	*Iran*	
CUBA	IRAQ	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	IRELAND	
FREE CITY OF DANZIG (Through the intermediary of Poland)	JAPAN	
	Latvia	

[1] The present *Procès-verbal* will come into force as soon as it shall have been signed in the name of all Governments parties to the Convention of July 13th, 1931 (§ 2).

6. PROCÈS-VERBAL TO ALTER THE LATEST DATE OF ISSUE OF THE ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE ESTIMATED WORLD REQUIREMENTS OF DANGEROUS DRUGS, DRAWN UP BY THE SUPERVISORY BODY, AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF JULY 13TH, 1931, FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS *(continued)*.

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

Not in Force.

Definitive Signatures.

LIECHTENSTEIN [1]
Luxemburg
MEXICO
MONACO
THE NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NORWAY
PANAMA
Peru
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
Salvador
SIAM
SPAIN
Sudan
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA

XLII. REFUGEES.

PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENT CONCERNING THE STATUS OF REFUGEES COMING FROM GERMANY.

(Geneva, July 4th, 1936.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

BELGIUM (October 7th, 1936)
In application of paragraph 1 of Article 12, the Belgian Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation as regards the Colony of the Congo, the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi, or any other territory provided in paragraph 1 of Article 12.

GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (September 25th, 1936)
Article 4. — Refugees who are the subject of extradition proceedings commenced in the United Kingdom will not be regarded as being entitled to claim the protection otherwise afforded to them under this Article.
Paragraph 2 of Article 4 will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose. The term "public order" is deemed to include matters relating to crime and morals.
His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom does not assume any obligations in respect of any of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories under suzerainty or territories administered under mandate.

DENMARK (July 4th, 1936)

Signature ad referendum.

THE NETHERLANDS

The Arrangement is open to Signature by:

AFGHANISTAN
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
ALBANIA
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLOMBIA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
ESTONIA
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
GREECE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
INDIA
IRAN
IRAQ
IRELAND
ITALY
LATVIA
LIBERIA

---

[1] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[2] The Arrangement came into force on August 4th, 1936. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXI, p. 75; and Vol. CLXXXI, p. 464.

PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENT CONCERNING THE STATUS OF REFUGEES COMING FROM GERMANY *(continued)*.

(Geneva, July 4th, 1936.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.	*The Arrangement is open to Signature by:*
FRANCE (July 4th, 1936) The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Arrangement, is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it. NORWAY (September 21st, 1936) SPAIN (January 27th, 1937) SWITZERLAND (August 30th, 1937)	LITHUANIA LUXEMBURG MEXICO NEW ZEALAND NICARAGUA PANAMA PARAGUAY PERU POLAND PORTUGAL ROUMANIA SALVADOR SIAM SWEDEN TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS URUGUAY VENEZUELA YUGOSLAVIA

XLIII. BROADCASTING.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING THE USE OF BROADCASTING IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE.[1]

(Geneva, September 23rd, 1936.)

In Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures or Accessions not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
Brazil (February 11th, 1938) GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (August 18th, 1937) *Burma* (October 13th, 1937 *a*) *Southern Rhodesia* (November 1st, 1937 *a*) AUSTRALIA (June 25th, 1937 *a*) Including the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru. *New Zealand* (January 27th, 1938) *Union of South Africa* (including the Mandated Territory of South West Africa) (February 1st, 1938 *a*) *Ireland* (May 25th, 1938 *a*) INDIA (August 11th, 1937) *Denmark* (October 11th, 1937) *Egypt* (July 29th, 1938) *Estonia* (August 18th, 1938) *France* (March 8th, 1938) *Luxemburg* (February 8th, 1938) *Norway* (May 5th, 1938) *Salvador* (August 18th, 1938 *a*) *Sweden* (June 22nd, 1938 *a*)	ALBANIA ARGENTINE REPUBLIC BELGIUM Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference. CHILE COLOMBIA CZECHOSLOVAKIA DOMINICAN REPUBLIC GREECE *Guatemala* a) LITHUANIA MEXICO THE NETHERLANDS ROUMANIA SPAIN Under reservation of the declaration mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference. SWITZERLAND TURKEY UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference. URUGUAY	AFGHANISTAN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BOLIVIA BULGARIA CANADA CHINA COSTA RICA CUBA FREE CITY OF DANZIG ECUADOR ETHIOPIA FINLAND GERMANY HAITI HONDURAS HUNGARY ICELAND IRAN IRAQ ITALY JAPAN LATVIA LIBERIA NICARAGUA PANAMA PARAGUAY PERU POLAND PORTUGAL SIAM VENEZUELA YUGOSLAVIA

[1] The Convention came into force on April 2nd, 1938, in accordance with its Article 11.

XLIV. TEACHING OF HISTORY.

DECLARATION REGARDING THE TEACHING OF HISTORY.[1]

(Revision of School Text-Books.)

(Geneva, October 2nd, 1937.)

In Force.

Definitive Signatures.

Afghanistan (February 24th, 1938
Union of South Africa (January 24th, 1938)
Argentine Republic (July 20th, 1938)
Belgium (November 24th, 1937)
Chile (January 6th, 1938)
Colombia (June 2nd, 1938)
Dominican Republic (November 5th, 1937)
Egypt (March 1st, 1938)
Estonia (March 8th, 1938)
Greece[2] (April 6th, 1938)
Iran (April 27th, 1938)
The Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao) (January 25th, 1938)
Norway (February 5th, 1938)
Sweden (February 25th, 1938)

The Declaration is open to signature by:

ALBANIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AUSTRALIA
BOLIVIA
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
BULGARIA
CANADA
CHINA
COSTA RICA
CUBA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
FREE CITY OF DANZIG
DENMARK
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GUATEMALA
HAITI
HONDURAS
HUNGARY
ICELAND
INDIA
IRAQ
IRELAND
ITALY
LATVIA
LIBERIA
LIECHTENSTEIN
LITHUANIA
LUXEMBURG
MEXICO
MONACO
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
PANAMA
PERU
POLAND
PORTUGAL
ROUMANIA
SALVADOR
SIAM
SPAIN
SWITZERLAND
TURKEY
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
URUGUAY
VENEZUELA
YUGOSLAVIA

---

[1] The Declaration came into force on November 24th, 1937. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CLXXXII, page 263.

[2] When signing this Declaration, the Permanent Delegate of Greece handed to the Secretary-General a communication informing him, on behalf of his Government, that instead of setting up a new Committee such as that referred to in Paragraph 3 of the Declaration, the Royal Government intends to entrust the duties of the above-mentioned Committee to the Supreme Council of Education, a permanent body which meets at the Ministry of Public Worship and National Education. The Royal Government is of opinion that disadvantages would be entailed by the creation of a new Committee which, as it would duplicate this Council, would be detrimental to the unity that is desirable in the matter of education.

XLV. TERRORISM.

I. Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.[1]

(Geneva, November 16th, 1937.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.	*Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.*	*The Convention is open to Accession by:*
	Albania	Afghanistan
	Argentine Republic	Union of South Africa
	Belgium	United States of America
	Bulgaria	Australia
	Cuba	Bolivia
	Czechoslovakia	Brazil
	Dominican Republic	Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Ecuador	Canada
	Egypt	Chile
	Estonia	China
	France	Colombia
	With reference to Article 25 of the Convention, the French Government does not assume any obligation as regards the whole of its Colonies and Protectorates or the territories for which a mandate has been entrusted to it.	Costa Rica
	Greece	Free City of Danzig
	Haiti	Denmark
	India	Ethiopia
	Monaco	Finland
	The Netherlands	Germany
	Norway	Guatemala
	Peru	Honduras
	Roumania	Hungary
	Spain	Iceland
	Turkey	Iran
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics[2]	Iraq
	The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will only be able to ratify the present Convention subject to the following reservation: "With regard to the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes only such obligations as are incumbent upon it as a Member of the League of Nations."	Ireland
	Venezuela	Italy
	Yugoslavia	Japan
		Latvia
		Liberia
		Liechtenstein
		Lithuania
		Luxemburg
		Mexico
		New Zealand
		Nicaragua
		Panama
		Poland
		Portugal
		Salvador
		San Marino
		Siam
		Sweden
		Switzerland
		Uruguay

[1] The present Convention shall, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant, be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Secretary-General of the third instrument of ratification or accession.

The Convention shall come into force on the date of such registration (Article 26).

[2] The reservation to which this signature is subject has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

2. Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court.[1]

(Geneva, November 16th, 1937.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications or definitive Accessions.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Belgium
Bulgaria
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
France
With reference to Article 52 of the Convention, the French Government does not assume any obligation as regards the whole of its Colonies and Protectorates or the territories for which a mandate has been entrusted to it.
Greece
Monaco
The Netherlands
Roumania
Spain
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
[2] The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will only be able to ratify the present Convention subject to the following reservation:
"With regard to the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes only such obligations as are incumbent upon it as a Member of the League of Nations."
Yugoslavia

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Free City of Danzig
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Estonia
Ethiopia
Finland
Germany
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Latvia
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Salvador
San Marino
Siam
Sweden
Switzerland
Uruguay
Venezuela

---

[1] The Government of the Netherlands is requested to convene a meeting of representatives of the States which ratify or accede to the present Convention. The meeting is to take place within one year after the receipt of the seventh instrument of ratification or accession by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and has for object to fix the date at which the present Convention shall be put into force.

The entry into force of the present Convention shall, however, be subject to the entry into force of the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism (Article 53).

[2] The reservation to which this signature is subject has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

XLVI. REFUGEES.

3. Convention concerning the Status of Refugees coming from Germany.[1]

(Geneva, February 10th, 1938.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications.

Belgium (September 1st, 1938)

Article 9. — The Belgian Government specifies that the meaning given in the Convention, with special reference to Article 9 (*a*), to the concept of residence is that which it possesses under the laws and internal regulations of Belgium.

Article 11. — Article 11, in so far as it concerns the application of the provisions of the domestic legislation relating to "unemployment insurance", cannot be accepted.

Article 12. — Article 12, concerning social insurance laws, cannot be favourably received.

Article 17. — Article 17, which concerns the enjoyment of the rights and favours accorded to foreigners, subject to reciprocity, cannot be admitted.

Article 24. — In application of paragraph 1 of Article 24, the Belgian Government, by its acceptance of the present Convention, is not assuming any obligation as regards the Colony of the Congo, the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi, or any other territory provided in paragraph 1 of Article 24.

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Article 1. — His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom regards the definition as applicable only to refugees coming from Germany as defined, who at the date of ratification no longer enjoy the protection of the German Government.

Article 5. — Refugees who are the subject of extradition proceedings begun in the United Kingdom will not be regarded as being entitled to claim the protection otherwise afforded to them under this Article.

Paragraph 2 of this Article will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose. The term "public order" is deemed to include matters relating to crime and morals.

Article 9. — The provisions of this Article will not be applicable to refugees who have been admitted to the United Kingdom for a temporary visit or purpose.

Article 14 cannot be accepted, owing to the special position of schools and universities in the United Kingdom.

Article 24. — His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom declares that it does not assume any obligations in respect of any of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories under suzerainty, or territories administered under mandate.

Denmark

Articles 9 and 17 are excluded from the undertaking given by Denmark.

The Convention will not apply to Greenland.

France

The French Government, by its acceptance of the present Convention, renews the reservations made by it on signing the Conventions of October 28th, 1933, and the Provisional Arrangement of July 4th, 1936, and declares, in particular, that it is not assuming any obligation in regard to the whole of its colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, territories placed under its suzerainty, or territories in respect of which a mandate has been confided to it.

The Convention is open to Accession by:

Afghanistan
Union of South Africa
Albania
United States of America
Sa'udi Arabia
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Bulgaria
Canada
Chile
China
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Free City of Danzig
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Ethiopia
Finland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Italy
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxemburg
Mexico
Monaco
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Roumania
Salvador
San Marino
Siam
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

---

[1] The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Covenant thirty days after the receipt by him of the second ratification or accession. The Convention shall come into force on the day of such registration.

3. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE STATUS OF REFUGEES COMING FROM GERMANY *(continued)*.

(Geneva, February 10th, 1938.)

Not in Force.

Ratifications

Signatures not yet perfected by Ratification:

The Netherlands
For the Kingdom in Europe, and with reservation as regards Article 5, paragraph 3, and Article 9.

Norway
With the following reservation:
Paragraph 2 (*d*) of Article 3 and Article 17 will not be applicable.

Spain
With the following reservations;
The Spanish Government, by its signature of the present Convention, is not assuming any obligations in regard to the whole of its protectorates and colonies.
It likewise declares that Articles 9 to 12 will not preclude the application of the provisions relating to labour and social insurance.

XLVII. — INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS.[1]

(*a*)

1. Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM	September 6th, 1926
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CANADA	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	September 20th, 1934
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
FRANCE [2]	June 2nd, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
ITALY [3]	October 6th, 1924
LATVIA [4]	August 15th, 1925
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN [5]	February 22nd, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

2. Convention concerning unemployment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciation*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	February 20th, 1924	*India* (April 16th, 1938)
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933	
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921	
BELGIUM [6]	August 25th, 1930	
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922	
CHILE	May 31st, 1933	
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	
DENMARK	October 13th, 1921	
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922	
FINLAND	October 19th, 1921	
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925	
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925	
GREECE	November 19th, 1920	
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928	
INDIA	July 14th, 1921	

---

[1] The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A.10(*a*).1923, Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning: The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of White Phosphorus in the Manufacture of Matches, Berne, September 26th, 1906.

The Annex to the Report on the Work of the League for the year 1935/36 (A.6(*a*).1936. Annex I. (V)) contains, moreover, complete details concerning the Amendment to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles and to the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties of Peace, Geneva, November 2nd, 1922, and the Protocol relative to this Amendment, Geneva, June 14th, 1923. (See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. CXLIX, pages 35 and 39.)

[2] This ratification is subject to the condition that the obligations it entails for France shall not take effect until the Convention has been ratified by Germany and Great Britain.

[3] Subject to the condition that it shall only come into force when the ratifications, without reservations or other conditions, of the following Members of the International Labour Organisation have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations: Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain and Switzerland.

[4] "The Convention shall come into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Draft Convention, after the ratifications of three of the Powers which are of the chief industrial importance, as laid down in Article 393, paragraphs 5 and 6, of the Treaty of Peace of Versailles, shall have been registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations."

[5] The reservation by which Spain made its ratification subject to the ratification of Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy was withdrawn on October 1st, 1931.

[6] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
IRELAND	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	February 6th, 1932
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

3. Convention concerning the employment of women before and after childbirth, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 29th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
GERMANY	October 31st, 1927
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
SPAIN	July 4th, 1923
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

4. Convention concerning the employment of women during the night, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciations*
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	November 1st, 1921	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (October 25th, 1935) This denunciation is not to take effect until the revised Convention of 1934 on the same subject shall have come into force.
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932	
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933	
BELGIUM [1]*	July 12th, 1924	BELGIUM (August 4th, 1937)
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934	BRAZIL (May 12th, 1937)
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (January 25th, 1937)
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922	
CHILE	October 8th, 1931	
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	
CUBA	August 6th, 1928	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921	
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922	ESTONIA (January 28th, 1936)
FRANCE	May 14th, 1925	
GREECE	November 19th, 1920	GREECE (June 30th, 1936)
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928	HUNGARY (December 18th, 1936)
INDIA	July 14th, 1921	
IRELAND	September 4th, 1925	IRELAND (March 15th, 1937)
ITALY	April 10th, 1923	
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931	
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928	
THE NETHERLANDS	September 4th, 1922	THE NETHERLANDS (June 12th, 1937)
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934	
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932	
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921	SWITZERLAND (June 4th, 1936)
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932	
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922	

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

5. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24th, 1921
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
IRELAND	September 4th, 1925
JAPAN	August 7th, 1926
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	July 21st, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 7th, 1937.
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

6. Convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its First Session on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
BELGIUM [1]	July 12th, 1924
BRAZIL	April 26th, 1934
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14th, 1922
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	January 4th, 1923
ESTONIA	December 20th, 1922
FRANCE	August 25th, 1925
GREECE	November 19th, 1920
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA	July 14th, 1921
IRELAND	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	April 10th, 1923
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 20th, 1937
THE NETHERLANDS	March 17th, 1924
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL [2]	May 10th, 1932
ROUMANIA	June 13th, 1921
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
SWITZERLAND	October 9th, 1922
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	March 7th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

(*b*)

7. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to employment at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14th, 1921
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CHINA	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
IRELAND	September 4th, 1925
ITALY	July 14th, 1932
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	March 26th, 1925
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	May 8th, 1922
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

8. Convention concerning unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA[1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
GREAT BRITAIN	March 12th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
Denmark [3]	February 15th, 1938.
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FRANCE	March 21st, 1929
GERMANY	March 4th, 1930
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru. Australia notified the Secretariat, on November 6th, 1937, of the application of the Convention to the territory of Papua and to the mandated territory of New Guinea.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] This ratification does not include Greenland.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
LATVIA [1]	August 29th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 20th, 1937
The Netherlands	December 15th, 1937
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 21st, 1936
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	January 1st, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

9. Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Second Session on July 10th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	November 30th, 1933
AUSTRALIA	August 3rd, 1925
BELGIUM [2]	February 4th, 1925
BULGARIA	March 16th, 1923
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
Denmark [3]	August 23rd, 1938
ESTONIA	March 3rd, 1923
FINLAND	October 7th, 1922
FRANCE	January 25th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
GREECE	December 16th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	November 23rd, 1922
LATVIA	June 3rd, 1926
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	November 23rd, 1921
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
SWEDEN	September 27th, 1921
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

(*c*)

10. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to employment in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 16th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [2]	June 13th, 1928
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	February 4th, 1933
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
HUNGARY	February 2nd, 1927
IRELAND	May 26th, 1925
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	December 19th, 1923
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Latvia had ratified this Convention on August 5th, 1926, subject to the following reservation: "The Convention shall enter into force in Latvia, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of this Convention, when the States which are of chief importance in maritime commerce shall have sent their ratifications for registration by the Secretariat of the League of Nations." By an instrument deposited with the Secretariat on August 29th, 1930, this reservation was withdrawn.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] This ratification does not include Greenland.

11. Convention concerning the rights of association and combination of agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6th, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA	April 27th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DENMARK [2]	June 20th, 1930
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	March 23rd, 1929
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRELAND	June 17th, 1924
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 20th, 1937
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
THE NETHERLANDS	August 20th, 1926
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	November 10th, 1930
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

12. Convention concerning workmen's compensation in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1*]	October 26th, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6th, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 22nd, 1935
DENMARK	February 26th, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	June 6th, 1925
ITALY [3]	September 1st, 1930
IRELAND	June 17th, 1924
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	November 1st, 1937
THE NETHERLANDS	August 20th, 1926
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
SPAIN	October 1st, 1931
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[*] As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Italian colonies and possessions.

13. Convention concerning the use of white lead in painting, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 19th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND [2]	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE	February 19th, 1926
GREECE	December 22nd, 1926
HUNGARY [3]	January 4th, 1928
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	January 7th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	December 4th, 1925
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27th, 1923
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	April 28th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

14. Convention concerning the application of the weekly rest in industrial undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 17th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	July 19th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 21st, 1935
CHILE	September 15th, 1925
CHINA [4]	May 17th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31st, 1923
DENMARK [5]	August 30th, 1935
ESTONIA	November 29th, 1923
FINLAND	June 19th, 1923
FRANCE	September 3rd, 1926
GREECE	May 11th, 1929
INDIA	May 11th, 1923
IRELAND	July 22nd, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	January 7th, 1938
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 7th, 1937
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
PORTUGAL	July 3rd, 1928
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
SWITZERLAND [6]	January 16th, 1935
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] Effective as from October 1st, 1929.

[3] The Convention shall not come into force as regards Hungary until it has been ratified by France, Great Britain and Germany.

[4] Article I of the Chinese "Amended Factory Laws" promulgated on December 30th, 1932, provides that "this Act shall apply to all factories using machines driven by motor-power and regularly employing thirty workers or more."

[5] This ratification does not include Greenland.

[6] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from September 1st, 1934.

15. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers or stokers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	July 19th, 1926
GREAT BRITAIN	March 8th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CHINA	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
DENMARK	May 12th, 1924
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
FRANCE	January 16th, 1928
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	June 14th, 1930
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	November 20th, 1922
IRELAND	June 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN [3]	December 4th, 1930
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
THE NETHERLANDS	June 17th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	October 7th, 1927
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14th, 1925
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

16. Convention concerning the compulsory medical examination of children and young persons employed at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Third Session on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ARGENTINE REPUBLIC	May 26th, 1936
AUSTRALIA [1]	June 28th, 1935
BELGIUM [2]	July 19th, 1926
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN	March 8th, 1926
BULGARIA	March 6th, 1925
CANADA	March 31st, 1926
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CHINA	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
Denmark [4]	April 23rd, 1938
ESTONIA	September 8th, 1922
FINLAND	October 10th, 1925
FRANCE	March 22nd, 1928
GERMANY	June 11th, 1929
GREECE	June 28th, 1930
HUNGARY	March 1st, 1928
INDIA	November 20th, 1922
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	September 8th, 1924
JAPAN	June 7th, 1924
LATVIA	September 9th, 1924
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	March 9th, 1938
THE NETHERLANDS	March 9th, 1928

[1] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[3] This ratification does not apply to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung or the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[4] This ratification does not include Greenland.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	June 21st, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18th, 1923
SPAIN	June 20th, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14th, 1925
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

(*d*)

17. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]*	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	May 29th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938.
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
Poland	November 3rd, 1937
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929
SPAIN	February 22nd, 1929
SWEDEN	September 8th, 1926
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

18. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration	*Denunciations*
BELGIUM [1]*	October 3rd, 1927	GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (April 29th, 1936)
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	October 6th, 1926	IRELAND (March 15th, 1937)
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929	SWEDEN (February 24th, 1937)
CHILE	May 31st, 1933	
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933	
CUBA	August 6th, 1928	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	September 19th, 1932	
DENMARK	June 18th, 1934	
FINLAND	September 17th, 1927	
FRANCE	August 13th, 1931	
GERMANY	September 18th, 1928	
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928	
INDIA [3]	September 30th, 1927	
IRELAND	November 25th, 1927	
ITALY [4]	January 22nd, 1934	
JAPAN [5]	October 8th, 1928	
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929	
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928	
THE NETHERLANDS	November 1st, 1928	
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934	
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929	
Poland	November 3rd, 1937	
PORTUGAL [2]	March 27th, 1929	
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932	
SWEDEN	October 15th, 1929	
SWITZERLAND	November 16th, 1927	
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933	
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927	

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

* As regards this Convention, the Belgian reservation has been withdrawn as from April 1st, 1934.

[2] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.

[4] Subject to subsequent decisions as regards the application of the Convention to the Italian Colonies and Possessions.

[5] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

19. Convention concerning equality of treatment for national and foreign workers as regards workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 5th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	March 30th, 1926
BELGIUM [1]	October 3rd, 1927
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	October 6th, 1926
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
CHINA	April 27th, 1934
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	February 8th, 1927
DENMARK [2]	March 31st, 1928
FINLAND	September 17th, 1927
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
ESTONIA	April 14th, 1930
GERMANY	September 18th, 1928
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
INDIA [3]	September 30th, 1927
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
ITALY	March 15th, 1928
JAPAN [4]	October 8th, 1928
LATVIA	May 29th, 1928
LITHUANIA	September 28th, 1934
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	June 11th, 1929
POLAND	February 28th, 1928
PORTUGAL [5]	March 27th, 1929
SPAIN	February 22nd, 1929
SWEDEN	September 8th, 1926
SWITZERLAND	February 1st, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	April 1st, 1927

20. Convention concerning night work in bakeries, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventh Session on June 8th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BULGARIA	September 5th, 1929
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	August 6th, 1928
ESTONIA	December 23rd, 1929
FINLAND	May 26th, 1928
IRELAND	March 15th, 1937
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(e)

21. Convention concerning the simplification of the inspection of emigrants on board ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighth Session on June 5th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
ALBANIA	March 17th, 1932
AUSTRALIA	April 18th, 1931
BELGIUM [1]	February 15th, 1928
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.
[2] This ratification does not include Greenland.
[3] The ratification by the Indian Government applies only to British India.
[4] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.
[5] With reservation as regards the application of the Convention to the Portuguese Colonies, until ulterior decisions can be taken.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [1]	September 16th, 1927
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	May 25th, 1928
FINLAND	April 5th, 1929
FRANCE [2]	January 13th, 1932
HUNGARY	February 3rd, 1931
INDIA	January 14th, 1928
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
JAPAN [3]	October 8th, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
Mexico	March 9th, 1938
THE NETHERLANDS	September 13th, 1927
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SWEDEN [4]	October 15th, 1929
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(f)

22. Convention concerning seamen's articles of agreement, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 24th, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [5]	April 1st, 1935
BELGIUM [6]	October 3rd, 1927
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
Canada	June 30th, 1938
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CHINA	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	May 10th, 1929
FRANCE	April 4th, 1928
GERMANY	September 20th, 1930
INDIA	October 31st, 1932
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
The Netherlands	December 15th, 1937
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

23. Convention concerning the repatriation of seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Ninth Session on June 23rd, 1926.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [6]	October 3rd, 1927
BULGARIA	November 29th, 1929
CHINA	December 2nd, 1936
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	July 7th, 1928
ESTONIA	July 9th, 1928
FRANCE	March 4th, 1929
GERMANY	March 14th, 1930
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
ITALY [7]	October 10th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934

[1] As regards Great Britain and Northern Ireland, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by France, Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Norway and Spain.

[2] The ratification of this Convention will only take effect as regards France from the date on which the Secretary-General of the League of Nations shall have registered the ratifications without reservation of Poland, Spain and Italy.

[3] This ratification does not include Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[4] As regards Sweden, this Convention will enter into force only when it has been ratified without reservation by Denmark, Finland and Norway.

[5] This ratification does not include the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[6] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[7] This ratification applies also to the Italian colonies.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
POLAND	August 8th, 1931
SPAIN	February 23rd, 1931
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

(*g*)

24. Convention concerning sickness insurance for workers in industry and commerce and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
HUNGARY	April 19th, 1928
LATVIA	November 29th, 1929
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
LITHUANIA	June 19th, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
ROUMANIA	June 28th, 1929
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
YUGOSLAVIA	September 30th, 1929

25. Convention concerning sickness insurance for agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Tenth Session on June 15th, 1927.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	February 20th, 1931
BULGARIA	November 1st, 1930
CHILE	October 8th, 1931
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	January 17th, 1929
GERMANY	January 23rd, 1928
LUXEMBURG	April 16th, 1928
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	September 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*h*)

26. Convention concerning the creation of minimum-wage-fixing machinery, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eleventh Session on June 16th, 1928.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	December 28th, 1932
AUSTRALIA	March 9th, 1931
BELGIUM [1]	August 11th, 1937
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	June 14th, 1929
BULGARIA	June 4th, 1935
CANADA	April 25th, 1935
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	May 5th, 1930
COLOMBIA	June 20th, 1933
CUBA	February 24th, 1936
FRANCE	September 18th, 1930
GERMANY	May 30th, 1929
HUNGARY	July 30th, 1932
ITALY	September 9th, 1930
IRELAND	June 3rd, 1930
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	November 10th, 1936
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 7th, 1933
SPAIN	April 8th, 1930
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

[1] This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo and the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

(1)

27. Convention concerning the marking of the weight on heavy packages transported by vessels, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session on June 21st, 1929.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA[1]	February 21st, 1933
AUSTRALIA[2]	March 9th, 1931
BELGIUM[3]	June 6th, 1934
BULGARIA	June 4th, 1935
Canada	June 30th, 1938
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
CHINA	June 24th, 1931
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	March 26th, 1934
DENMARK[4]	January 18th, 1933
ESTONIA	January 18th, 1932
FINLAND[5]	August 8th, 1932
FRANCE	July 29th, 1935
GERMANY	July 5th, 1933
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
Hungary	December 6th, 1937
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
INDIA	September 7th, 1931
ITALY	July 18th, 1933
JAPAN[6]	March 16th, 1931
LITHUANIA	September 28th, 1934
LUXEMBURG	April 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
THE NETHERLANDS	January 4th, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
POLAND	June 18th, 1932
PORTUGAL[7]	March 1st, 1932
ROUMANIA	December 7th, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	April 11th, 1932
SWITZERLAND[8]	November 8th, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933
VENEZUELA	December 17th, 1932
YUGOSLAVIA	April 22nd, 1933

28. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twelfth Session on June 21st, 1929.[9]

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
IRELAND	July 5th, 1930
LUXEMBURG	April 1st, 1931
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN[10]	August 29th, 1932

---

[1] The ratification by the Union of South Africa shall not take effect unless and until the ratifications of Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy have been registered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in terms of Article 406 of the Treaty of Versailles.

[2] The Convention applies to the Territory of Nauru.

[3] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[4] This ratification does not include Greenland.

The Danish Government makes the entry into force of the Convention, as regards Denmark, subject to its being also ratified by Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy and The Netherlands.

[5] This Convention shall be put into force in Finland as from January 1st, 1933.

[6] This ratification includes Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

[7] This ratification does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

[8] This Convention takes effect for Switzerland as from October 1st, 1934.

[9] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1932 involves, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirement of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 21 of the present Convention. The present Convention has ceased to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1932 (October 30th, 1934). It remains, nevertheless, in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

[10] This Convention is denounced as regards Spain as from October 30th, 1934, date of the coming into force of the revising Convention of 1932, Spain having ratified the latter Convention on July 28th, 1934.

(*j*)

29. Convention concerning forced or compulsory labour, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AUSTRALIA [1]	January 2nd, 1932
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND [2]	June 3rd, 1931
BULGARIA	September 22nd, 1932
CHILE	May 31st, 1933
DENMARK	February 11th, 1932
FINLAND	January 13th, 1936
FRANCE [3]	June 24th, 1937
IRELAND	March 2nd, 1931
ITALY	June 18th, 1934
JAPAN [4]	November 21st, 1932
LIBERIA	May 1st, 1931
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938

[1] This ratification applies also to the Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and to the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

[2] The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland is accompanied with a Declaration, as provided for in Article 26 of the Convention, that the provisions of the Convention shall be applied without modification to the following Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under mandate:

Bahamas
Barbados
Bermuda
British Guiana
British Honduras
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands and Dependencies
Fiji
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate)
Gibraltar
Gold Coast:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Ashanti
(*c*) Northern Territories
(*d*) Togoland under British Mandate
Hong-Kong
Jamaica (including Turks and Caïcos Islands and the Cayman Islands)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)
Leeward Islands:
Antigua
Dominica
Montserrat
St. Christopher and Nevis
Virgin Islands
Malay States:
(*a*) Federated Malay States:
Negri Sembilan
Pahang
Perak
Selangor
(*b*) Unfederated Malay States:
Johore
Kedah
Kelantan
Perlis
Trengganu
Brunei
Malta
Mauritius
Nigeria:
(*a*) Colony
(*b*) Protectorate
(*c*) Cameroons under British Mandate
North Borneo, State of
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland Protectorate
Palestine
St. Helena and Ascension
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)
Somaliland Protectorate
South Africa High Commission, Territories of the
Basutoland
Bechuanaland Protectorate
Swaziland
Straits Settlements
Tanganyika Territory
Trans-Jordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Uganda Protectorate
Western Pacific, Islands of:
British Solomon Islands Protectorate
Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
Tonga
Windward Islands:
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Zanzibar Protectorate

The ratification by the Government of His Majesty in Great Britain and Northern Ireland applies also to Newfoundland, November 13th, 1931, and to Southern Rhodesia, March 20th, 1933.

[3] 1. France intends to apply the provisions of the Convention with certain modifications to the following territories only:

French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Indo-China, Madagascar, French Settlements in Oceania, New Caledonia, territories under B mandate.

The modifications in question apply to the following provisions of the Convention:

(a) *Article* 2, *second paragraph (letter* a*)*. This provision should be applied as if it did not contain the words " for work of a purely military character ".

(b) *Article* 10. The provisions of this article shall not be applied as regards forced or compulsory labour exacted as a tax.

(c) *Article* 12, *first paragraph*. This clause shall not be applied where recourse is had to forced or compulsory labour for the execution of public works for the benefit of the community as a whole.

(d) *Article* 19. This clause shall not be applied in the case of cultivation for the purpose of experimental agricultural instruction.

2. France reserves her decision as regards the following territories:

Morocco, Tunisia and the States of the Levant under French mandate.

[4] This ratification applies also to Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the Leased Territory of Kwantung and the South Sea Islands under Japanese mandate.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
THE NETHERLANDS [1]	March 31st, 1933
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
NORWAY	July 1st, 1932
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
SWEDEN	December 22nd, 1931
YUGOSLAVIA	March 4th, 1933

30. Convention concerning the regulation of hours of work in commerce and offices, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fourteenth Session on June 28th, 1930.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BULGARIA	June 22nd, 1932
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CUBA	February 24th, 1936
FINLAND	January 13th, 1936
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NICARAGUA	April 12th, 1934
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(*k*)

31. Convention limiting hours of work in coal-mines, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Fifteenth Session on June 18th, 1931 [2].

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
SPAIN	August 29th, 1932

(*l*)

32. Convention concerning the protection against accidents of workers employed in loading or unloading ships (revised 1932), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 27th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	January 10th, 1935
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
CHINA	November 30th, 1935
ITALY	October 30th, 1933
MEXICO	May 12th, 1934
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
SPAIN	July 28th, 1934
Sweden	August 3rd, 1938
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

---

[1] I. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention integrally in the Kingdom in Europe, in Surinam and in Curaçao;

II. The Netherlands Government intends to apply the provisions of the Convention to the Netherlands Indies with the following modifications:

(*a*) Article 3 will not be applied; nevertheless, the competent central authorities will be responsible for the employment of forced or compulsory labour;

(*b*) Article 4 will not be applied to services rendered to owners by persons living in the so-called " particuliere landerijen " in the Island of Java.

[2] The ratification of the new revising Convention of 1935 shall involve, *ipso jure*, denunciation of the present Convention without any requirements of delay, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 20 of the present Convention. The present Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members as from the date of the coming into force of the new revising Convention of 1935. It shall remain nevertheless in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

33. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to non-industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Sixteenth Session on April 30th, 1932.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	June 6th, 1934
CUBA	February 24th, 1936
THE NETHERLANDS	July 12th, 1935
SPAIN	June 22nd, 1934
URUGUAY	June 6th, 1933

(m)

34. Convention concerning fee-charging employment agencies, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
CHILE	October 18th, 1935
FINLAND	January 13th, 1936
Mexico	February 21st, 1938
SPAIN	April 27th, 1935
SWEDEN	January 1st, 1936

35. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

36. Convention concerning compulsory old-age insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

37. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate

38. Convention concerning compulsory invalidity insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHILE	October 18th, 1935

39. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in industrial or commercial undertakings, in the liberal professions, and for outworkers and domestic servants, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936

40. Convention concerning compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance for persons employed in agricultural undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Seventeenth Session on June 29th, 1933.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936

(n)

41. Convention concerning employment of women during the night (revised 1934), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 19th, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	May 28th, 1935
BELGIUM	August 4th, 1937
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	January 25th, 1937
ESTONIA	December 21st, 1935
France	January 25th, 1938
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
HUNGARY	December 18th, 1936
INDIA	November 22nd, 1935
Iraq	March 28th, 1938
IRELAND	March 15th, 1937
THE NETHERLANDS	December 9th, 1935
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
SWITZERLAND	June 4th, 1936

42. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases (revised 1934), adopted as Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BRAZIL	June 8th, 1936
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	April 29th, 1936
CUBA	October 22nd, 1936
HUNGARY	June 17th, 1935
IRELAND	March 15th, 1937
JAPAN[1]	June 6th, 1936
MEXICO	May 20th, 1937
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NORWAY	May 21st, 1935
SWEDEN	February 24th, 1937

[1] The Japanese Government intend to apply the above-mentioned Convention, in so far as mining industries are concerned, also to Taiwan and Karafuto.

43. Convention for the regulation of hours of work in automatic sheet-glass works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 21st, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
BELGIUM [1]	August 4th, 1937
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	January 13th, 1937
France	February 5th, 1938
Mexico	March 9th, 1938
NORWAY	May 21st, 1935

44. Convention ensuring benefit or allowances to the involuntarily unemployed, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session on June 23rd, 1934.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	April 29th, 1936
IRELAND	June 10th, 1937
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938

(o)

45. Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
AFGHANISTAN	May 14th, 1937
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	June 25th, 1936
BELGIUM [1]	August 4th, 1937
GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	July 18th, 1936
CHINA	December 2nd, 1936
CUBA	April 14th, 1936
ESTONIA	June 4th, 1937
Finland	March 3rd, 1938
France	January 25th, 1938
GREECE	May 30th, 1936
India	March 25th, 1938
IRELAND	August 20th, 1936
Mexico	February 21st, 1938
THE NETHERLANDS	February 20th, 1937
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
Portugal	October 18th, 1937
SWEDEN	July 11th, 1936
Turkey	April 21st, 1938

46. Convention limiting hours of work in coal mines (revised 1935), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 21st, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
CUBA	April 14th, 1936

[1] Excluding the Belgian Congo and the mandated territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

47. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work to forty a week, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938

48. Convention concerning the establishment of an international scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' insurance, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 22nd, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
HUNGARY	August 10th, 1937
Poland	March 21st, 1938
SPAIN	July 8th, 1937

49. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in glass-bottle works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Nineteenth Session on June 25th, 1935.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between	Date of Registration
France	January 25th, 1938
IRELAND	June 10th, 1937
Mexico	February 21st, 1938
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NORWAY	July 21st, 1936

(*p*)

50. Convention concerning the regulation of certain special systems of recruiting workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session on June 20th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
NORWAY	July 7th, 1937

51. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work on public works, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session on June 23rd, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938

52. Convention concerning annual holidays with pay, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twentieth Session on June 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Mexico	March 9th, 1938

53. Convention concerning the minimum requirement of professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant ships, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Belgium [1]	April 11th, 1938
Denmark [2]	July 13th, 1938
Estonia	June 20th, 1938
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938
NORWAY	July 7th, 1937

54. Convention concerning annual holidays with pay for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Belgium [1]	April 11th, 1938.

55. Convention concerning the liability of the shipowner in case of sickness, injury or death of seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Belgium [1]	April 11th, 1938

56. Convention concerning sickness insurance for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
. . . . .	

57. Convention concerning hours of work on board ship and manning, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-first Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Belgium [1]	April 11th, 1938

58. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of children to employment at sea (revised 1936), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-second Session on October 24th, 1936.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Belgium [1]	April 11th, 1938.
NORWAY	July 7th, 1937

---

[1] Subject to subsequent decisions regarding the application of the Convention to the Belgian Congo and to the territories under Belgian mandate.

[2] In accordance with Article 7 of this Convention, the Danish Government undertakes to apply the provisions thereof without modification as regards all Danish territories, with the exception of Greenland where navigation is reserved to the Danish State.

(s)

59. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment (revised 1937), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 22nd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
Norway	August 26th, 1938

60. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to non-industrial employment (revised 1937), adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 22nd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration

61. Convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in the textile industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 22nd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration
New Zealand	March 29th, 1938

62. Convention concerning safety provisions in the building industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-third Session on June 23rd, 1937.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration

(t)

63. Convention concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the International Labour Conference at its Twenty-fourth Session on June 20th, 1938.

This Convention has been ratified by	Date of Registration

[Communicated to the Assembly, the Council and the Members of the League.]

Official No.: A. 26. 1938. V. 636

Geneva, September 5th, 1938.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

RATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Results of the Eighth Enquiry addressed by the Secretary-General to the Governments under the Assembly's Resolution of October 3rd, 1930

Series of League of Nations Publications

V. LEGAL

1938. V. 5.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Point I of the Assembly's resolution of October 3rd, 1930, requires the Secretary-General each year to request the Members of the League and non-member States to inform him of their intentions with regard to ratifying Conventions concluded under the auspices of the League which they have signed but have not ratified within a year from the date at which the Convention ceased to be open for signature.

This year, only one Convention fell within the scope of the resolution, namely :

The Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs and Protocol of Signature, signed at Geneva on June 26th, 1936.

In accordance with the established practice, the Secretary-General also asked whether the Governments wished to modify or amplify the information given in reply to previous enquiries made in virtue of the Assembly's resolution. A number of Governments have either notified a change of attitude or stated that their attitude has not altered.

The present document sets out the new information received as a result of this year's enquiry. The results of previous enquiries will be found in documents A.30.1931.V, A.25. 1932.V, A.17.1933.V, A.13.1934.V, A.17.1935.V, A.22.1936.V and A.20.1937.V.

RATIFICATION BY MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND NON-MEMBER STATES OF CONVENTIONS SIGNED BY THEM BUT NOT RATIFIED WITHIN ONE YEAR FROM THE EXPIRY OF THE TIME-LIMIT FOR SIGNING SUCH CONVENTIONS

(Point I of the Assembly Resolution of October 3rd, 1930)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN

(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Argentine Republic.

The Government of the Argentine Republic, in a message addressed to the Honourable National Congress, has asked for the ratification of this Convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF, AND TRAFFIC IN, OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS

(Geneva, September 12th, 1923.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Argentine Republic.

The Government of the Argentine Republic, in a message addressed to the Honourable National Congress, has asked for the ratification of this Convention.

CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

The Belgian Senate has not yet examined the Bill to approve this Convention. This Bill is now before the Senate, after having been voted by the Chamber of Representatives. (Letter of June 3rd, 1938.)

Ireland.

The initial steps for the ratification of this Convention have been taken, but, owing to pressure on parliamentary time, it has not, up to the present, been found possible to make further progress. (Letter of June 24th, 1938.)

3694. — S.d.N. 990 (F). 765 (A). 9/38. — Imp. Réunies, Chambéry.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO MILITARY OBLIGATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES OF DOUBLE NATIONALITY

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

The Belgian Senate has not yet examined the Bill to approve this Protocol. This Bill is now before the Senate, after having been voted by the Chamber of Representatives. (Letter of June 3rd, 1938.)

Ireland.

The initial steps for the ratification of this Protocol have been taken, but, owing to pressure on parliamentary time, it has not, up to the present, been found possible to make further progress. (Letter of June 24th, 1938.)

PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Ireland.

The initial steps for the ratification of this Protocol have been taken, but, owing to pressure on parliamentary time, it has not, up to the present, been found possible to make further progress. (Letter of June 24th, 1938.)

SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS

(The Hague, April 12th, 1930.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

The Belgian Senate has not yet examined the Bill to approve this Protocol. This Bill is now before the Senate, after having been voted by the Chamber of Representatives. (Letter of June 3rd, 1938.)

Ireland.

The initial steps for the ratification of this Protocol have been taken, but, owing to pressure on parliamentary time, it has not, up to the present, been found possible to make further progress. (Letter of June 24th, 1938.)

CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The discussion in the Second Chamber of the Bill concerning this Convention has not yet taken place. (Letter of June 9th, 1938.)

CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS, RIGHTS *IN REM* OVER SUCH VESSELS, AND OTHER COGNATE QUESTIONS, WITH PROTOCOL-ANNEX

(Geneva, December 9th, 1930.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The discussion in the Second Chamber of the Bill concerning this Convention has not yet taken place. (Letter of June 9th, 1938.)

CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES, WITH ANNEXES AND PROTOCOL

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

The Belgian Senate has not yet examined the Bill to approve this Convention. This Bill is now before the Senate, after having been voted by the Chamber of Representatives. (Letter of June 3rd, 1938.)

CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

The Belgian Senate has not yet examined the Bill to approve this Convention. This Bill is now before the Senate, after having been voted by the Chamber of Representatives. (Letter of June 3rd, 1938.)

CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES, AND PROTOCOL

(Geneva, March 19th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Belgium.

The Belgian Senate has not yet examined the Bill to approve this Convention. This Bill is now before the Senate, after having been voted by the Chamber of Representatives. (Letter of June 3rd, 1938.)

CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING

(Geneva, September 24th, 1931.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Australia.

In a letter dated April 15th, 1937, from the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, it was stated that the subject matter of this Convention partly fell within the jurisdiction of the several States of Australia, but in view of a recent decision by the High Court, an examination is being made with a view to ascertaining whether the Commonwealth Government is in a position to ratify without reservation. (Letter of June 20th, 1938.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE

(Geneva, October 11th, 1933.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Monaco.

The competent Departments are now bringing the Monegasque legislation into harmony with the provisions of this Convention, and the ratification will be deposited as soon as this work is completed. (Letter of March 21st, 1938.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS, WITH DECLARATION ATTACHED

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The preparatory work in view of the Parliamentary approval of this Convention is not yet completed. (Letter of June 9th, 1938.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING THE TRANSIT OF ANIMALS, MEAT AND OTHER PRODUCTS OF ANIMAL ORIGIN, WITH ANNEX

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The preparatory work in view of the Parliamentary approval of this Convention is not yet completed. (Letter of June 9th, 1938.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXPORT AND IMPORT OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS (OTHER THAN MEAT, MEAT PREPARATIONS, FRESH ANIMAL PRODUCTS, MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS), WITH ANNEX

(Geneva, February 20th, 1935.)

REPLY RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

The Netherlands.

The preparatory work in view of the Parliamentary approval of this Convention is not yet completed. (Letter of June 9th, 1938.)

CONVENTION OF 1936 FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS, AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE

(Geneva, June 26th, 1936.)

REPLIES RECEIVED TO THE ENQUIRY ADDRESSED THIS YEAR BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

While it is the intention of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to ratify this Convention, ratification will be delayed owing to the necessity for certain amendments of the extradition law. His Majesty's Government will undertake the necessary legislation at the earliest opportunity. (Letter of July 14th, 1938.)

Bulgaria.

The Department of Public Health has been entrusted with the preparation of the formalities connected with the ratification of this Convention, in order that such ratification may take place shortly. (Letter of July 20th, 1938.)

Denmark.

The question of the ratification of this Convention is still under consideration. (Letter of July 9th, 1938.)

Estonia.

While highly appreciating the principles laid down in this Convention, Estonia does not feel in a position to ratify it at the present moment. (Letter of June 28th, 1938.)

Hungary.

The Royal Hungarian Government intends to ratify this Convention. The Bill for its ratification is being examined by the competent Departments, and the Hungarian Government is therefore not yet in a position to give information as to the date of its introduction in Parliament, such introduction, according to the Constitution, being the first stage of the procedure of ratification. (Letter of June 28th, 1938.)

Monaco.

The competent Departments are now bringing the Monegasque legislation into harmony with the provisions of this Convention, and the ratification will be deposited as soon as this work is completed. (Letter of March 21st, 1938.)

The Netherlands.

A Bill for the approval of this Convention is in preparation. As the Netherlands legislation will have to be adapted to this Convention, the preparatory work requires a certain time. (Letter of June 9th, 1938.)

Panama.

This Convention will be placed before the National Assembly, which is to meet on September 1st, 1938. (Letter of June 24th, 1938.)

Poland.

This Convention is still under consideration by the competent authorities. (Letter of June 22nd, 1938.)

Switzerland.

The Federal Authorities hope to be able to ratify this Convention in the near future. They will not be able to do so, however, until the new law on narcotics, which has for some considerable time been under examination, comes into force. (Letter of March 12th, 1938.)

GOVERNMENTS WHOSE REPLIES HAVE NOT YET REACHED THE SECRETARY-GENERAL :

Canada,
Colombia,
Cuba,
Czechoslovakia,
Ecuador,
Egypt,
France,
Honduras,
Japan,
Mexico,
Portugal,
Spain,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
Uruguay,
Venezuela.