

[Distributed to the Council,
the Members of the League
and the Delegates at the Assembly.]

A. 7 (a). 1925.

GENEVA,
August 21st, 1925

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Supplementary Report to the Sixth ~~Assembly~~ of
the League on the Work of the Council, on
the Work of the Secretariat and on the Measures
taken to execute the Decisions of the Assembly.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

1. THE PRESENT POSITION AS REGARDS INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARIAT OR CONNECTED WITH THE WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS	3
2. LEGAL QUESTIONS : Transfer by the German Government to the Polish Government of the Social Insurance Funds in the Territory of Upper Silesia ceded by Germany to Poland	3
3. FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAGUE	3
4. REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.	4
5. POLITICAL QUESTIONS : I. Expulsion of the Œcumenical Patriarch from Constantinople II. Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations	11 11
6. ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS : I. The Territory of the Saar Basin II. Free City of Danzig	12 13 ^o
7. PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.	14
8. MANDATES	20
9. SLAVERY	24
10. ECONOMIC ENQUIRY IN AUSTRIA	25
11. WORK OF THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS : I. The Economic and Financial Organisation : A. Work of the Economic Committee B. Work of the Financial Committee : 1. Financial Reconstruction of Austria 2. Financial Reconstruction of Hungary 3. Double Taxation and Tax Evasion 4. Finances of the Free City of Danzig II. The Organisation for Communications and Transit III. The Health Organisation	26 26 30 33 33 33 41
12. HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS : I. Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs II. Protection of Women and Children in the Near East	43 44
13. MEASURES TO HELP REFUGEES : Work of the Greek Refugee Settlement Commission	46
14. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION	47
15. INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX	50
16. WORK OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN BUREAU.	50

1.

**THE PRESENT POSITION AS REGARDS INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENTS
DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARIAT OR CONNECTED WITH THE
WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.**

A complete list of signatures and ratifications of and accessions to international engagements deposited with the Secretariat or connected with the work of the League of Nations has been prepared and will be distributed as an annex to this report.

2.

LEGAL QUESTIONS.

**TRANSFER BY THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT TO THE POLISH GOVERNMENT
OF THE SOCIAL INSURANCE FUNDS IN THE TERRITORY OF UPPER SILESIA
CEDED BY GERMANY TO POLAND.**

The Council on December 9th, 1924, approved the recommendations of the Commission set up under Article 312 of the Treaty of Versailles concerning the transfer of the social insurance funds in the territory of Upper Silesia ceded by Germany to Poland.

The attention of the Council, at its meeting on March 14th, 1925, was drawn by the Polish Government to certain difficulties which had arisen between Poland and Germany in regard to the first payment contemplated under the regulations approved by the Council on December 9th, 1924.

The Council, after having communicated with the Reparation Commission, the Agent-General for Reparation Payments and the German Government, and after having heard the explanations given at its meeting of June 9th, 1925, by the representative of Poland, adopted a report of the Brazilian representative noting that the German Government was not contesting the execution of its obligation and recognising the great importance from a social and humanitarian point of view of a speedy settlement of the question of the method of payment. Such a settlement, in the opinion of the Council, appeared to be quite practicable in view of the fact that both the German Government and the Reparation Commission had declared that the question might be settled in accordance with the rules laid down in the Dawes plan (see clause IIIb of Annex 1 and clause I of Annex II of the London Protocol of August 30th, 1924). Whether the German Government, as a result of the postponement of the payment of the first instalment, was under an obligation to pay delayed interest charges was a question which, in the opinion of the Council, might possibly arise.

3.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAGUE.

1. GENERAL FINANCIAL POSITION.

The general financial position continues to be satisfactory, the receipts during the month of July having exceeded the amounts paid during any month since the beginning of the League.

2. ACTION TAKEN BY THE COUNCIL AT ITS JUNE SESSION.

The Council, at its June session, decided not to submit any observations on the report of the Supervisory Commission on the accounts for 1924 and on the budget for 1926, reserving, however, the right of its representatives to make, during the Assembly, such proposals or such amendments as they might think desirable.

The Council also approved, as regards the report on the 1924 accounts, the delegation by M. Ceresa to Dr. F. Vivaldi of his duties as auditor under the Financial Regulations.

In accordance with the decision of the fifth Assembly the question of certain contributions in arrears was placed on the agenda of the June session of the Council. The Council decided that, in view of the rather peculiar situation of the States referred to in the Assembly's resolution, the Secretary-General should be requested to communicate to the States concerned the report which he had submitted and to place this question for further consideration on the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the Council.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

I. ARBITRATION, SECURITY AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

The special document, to which reference is made on page 12 of the General Report to the Sixth Assembly, containing the communications received from Governments in regard to this question is distributed as Document A. 25.

II. RIGHT OF INVESTIGATION IN THE STATES SUBJECT TO INVESTIGATION UNDER THE TREATIES OF VERSAILLES, ST. GERMAIN, TRIANON AND NEUILLY.

In accordance with the resolution of the Council of March 14th, 1925 (see General Report to the Sixth Assembly, page 14), the Secretary-General has presented to the Council a memorandum the object of which is to ascertain whether, and to what extent, the system established by the regulations adopted by the Council to ensure free execution of the task entrusted to the Commissions of Investigation may necessitate legislative measures on the part of the countries subject to the right of investigation.

The Council examined this memorandum at its meeting of June 10th, 1925, and instructed the Secretary-General to address a communication to the Governments of the four countries subject to the right of investigation in the following terms :

“ I have the honour to inform you that at its meeting of March 14th, 1925, the Council adopted the following resolution :

“ “ The Council,

“ “ After having examined the various questions on the agenda relative to the right of investigation,

“ “ Decides :

“ “ 1. To adopt the report of the Mixed Commission (jurists and representatives of the Permanent Advisory Commission) on the ways and means of assuring to Commissions of Investigation the free and complete execution of the duties entrusted to them ;

“ “ 2. To request the Secretary-General to cause a study to be made as to whether, and, if so, to what extent, the system approved as above will necessitate legislative measures on the part of the countries subject to the right of investigation and to furnish a report thereon for the information of the Council. ’

“ The report of the Mixed Commission referred to in the first of these resolutions was, on the instructions of the Council, communicated to you by my letter of March 19th, 1925.

“ I am instructed by the Council to inform you that the study referred to in the second resolution has been duly submitted to it. The Council has, however, not considered it necessary to discuss in detail or take any decision on this question.

“ The essential fact for the Council is that the countries subject to investigation are definitely bound by the respective Treaties of Peace ‘ to give every facility for any investigation which the Council, acting, if need be, by a majority vote, may consider necessary ’. ”

III. PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

The questionnaire mentioned in the General Report to the Sixth Assembly (page 16) has been studied by the Economic Committee, the Financial Committee, the Permanent Advisory Commission for Military, Naval and Air Questions and the Workers' Group of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. The Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit and the Employers' Group of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office were also asked to give their opinion on the questionnaire, but have not yet replied.

It should be remembered in this connection that the Conference for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War examined the relation between the question of the control of the international trade in arms and the question of the manufacture of arms. The Conference inserted the following declaration in its Final Act :

“ That the Convention of to-day's date must be considered as an important step towards a general system of international agreements regarding arms and ammunition and implements of war, and that it is desirable that the international aspect of the manufacture of such arms, ammunition and implements of war should receive early consideration by the different Governments. ”

IV. CHEMICAL WARFARE.

The Conference for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War also considered the question of chemical warfare. The Conference adopted a Protocol on chemical and bacteriological warfare. It also instructed its President to request the Secretary-General to ask the Council of the League of Nations to draw the attention of the Committee of Jurists which it appointed with a view to the codification of international law to the Protocol adopted by the Conference and to the clause of the Treaty of Washington concerning the prohibition of chemical warfare.

V. PUBLICATION OF THE MILITARY YEAR-BOOK.

The Military Year-Book contemplated in the decisions of the Council and of the Assembly, to which reference is made on page 16 of the General Report to the Sixth Assembly, is at present in course of preparation and will be published towards the end of the present year. According to the wishes expressed by the last Assembly, the part of this Year-Book dealing with industrial and economic resources capable of being utilised for war will be gradually developed. A first step in this direction will be made in the edition for the present year.

VI. INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR.

The Fifth Assembly adopted the following resolution on this subject :

“ The Assembly requests the Council to submit to the Governments of States Members and non-Members of the League of Nations the draft Convention relating to the Control of the International Trade in Arms, Munitions and Implements of War drawn up by the Temporary Mixed Commission, and to request these Governments to inform the Secretary-General, before the Council meets in December, whether they are prepared to take part in a Conference to be convened in April or May 1925 for the purpose of discussing this draft Convention. ”

In view of this resolution, the Council took the following decision on September 30th, 1924 :

“ On the proposal of the Assembly, the Council decides to authorise the Secretary-General to submit to the Governments of the States Members and non-Members of the League of Nations the draft Convention relating to the Control of the International Trade in Arms, Munitions and Implements of War drawn up by the Temporary Mixed Commission, and to request these Governments to inform him, before the Council meets in December, whether they are prepared to take part in a Conference to be convened in April or May 1925 for the purpose of discussing the draft Convention. ”

In pursuance of these decisions, the Secretary-General wrote to the various Governments on October 9th.

As a result of the correspondence between the Secretary-General and the different Governments of the Members of the League and non-Members, and of subsequent resolutions of the Council, the Conference assembled at Geneva on Monday, May 4th, 1925.

The following States were represented :

Abyssinia	France	Persia
Austria	Germany	Poland
Belgium	Greece	Portugal
Brazil	Hungary	Roumania
British Empire	India	Salvador
Bulgaria	Irish Free State	Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom
Canada	Italy	Siam
Chile	Japan	Spain
China	Latvia	Sweden
Colombia	Lithuania	Switzerland
Czechoslovakia	Luxemburg	Turkey
Denmark	Netherlands	Uruguay
Egypt	Nicaragua	United States
Esthonia	Norway	Venezuela
Finland	Panama	

The Argentine Republic sent observers.

The Council appointed as President of the Conference, His Excellency, Count CARTON DE WIART, Minister of State, former Prime Minister of Belgium.

Agenda.

The agenda of the Conference was the following :

1. Examination of the draft Convention prepared by the Temporary Mixed Commission.
2. Examination of the standardisation of nomenclatures and statistical systems for the trade in arms, munitions and implements of war.

The draft Convention which was submitted to the Conference had been summarised in the following terms by the Temporary Mixed Commission, which prepared it :

“ The text finally adopted by the Commission contains six chapters.

“ Chapter I, consisting of the first Article of the draft, deals with the definition and enumeration of the arms, munitions and implements of war the international commerce of which is to be controlled. In this task the Temporary Mixed Commission had the advantage of the technical co-operation of the Permanent Advisory Commission, and the classification adopted by the Temporary Mixed Commission has for its basis that which the Permanent Advisory Commission had prepared at its May (1924) session in Paris. In this connection, the Temporary Mixed Commission endorses the following remarks to be found in the report of the Permanent Advisory Commission on the subject :

“ ‘ After considering the arms and munitions in relation to their intended or possible use for war, the Commission decided to form three distinct categories.

“ ‘ The Commission decided that a first category should be set apart for arms and munitions exclusively designed for war.

“ ‘ In view of the developments which have been effected in arms manufactured for commercial purposes, and particularly in sporting rifles, there is little difference between sporting and military weapons, and the former have acquired a military value which must be taken into consideration. The Commission accordingly considered it advisable to make a second category to include arms and ammunition which, without being designed exclusively for war, were nevertheless capable of being utilised to some extent for military purposes.

“ ‘ Lastly, the arms which are not covered by the two previous categories, either because they are not specially designed for war or because they are not capable of being utilised for military purposes, have been put into a third category.

“ ‘ The Commission has thought it desirable to append a note to the list to the effect that it was considered unnecessary to include therein arms the use of which is prohibited by international law.’

“ The Temporary Mixed Commission thought it necessary to add to the arms and munitions enumerated in Category I of the classification established by the Permanent Advisory Commission certain implements of war, as well as certain component parts thereof.

“ Chapter II of the Convention includes all the stipulations relative to the export and transit of arms, munitions and implements of war. Starting from Article 2, which establishes a general prohibition, this part of the Convention has for its object the building-up of a system of control subject to which all international movements of the material defined in Article 1 would have to take place. This system has for its basis the control of the export of material in Category I by means of a licence which the Government of the exporting country is to grant only in the case of direct delivery to a Government which it has recognised as such. The Convention, however, stipulates that under certain conditions component parts may be exported to private manufacturers of arms. The export licence must be as nearly as possible in the form contained in the Annex to the Convention.

“ Arms and munitions in Category II may be exported without licence provided that they are not intended for warlike purposes. With this end in view, the Governments of the High Contracting Parties undertake to determine from the size, destination and other circumstances of each consignment of Category II material, whether this material may be intended for war purposes, and in that case to submit it to the same rules which apply to Category I.

“ The international trade in material placed in Category III is free. The export of this material is, however, prohibited in general to certain maritime and territorial zones which are discussed hereafter.

“ The international control suggested in the Convention is based on publicity, and the organisation entrusted with it is an International Central Office to be set up by the Council of the League of Nations. This Office will receive from the Governments of importing and exporting countries quarterly returns of the licences mentioned above and will publish them.

“ Chapter III deals with the importation of material defined in Article 1 in certain maritime and territorial zones. The main purpose of this chapter is contained in Article 9, which stipulates that the import of all the material defined in Article 1 is to be prohibited in these zones.

“ The Commission adopted this principle and settled the text of the two paragraphs of Article 9 which are to be found in the enclosed draft. The Commission, however, was of the opinion that this question required further consideration by the

Council. It therefore encloses for information the Minutes of its debates on this point including a number of amendments submitted by the British Delegation to the Permanent Advisory Commission.

“ As for the territories to be included in the prohibited zones, the Commission was of opinion, in view of the new circumstances which have arisen since the Convention of St. Germain was drawn up, that the question might with advantage be the object of special consideration by the Council.

“ Chapters IV and V deal with the land and sea supervision of the trade and the measures to be taken to carry out the preceding provisions in the prohibited zones. These chapters have been drafted on the basis of the corresponding chapters of the Convention of St. Germain, taking into account the technical modifications suggested by the Permanent Advisory Commission, and, in the case of the maritime supervision, by the Naval Sub-Commission of the Permanent Advisory Commission.

“ Finally, Chapter VI of the draft deals with general and protocol provisions. ’

Organisation of the Conference.

The Conference decided to organise its work in the following manner :

1. After a general discussion by the Conference, the agenda would be examined by the Committees. Provision was made for the following Committees :

(a) *A General Committee*, presided over by Count Carton DE WIART, the President of the Conference, and consisting of one delegate from each delegation. This General Committee was to undertake a first reading of the Convention in order to determine any questions of principle which might be raised. When these questions of principle had been decided by the General Committee, the articles of the draft were to be referred to the competent technical Committees for more detailed study and, if possible, for a preliminary drafting.

(b) *A Military, Naval and Air Technical Committee*, to examine questions more particularly connected with armaments.

(c) *A Legal Committee*, to examine legal questions.

(d) *A Customs Committee*, to deal with questions regarding licences, statistics and, if necessary, transit.

(e) *A Committee*, known as the *Geographical Committee*, to devote particular attention to Chapters III, IV, V of the draft Convention regarding the special zones.

In addition, the Conference, at the beginning of its deliberations, adopted the following measures in regard to its organisation :

(1) The appointment of a Vice-President : His Excellency M. Gustavo GUERRERO, representative of Salvador, was unanimously elected Vice-President of the Conference.

(2) The creation of a *Bureau* to direct the general work of the Conference.

(3) The appointment of a *Drafting Committee*.

Subsequently, the General Committee decided to create a *Co-ordination Committee* to examine reports submitted to the General Committee by the various technical committees on one and the same subject and to submit them to the General Committee, accompanied by a single set of conclusions and, if possible, by a draft text.

Order of Work.

The General Committee decided at the outset to refer to the Military, Naval and Air Technical Committee Chapter I, dealing with the definition of the arms, ammunition and implements of war the trade in which was to be covered by the draft Convention. The latter Committee devoted the greater part of its meetings to this question. Its report, dated May 23rd, 1925, contained conclusions which, on certain and by no means unimportant points, had been adopted by small majorities, and with a large number of abstentions. This was particularly the case in regard to the treatment to be accorded to warships and aircraft. In both cases weighty arguments were advanced from a military, Customs and legal point of view for and against the inclusion of such apparatus in one or other of the categories provided for in Article 1.

The Bureau, on receiving the report, decided that the question should be examined by a mixed Committee of the Military, Customs and Legal Committees.

As a result of the deliberations of this Mixed Committee a report was submitted to the General Committee. The General Committee adopted the conclusions of the report subject to certain formal changes, to be made by the Drafting Committee. On the basis of these conclusions, modified in certain points of detail by decisions of the Drafting Committee and the General Committee, Chapter I was drawn up, in its final form, so as to include five categories.

The characteristic features selected for the definition of these five categories are set out in the General Report, subject to certain exceptions which will be found in the text of the Article. They are as follows :

First category : arms used exclusively for war.
Second category : arms capable of being used for war.
Third category : warships.
Fourth category : aircraft.
Fifth category : other arms.

* * *

Chapter II lays down as the basis for the supervision of the trade in arms the principle of licences in the case of articles in Categories I and II, and of publicity in regard to articles in the first four categories.

With regard to licences, two points of view were revealed in the General Committee ; one section was in favour of the principle of freedom to export, subject to certain conditions ; while the other section upheld the principle of general prohibition, subject to certain exceptions. The General Committee decided that the Convention should be based on the following principles :

- (1) The export of arms, ammunition and implements of war to private individuals should be prohibited.
- (2) The export of arms, ammunition and implements of war to Governments should be permitted under certain conditions.

The second of the above rules gave rise to a fresh difficulty in connection with the definition of the word "Government". In the draft Convention it had been proposed that arms should only be exported to Governments recognised by the Government of the exporting country. Certain delegations considered that the guarantee thus offered by the draft was inadequate. After the question had been considered by the General Committee and the Legal Committee, the General Committee adopted the text which now forms part of the Convention, and which gave entire satisfaction to all points of view.

The Convention as adopted differs from the draft in that the export of arms and munitions of Category II, which was to be free, as a general rule, according to the draft, is now made subject to licence in the Convention. Certain exceptions to the rule which limits export to Governments are provided for and are carefully regulated in Article 3.

Chapter II raised the question of the international organ which had been provided for in the draft Convention submitted to the Conference and which was designed to effect control by means of publicity. On the one hand, the delegation of the United States of America pointed out that practical difficulties would arise for his Government as regards treaty obligations concerning an organisation set up or directed by the League of Nations ; on the other hand, the Members of the League of Nations, being bound by Article 24 of the Covenant, felt an equal objection to the idea of this organ being entirely independent of the League. Various compromises were suggested, in particular by the United States delegation and the Spanish delegation. The General Committee decided to have the point examined by a special Committee, appointed *ad hoc*.

This special Committee arrived at the conclusion that, as the suggested control would only consist of the periodical and uniform publication of facts regarding the international trade in arms and regarding the laws and regulations in force in various countries on the subject of such trade, it did not seem necessary to create a special organ, provided that the uniform and periodical publication of these data were assured by a reciprocal undertaking on the part of the States signing the Convention.

The Conference agreed with this conclusion.

The Conference felt that, by providing for a periodical and uniform system of publicity concerning the international trade in arms and munitions for war, and by recommending (as in the Annex to the Convention) the precise form which the system of licences and publicity should assume, it had dealt adequately with the second point placed on its agenda by the Council of the League of Nations, the standardisation of nomenclatures and statistical systems for the trade in arms, munitions and implements of war. (See Document A. 7. 1925, page 14.)

The difficulties raised by the States adjacent to Russia were connected with this same question of publicity. The original draft provided (Article 32) that the Convention should not come into force until it had been ratified by a certain number of Powers, specified by name, including Russia. The General Committee decided to remove the name of Russia from this list because the Soviet Government had not sent a delegation to the Conference. Moreover, it was finally decided that no list should appear in this Article. The States adjacent to Russia thereupon pointed out how difficult would be their position if a great producing State remained independent of the system of publicity laid down in Chapter II of the Convention. Various solutions were considered and the General Committee decided to submit all the suggestions received to a Special Committee.

This Committee adopted a text which was subsequently, on the advice of the Drafting Committee, inserted as an Article (Article 29) in the Chapter "Special Provisions" in the Convention as finally adopted.

Provisions for the supervision of the trade in arms and munitions during transit were contained in some of the drafts examined by the Temporary Mixed Commission, but they did not appear in the draft Convention adopted by that Commission. The subject was discussed by the General Committee on an amendment submitted by the British delegation for the establishment of a supervision of this nature in certain cases. The General Committee came to the conclusion that it was not necessary that the Convention should contain provisions for a

special control over arms, munitions and implements of war during transit. A motion by M. Veverka (Czechoslovakia) to introduce the idea of supervision during transit in the form of a recommendation, led to the adoption of Declaration No. 1 which appears in the Final Act.

* * *

The examination of Chapters III, IV and V of the draft of the Temporary Mixed Commission — that is to say, the whole body of provisions in this Convention which concern the system of special zones — was undertaken by the Geographical Committee, which was duly empowered by the General Committee to refer certain questions to the competent technical Committees if this course appeared necessary and to receive their reports direct.

The principles on which this system was to be based had not been definitely settled by the Temporary Mixed Commission. The latter confined itself to pointing out to the Council the delicate nature of the question and to inserting in the Convention an article which merely established the general principle of a regime, without entering into geographical details concerning the definition of the special zones. Persia had pointed out to the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Council and the Assembly, the particular importance which she attached to this question. The Council in its turn, had referred the matter to the countries invited to take part in the Conference. It was therefore left to the Conference, and consequently to the Geographical Committee, to decide this question.

In regard to the definition of the land zones it had also to take into consideration the position of Abyssinia, which had been brought to the notice of the Council by that Power and by the Council to the notice of the Conference. Article 28, which appears in the chapter "Special Provisions", contains the results of the agreement reached on this subject. On the proposal of the United States delegation, a third paragraph was added in order to provide for the case of other States wishing to undertake engagements similar to those contained in the first two paragraphs of Article 28.

It should be mentioned here that, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations dated July 30th, 1925, the Government of Liberia stated that it would accept without hesitation the compromise embodied in this paragraph of Article 28.

When these points concerning the definition of the land zones had been decided, the Committee encountered some difficulty in surmounting the obstacles in connection with the definition of the maritime zone and the system to be applied to it, as differing views were held on this subject by the Persian delegation and other delegations. The solution arrived at was not considered acceptable by the Persian delegation and it accordingly decided to withdraw from the Conference at the meeting of June 15th, 1925.

On the proposal of the Naval Sub-Committee of the Technical Committee, it was decided to recast Chapters III, IV and V of the draft Convention with a view to collecting all the points of principle in regard to the system of special zones in Chapter III of the new Convention and relegating the executive details to an annex of the Convention.

* * *

As regards the General Provisions, questions of various kinds were raised during the discussion of Article 32 of the draft Convention. Thus the question of the relations between the control of the private manufacture of arms and that of the trade in arms was raised, during the discussion of this Article, by an amendment proposed by the delegation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to the effect that the coming into force of the Convention should be postponed until the coming into force of a convention on the private manufacture of arms. This amendment was expressive of the attitude of various delegations which desired to see equality established between producing and non-producing countries. The adoption of this principle had been moved at the commencement of the Conference by the Greek representative. As a result of the discussions on this subject, the second Declaration was inserted in the Final Act.

Another question raised during the discussion of Article 32 of the draft Convention was that of partial or conditional adhesions, which is dealt with in Article 26 of the draft Convention. This idea had been introduced into the draft Convention in order to give it the required elasticity, particularly in view of the third of the objections to the Convention of Saint-Germain brought by the Government of the United States of America in its correspondence with the Council (see letter of September 12th, 1923).

"It should be observed also that the acceptance by the United States of an agreement of the nature and scope of the Convention of Saint-Germain would call for the enactment of legislation to make it operative and particularly for the imposition of penalties applicable to private arms-producing concerns as a means of establishing an effective control. This Government is not in a position to undertake to attain the enactment of such legislation."

The Conference came to the conclusion that this provision relating to partial or conditional adhesions might be omitted from the Convention; the delegation of the United States of America agreed as it did not consider such a provision necessary.

It should, however, be remarked that Article 36 makes provision for the possibility of signature, ratification or adhesion subject to exceptions regarding certain territories. This Article was inserted in the Convention on the proposal of the British delegation to meet the special conditions of the constitution of the British Empire.

The draft Convention had provided a complete system of reservations together with rules

as to their admissibility. The Conference eliminated all provisions of this nature from the Convention.

The Conference thought it necessary to modify the draft in such a way as to make the working of the Convention as independent as possible of the League of Nations in order to facilitate the ratification of the Convention by the United States of America, a condition which was considered indispensable, if the system established by the Convention was to become effective. Adhesions, ratifications and denunciations are to be addressed to the Government of the French Republic which will communicate them to all the signatory and adhering countries.

* * *

During the discussion on the Preamble, the delegation of the United States of America gave notice of its intention to ask the Conference to adopt certain measures concerning chemical warfare. The proposal in its original form was to prohibit the export of material and implements intended for chemical warfare. The Polish delegation moved to extend this provision to cover bacteriological warfare. These proposals were first examined by the Legal Committee, which appointed a special Sub-Committee for the purpose, and then by the Military, Naval and Air Technical Committee. After assuming various forms, the proposal finally took the shape of a draft Protocol which was submitted by the delegation of the United States of America and amended by the Swiss delegation and which was finally adopted in the form submitted by the Drafting Committee.

* * *

As an outcome of its work the Conference adopted the following instruments :

1. The Convention.
2. The Declaration regarding the Territory of Ifni.
3. The Protocol relating to Chemical and Bacteriological Warfare.
4. The Protocol of Signature.
5. The Final Act.

Up to the present the following countries have signed the documents mentioned below

Convention.

Abyssinia	Hungary
United States of America	India
Austria	Italy
Brazil	Japan
British Empire	Latvia
Chile	Luxemburg
Czechoslovakia	Poland
Esthonia	Roumania
Finland	Salvador
France	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Germany	Spain

Declaration regarding the Territory of Ifni.

Abyssinia	Italy
Austria	Japan
Brazil	Latvia
British Empire	Luxemburg
Chile	Poland
Czechoslovakia	Roumania
Esthonia	Salvador
Finland	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
France	Spain.
India	

Protocol relating to Chemical and Bacteriological Warfare.

Abyssinia	Japan
United States of America	Latvia
Austria	Luxemburg
Brazil	Netherlands
British Empire	Nicaragua
Canada	Poland
Chile	Portugal
Czechoslovakia	Roumania
Denmark	Salvador
Esthonia	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Finland	Spain
France	Switzerland
Germany	Turkey
Greece	Uruguay
India	
Italy	

Protocol of Signature.

Abyssinia
United States of America
Austria
Brazil
British Empire
Chile
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Esthonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
India
Italy

Japan
Latvia
Luxemburg
Netherlands
Nicaragua
Poland
Portugal
Roumania
Salvador
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Spain
Switzerland
Turkey
Uruguay.

Final Act.

Abyssinia
United States of America
Austria
Belgium
Brazil
British Empire
Chile
China
Czechoslovakia
Egypt
Esthonia
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary

India
Irish Free State
Italy
Japan
Latvia
Luxemburg
Netherlands
Poland
Roumania
Salvador
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Siam
Spain
Sweden

No ratifications have up to the present been notified.

5.

POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. EXPULSION OF THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH FROM CONSTANTINOPLE.

At its meeting on June 8th, 1925, the Council, acting on the request of the Greek Government, withdrew from its agenda the above question, which it was informed had been decided by direct negotiation. The Council at the same time caused the Permanent Court of International Justice to be informed that, in consequence, it withdrew its request for an advisory opinion regarding its competence in the matter, which had been questioned by the Turkish Government.

II. EXCHANGE OF GREEK AND TURKISH POPULATIONS.

GREEK MINORITY IN CONSTANTINOPLE AND TURKISH MINORITY IN WESTERN THRACE.

The neutral members of the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations informed the Council, on May 29th, that they had found it impossible to finish the preliminary work for the preparation of the report on the Greek minority in Constantinople, and that transmission of their report would therefore be delayed for some weeks.

The Council postponed consideration of the question until its September session. The representatives of Greece and Turkey informed the Council that negotiations between the two Governments were proceeding satisfactorily and that it was to be expected that the Council, at the next session, would be able to take note of an agreement concluded between the two countries.

6.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS.

I. THE TERRITORY OF THE SAAR BASIN.

During its session of June 1925, the Council dealt with the question of the measures to be taken to preserve documents which will be required in view of the plebiscite to be held in the Territory of the Saar.

Since the preparation of the General Report to the sixth Assembly, the periodical report of the Governing Commission for the second quarter of 1925 has been communicated to the Council and to the Members of the League.

1. QUESTIONS EXAMINED BY THE COUNCIL.

Preservation of Documents with a view to the Plebiscite.

The Council, at its meeting of June 10th, 1925, after hearing the report of the representative of Italy, decided to invite M. Bonzon, former Provisional Commissioner of Archives for the Plebiscite in the Territory of the Saar, to return to the Territory in order to examine the documents which had been placed at the disposal of the Governing Commission by the Prussian and Bavarian Governments on February 2nd, 1924. Reference is made to these documents in the General Report to the sixth Assembly.

M. Bonzon, in conformity with this resolution, went to the Territory of the Saar in June, and made an examination of the documents in question. Upon his return on June 24th, he addressed to the Council a report, from which it appears that these documents are in a satisfactory condition, and that they have now been distributed among the sub-prefects. The Commissioner intends to return to the Saar in a few months' time in order to ascertain under what conditions the documents are being kept by the local authorities. He will then address a second report to the Council.

2. GENERAL QUESTIONS.

The following questions relating to the second quarter of 1925 are noted in the twenty-second periodical report of the Governing Commission.

(a) *Political Situation.*

On April 1st, a change was made in the distribution of the powers and duties of the members of the Governing Commission. M. Kossmann, the Saar member, agreed to direct the Department of Labour (*Arbeitsamt*), which hitherto had been included among the ministerial departments entrusted to the Chairman of the Governing Commission.

The second quarter, from the political point of view, was marked by the Rhineland millenary celebrations held in the majority of the districts of the Territory. The Governing Commission gives an account of the attitude which it adopted on this occasion.

The Advisory Council was convened at the end of the quarter. Some ten draft ordinances were placed on the agenda.

(b) *Economic and Social Position.*

The economic and social position did not appreciably change during the second quarter. There was a slight decrease in production, but the number of unemployed remained at an extremely low figure. The Commission draws attention, however, to certain signs of agitation among the workers, particularly among the miners, during the last days of the quarter. Industry and commerce remained subject to the same uncertainty which has characterised the situation since January 10th, 1925, and they are awaiting the conclusion of the Franco-German Treaty of Commerce. The Governing Commission, in reply to a question addressed to it by the French and German delegations entrusted with the preparation of the clauses of this Treaty relating to the Saar Basin, declared itself ready to assume certain duties which will fall to it in connection with the carrying out of the Treaty.

(c) *Administrative Activity.*

The number of the local gendarmerie during the quarter was raised by 62, which brings the number of gendarmes to 817 men.

With a view to facilitating movement between the Saar Territory and Germany, the Governing Commission has issued a decree stipulating that any person provided with the necessary papers of identity may freely enter the Territory without previous authorisation, on the understanding that he will notify the police.

The French Government has on its side agreed that the inhabitants of the Saar Territory may obtain, until further notice, a visa for their identity cards issued in the Saar, which will enable them to move freely in France for one year.

The Governing Commission has decreed a general increase of the salaries of officials. It has approved a contract between the Inter-Communal Association and the Ames-Emmerich Consortium for the issue of a loan of four million dollars.

The periodical report also contains information in regard to finance, the railways, posts and telegraphs, public works, commerce, labour and social assurance, public relief and social hygiene and agriculture.

3. PETITIONS FROM THE INHABITANTS OF THE TERRITORY.

The Governing Commission, on July 17th, 1925, in conformity with the resolution of the Council of May 17th, 1920, forwarded to the Council, with its observations, a petition, dated June 30th, from the Union of the Saar Press concerning the liberty of the press in the Saar.

II. FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

1. QUESTIONS DEALT WITH BY THE COUNCIL.

The Council was asked to deal with three questions concerning Danzig during its June session :

(a) *Polish Postal Services in the Territory of Danzig.*

Mention is made in the General Report to the sixth Assembly of an advisory opinion, dated May 16th, 1925, given by the Court at the request of the Council on the question of the Polish postal services in Danzig. The Council, at its meeting of June 11th, 1925, adopted the opinion of the Court to the effect that "within the port of Danzig the Polish postal service is entitled to set up letter-boxes and to collect and deliver postal matter outside its premises in the Heveliusplatz, and is not restricted to operations which can be performed entirely within those premises ; and that the use of the said services is open to the public and is not confined to the Polish authorities and officials".

The Council, moreover, decided that the limits of the port of Danzig should be traced from the point of view of the Polish postal service, taking into account the considerations submitted by the Court. For this purpose it invited the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, in agreement with the Rapporteur of the Council, to appoint four experts, one of whom was to be a jurist, who would be asked to submit to the Council, through the High Commissioner, proposals regarding the delimitation of the port of Danzig.

The Committee was constituted as follows :

M. HOSTIE (Belgian), Secretary-General of the Rhine Navigation Commission.

M. MONTARROYOS (Brazilian), Attaché to the Brazilian Delegation to the League of Nations, former member of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit.

Colonel DE REYNIER (Swiss), former Chairman of the Harbour Board of Danzig.

M. SCHREUDER (Dutch), Director of the Postal Administration at Amsterdam.

The Committee met at Geneva on July 16th, and noted the documents submitted to it. It proceeded on the following day to Danzig, where, from July 19th to 23rd, it conducted an enquiry into the question on the spot, and finally framed its conclusions. It met again at Geneva on July 30th in order to complete its report, which has been forwarded to the Council through the High Commissioner.

(b) *Procedure to be followed in settling Disputes between Danzig and Poland.*

The Council, during its session of March 1925, with a view to reducing the number of decisions which the High Commissioner is called upon to take, as well as the number of appeals from these decisions addressed to the Council, begged its Rapporteur to frame, with the assistance of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General, detailed proposals in regard to the procedure to be followed under Article 39 of the Treaty of November 9th, 1920.

The Rapporteur communicated his proposals to the members of the Council in May, inviting the Free City of Danzig and Poland to present their observations. The Council, at its meeting of June 11th, 1925, approved the rules of procedure submitted to it by the Rapporteur, after having considered the observations of the two Governments.

The new rules are based on the following principles :

1. The High Commissioner, before dealing with a dispute, should satisfy himself, as he has done in the past, that the dispute cannot be settled by direct negotiations between the parties through the mediation of the High Commissioner.

2. The High Commissioner, before dealing with a dispute, may have recourse through the Secretary-General to the technical services of the League of Nations in order to obtain a technical advisory opinion. In the same way he may, through the Secretary-General and the Rapporteur, obtain a legal opinion. The High Commissioner will communicate this advisory

opinion to the parties and will consider whether it is possible to establish an agreement, on the basis of this opinion, such as would render it unnecessary for him to take any decision on the subject. In the contrary event he will make use of the advisory opinion in formulating his decision.

3. The rules fix the periods within which the pleadings and counter-pleadings should be submitted to the High Commissioner, as well as the period within which an appeal against a decision of the High Commissioner should be made to the Council.

(c) *Procedure to be followed in the case of Petitions addressed to the League of Nations by Nationals of the Free City.*

The Council, at its meeting of June 10th, framed a letter which the Secretary-General subsequently addressed to the High Commissioner at Danzig concerning the procedure to be followed in the case of petitions addressed to the League of Nations by nationals of the Free City. The Council considered that, as the High Commissioner was the representative of the League of Nations at Danzig, nationals of the Free City might address petitions to him, the contents of which he might use as information concerning the situation at Danzig. As the constitution of the Free City is placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations, it seems only natural for the High Commissioner, if he should learn by means of petitions or otherwise that there is a danger of the provisions of the constitution being infringed, to bring the matter to the knowledge of the Council.

2. OTHER QUESTIONS.

(a) *Depot for Polish Munitions in Transit.*

The High Commissioner suggested by telegram that the question of the delimitation of the Westerplatte, placed at the disposal of the Polish Government under the resolution of the Council of March 14th, 1924, for the discharge, warehousing and expedition to Poland of materials of war and explosives in transit, should be placed on the agenda of the session of the Council held in June. The documents concerning this question, however, were received very late, and one of the parties was not ready to discuss the matter. The Council accordingly did not think it advisable to place the question on the agenda of that session. The High Commissioner, in a letter dated June 19th, 1925, asked that the question should be placed on the agenda of the next session of the Council in September.

(b) *Visits of Foreign Warships to Danzig.*

The High Commissioner, on July 10th, 1925, forwarded to the League of Nations the text of an agreement concluded on June 29th, 1925, between the representatives of Poland and the Free City concerning the procedure to be observed for the visits of foreign warships to Danzig.

The High Commissioner informed the Secretary-General, in a letter dated August 7th, 1925, that a supplementary agreement had been reached, laying down that the official visits within the territory of the Free City should be made in the following order: President of the Senate of the Free City, High Commissioner, Diplomatic Representative of Poland, Chairman of the Harbour Board.

7.

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

I. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

The General Report to the sixth Assembly contains a special chapter on questions concerning the protection of racial, religious and linguistic minorities in conformity with the international instruments at the moment in force. Further, certain questions, dealt with in the chapter of the report on "Political Questions", because they were raised under Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, were in reality minorities questions, and were examined as such by the Council. They include the question of Moslems of Albanian origin in Greece, the Greek minority in Constantinople and the Turkish minority in Western Thrace. To obtain a clear idea of the work of the League of Nations in these matters, it should be borne in mind that a certain number of minorities questions — in fact, the great majority of questions of this kind — have been examined by the Minorities Committee under the resolution of the Council dated October 25th, 1920, without being placed on the agenda of the Council (see paragraph VI of the present chapter).

Since the drafting of the General Report to the Assembly, the Council, during its session of June 1925, examined the following minorities questions, apart from the questions which were examined by the Minorities Committee without being placed on the agenda of the Council.

II. BULGARIAN MINORITIES IN GREECE¹.

The reply of the Greek Government to the questionnaire which the Council sent to it on March 14th, 1925, was sent to the Secretary-General in a letter dated May 29th, 1925, from the Permanent Greek Delegate to the League of Nations.

The Greek Government, in its reply, explained that no new legislative or other provisions had been adopted in order to carry into effect the provisions contained in the Treaty for the protection of minorities, because this Treaty had only come into force on August 6th, 1924, and the period allowed for the depositing of the declarations of emigration under the Convention on the exchange of Greek and Bulgarian populations had only expired on December 31st last. Nevertheless, well before Greece had signed the Treaty for the protection of minorities, she accorded protection to their legitimate rights by a series of legislative and other measures constituting a quasi-complete system of protection of the rights of minorities. The Greek Government is showing constant care in the application of the Minorities Treaty. At the moment, it is studying appropriate measures for securing a sufficient number of persons for the staff which is necessary for teaching in the languages of the minorities. It affirms that the Slav-speaking minority has enjoyed the rights and advantages contained in the minorities treaties on the same footing as other minorities. This minority has not, up to the moment, enjoyed the scholastic or ecclesiastical advantages, owing, first, to the uncertain situation resulting from the Convention on Greek and Bulgarian emigration. The Government will favourably investigate any request submitted by this minority for the opening and working of a school in which education will be given in the language of the minority in conformity with the laws and regulations of the country in regard to private schools or primary education. Since the Greek nationals belonging to the Slav-speaking minority are orthodox Christians, the Government does not think it can justifiably be maintained that they form a religious minority in a country where the predominant faith is their own. Nevertheless, the Greek Government will always be ready favourably to examine any request from these nationals for the use in a church of their own language in place of the Greek language. Further, the Government is ready to extend to the new provinces inhabited by linguistic minorities the law of December 17th, 1923, by which priests are no longer to be appointed by the metropolitan bishops, according to the procedure under the Greek regime, but will be elected by their parishioners by secret ballot.

The Council again examined this question during its meeting of June 10th, 1925. On this occasion, M. Caclamanos, representative of Greece, made on behalf of his Government declarations intended to complete the replies contained in the note of May 29th, 1925. He explained to the Council that the Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs had addressed a communication to the Minister of Education asking him to examine as a matter of urgency: (1) whether there existed internal legislative provisions which were contrary to the application of Articles 8 and 9 of the Minorities Treaty and which should therefore be modified; (2) whether there existed in the internal legislation of the country provisions ensuring the execution of these articles; (3) what measures should be taken, if necessary, to complete these provisions.

The reply of the Minister for Education was not regarded as sufficient and the Minister for Foreign Affairs addressed to him the following requests: (1) urgent steps should be taken to frame a special programme for the execution of Article 9 of the Minorities Treaty, dealing with the measures to be taken by the Greek Government to facilitate the education of the Slav-speaking population in their own language in districts where there were important groups of this population; (2) steps should be taken to recruit in due course a staff able to give such instruction; (3) school books necessary for such instruction should be prepared, to be printed at the cost of the Government. The Governing Board of the Ministry of Education has been invited by the competent Minister to indicate as a matter of urgency the necessary measures and to take such decisions as are indispensable for carrying out the above requests during the summer of 1925. The Minister for Education will thus be able to take the necessary steps to meet the obligations of Greece towards the Slav minority by October 1925. It is understood that the education in their own language instituted for the benefit of the Greek Slav-speaking population will include instruction in the Greek language.

M. Caclamanos also gave some explanations concerning the religious needs of these populations. He explained, in particular, that in Greece the Orthodox communities had the right to elect their priests themselves from among persons entitled to perform the priestly office. Slav-speaking populations will therefore be able to appoint priests of their own language to perform the religious offices for their own communities. These provisions, which up to the present have only been in force in Old Greece, will be extended to New Greece.

The representative of the British Empire, acting as Rapporteur, having heard the explanations of the Greek representative, expressed the hope that his colleagues would agree with him in considering that the letter of the Greek Government, completed by the important declarations of the representative of Greece, was satisfactory and showed that the Greek Government realised its obligations and was prepared to carry them into effect.

The Council, in accordance with the proposal of its Rapporteur, noted the declarations of the Greek Government.

¹ See page 46 of the General Report (A. 7. 1925).

III. MINORITIES IN LITHUANIA¹

This question was again placed on the agenda of the Council for its session of June 1925. The Rapporteur, in conformity with the resolution of the Council of March 14th, 1925, presented a report acquainting the Council with the result of his examination of the documents in the case. He noted that the information furnished by the Lithuanian Government showed, first, that the Government desired to co-operate with the League of Nations in order to remove any doubts which might subsist as to the way in which the Lithuanian people was fulfilling its obligations towards its minorities and, secondly, that certain grievances submitted by petitioners had already been satisfactorily explained, apart from grievances which did not come within the limits of the international obligations assumed by the Lithuanian Government by its declaration of May 12th, 1922, concerning the protection of minorities. There remained, however, a certain number of points concerning which it would be advisable to ask the Lithuanian Government for further information or in regard to which the observations of the Lithuanian Government might with advantage call for a more precise definition of the position by the League of Nations.

The most important points raised by the Rapporteur dealt with the following questions :

The freedom for persons belonging to minorities to address the League of Nations by means of a petition ;

The numerical strength of the minorities and the general census ;

The participation of the representatives of minorities in the Commissions of the Diet ;

The use of minority languages in the press and at public meetings and before the courts ;

The primary education of children in the mother tongue and, in particular, conditions for the establishment of primary schools ;

The language used for business signs, inscriptions, and for notices publicly posted ;

The obligation to keep certain account books of business firms in the Lithuanian language ;

Agrarian reform from the point of view of the expropriation of lands and forests, with or without compensation, and from the point of view of the distribution of the lands to those having a right to them ;

Certain questions arising from the interpretation of the Lithuanian declaration of May 12th, 1922.

The Lithuanian representative gave to the Council on June 10th, 1925, detailed information concerning the report, the principal points of which were those mentioned above.

The further examination of the question was postponed to the next session of the Council after certain observations had been presented by several of its members.

The Rapporteur has communicated to the Council a new report in which he deals with certain points which he thought it necessary still further to define and in which he presents his conclusions. This report will be examined by the Council in September.

IV. MINORITIES IN POLAND.

ACQUISITION OF POLISH NATIONALITY.

The Council at its meeting of June 8th, 1925, noted the exchange of ratifications of the Convention of Vienna of August 30th, 1924, between the Polish and German Governments concerning the acquisition of Polish nationality, and approved the clauses of this Convention, so far as the League of Nations was concerned under the Treaty of June 28th, 1919, between the principal Allied and Associated Powers and Poland.

V. MINORITIES IN ROUMANIA.

A petition was deposited with the Secretariat of the League of Nations on February 25th, 1925, dated February 18th, 1925, from colonists of Hungarian race inhabiting a certain number of villages of the Banat and of Transylvania (Roumania). The petition concerned the possession of their lands.

The Secretary-General communicated the petition to the Roumanian Government on February 28th, 1925, for any observations which it might wish to make. The petition was distributed to the members of the Council on March 2nd for their information. The reply of the Roumanian Government, dated April 27th, 1925, was received by the Secretary-General on May 1st, 1925, and was distributed on May 7th to the members of the Council for their information.

According to the petition, the question at issue affects certain small farmers of Hungarian race established by the former Hungarian Government with the object of internal colonisation. The peasants interested now number nearly 24,000 souls. Their properties do not exceed

¹ See page 47 of the General Report (A. 7. 1925).

24 jugars or 13.8 hectares in area. These colonists are now Roumanian subjects with a right under the Minorities Treaty to a treatment equal to that accorded to other Roumanian nationals.

The petitioners in their request refer principally to two provisions of the Roumanian legislation : Article 10 of the law of July 23rd, 1921, dealing with agrarian reform in Transylvania, the Banat, Crisana and Maramures, and Article 2, paragraph 1, of the law of October 25th, 1921.

The first of these provisions is as follows :

“ The estates of the colonists established after January 1st, 1885, shall be expropriated up to the limit of the allotment fixed for their respective regions with a view to the allocation of lands to the beneficiaries named in Article 92. ”

The petitioners affirm that, according to this provision, they will necessarily be subjected to conditions of expropriation more severe than those suffered by other Roumanian citizens under the ordinary provisions of the law.

The second of the provisions referred to deals with the acts concluded after December 1st, 1918, by the Hungarian authorities with regard to State property in the territories attached to Roumania and declares such acts to be invalid. The petitioners affirm that their colonies were established on land belonging to the Hungarian State and that a certain number were not placed on the land register until the spring of 1919 owing to a delay in the administrative order not due to any carelessness or omission on their part. They point out that, as a result, the inscription of these lands on the register can be regarded under the Roumanian law of October 25th, 1921, as invalid, and they affirm that their property rights, recognised for many years, may thus be annulled without any compensation.

The Roumanian Government observed in its reply that, while the object of the colonies established before 1885 was to exploit regions where there was a lack of labour, the object of those established subsequently was the magyarisation of regions purely Roumanian by transplanting Magyar elements into regions where the Hungarian State had immense domains, whereas the Roumanian population had no land at all fit for cultivation. The result of the establishment of these colonies was that, when the Roumanian agrarian reform scheme came to be applied in regions where these colonies had been established, there were found to exist on the one hand numerous peasants of Magyar nationality in possession of lands of from 15 to 25 jugars in area, and, on the other hand, indigenous Roumanian peasants with no land at all and living in the most complete destitution. The provision of Article 10 of the Agrarian Law for Transylvania had been necessary because, in spite of the expropriation of the larger properties, there had not been sufficient land to satisfy the rights of all those who were intended to benefit from the expropriation. For this reason, Article 10 of the agrarian law had laid down that the estates of the colonists established after 1885 would be expropriated up to the limits of the typical allotment of the district. This meant that each colonist would only keep an area equal to that allotted to the peasants who became owners of their land under the Agrarian Law. The Roumanian Government added that, in allotting the estates formed from the lands expropriated either from the big landowners or from the colonists, no distinction had been made, so far as nationality was concerned, among those who benefited from the allotment.

The Roumanian Government stated that the law concerning the invalidity of acts relating to property in the territories restored to Roumania did not in any way affect the position of the colonists who had acquired their property in a regular way and could prove that they had paid their annuities to the competent bodies. It was only acquisition of lands irregularly made which had been revised and annulled in accordance with the provisions of the above-mentioned law. These acts of annulment had not resulted in any case of dispossession.

In accordance with the resolution of October 25th, 1920, the petition was examined by the representatives on the Council of Brazil (acting President), of the British Empire and of Sweden, and at the request of these three members was placed on the agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the Council. During this session the above representatives of the Council had an opportunity of examining the matter with the representative of the Roumanian Government, who declared that, since the end of March 1925, there had been no material dispossession of the colonists in question and who said he was authorised to assure the Council that the Roumanian Government would suspend any measure which might modify the existing position as regarded the property of these colonists until the Council was in a position to express a final opinion on the substance of the matter.

The Council, on the proposal of the representative of Brazil, Rapporteur, decided, at its meeting of June 11th, 1925, to postpone the examination of the question to its next session.

VI. QUESTIONS OF PROCEDURE.

M. de Mello-Franco, representative of Brazil, submitted to the Council on June 10th, 1925, the following report :

“ The Council of the League of Nations adopted on October 25th, 1920, a resolution according to which any petition or communication regarding an infraction or danger of infraction of one of the clauses of the Treaties for the protection of racial, linguistic or religious minorities should, after being brought to the notice of the Members of the Council, be considered as soon as possible by the President and two other members of the Council appointed by him.

“ In accordance with the resolution of the Council of June 27th, 1921, petitions emanating from a source other than from a Member of the League of Nations are not ordinarily communicated to the Members of the Council until the Government of the country to which the persons of the minority in question belong has had an opportunity to present its observations.

“ The resolution of the Council of September 5th, 1923, emphasised that the consideration of a minorities petition and any observations thereon presented by the Government in question, in accordance with the resolution of October 25th, 1920, is undertaken with the sole object of determining whether there is reason or not for one or more members of the Council to exercise the right accorded in the Minorities Treaty to draw the attention of the Council to the infraction or danger of infraction stated in the petition.

“ The system of procedure established by these different resolutions of the Council provides for as careful an examination as possible of minorities questions by certain members of the Council, while reserving to the other members the right of initiative conferred upon them by the Treaties. In practice, the Minorities Committee has become a normal body for dealing with that part of the work of the League of Nations which concerns the protection of minorities. This makes the appointment of the members of the Council under the above resolution of very considerable importance. For this reason, it seems to me that the Council should take note of, and confirm formally, certain practices which have gradually developed in this matter.

“ In practice, the Acting-President of the Council, when appointing two of his colleagues in accordance with the resolution of October 25th, 1920, has usually been guided by the following principle, which I consider should always be applied : namely, the Government to be entrusted with the duty laid down in the resolution of October 25th, 1920, should not be a Government of a State neighbouring that of which the persons belonging to the minority in question are subjects, nor the Government of a State the majority of whose subjects belong from the ethnical point of view to the same people as the minority in question. It goes without saying that the Government against whom the minorities petition is directed, if represented on the Council, should not be included in the three members appointed to consider the matter.

“ I venture to submit to you the following draft resolution, which, I believe, will help the President of the Council in his very delicate and important task in dealing with this matter, without affecting in any way the terms of the treaties :

“ The Council of the League of Nations,

“ Considering that by the resolution of October 25th, 1920, it was decided, with a view to assisting members of the Council in the exercise of their rights and duties as regards the protection of minorities, that it is desirable that the President and two members appointed by him in each case should proceed to consider any petition or communication addressed to the League of Nations with regard to an infraction or danger of infraction of the clauses of the Treaties for the protection of minorities, and that this enquiry should be held as soon as the petition or communication in question has been brought to the notice of the members of the Council,

“ Decides :

“ I. If the Acting-President of the Council is the representative of the State of which the persons belonging to the minority in question are subjects, or,

“ The representative of a neighbouring State of the State of which the persons belonging to the minority in question are subjects, or,

“ The representative of a State the majority of the population of which belongs from the ethnical point of view to the same people as the persons belonging to the minority in question,

“ The duty which falls upon the President of the Council in accordance with the terms of the resolution of October 25th, 1920, shall be performed by the Member of the Council who exercised the duties of President immediately before the Acting-President and who is not in the same position.

“ II. The President of the Council, in appointing two of his colleagues in conformity with the resolution of October 25th, 1920, shall not appoint either the representative of the State to which the persons belonging to the minority in question are subject, or the representative of a State neighbouring the State to which these persons are subject, or the representative of a State a majority of whose population belong from the ethnical point of view to the same people as the persons in question. ”

This draft resolution was unanimously adopted by the Council.

(2) The object of the examination of a minorities petition by the President and two other members of the Council, as emphasised in the resolution of the Council of September 5th, 1923, and in the report of M. de Mello-Franco of June 10th, 1925, is to establish whether it is advisable or not for them to exercise the right conferred upon them by the Minorities Treaties of drawing the attention of the Council to the infraction or danger of an infraction which is the subject of the petition, while reserving to other members of the Council the right of initiative which belongs to them under the Treaties.

(3) It is the duty of each member of the Council to take a special interest in the protection of minorities, as M. Tittoni pointed out in his report of October 22th, 1920. It is the duty of the three members of the Council who, under the resolution of October 25th, 1920, are entrusted in a special way with the examination of any communication to the League of Nations concerning an infraction of a clause of the Minorities Treaties to conduct this examination as, in a sense, the mandatories of all their colleagues on the Council and in an objective spirit. For this reason it is important that the Committee should be constituted in such a way as to guarantee its independence and its disinterestedness. All the members of the Council receive the document for the examination of which the Minorities Committee is set up, and can, if they take a special interest in the matter, inform themselves through the Secretariat of the treatment of the petition in the Committee, and, if necessary, submit to the Committee their own observations, either formally or informally.

(4) A Minorities Committee is set up for each petition. After the communication of the petition to the Council, with the observations, if any, of the interested Government, the Director of the Minorities Section addresses a letter, accompanied by a copy of the document in question, to the Acting President of the Council, reminding him that it is his duty to appoint two of his colleagues in order to proceed without delay to an examination of the document. As soon as the President has sent his reply, the Director of the Minorities Section gets into touch with the two other members of the Council.

The Minorities Section, in some cases in collaboration with the Legal Section, prepares for the use of the three members of the Committee a written statement on the questions of fact and law raised by the petition and by the observations of the interested Government. Further, the Minorities Section is at the disposal of the members of the Committee and of the other members of the Council to procure for them any supplementary information which they may wish to receive.

The meetings of the Minorities Committee, or more correctly of the various minorities committees, which are simultaneously at work, generally take place during the sessions of the Council. Of late, some meetings have also taken place between the sessions of the Council owing to the difficulty of finding in all cases during the sessions of the Council the time necessary for the discussion of these matters, which are sometimes extremely detailed and prolonged, and which always have a delicate side to them and require the most conscientious preparation both by the Secretariat and by the members of the Council.

The examination of a case by the Minorities Committee is not, of course, restricted to the formal meetings of the Committee. It is the duty of each member of the Committee, as well as of the Secretariat, to proceed to this examination without delay after the communication to the Council of the document relating to the case. The Secretariat begins an examination of the case without waiting for the distribution of this document. The discussion is accordingly, from the first meeting of the three members of the Committee, except perhaps in cases of extreme urgency, based on a very considerable amount of preparatory work.

• The meetings of the Committee are held in private, and no formal Minutes are kept.

Each Committee is free to adopt its own procedure.

(5) It results from the object of the work undertaken by a Minorities Committee that its members are free to form the best opinion they can of all the factors in the case which they are asked to examine. They may take into consideration the greater or less importance of the case, and its more or less general significance. They may take into account the attitude more or less conciliatory of the interested Government towards the requests of the minority as well as the attitude more or less loyal of the persons belonging to the minority. They may form the opinion, in a particular case, that the petitioner should have resorted to the administrative or judicial authorities of the country before addressing the League of Nations. In the Minorities Committees all these factors are continually discussed and taken into consideration.

The members of the Committee may, moreover, enter into correspondence with the interested Government with a view to removing doubts or misunderstandings or making friendly suggestions to the Government to induce it to modify its attitude on a point which, failing such a solution, would appear to the members of the Committee to be a case which should be brought to the attention of the Council. Before deciding whether it should or should not draw the attention of the Council to a matter which is the subject of a petition, the members of a Committee have in many cases asked the interested Government for supplementary information either in general terms or by putting definite questions. In some cases, such requests have been accompanied by other suggestions, as, for example, that the interested Government should postpone taking any steps which might have the effect of creating a *fait accompli* before the Committee was in a position to take a decision on the question of substance, or that the Government should present to the Council a special report on its intentions in the matter.

The members of the Committee have, in certain cases, made personal representations to the representative of the interested Government, with the object of drawing friendly attention to the advisability of putting an end to the difficulties with which the minority is concerned. In the majority of cases the Committee addresses the Government in question through the Director of the Minorities Section of the Secretariat, either by writing or verbally, either formally or informally.

The Committee often does not reach a final decision, even after having received all the supplementary information which it may desire. The case may be regarded rather as a link in a long chain than as an independent affair, and the members of the Committee sometimes consider that such a case, although of secondary importance in itself, may be of a character to be brought before the Council, if other similar cases should arise. The Committee, in these circumstances, invites the Minorities Section to follow the case for a certain period of time, and to notify it if there should arise any fact which would appear to justify a further discussion between its members.

The elasticity of the procedure of the Minorities Committee enables its members to take account of the circumstances special to each case, and to apply the first resolution of the third Assembly on the utility of informal and friendly communications between the League and the interested Governments as the best means of encouraging in ordinary cases good relations between the Governments and their minorities. The Minorities Committee has also invariably kept in mind the other resolutions of the third Assembly. The question, for example, whether a particular case should or should not be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice has often been examined by the Minorities Committees.

(6) The above explanations concerning the work of the Minorities Committee will show, as M. de Mello-Franco stated in his report of June 10th, 1925, that "in practice the Mino-

rities Committee has become a normal body for dealing with that part of the work of the League of Nations which concerns the protection of minorities ”.

The Minorities Committee was set up essentially in the interests of the minorities, and in order that the minorities might have direct recourse to the League of Nations.

The Treaties merely indicated that it is the duty of the members of the Council to watch over the execution of the clauses established in favour of the minorities. From the beginning of the existence of the League, however, the members of the Council have realised that, however keen their desire to conform with the spirit of the Minorities Treaties, it is in practice extremely difficult to keep directly in touch with the way in which these treaties are applied. Moreover, there are certain difficulties in the way of minorities addressing petitions directly to any particular individual member of the Council. A direct address of this character would have the same disadvantages as the old system of the protection of minorities by means of the intervention of the great Powers, an intervention which might be made with purely political ends. The covering letter of the President of the Peace Conference to the first signatory of a minorities Treaty emphasised that one of the essential reasons for the system of Minorities Treaties was to avoid in future the interference of a State in the internal affairs of another State, history having shown the danger of such a policy. Direct resort of the minorities to a foreign Power might, moreover, easily be interpreted by the Government responsible for the minorities as an action contrary to the obligation contracted by the minorities to conduct themselves as loyal citizens of the country of which they are now the nationals.

The system of petitions addressed directly to the League of Nations by minorities meets these various difficulties. The Council recognised the system when it adopted the report of M. Tittoni in October 22nd, 1920, which indicated to the minorities the method of petitions as being an excellent means of rendering effective the protection accorded to them by the League. The Council, at the same time, wished to guarantee the minorities that their petitions would be seriously considered, and by its resolution of the 25th of the same month it set up the Minorities Committee. The Council has thus placed at the disposal of the minorities a special body which enables them to state their claims without infringing in any way either the letter or spirit of the treaties. Since then, in the interests of the minorities themselves, the work of the League of Nations has defined and strengthened the procedure of the Minorities Committee or, as it is often called, “ the Committee of Three ”. As a result of five years’ experience, this procedure has developed, as is shown both by the resolutions of the Council to which reference has been made and by the increasing body of work which the Committee is asked to undertake.

8.

MANDATES.

WORK OF THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE PERMANENT MANDATES COMMISSION (June–July 1925).

The Permanent Mandates Commission met for its sixth session at Geneva from June 26th–July 10th, 1925.

The agenda of the session comprised the examination of seven annual reports in the presence of accredited representatives of the mandatory Powers and of certain petitions, as well as various questions of a general character arising out of the application of Article 22 of the Covenant.

I. EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE MANDATORY POWERS.

The Commission expressed its gratification that, of the seven reports considered during the session, two could be examined in the presence of officials of the mandatory Powers who were at present taking an active part in the administration of the mandated territories, a practice recommended both by the Commission, the Council, and the Assembly last year. The two officials in question, M. Bonnacarrère, French Commissioner for Togoland, and Captain E. T. Mansfield, District Commissioner of the Gold Coast Administration, also made, at the request of the Commission, a general statement on the situation in the territories and the principles guiding the policy of the Administrations. During the examination of the report on Tanganyika, the Commission had the advantage of the presence of the Hon. W. G. Ormsby-Gore, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, who was able to furnish the Commission with information recently collected on the spot in his capacity as Chairman of the East Africa Commission.

The observations of the Commission on the reports which it examined may be summarised as follows :

Territories under B Mandate.

French Togoland and Cameroons.

(Representative of the mandatory Power : M. A. DUCHÊNE, Councillor of State, Director of Political Affairs at the French Ministry for the Colonies, assisted, for the discussion of the Togo report, by M. BONNECARRÈRE, French Commissioner for Togoland.)

Observations common to both territories.

The Commission noted with satisfaction that the military forces in the territories were now organised separately from those of the neighbouring French Colonies. It was glad to learn that the mandatory Power would consider a change in the text of the legislation on land tenure in order that all ambiguity with regard to the legal status of State lands might disappear.

In the course of the discussion concerning a tax in the form of a labour levy (*prestation*) which was exacted in the two territories, divergent views were expressed concerning the legality and advisability of this practice from the point of view of the principle of the mandate and of colonial administration in general. The accredited representative, in his observations on this part of the Commission's report, repeated the point of view expressed by him during the discussion of the Commission to the effect that the tax in question, which must be considered as a fiscal measure and not as forced labour, was entirely justified.

French Togoland.

The Commission recorded its interest in the manner in which the direct participation of the natives in the general administrative life of the country had been brought about, and expressed the hope that it would be kept informed of the result of this collaboration. It expressed its satisfaction with the native policy followed by the mandatory Power, which aimed at promoting the moral welfare of the natives by improving their material condition, especially by encouraging the cultivation of the land by natives themselves with the help of European capital, implements and technique. It further noted with satisfaction that, in its educational policy, the mandatory Power was paying special attention to the development of vocational and agricultural training.

The Commission also took note of the fact that the budget surplus did not result entirely from the taxation of the natives.

Further observations of the Commission related to the encouragement by the mandatory Power of the migration of families to meet shortages of labour, and the possibility of increasing certain penalties against the sale of alcoholic liquor in the Northern Section.

French Cameroons.

The Commission renewed its request for exact and complete information with regard to the conditions of life for the 6,000 workers employed in the construction of the Midland Railway and, in view of the high mortality, expressed the desire that the mandatory Power should develop the medical service connected with these constructive works. In commenting on this observation, the accredited representative pointed out that the death-rate on these works before the war was considerably higher than in 1924.

British Togoland.

(Representative of the mandatory Power : Captain E. T. MANSFIELD, District Commissioner of the Gold Coast Administration.)

The Commission expressed the desire to have further information on several points as, for instance, the development of the Kete Kratchi district, particularly as regards public health and education ; the regime applied to goods in transit from or to British Togoland from the port of Lomé ; the development of the native land system ; the exact methods used in securing compulsory labour for certain public services and in assuring payment to the individual workers, and the steps taken by the Administration to assure their welfare.

It noted with satisfaction that the recruiting of natives from the mandated territory for the mines of the Gold Coast had ceased.

It expressed the desire to be kept informed of the progress made towards the realisation of the educational programme of the Government and of such steps as might be contemplated or actually taken for developing the medical services of the territory.

Although appreciating the efforts made by the mandatory Power to comply with its request for more definite information on the finances of the territory, the Commission expressed the wish to receive next year further details concerning the amount spent in Togoland on certain essential services.

Tanganyika.

(Representative of the mandatory Power : The Hon. W. G. ORMSBY-GORE, M. P., Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies.)

The Commissioner was glad to learn of the measures adopted by the British Government for a thorough examination of the problem of the tsetse-fly peril, the gravity of which, for the development of the territory, was strongly emphasised by the accredited representative.

It noted the difficulties caused by the fact that the Masai tribe in the Arusha region is divided by the present frontier between Kenya Colony and the mandated territory of Tanganyika. The Commission will examine any proposal which may be made with a view to reuniting this tribe, provided that it does not involve any limitation of the control exercised by the League of Nations under the mandate.

Concerning education, it noted with satisfaction that a working arrangement would be reached between the Educational Department of the territory and the mission schools.

The Commission was not able to secure a clear idea of the financial situation of the territory from the figures given in the annual report, but was grateful for the offer of the accredited representative to give, in the next report, a detailed statement of the total amount put at the disposal of the territory by the British Government since the mandate was conferred.

Other observations of the Commission contained requests for further information on the policy of the Administration as regards reliance on tribal organisations, domestic slavery in the territory, statistics and information concerning the number and conditions of workers recruited for the plantations, penal sanctions in cases of breach of labour contracts, and the reopening of the Amani Institute.

Territories under C Mandate.

South-West Africa.

(Representative of the mandatory Power : Mr. J. S. SMIT, High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa in London.)

The Commission expressed the desire that in the future a report on the administration of the Caprivi Zipfel Zone should be communicated to it at the same time as the report on the rest of the territory under mandate, no report on this zone having reached the Commission for consideration at its sixth session.

The Commission noted with interest the measures being taken by the mandatory Power for the development of representative government in the territory.

While appreciating the efforts already made with a view to reducing the number of deaths and the cases of illness of workers in the diamond mines at Luderitz, the Commission noted that the mortality rate was still extremely high, particularly among the workers natives of Ovamboland. In commenting on this observation, the accredited representative called attention to the steady drop since January 1924 in the mortality rate.

Requests were made for further information concerning legislation in respect of the acquisition by natives of non-urban property outside the reserves, the extension of supervision over the northern districts, the work of religious missions and the conditions of their admission into the territory, demographic statistics, and the financial situation of the territory.

The attention of the Commission was once more called to the legal situation of those railways in South-West Africa which were formerly the property of the German Government. Although satisfied with the interpretation of the legal texts as given by the mandatory Power, the Commission raised the point whether, to avoid any misunderstanding in the future, it would not be advisable to amend the Railways Law of 1922 in order to bring the text into conformity with this interpretation.

The Commission expressed the hope that it might be found possible to devote a larger proportion of the revenues to native education of a practical nature, and that it might find in next year's report the general outlines of a native education policy. It further hoped that it would be possible to give to the collaboration already existing between the Administration and the different missions the form of an advisory board. As regards expenditure on native education, the accredited representative stated that the present amount was three times more than the revenue derived from the natives.

Nauru.

(Representative of the mandatory Power : The Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph Cook, G.C.M.G., High Commissioner for Australia in London.)

The Commission expressed its appreciation of the completeness of the report and its clear form. It noted that the considerable financial resources of the territory facilitated the administration of the island.

Information as to why so considerable a proportion of the Chinese labourers repatriated were medically unfit for work was requested and reference was made to the question of bringing cases of breach of labour contracts before the civil courts.

New Guinea.

(Representative of the mandatory Power : The Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph Cook.)

The Commission thanked the mandatory Power for having communicated to it the report of Colonel Ainsworth, who, at the request of the Australian Government, had recently proceeded to an investigation concerning the administrative arrangements and matters affecting the native population of the territory.

The Commission noted with interest that the mandatory Power had already approved some of Colonel Ainsworth's suggestions, such as the creation of an advisory council, the adoption of a policy of native agriculture, and an annual grant of £10,000 for the betterment

of the conditions of the natives. On the other hand, it noted that the Australian Government was unable to agree to other proposals, including those concerning changes in the immigration regulations and the suppression of the present system of education.

The organisation of an advisory council was noted with interest and further information was requested concerning the extension of effective control over the islands, the training of public officials and the review of judicial decisions given by the courts in the districts. Observations of the Commission also referred to the complaints of the Chinese population, to certain labour matters, the effects of the extension of the Australian Navigation Act to the territory, and the financial situation.

II. PETITIONS.

During the session the Commission considered five petitions from individuals or sections of the population of the mandated territories transmitted through the Government of the mandatory Power in accordance with the regular procedure :

(a) *Palestine.*

The Commission decided to examine two letters from the Council of the Ashkenasic Jewish Community at its autumn session and asked to have the observations of the British Government on the subject-matter of the petition before that time.

(b) *South-West Africa.*

(1) A petition from certain burghers of the Rehoboth Community. The Commission, after careful review of the complaints, saw no ground for proposing any action by the Council, but recommended that the petitioners should adopt the course proposed by the Administrator.

(2) A petition from Mr. John Robertson.

(3) A letter from Mr. E. J. E. Lange.

(4) A petition from Mr. Franz Gramowski.

In view of the nature of the complaints made in these petitions, the Commission was of opinion that it could not consider them.

III. GENERAL QUESTIONS.

The Commission dealt with various questions of general interest arising out of Article 22 of the Covenant, some of which had already engaged its attention at preceding sessions.

(a) *Loans, Advances and Investments of Public and Private Capital.*

At the request of the Council¹, the Commission resumed its study of the question and prepared a draft decision with a view to reassuring investors and defining the obligations of the Mandatories.

(b) *Application of Special International Conventions to Mandated Territories.*

The Council at its June session had requested the Commission to consider the opinions expressed by the mandatory Powers on the question of the possibility of extending special international treaties and agreements to mandated territories. The Commission, after examining the replies, repeated, with certain further explanations, the view expressed in the report on its fourth session that the benefits of past and future treaties concluded by the Mandatories should, as far as possible, be extended to territories under mandate.²

(c) *Frontiers between the British and French Cameroons and between British and French Togoland.*

The Commission took note of information to the effect that negotiations were in progress between the local representatives of the British and French Governments with a view to possible frontier rectifications in these regions.

(d) *Frontier Zone between Angola and South-West Africa.*

The Commission expressed the hope that the question under discussion between the Portuguese Government and the British Government, acting on behalf of the Union of South Africa, regarding the frontier zone and the use of the waters of the Cunene might be settled as soon as possible.³

The Commission further considered certain questions primarily of an administrative character. It emphasised the fact that the delay in the receipt of the annual reports beyond the date stipulated in the rules of procedure put serious difficulties in the way of their thorough examination. It also suggested that all reports should contain in their titles the explicit state-

¹ See report to the Sixth Assembly, page 55.

² See report to the Fifth Assembly, page 43.

³ See report to the Sixth Assembly, page 50.

to be conducted as soon as possible by the smallest possible number of experts of recognised scientific competence. The enquiry was to be conducted without reference to political considerations and with the object of ascertaining the possible relationship between present economic conditions and the work of financial reconstruction undertaken by the League of Nations.

The Secretary-General, on May 23rd, notified the Austrian Government that all the members of the Austrian Committee of the Council had agreed to the idea of an enquiry.

The Council, at its meeting of June 9th, 1925, decided to invite Mr. W. T. Layton and Professor Rist to conduct an enquiry into the economic position of Austria under the conditions laid down in the note of the Austrian Government.

The experts appointed by the Council went to Austria at the beginning of July. Their report will be examined by the Austrian Committee and by the Council during their next session in September.

II.

WORK OF THE TECHNICAL ORGANISATIONS.

I. THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ORGANISATION.

A. WORK OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE.

The report on the work of the Economic Committee during its fifteenth session, held at Geneva from May 26th to June 3rd, 1925, was approved by the Council on June 10th, 1925.

The Council noted in particular that, in the opinion of the Economic Committee, the system of import and export prohibitions which had been condemned on many occasions at Brussels, at Genoa, at Porta Rosa, and also at Geneva, has now reached a stage in its evolution which justified the hope that it might shortly be abolished or reduced to a minimum by means of an international agreement.

The Council further decided to forward the recommendations of the Economic Committee regarding the treatment of foreigners to the States Members of the League, intimating that it would be glad to know to what extent they had been able to give effect to the previous recommendations of the Economic Committee in regard to the treatment of foreign nationals and enterprises communicated to the Governments in 1923.

The resolution adopted by the Council was in the following terms :

“ The Council :

“ Noting the progress made in the study of the various questions entrusted to the Economic Committee ;

“ Approves the latter's report on the work of its fifteenth session and requests the Secretary-General to forward to the States Members of the League, in continuation of his previous communication on the subject, the further recommendations contained in the Economic Committee's report regarding the treatment of foreigners. The Council would be glad to know to what extent the States Members of the League have been able to give effect to the previous recommendations. ”

B. WORK OF THE FINANCIAL COMMITTEE.

1. *Financial Reconstruction of Austria.*

Electrification of the Railways.

The Financial Committee devoted several meetings during its session held from June 4th to June 8th to an examination of a plan for the electrification of the Salsburg-Innsbruck railway line, with the Wörgl-Kufstein and Innsbruck-Brenner branches, which had been submitted by the Austrian Government to the Commissioner-General. The Austrian Government, in a letter of June 2nd, 1925, explained that the general management of the railways had at first intended to contract a special loan in order to cover the cost of electrification, but that, as the Committee of Control of the guarantor States had not given the necessary authorisation for the raising of this loan, the Government was asking the Commissioner-General to place at the disposal of the Federal Railways a sum of 18 million dollars allocated from the reliquat of the international loan, to be paid in three annual instalments as the construction progressed. Dr. Ahrer, Minister for Finance, and Mr. Gunther, Chairman of the Administrative Committee of the Austrian Federal Railways, took part in the discussion.

Mr. Gunther explained in detail to the Committee the present position of the railways and the improvements effected in their management. The staff had been reduced from 112,500 persons in October 1923 to 89,500 persons in December 1924, and it was estimated that the total staff would be reduced to 83,000 persons by the end of 1925. The number of employees per kilometer would then be comparable with the number employed per kilometer on the Swiss Railways. In spite of the increases of salary which had been granted, and as a result of the

economies which had been effected, particularly in the purchase of fuel, it had been possible to reduce considerably in 1924 the deficit in the working of the railways, and it might be hoped that equilibrium as between expenditure and receipts would shortly be realised.

Mr. Gunther explained the technical advantages of the scheme of electrification, which would facilitate an economic working of the railways and, by increasing the speed of the trains and reducing working expenses, would enable them to compete favourably with rival lines. Dr. Ahrer insisted on the usefulness of the electrification scheme as a means of reducing unemployment and improving the general economic position of the country.

The Financial Committee, in agreement with the Commissioner-General, considered that the proposed plan of electrification might be regarded as a productive enterprise, and decided to recommend the allocation from the reliquat of the international loan of a maximum sum of 88 million gold crowns, provided equilibrium was established in the ordinary budget. The sums taken from the reliquat would be paid over by instalments in accordance with requests presented by the Minister for Finance. Payments would be made with a view to meeting the costs of the plan of electrification during a period of three years.

The recommendation of the Financial Committee was approved by the Council.

Measures of Reform.

The reduction in the number of Government officials amounted on July 31st, 1925, to 77,900. Laws introducing several important reforms in conformity with the agreement of September 1924 have been voted by the House of Representatives. The main object of these bills was to fix the financial, constitutional and administrative relations between the Confederation and the provinces. They dealt particularly with the rights of autonomous organisations to levy taxes, with the amalgamation of the Federal with the provincial administrations and the control of the financial administration of the provinces by the Central Accounts Department.

Economic Situation.

There has been an appreciable decrease of unemployment. The number of unemployed had fallen to 112,000 on July 15th, 1925. The position of the National Bank is favourable. The gold reserve has continued to increase (from 355 million schillings to 501 million schillings). In spite of the reduction of the rate of discount from 13 to 11 per cent on April 25th, 1925, and to 10% on July 23rd, there has been no increase in commercial bills (103 million schillings on May 7th, 73 million schillings on August 23rd). Currency to the value of 38 million schillings was in circulation on July 7th, 1925.

Annex.

The following table, taken from the thirty-first report of the Commissioner-General, gives the most recent statistics concerning the public finances, the economic position, and the situation of the Austrian National Bank.

**STATISTICAL DATA
IN MILLIONS**

I. PUBLIC FINANCES.	1925			5th Stage	4th Stage
	Annual basis on figures for				
	July	June	May	1st half-year 1925	2nd half-year 1924
(a) <i>Gross receipts:</i>					
Customs	—	125.—	117.5	123.75	93.6
Tobacco	—	186.7	186.6	180.—	184.6
Total	—	311.7	304.1	303.75	278.2
(b) <i>Preliminary monthly budgets:</i>					
<i>invest.</i>					
Estimated expenditure *	599.8 (53.8)	652.— (60.5)	657.— (59.7)	644.1 (52.9)	632.5
Estimated receipts * . . .	631.2 (4.3)	573.— (4.4)	563.9 (4.7)	577.5 (3.7)	561.7
Deficit	—	— 79.—	— 93.1	— 66.6	— 70.8
Surplus	31.4	—	—	—	—
Total investments	(63.1)	(64.9)	(64.4)	(56.6)	—
Surplus or deficit } <i>excluding</i>	+ 94.5	—	—	—	—
} <i>investments</i>	—	— 14.1	— 28.7	— 10.—	—
(c) <i>Closed accounts:</i>					
<i>May</i>					
Expenditure*	665.9 (58.2)	639.2 (49.5)	699.2 (40.8)	635.6 (49.6)	667.8
Receipts*	569.2 (1.2)	594.5 (1.2)	637.2 (1.7)	602.— (1.4)	580.8
Deficit*	— 96.7	— 44.7	— 62.—	— 33.6	— 87.—
Surplus*	—	—	—	—	—
Total investments	(59.4)	(50.7)	(42.5)	(51.—)	—
Surplus or deficit } <i>excluding</i>	— 37.3	+ 6.—	— 19.5	+ 17.4	—
} <i>investments</i>					

II. REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF OFFICIALS

Central Administration and State Undertakings	<i>Personnel discharged</i>	
	<i>In June 1925</i>	<i>Total discharged</i>
	999 (Südbahn 45)	77,343 (Südbahn 10,515)

III. TRADE AND INDUSTRY.	1925		Monthly averages					
	April, May and June	March *	From Jan. 1st, 1925	1924	1923	1922	1921	1920
Value of imports	The statistical data for these two months have not yet been drawn up.	237.9	180.25	199.55	160.—	146.3	141.6	141.7
Value of exports		185.9	126.85	114.04	93.5	91.9	75.3	77.7
Trade deficit (excl. of movements of precious metals)		— 52.— *	— 53.4	— 85.51	— 66.5	— 54.4	— 66.3	— 64.—

	1925		End of		
	June	May	Fourth Stage Dec. 1924	Third Stage June 1924	Second St. Dec. 1923
Number of unemployed receiving relief †	113,370 (63,556)	130,767 (68,969)	154,493 (98,060)	63,556 (92,789)	98,060 (117,144)
Number of travellers who stayed at hotels in Vienna †	39,923 (41,186)	38,531 (40,441)	36,238 (38,470)	41,186 (30,132)	38,740 (22,301)
Official index of prices **:	In S	April In S.	In P. C.	In P. C.	In P. C.
A. *					
Food	—	1.5830	16,248	14,457	12,860
Clothing	—	2.1656	21,578	20,634	18,673
House rent	—	0.1330	1,326	1,002	724
Light and fuel	—	1.4969	14,924	14,673	14,525
Cost-of-living index	—	1.3432	13,650	12,442	11,249
ditto, excluding house rent	—	1.6534	16,810	15,376	13,948
May					
Foodstuffs	2.0004	1.9148	20,012	16,765	16,216
Materials required by industries	2.1169	2.1433	22,416	21,679	22,582
Index of wholesale prices	2.0364	1.9854	20,754	18,282	18,181
Exchange index according to the average gold parity rate fixed for Customs. 1 gold cr. = in Sch. (in pap. cr. respectively)	1.44	1.44	14,400	14,400	14,400
Mean parity of dollar in Sch. (or paper crowns) (pre-war gold parity 4.935 paper crowns)	7.0935	7.0935	70,935	70,935	70,935
FINANCE OTHER THAN PUBLIC. †					
Stock Exchange index (first half 1914 = 1) *** (or else 10,000)	In S. 0.1019	In S. 0.1059	In P. C. 1,194	In P. C. 1,376	In P. C. 2,586
Deposits in savings banks and 9 credit institutions (12 since 1924)	296.2	280.4*	175.9	86.9	41.3
	In millions of gold crowns				
	Millions of gold crowns at the rate of:				
	14,400				12,834
NATIONAL BANK OF AUSTRIA †					
State Debt to the National Bank (advances during period of inflation)	141.5	144.9	151.3	155.4	197.4
Holdings of bills	66.04	64.25	130.5	213.9	103.—
Gold reserve and foreign currency holdings	304.6	276.1	339.—	228.2	305.—
Value of notes in circulation	575.1	567.1	582.5	533.9	55.—
Percentage of circulation covered by metal reserve	52.96%	48.7%	58.2%	42.2%	55%

† At the end of the month.

** During the month.

*** In the middle of the month.

***FOR JUNE 1925.
OF GOLD CROWNS**

3rd Stage	2nd Stage	1st Stage	Begin. of Scheme
1st half-year 1924	2nd half-year 1923	1st half-year 1923	Dec. 1922
103.1 158.9 262.-	83.7 139.6 223.3	58.3 99.2 157.5	48.3 72.5 120.8
533.7 499.1 34.6	525.2 366.9 158.3	561.9 284.5 277.4	672.5 215.1 457.4
644.7 630.2 14.5	525.- 466.7 58.3	540.9 362.8 178.1	— — —

• **Strength on
June 30th, 1925**
170,194
(plus 20,761 employees on
the Südbahn)

£ 1 = about 23.5 gold crowns
\$ 1 = about 5 gold crowns

REMARKS

Ad. I (b). The Programme drawn up in 1922 and modified for 1925 by the Geneva Agreements of September 1924 provided for an

Annual basis of (in millions of gold crowns)

	Draft Budget 1925 *	Fourth stage	Third stage	Second stage	First stage
Expenditure	544.8 (50.- invest.)*	439.-	478.-	536.-	570.-
Receipts	504.1 (4.2 invest.)*	401.-	435.-	378.-	287.-
Deficit	40.7	—	43.-	158.-	283.-
Surplus	—	+ 22.-	—	—	—

Total investments: 54.2
Excluding investments, surplus equals + 13.5

* The figures in parentheses indicate investments expenditure reckoned under the heading either of expenditure, which is thereby increased, or under the heading receipts, in which case the net amount to be collected is reduced to the figures indicated (similarly as regards I(c)).

Ad. I (c) § Excluding temporary movements of funds advanced and subsequently repaid (current account transactions).

* See remark under I (b).

Ad. II. The Reform Programme provided for the discharge of a total of 100,000 officials before July 1st, 1924.

The Südbahn staff was not under the authority of the State administration when the work of reconstruction began.

Ad. III. The March figures are as an exception gross and include movements of precious metals. Also the monthly averages do not yet take them into account.

End of	Begin. of Reform Scheme	
	December 1922	September 1922
First Stage June 1923		
95,594 (33,393)	120,525	37,999
30,132 (43,244)	22,301	51,223
In P. C.	In P. C.	In P. C.
14,132	—	—
15,323	—	—
496	—	—
14,364	—	—
11,513	9,375	11,271
14,338	—	—
17,124	—	—
21,061	—	—
18,339	—	—
14,400	14,380	15,100
70,985	71,008	74,976
In P. C.	In P. C.	In P. C.
1,479	719	502
23.5	7.7	2.1
12,834	January 7th, 1923	
198.4	199.3	
55.-	57.-	
203.-	93.-	
423.-	315.-	
47.9%	29.4%	

*Ad. A.** As the Paritary Commission for fixing the cost of living came to an end at the beginning of May (see page 15 of my 29th report), there will be no official index numbers in future.

All the indices in this table are calculated according to the present prices in schillings (1 schilling = 10,000 paper crowns) compared with pre-war prices in crowns (co-efficient of high cost of living).
What cost 1 crown in 1914 cost x schillings in the months indicated.
Having regard to the relation between the gold crown and the schilling (1 gold crown = 1.44 schilling), the index number of wholesale prices corresponds to a gold price index number of 1.37.
(U. S. A.: April 1925 = 1.56.)

The Stock Exchange index was 0.1125 at the beginning of July (compared with the schilling).

* Figures recently corrected by the Federal Administration.

The National Bank of Austria began operations on January 2nd, 1923. In accordance with the Statutes, the sums in gold crowns are calculated on the basis of the average rate of exchange for the second half of the preceding year, viz.:

For 1923: 12,834
For 1924: 14,400
Up to March 1st, 1925: 14,400
As from March 1st, 1925, 1 gold crown = 1.44 sch. (1 sch. = 0.2117 grammes of fine gold = 0.694 gold cr. = 10,000 paper cr.)

2. *Financial Reconstruction of Hungary.*

The Prime Minister, Count Bethlen, the Finance Minister, Dr. Bud, and Mr. Smith, the Commissioner-General, took part in the discussions of the Financial Committee on the financial reconstruction of Hungary during its June session.

Budget for the Financial Year 1925-1926.

The Hungarian Government submitted to the Financial Committee the draft budget for the financial year 1925-1926.

This draft budget shows 459 million gold crowns of net expenditure and 487 million gold crowns of net receipts. If these figures are compared with those contemplated in the draft schedule of the reconstruction scheme, it will be seen that, in place of the expected deficit, there is a surplus of expenditure exceeding by 9 per cent the estimates of the scheme, and a surplus of receipts exceeding the estimates of the scheme by 30 per cent. The increase in expenditure is to be attributed, as in the past, chiefly to the increase in the gold value of the crown, which has appreciated with the rise in sterling by about 16 per cent (see General Report, A. 7. 1925, p. 69).

Increase in the Salaries of the Officials.

The Hungarian Government notified the Financial Committee that it seemed indispensable to increase the salaries of the officials. The Financial Committee, after prolonged consideration, decided to raise no objections to this increase, which will amount to some 20 per cent. The increase represents a continuation of the temporary increases of 15 per cent already accorded by the Government, and a new sum equivalent to 5 per cent of the total expenditure on staff placed upon the budget which will be used in order to carry out a scheme for the reclassification of the officials. But the Committee has accepted these proposals on the understanding that the Hungarian Government will rapidly proceed with the reduction of staff and will prepare a complete scheme of simplified administration showing the numbers in each class of the officials which it is considered necessary to retain permanently in each department.

The expenses due to the increases in the salaries of officials will absorb an important part of the surplus shown in the budget for 1925-1926.

Capital Expenditure.

The Hungarian Government also requested the views of the Financial Committee as regards the allocation of a portion of the proceeds of the reconstruction loan for certain capital expenditure which it desires to undertake. Budgetary equilibrium was completely realised during the financial year 1924-1925, in spite of the fact that, under the plan of reconstruction, a deficit of 100 million gold crowns, to be covered from the reliquat of the loan, was contemplated for this period. There is accordingly a sum of 185 million gold crowns remaining out of the proceeds of the reconstruction loan which the Hungarian Government wishes to use in the best possible way for the interests of the country.

The plans for investing this capital drawn up by the Hungarian Government comprise expenditure for the benefit of the working of the State services (railways, etc.), the construction of dwellings, the organisation of agricultural credits, the construction and reparation of dykes, as well as drainage works and works of protection against floods.

The Financial Committee recommended that the surplus for the period 1924-1925, together with a sum of 30 million gold crowns to be taken from the proceeds of the loan, should be devoted, subject to the assent of the Commissioner-General, to such capital expenditure as the Government may propose and the Commissioner-General may approve. The Committee added that it would be disposed to discuss during its December session the possibility of recommending an increase of this allotment if the financial conditions remained favourable, and if the proposals submitted to it justified the allocation of supplementary sums.

Economic and Financial Position.

The results of Treasury operations during the last months of the budgetary year for 1924-1925 confirmed the optimistic forecasts contained in the previous reports of the Commissioner-General (see General Report, A. 7. 1925, p. 68). The year will be brought to a close not only without a deficit, but with a substantial surplus of receipts.

The proceeds of the revenue assigned to meet the service of the loan during the year ending June 30th amounted to 229.5 million gold crowns, or nearly seven times the sum necessary for the services of the reconstruction loan.

Owing to the return of the £ sterling to a gold basis, the Hungarian crown, the rate of which had been based on the £ sterling and which up to that moment had varied with it, was definitely stabilised at a level almost exactly equivalent to that of the Austrian crown.

The volume of trade during the first half of 1925 showed, in comparison with the first half of 1924, an advance of about 13 per cent, and there was some increase in the visible adverse balance. But imports, which were very high during the first months of the year, fell from April onwards, and exports increased during April and May. At the end of June the harvest of wheat, rye and barley began under favourable conditions, and a more abundant harvest than that of the previous year is expected.

National Bank of Hungary.

On July 31st, 1925, the gold, silver and foreign exchange reserve of the Bank amounted to 2,646,726,884,438 paper crowns, or 57.4 % of the total circulation (4,153 milliards) plus sight liabilities minus the State debt. The bank rate has been 9 % since May 28th, 1925.

Council Meeting in June.

The Commissioner-General had been asked at the March session of the Council to give information concerning the budget, which had been criticised as including too high an expenditure on certain items, and as being, in general, too burdensome for a country of the size of Hungary. This information was given to the Council together with further explanations at the June session and the Council adopted the following resolution :

“ The Council,

“ 1. Notes the 10th, 11th and 12th reports of the Commissioner-General for Hungary and the report of the Financial Committee upon the general progress of the reconstruction scheme ;

“ 2. In particular, observes with satisfaction the striking fact that the year July 1924-June 1925 (the first complete financial year after the beginning of the reconstruction period in May 1924) will show, instead of a deficit for which a provision of 100 million gold crowns had been made, a substantial surplus, and that the prospects of a balanced budget in the financial year 1925-1926 are also good ; that the currency is stabilised ; and that the volume of trade has increased ;

“ 3. Notes the observations of the Financial Committee regarding the heavy fiscal burden entailed by the present budget level ;

“ 4. Shares the earnest hope expressed by the Committee that the efforts of Hungary and of the other countries concerned will result in rapid progress in the negotiations of commercial treaties and the reduction of the barriers which impede the flow both of imports and exports ;

“ 5. Expresses the hope that the reductions of administrative staff proposed by the Economy Committee appointed by the Hungarian Government may be further extended in a more radical scheme of re-organisation appropriate to the present administrative requirements of Hungary which, as the Commissioner-General and the Financial Committee have pointed out, would make a vital difference to the permanent budget position ;

“ 6. Adopts the recommendations contained in the report of the Financial Committee including the specific recommendations with regard to official's salaries and the use of a part of the unexpended portion of the reconstruction loan ;

“ 7. Concludes that the experience of the first year of the reconstruction period now gives every reason to believe that the scheme can and will be successfully carried to a conclusion.

Annex.

EXTRACTED FROM THE FOURTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER-GENERAL.

STATISTICS.

(See following page.)

I. RETAIL PRICE INDEX (from the Pester Lloyd)
(July 1914 = 1)

1924			
June 30th	July 31st	September 30th	December 30th
21,817	22,018*	21,299	20,884
1925			
March 31st	April 30th	May 31st	June 30th
19,281	18,805	18,853	18,776

* The highest point reached by this index.

2. WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX (issued by Hungarian Statistical Office)
(1913 = 1)

1924	Price index	Change over preceding month	Comparison with 1913 gold prices
June 30th	22,078	— 2.7 %	1.33
July 31st	22,945	+ 3.9 %	1.45
August 31st	22,420	— 2.3 %	1.45
September 30th	22,366	— 0.2 %	1.42
October 31st	22,852	+ 2.2 %	1.49
November 30th	23,095	+ 1.0 %	1.54
December 31st	23,466	+ 1.6 %	1.60
1925			
January 31st	23,075	— 1.7 %	1.59
February 28th	22,187	— 3.9 %	1.52
March 31st	21,178	— 4.5 %	1.45
April 30th	20,766	— 2.0 %	1.44
May 31st	20,264	— 2.4 %	1.41
June 30th	20,326	+ 0.3 %	1.41

3. STOCK EXCHANGE INDEX
(Ten important Securities quoted on the Stock Exchange)

Figures refer to the end of each month

(1914 = 100)

1924						
July	August	September	October	November	December	
22.2	22.8	17.4	19.6	23.93	25.4	
1925						
	January	February	March	April	May	June
	23.—	21.4	21.7	20.7	18.9	18.5

4. DEPOSITS IN THE POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS AND IN THIRTEEN OF THE MOST IMPORTANT BANKS IN BUDAPEST
(Current Accounts and Savings Deposits)

	1924			1925			
	June 30th	Sept. 30th	Dec. 31st	March 31st	April 30th	May 31st	June 30th*
	(In millions of Gold Crowns)						
Savings Deposits:							
(a) In paper crowns	2.6	7.9	23.8	44.1	50.0	57.9	71.5
(b) In foreign currency. . .	0.4	1.5	2.5	3.0	0.3	3.3	—
Current accounts:							
(a) In paper crowns	55.3	114.1	160.6	184.7	188.7	190.6	261.7
(b) In foreign currency. . .	18.2	20.8	44.3	39.1	41.4	42.3	—
Total Deposits	76.7	144.4	231.3	271.1	283.2	294.1	333.2

* Details are not yet available showing how much of the deposits at June 30th is in paper crowns and how much in foreign currency.

5. UNEMPLOYED

(Figures relate only to members of the Union of Socialist Workers unemployed at the end of each month)
Total membership approximately: 210,000.

1924					
July	August	September	October	November	December
31,134	30,401	26,020	30,120	30,568	33,095
1925					
January	February	March	April	May	June
36,641	36,764	36,873	36,360	34,011	34,015

3. *Double Taxation and Tax Evasion.*

The Financial Committee examined during its session of June 1925 the report of the technical experts on double taxation and tax evasion which were analysed in the General Report (A. 7. 1925). The Chairman of the Committee of Experts, M. d'Aroma, gave a verbal explanation of the conclusions of the experts.

The Financial Committee supported the recommendation of the experts for the convocation of a new Conference of technical experts. It was proposed that the Conference should be enlarged, and that other countries should be represented in addition to the seven countries which had appointed the experts already sitting. It was understood that this Conference would take as a basis for its work the resolutions of the Committee of Experts, and see if it were possible to draw up preliminary drafts for international conventions. The Financial Committee declared itself generally in agreement with the conclusions of the experts; it insisted that the future Conference, while endeavouring to combat tax evasion and double taxation, should take into consideration the disadvantages which might arise from placing any obstacle in the way of the international circulation of capital.

The Council of the League of Nations adopted the proposals of the Financial Committee for the convening of a new Conference of experts (meeting of June 11th, 1925). The Secretary-General has accordingly invited, in addition to the Governments which had previously appointed experts, the Governments of Germany, the United States, Poland, Japan, the Argentine Republic and Venezuela to send a representative to the Conference. The date of the Conference will be fixed later.

4. *Finances of the Free City of Danzig.*

It was noted in the General Report to the Sixth Assembly that the Danzig Municipal Loan was, under the auspices of the League of Nations, placed on the London market on April 3rd, 1925, and that the loan was a complete success.

The Financial Committee, during its session in June, was asked to consider a subsidiary question concerning two of the articles of the General Bond, drawn up subsequent to the resolutions adopted by the Council in March. These two articles accorded to the Council of the League certain duties in case the trustee should draw its attention to any infraction of the clauses of the General Bond, and also in the case of any dispute arising between the municipality and the bankers and/or the trustee.

The Financial Committee, after considering the matter, expressed the opinion that the Council might accept the duties defined in these articles.

The Financial Committee also considered a letter from the Conference of Ambassadors dated March 2nd, 1925, concerning the date and terms for the repayment of its claims on the Free City of Danzig, together with a letter from the Reparation Commission to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations concerning these claims.

The Committee noted that Senator Volkmann, who was entrusted with the administration of the finances of the Free City, had stated that he was prepared to recommend the Senate to repay shortly to the Conference of Ambassadors the cost of the delimitation of its territory (about 29,000 gold marks) and the cost of the civil administration (about 287,000 gold marks).

There remained a third and larger claim for the costs of the military occupation of Danzig. The Committee noted that the Free City of Danzig intended to make proposals to the Conference of Ambassadors for the discharge of this liability, and that the Reparation Commission was refraining from expressing any opinion on the question pending the consideration of these proposals. The Financial Committee expressed the view that these proposals would probably result in a settlement, and strongly hoped that a satisfactory agreement would be reached.

II. THE ORGANISATION FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT¹.

The Council, since the publication of the general report to the Sixth Assembly, has considered various steps to be taken as a result of the work of the Organisation.

Further, the Committee of Railway Experts appointed by the Sub-Committee on Transport by Rail held a session from July 13th to 15th, 1925.

Finally, the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit itself met in Geneva during the last week of July.

The mission of enquiry into navigation on the Rhine and on the Danube entrusted to Mr. Hines was also completed during this period.

The principal resolutions adopted were as follows :

¹ This chapter is supplementary to the report of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit on the work of the Organisation for Communications and Transit between the Fifth and Sixth Assemblies (see General Report, A. 7, pages 81-85).

1. INLAND NAVIGATION.

(a) Tonnage Measurement in Inland Navigation.

The Council at its last session approved the proposals of the Advisory and Technical Committee for the convocation of a conference on tonnage measurement in inland navigation in Europe. This conference will meet at Paris on November 20th.

(b) General Position as regards Inland Navigation in Europe.

(Application of the resolutions of the Conference of Genoa.)

The publication of the reports of Mr. Hines on the Rhine and on the Danube is in preparation. In regard to these reports, which will be forwarded in due course to all the interested Governments and subsequently examined by the Sub-Committee on Inland Navigation of the Advisory and Technical Committee, the following information may be given :

As regards the Rhine, the report of Mr. Hines specially emphasises the influence of the railway policy of a certain number of riparian States, the result of which is to place the Rhine navigation in an unfavourable position. The report also examines the effects from this point of view of certain super-taxes and Customs formalities.

Mr. Hines, with the assistance of Major Somervell, has devoted the greater part of his attention to the Danube, and in this question he has had the advantage, as for the Rhine, of a complete collaboration on the part of interested circles in the riparian States. The following is a summary of his observations.

Traffic.

There are no comprehensive traffic or other statistics for the Danube, but the investigation indicates that the Danube freight traffic in 1923 and 1924 is only about 56 per cent of the normal pre-war traffic. The first six months of 1925 show an increase of about 50 per cent over the corresponding six months of 1924, being due to a special movement of maize from the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to the sea.

No complete comparison could be made as to the amount of passenger travel pre-war and post-war, but the amount of passenger service available for travellers is greater for Austria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary than before the war, somewhat less in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, very much less in Roumania, and somewhat greater in Bulgaria. There has never been any regular passenger service on the Danube in Germany.

The navigation companies and their fleets.

Before the war, the Austrian and Hungarian navigation companies carried most of the Danube traffic, except that a part of the traffic below the Iron Gates was carried by Roumanian and Greek interests. This has been greatly changed. Now the traffic is divided among German, Austrian, Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Serb-Croat-Slovene, Roumanian, French and Dutch navigation companies, and the Roumanian companies have been operating above the Iron Gates more than formerly. This makes the river far more international in its actual utilisation than ever before. The Greek boats, on account of their draught, still confine themselves almost wholly to operations below the Iron Gates.

The Danube fleets as a whole are about 25 per cent more than pre-war, although the Austrian and Hungarian fleets have diminished considerably, due to parts of them having become the property of Czechoslovak, Serb-Croat-Slovene, Roumanian and French interests as a result of the war. The port and shop facilities are in general as great as, or greater than, before the war, while the traffic is still much less. An important development is the growing use of self-propelled barges for certain sorts of goods.

Already there are evidences of co-operation. The up-river companies are in a cartel to stabilise rates. The Bavarian Lloyd and Czechoslovak Company have arrangements for joint towing, joint operation of self-propelled barges and common use of some terminals.

The influence of economic conditions generally and particularly in Roumania.

The post-war diminution of traffic has been largely due to the economic depression characteristic of Europe, but intensified in the Danube countries by the breaking-up of the wide free trade area which existed in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. At present, this former free trade area is cut across by the tariff barriers of seven different States, and this has seriously diminished commerce among them and promises to do so to a great extent, except so far as the situation may be ameliorated by commercial treaties among them. The making of such commercial treaties would be of distinct value to Danube navigation.

Since Old Roumania normally produced cereals enabling it to supply one-third of the total traffic moving on the Danube, the ability of the New Roumania to produce and export cereals is of first importance to that traffic. But this outlook is unfavourable, because the post-war readjustments in the enlarged Kingdom seem to have cut down production while enlarging domestic consumption, leaving for Danube transport much less than before the war.

Cabotage and territorial waters.

- A new practice since the war is that the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and Roumania now exclude all foreign navigation companies from handling any internal traffic or "cabotage" on the Danube in their respective countries, and also from handling any traffic on certain important tributaries of the Danube, such as the Save and the Bega, which are now treated as territorial instead of international waters. This throws to their navigation interests large volumes of traffic enjoyed before the war by the Austrian and Hungarian companies. The latter also criticise the new practice as diminishing the total traffic through affording less satisfactory service. The questions of right involved are partly conceded and partly disputed, and such disputes can be settled only in such way as may be found in the conventions among the States. But, apart from questions of principle, it is a practical question as to how far Roumania and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes may not find it in their interest to grant limited permissions to foreign companies to participate in this traffic from time to time under carefully guarded conditions. This might considerably improve local transportation service. Bulgaria enjoys for a long distance eight times as much passenger service as Roumania on account of the latter's cabotage policy. Already, as a matter of convenience, and without waiving its rights, Roumania has granted foreign companies access to its ports on the Bega.

Conditions of river channel.

The general conception of a minimum depth of two meters at low water frequently fails of realisation, at times for substantial proportions of the navigable season, because of obstacles which should be removed. Such removal above Vienna would, however, be so costly that it probably could not be done except in connection with the development of hydro-electric projects. Improvements of this character would correct the present difficulties of navigation and probably be advantageous to the general economic condition of Austria. Such a project is now nearing completion at Passau in Germany and will greatly improve the condition of the river for a considerable distance.

An important stretch of the river, where it is the frontier between Czechoslovakia and Hungary, can and should be improved. It is hoped that the two States can promptly co-operate to that end, because this stretch now constitutes the limiting factor in navigation between Vienna, Bratislava and Budapest. Between Budapest and Belgrade there are two points, one in Hungary and one in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, at both of which correction of the existing conditions is desirable.

The most difficult stretch on the river is the Iron Gates section. The necessary depth of water is frequently not obtainable. Operation through this section is especially difficult, even with ample water, because the current prevents the handling of more than one or two barges at a time through the swifter portions. Elimination of these difficulties calls for a comprehensive study of various alternatives which are set forth in the report. The amounts of money which would be involved are so large that the co-operation of all the riparian States would probably be necessary. This work should be promptly entered upon.

Complaints as to inadequate channel at Sulina, the mouth of the river, are now being corrected. The channel between the newly extended jetties was opened on July 25th, with a depth of 20 feet, with the prospect that the depth would be restored to the old figure of 24 feet. On July 31st a depth of 22 feet had been already obtained.

It is highly desirable, in the interest of all the Danube countries, for the International Danube Commission to take prompt steps to draw up a general programme for the comprehensive improvement of the river. This involves a determination as to how far the prospective traffic will justify the cost of any particular programme. Such an investigation will take a long time and will call for the services of competent engineers.

Frontier formalities.

Navigation could be substantially promoted by cutting down the amount of frontier formalities and the time required for them and by providing more adequate port facilities.

- The frontier formalities now involve a large economic waste, requiring tugboats and barges to remain idle for long periods, estimated to be about 6,000 barge days per year, with corresponding loss of time for tugs. These delays are almost entirely post-war burdens. Before the war the Danube crossed no frontier between Passau and Orsova, a distance of 1,272 kilometers, whereas, in this same section, there are now four frontiers and six frontier examinations. Hungary and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes now maintain separate stations at their common frontier involving double delay, sometimes amounting to an entire day. Both States have indicated that they have no objection in principle to combining their stations, and this report urges that they come to an agreement upon the necessary details to accomplish that result. Much of the delay at the various frontiers is due to the attitude of the local functionaries. The report suggests that the riparian States would be justified in concerning themselves very actively with this situation so as to stimulate greater expedition. In these matters river shipping appears to be subjected to burdens, delays and expense which have no counterpart on the railways that compete with the river.

Port facilities.

As to port facilities, numerous specific situations are discussed. One involves the difficulty of the Czechoslovakia company in getting a satisfactory terminal in Vienna. This is

closely connected with the Austrian difficulty in getting satisfactory assurance as to its terminal in Bratislava. The two questions should be considered together and a fair compromise arrived at. The Austrian and Hungarian companies are denied the right to use many of the port facilities which before the war they owned in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and Roumania. This grows out of the policy of these two States that all port facilities should be owned and operated by the State; hence their reluctance to permit private companies to establish their own facilities. Nevertheless, there is at present a great shortage of State pontons in Roumania and a great shortage of State pontons and other port facilities in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Until a State can itself supply ample facilities to carry out its policy, it is suggested that provisional arrangements should be made whereby private companies could provide their own pontons and other facilities. Roumania has already indicated that it has no objection to making arrangements to let the private companies use their own pontons, subject to eventual transfer to the State.

Acting upon a general law designed to protect domestic labour, certain navigation companies have been notified by the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes that they must replace their agents and other employees with nationals of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. This law is not directed against navigation, and there is also provision in it for making exceptions. It is hoped that the necessary exceptions can be made, to avoid an unfortunate precedent which might create similar hindrances in other States also.

Belgrade's port authorities subject foreign vessels to double taxation, and exclude them from certain forms of international traffic because the landing facilities are on the Save, a territorial river, and not on the Danube. The great and growing business interests of Belgrade cannot afford to have their city thus advertised as a city which has not the same freedom of access to the Danube as is enjoyed by Vienna and Budapest. The future of Belgrade is too important to admit of such a limitation, especially since the State appears to feel that little, if anything, is gained as a result of the action of the port authorities.

Statistics.

It is recommended that adequate statistics of Danube traffic should be provided. These will be valuable to the States and the navigation companies and will be almost indispensable in reaching a sound conclusion as to how much money can be justifiably spent in carrying out any comprehensive programme of river improvement.

Danube International Commission.

The report discusses the work of the Danube International Commission, the organ administering the Danube Statute (which has been instituted by a convention among the States) for all the river except the maritime part below Braila. Considering the great difficulties which confronted the Commission's work in the early years, it has accomplished substantial results. But the Commission has not yet been able to dispose of many of the most important problems which have been entrusted to its jurisdiction, and it is suggested that the practice of repeated postponements of important questions should give way to the practice of taking a definite vote upon them. The Commission must decide by a two-thirds majority, but there are probably very few questions where it is not possible for two-thirds of the delegates to agree upon the broad principles, and, if so, then upon details as well.

Danube European Commission.

The European Commission, which has jurisdiction over the maritime Danube from Braila to Sulina, was established in 1856. Before the war it was slow to act to prevent the formation of shoals in the channel, and, by the time it could be re-organised after the war, the shoals had seriously interfered with navigation. The Commission then proceeded with reasonable diligence and has just been able to announce that the jetties have been extended in accordance with its plan, and the channel opened provides a depth of 22 feet. Roumania has complained that the shallowness of the channel has greatly interfered with the export and import business of Braila and Galatz. At least as much diminution of business is observable at Constanza, another Roumanian port on the Black Sea. Hence the fundamental causes cannot be connected with the Sulina channel, but are probably *the general economic difficulties in Roumania, lessened exportable surplus of cereals, its heavy export tax on cereals and the difficulties of its railways in moving traffic.* Complaint has also been made by Roumania as to the heavy dues imposed by the European Commission. The Commission has found it necessary to impose these dues, which are admittedly heavy, in order to pay for the improvement of the channel, and there seems to be no practical alternative to this plan. Some suggestions are made as to possible economies that the Commission might be justified in taking into consideration.

Efficiency of operation.

It is highly desirable, in view of the extremely difficult situation of Danube navigation, for the navigation companies to do everything in their power to improve their own efficiency. The question is raised whether they cannot secure more efficient performance of their barges and tugs than is now observable. Reference is made to the extraordinary results which have been accomplished in the United States by analogous efforts on the part of the railways. There may be room for important economies in this direction. More efficient operation would be promoted by providing special telegraph facilities along all of the navigable river. The

companies should also seek to co-operate more and utilise facilities in common, such as port facilities, shop facilities and also tug boats, so as to avoid the waste of capital and labour involved in needless duplication. In Austria and Hungary especially, the existing port and shop facilities seem much in excess of the needs of their own companies. Many of the tug boats probably should be replaced by modern and more economical types. The question is raised whether there is not a great field for the building-up of a profitable tourist passenger traffic.

More co-operation on the part of State railways.

The Danube, like any other transportation system, needs adequate feeders. In large part these feeders should be the railways, and therefore there ought to be rail-and-river through rates and bills of lading. A State making through rates with foreign railways loses all benefits from the traffic at the frontier. When it makes through railway and river rates, the likelihood is that the bulk of the traffic will move in domestic boats to final destination and the State and its nationals will enjoy the entire profits of transportation. At present, in many instances, the railways seem to work against the Danube by establishing extremely low rates *via* other routes. More sympathetic attention to the just needs of the river should be given by the States and should be urged by the navigation companies.

Effect of Danube policy upon general credit of the riparian States.

The need of the riparian States for capital for public and private purposes is evident. It is extremely difficult to get this capital at reasonable rates. An important factor in this condition is the misgiving on the part of capitalists in other countries as to whether a satisfactory state of international tranquillity exists and will continue in these Danube States. The Danube conditions themselves constitute an indication one way or the other in this matter. If the States succeed in removing causes of friction on the Danube, that condition will be a favourable argument to encourage foreign capital. To the extent that friction continues in Danube matters, the condition will be an indication in the wrong direction.

2. MARITIME NAVIGATION.

The Committee for Communications and Transit adopted on July 30th the following resolution on health questions of interest to maritime navigation :

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee,

“ Having regard to the resolutions already communicated to the last Assembly concerning health questions connected with maritime navigation, and having noted that a Conference is to be convened at Paris next spring for the revision of the present International Health Convention :

“ Decides once more to draw the attention of the Health Committee of the League of Nations to these resolutions, and to request the Secretary General of the League to bring them, if necessary, to the notice of the French Government with a view to their transmission to the Conference, if the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee thinks such a course necessary, in order to ensure that the Conference shall consider what action should be taken in pursuance of these resolutions.

“ The Committee would again point out the importance which is attached by maritime commerce to consideration being given to the principles embodied in these resolutions. It is prepared, through its representatives, to afford the International Conference any assistance which may be required to assist them in examining these resolutions. ”

The resolutions referred to in the above resolution and communicated to the last Assembly were as follows :

“ The sole aim of the Sub-Committee is to facilitate maritime navigation without undertaking a technical discussion of health questions as such. It therefore decides, particularly in view of the forthcoming revision of the existing International Health Convention, to draw the attention of the Health Committee of the League of Nations to the following points :

“ The Sub-Committee is of opinion that the health authorities in the different countries should take all measures with a view to providing that the formalities required by each of the administrations shall lead to no indirect flag discrimination and can be carried out within the shortest possible period of time and with the minimum of expense for the shipping industry, which expense must necessarily eventually fall on consumers and users. Special account should be taken of this principle when the existing International Convention comes to be revised and also when agreements of a less general nature are concluded between the health authorities of different countries

“ In particular :

“ 1. Measures for the purpose of disinfection such as fumigation should not be made compulsory on “ healthy ” ships as defined by the International Sanitary Convention. These should be disinfected only as and when the number of rats or the possibility of plague infection makes it desirable. Ships trading

with ports where plague is endemic should not be compulsorily fumigated more often than once in six months, provided they remain "healthy" and no epidemic has broken out at ports of call.

" 2. It should be internationally agreed which methods of deratisation are effective and practical, and when a ship has been deratised by an approved method under the supervision of the local health authority, a certificate of deratisation should be issued by that authority. Such a certificate must be accepted by the health authority of any other country as exempting the ship from further deratisation to the same extent as one of its own certificates.

" 3. Any proposal tending to make the keeping of a *carnet sanitaire* should be rejected unless it be shown that the keeping of such a *carnet* would result in lessening delays, expenditure and the opportunities for indirect flag discrimination.

" 4. For those conditions under which it is not possible to dispense with bills of health there should be a standard form of the simplest possible character, which should be mutually accepted by all countries, and consular bills of health and other special health documents should not be required. The health authority at each port should, on application from the master of any ship, issue such a bill of health free or for a nominal charge.

" 5. Agreements should be concluded, subject to certain conditions to be laid down later, allowing a ship which has been declared "healthy" in one port and which has remained "healthy" automatically to obtain *libre pratique* in another port belonging to another country.

" The Sub-Committee requests its Chairman to appoint from among its members a small Committee to represent it and to collaborate with the Health Committee, or any body that that Committee may set up, in order to facilitate the putting into practice of these principles. "

3. TRANSPORT BY RAIL.

(a) *Classification of Goods.*

The Committee of Experts adopted the following conclusions which will be submitted to the Sub-Committee on Transport by Rail :

" The Committee takes note of the information received by the Advisory Committee and its members to the effect that the work of the International Railway Union on the unification of the nomenclature of goods is likely in the near future to assume a more definite form, which will afford a clearer notion of the aims to which it is directed and the results which may be achieved ; and decides to postpone any decision on this subject until after the session of the competent organisation of the International Railway Union next autumn.

" The Committee, having considered the relations between the unification of the nomenclature of goods (a question which is on its agenda) and other questions of unification also affecting international traffic and the application of the General Convention on the International Regime of Railways, such as the unification of the mode of presentation of tariffs, the unification of the mode of presentation of operation regulations and the unification of private law as applicable to internal traffic and to international traffic on successive contracts ;

" Considering that, whatever difficulties may be involved in extending such unifications to all European systems, it is, in any event, urgent and essential that all possible steps should be taken to maintain, preserve, and where necessary adapt to present conditions, those unifications which had already been effected before the war between certain systems in Central and Eastern Europe ;

" Decides to ask the Sub-Committee on Railway Transport to place this question on its agenda, and, in particular, to consider the suggestion made to the Committee of Experts that the League of Nations might be prevailed upon to summon a partial Communications and Transit Conference on this subject, to which the European States concerned should be invited.

(b) *Conditions of Transport by Rail in Comparison with the Pre-War Period.*

As a result of its enquiry, the Committee of Experts, after examining the information supplied by the National Committees of the International Chamber of Commerce, adopted the following conclusions :

" It appears from the replies received that international tariffs must be understood as meaning through services with a single waybill, and also services involving re-entry at frontier stations without direct charge and services, subject to common international tariffs in the strict sense of the term.

" In view of the considerable advantages offered by common international tariffs, users of railways are anxious — and the Committee of Experts agrees — that the number of such tariffs should be increased as far as possible, at all events in respect of all goods forming a regular and considerable international traffic.

“ While, however, it realises the obstacles in the way of a return to the pre-war situation in this connection, the Committee feels that it would be desirable, in the first place, for international traffic on the Continent of Europe to be, as a general rule, carried by through services, the existing Berne Convention being applied *through-out*. The Committee of Experts would further urge that it is essential that the new Berne Conventions concluded on October 23rd, 1924, should be ratified as speedily and by as many countries as possible.

“ Furthermore, in view of the importance of the traffic between Great Britain and the Continent of Europe, the Committee of Experts thinks it highly desirable that all suitable steps should be taken to facilitate and develop this traffic by means of international tariffs.

“ Lastly, in pursuance of the principles laid down in Articles 38 and 39 of the Statute on the International Regime of Railways, the Committee of Experts feels called upon to draw the Sub-Committee's attention to the desirability of investigating the question of the development and regulation of combined traffic between railways and other transport undertakings with combined tariffs and single transport document.

“ The Committee of Experts desires to express its appreciation of the assistance so kindly afforded by the International Chamber of Commerce. ”

4. TELEPHONIC QUESTIONS AND WIRELESS TELEPHONY.

The Committee for Communications and Transit has organised a system of liaison with the International Committee on Long-Distance Telephony, which includes the majority of the European telephonic administrations. The Committee adopted the following resolution, to which it draws the attention of the Assembly :

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee,

“ Appreciating the value of the relations at present established between itself and the International Advisory Committee on Long-Distance Telephony,

“ Decides to request the latter Committee to communicate the plan for the establishment of the new European long-distance telephony system, as at present contemplated, and recommends that the Assembly of the League of Nations should point out to the Governments concerned how important it is, both from a political and from a practical point of view, that, when determining the order of priority for the establishment of the various lines, communication between the seat of the League of Nations and the principal European capitals should be treated in the same way as communication between great capitals and should be recognised as possessing the same degree of urgency. ”

The Committee for Communications and Transit is now also in direct relation with the “ Office International de Radiophonie ”, at Geneva which includes the greater number of the radiophonic companies.

5. ROAD TRAFFIC.

The Advisory and Technical Committee was informed during its last session that the French Government proposed to convene a Conference on road traffic next spring. The agenda of this Conference will include the draft Convention (revision of the 1909 Convention) established by the Special Committee on Road Traffic of the Committee for Communications and Transit. The Secretary-General for the Committee on Communications and Transit will take part in this conference in an advisory capacity.

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee has decided to instruct the Sub-Committee on Road Traffic to study the unification of traffic regulations in the various countries. It regards such unification as particularly desirable, both from the point of view of public security and the facilitating of motor traffic.

6. RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SECOND GENERAL CONFERENCE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

The Committee for Communications and Transit adopted the following resolution, which is now presented to the Assembly :

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee,

“ Considering it highly desirable that the Conventions adopted at the last General Conference on Communications and Transit should come into force at the earliest possible date and between as many States as possible.

“ Requests the Assembly of the League of Nations to direct the attention of the Governments concerned to this point, and declares that, in case any of the said Governments should desire, with a view to facilitating the procedure of ratification or adhesion, to obtain information or enlightenment on any point in these Conventions in order to remove any possibility of misunderstandings, the Advisory and Technical Committee would always be prepared to give any assistance that might be required in this connection. ”

7. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE APPLICATION OF THE MEMEL CONVENTION.

The Committee for Communications and Transit has considered at some length various questions relating to the application of the Memel Convention. It examined in this connection, at the request of its Chairman, certain questions of a general character concerning the mission of the member of the Harbour Board appointed by the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee. The member in question — M. Kjelstrup — was present at the discussions.

Moreover, having officially received from the Harbour Board a copy of the regulations for the floating of wood on the Niemen, the Committee examined these regulations, as promulgated by the Lithuanian Government, from a purely technical and legal standpoint, basing its views exclusively on the practical needs of commerce and on the texts of treaties and conventions in force and applicable to the case.

The Committee has submitted a certain number of observations and suggested certain modifications with a view to their communication to the members of the Council.

8. DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES.

(a) *Dispute concerning the Application of the Articles of the Treaty of Peace concerning the Oder.*

The Advisory and Technical Committee adopted the following resolution :

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee,

“ Considering that the replies received from the various Governments parties to the dispute concerning the Oder show that the suggestions for conciliation made by the Committee at its last meeting have been accepted by the Governments of Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France and Sweden ;

“ And that the German Government has only accepted these suggestions subject to the receipt of satisfactory replies to the two enquiries addressed by it to the Governments concerned, and that it reserves its opinion, for the time being, if it should fail to obtain such replies ;

“ And that the Polish Government has declared, at once, that it definitively declines to accept the suggestion for conciliation ;

“ And, having regard to the resolutions adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations on December 9th, 1920, which state that ‘ the Committee will be entrusted with the investigation of any disputes which may be referred to the League under Articles 336, 376 and 386 of the Treaty of Versailles and corresponding articles in the other Treaties of Peace, and will endeavour to adjust such disputes whenever possible by conciliation between the parties ’, and that ‘ all disputes brought before the League of Nations under Articles 336, 337, 376 and 386 of the Treaty of Versailles, and analogous articles of the other Treaties of Peace which are not settled by the procedure provided in the resolution relating to the organisation of transit, shall be brought before the Permanent Court of International Justice ’.

“ Considers that it should declare that the procedure of conciliation which has been undertaken is now closed and that it should duly inform the Governments concerned of this fact, communicating to them at the same time the replies which have been received.

“ The Committee nevertheless thinks it desirable to give a reply to the questions raised by the German Government, in so far as they necessitate an interpretation of the suggestions previously offered, and in this connection is of opinion :

“ 1. That, as regards the first question, in the case of waterways subject to the regime of the Barcelona Convention, the regime of timber-floating is to be regarded as a special aspect of the regime of navigation, it being of course understood that timber may be subjected, like any other form of navigation, to such special regulations as may be required in the interests of traffic on the waterway, and are in conformity with the stipulations of the Barcelona Convention ;

“ 2. That, as regards the second question, since this matter does not fall within the scope of the dispute submitted to the Advisory and Technical Committee, the opinion of the Committee in no way prejudices the solution which may eventually be given to this problem. ”

(b) *Jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube.*

The special committee the composition of which was noted in the General Report to the sixth Assembly has submitted a long report which is the result of a study of the relevant texts and of an examination of the position on the spot. It has already been noted that this special committee held a first session in February 1925, during which it heard the views of the Roumanian Government. During a second session, held at Geneva in March, the Committee heard the views of the British Government, presented by Sir Cecil Hurst ; of the French Government, presented by M. Basdevant and M. Charguéraud-Hartmann, and of the Italian Government, presented by M. Rossetti. The Committee then visited the Roumanian Government and the European Commission of the Danube and conducted an enquiry at Galatz, Braila and Soulina.

The Advisory and Technical Committee, having noted the report of the special committee, adopted the following resolutions :

1. *Resolution adopted on July 30th.*

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee, having taken note of the report drawn up by the Special Committee on the question of the jurisdiction of the European Danube Commission, wishes to express its sincere thanks to this Committee for the vast amount of work, both of a legal and technical character, which it has succeeded in accomplishing in an absolutely impartial and unbiased spirit.

“ It also expresses to the Roumanian Government and the European Danube Commission its gratitude for the facilities granted for the conduct of the enquiry.”

2. *Resolution adopted on July 28th.*

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee, having had submitted to it, by a letter from the British Government dated September 6th, 1924, the dispute concerning the jurisdiction of the European Danube Commission ;

“ Having taken note of the report of the Special Committee appointed to examine this question :

“ Is of opinion that, as regards the question of competence raised by the Roumanian Government, it is neither necessary nor opportune, for the reasons set out in the above-mentioned report, for the Committee to give a decision on this point ;

“ And, as regards the substantial issues involved, is of opinion :

“ (a) That, in conformity with the conclusions of the Committee's report, the jurisdiction of the European Danube Commission extends from Galatz to above Braila under the same conditions as from the sea to Galatz ;

“ (b) That consequently the question of fixing a point below Galatz cannot be taken into consideration ;

“ (c) That the distinction between the competence of the European Danube Commission and that of the Roumanian authority which is exercised over the ports cannot be drawn on the basis of a geographical boundary, but that it should be founded on the distinction which exists between questions of navigation and port questions, in accordance with the principles laid down in the Committee's report. ”

3. *Resolution adopted on July 28th.*

“ The Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit,

“ Having taken note of the suggestions contained in the tenth part of the report of the Special Committee ;

“ And, considering that these suggestions, which have been framed with a view to conciliation, are in keeping with the conception which it has always entertained of the nature of its duties, and are calculated to ensure the fullest co-operation between the States concerned :

“ Invites the Governments parties to the dispute to give their most favourable consideration to these suggestions, in case the Statute of the Danube should be partially revised ; and, in order to assist them in this examination, which it confidently expects will give satisfactory results, it authorises the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit to take steps, later on, if he thinks it desirable, for the convening of a meeting of the members of the Special Committee and of the delegates on the European Danube Commission. ”

III. THE HEALTH ORGANISATION.

I. APPROVAL BY THE COUNCIL OF THE WORK OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE HEALTH COMMITTEE.

The Council on June 9th, 1925, approved the resolutions adopted by the Health Committee during its fourth session held in April 1925, together with observations contained in the report made by the Japanese representative on the work of the session.

The British representative on the Council made certain observations on the growth of the expenditure for the work of the Health Organisation, and the Minutes of the meeting were transmitted to the Governments and to the Assembly, as well as to the Health Committee, for observations. (A. 12.1925.X.) The Bureau of the Committee has prepared a memorandum which has been forwarded to the members of the Council and of the Assembly (Doc. A.17.1925.III).

II. THE CONFERENCE ON SLEEPING-SICKNESS.

The preparatory work for the International Conference on Sleeping-Sickness, which met in London on May 19th, 1925, was described in the General Report to the sixth Assembly (pages 91 and 92).

Delegates from Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Portugal and Spain attended the Conference, which sat in London from May 19th to May 22nd, 1925.

The delegates at the Conference unanimously decided to make to the Council of the League of Nations and to their respective Governments the following recommendations :

1. *Administrative Measures.*

Facilities should be afforded for periodical official conferences between administrative and medical officers in charge of the campaign against sleeping-sickness on both sides of the boundaries between infected countries, and special agreements might with advantage be concluded between local administrations in order to allow of a rapid and regular interchange of all epidemiological intelligence and information regarding the measures taken for the control of sleeping-sickness. The recommendations of the chief of the medical service or his representative in sleeping-sickness areas should be binding on the local administration, and medical officers should be given magisterial powers for the application of all necessary measures. The medical and health services should be proportionate to the number of the population in the district to be inspected. The system of sanitary passports for the native population in infected areas should be adopted where practicable, and a uniform method of recording morbidity and mortality figures of sleeping-sickness should, as far as possible, be followed.

2. *Special Studies and Investigations.*

The Conference carefully examined the proposals contained in the reports of the Committee of Experts on Sleeping-Sickness, and examined further recommendations made by the Committee during the Conference.

The Conference recommended that an International Commission should be entrusted with the task of investigating certain specific problems relating to the epidemiology of sleeping-sickness. It noted that an investigation of these problems was already being made in the institutes of the several African countries, and represented that it was desirable for the methods of research in these various institutes to be continued and co-ordinated. The International Commission recommended by the Conference would, it was hoped, find valuable opportunities for scientific collaboration, and be in a position to collect data for the improvement and co-ordination of the national efforts.

The Conference considered that the best region for the study of the problems selected would be Uganda and the districts in the neighbourhood of Lake Victoria. It recommended that the Commission should be placed under the presidency and control of Dr. Duke, who had for several years carried out valuable research work in Uganda at the laboratories of Entebbe. The field work for the control of the tsetse fly undertaken by Mr. Swynnerton in the Tanganyika territory should also be studied.

The Conference recommended that the interested Governments be asked to contribute to a common fund to cover the costs of the international commission, and hoped that these Governments would endeavour to obtain on behalf of the work of the Commission a credit of at least £3,000 sterling to be placed on the next budget of the Health Organisation.

The Council, during its June session, approved the recommendations of the Conference subject to their adoption by the Governments concerned. The British representative on the Council said that the Government of Uganda would place its laboratory at Entebbe at the disposal of the Commission and would give every assistance to the enquiry planned by the League of Nations.

The international commission will work at the Entebbe Institute for a preliminary period of twelve months, at the end of which it will present a special report to the Committee of Experts of the Health Organisation of the League of Nations. The Commission will meet at Entebbe at the end of December 1925 or in January 1926.

III. CAMPAIGN AGAINST MALARIA : STUDY TOUR IN SPAIN.

It was noted in the General Report to the sixth Assembly that the Spanish Government had invited the Malaria Commission to make a study of the position in regard to malaria in Spain.

The tour opened on August 13th at San Sebastian, and is still in progress. The Commission has visited San Sebastian, Madrid, the malarial districts of Talavera de la Reina, Naval-moral, La Bazagonna, Mirabel, Caceres, Badajoz, Olivenza, Huelva, Seville, Cordoba, Granada, Valencia, Tortosa and Barcelona.

The Commission has everywhere received a most cordial welcome from the authorities, and every facility has been afforded for the necessary investigations.

IV. THIRD COLLECTIVE STUDY OF MEDICAL STATISTICS.

The final Conference of the third collective study tour of medical statisticians met at Geneva on August 21st, 1925. The object of the tour was to study in various countries the different systems of recording and tabulating statistics of causes of death, and the object of the final Conference was to crystallise the impressions obtained, to compare the various national procedures and to study the lines along which international comparability of death statistics might eventually be obtained. International comparison has hitherto been difficult or impossible owing to divergencies in the existing systems.

The Conference was attended by medical statistical officers responsible for the compiling of mortality statistics in their own countries. Representatives from Belgium, Denmark, England, Finland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States participated.

V. SEROLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WORK.

The second International Conference for the Standardisation of certain Biological Remedies, *i.e.*, remedies whose therapeutic value or toxic strength cannot be estimated by chemical methods, met at Geneva on August 31st, 1925.

The first International Conference dealing with this question met at Edinburgh in July 1923, under the auspices of the League of Nations, and adopted final resolutions as regards the titration of adrenaline and of *filix mas*. The present Conference proposes to study the methods of titrating digitalis and other cardiac toxics : thyroid preparations, ergot, pituitary extract, insulin, organic arsenical preparations and vitamins. It is hoped that an agreement will be reached in regard to methods of titration which it will be possible to recommend for international adoption.

In the absence of Dr. Madsen, Chairman of the Health Committee, the Conference was convened under the Chairmanship of Dr. H. H. Dale, of the Medical Research Council of London. Experts from Germany, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, United States, France, Great Britain, Norway and the Netherlands participated.

12.

HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS.

I. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE DURING ITS SEVENTH SESSION.

The Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs held its seventh session at Geneva from August 24th to 31st, 1925. In view of the fact that two International Conferences summoned for the purpose of strengthening the Hague Convention of 1912 had met and adopted an Agreement and a Convention, the Committee's work during this session was mainly concerned with questions of an administrative character, particularly as regards the prevention of the illicit traffic in opium and other drugs.

The following members and assessors attended the session :

Sir Malcolm Delevingne K.C.B. (<i>Chairman</i>)	British Empire
Dr. Anselmino (<i>Vice-Chairman</i>)	Germany
M. Bourgeois	France
Sir John Campbell, C.S.I., O.B.E.	India
Dr. Tsurumi	Japan
M. van Wettum	Netherlands
S.E. M. Ferreira	Portugal
M. Petrovitch	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes
Luang Sri Visarnvaja	Siam
Dr. Carrière	Switzerland
Mr. Pinkney Tuck	United States of America

Assessors

M. Henri Brenier
Sir John Jordan, G.C.I.E., K.C.B., K.C.M.G.
Mrs. Hamilton Wright.

The Committee was informed that the Chinese representative had received instructions from his Government not to attend the session, and that the representative of Bolivia was unavoidably detained.

The Committee held its meetings in public, with the exception of two private sittings, at which it considered measures for dealing with the illicit traffic and the question of the qualifications required for assessors to the Committee.

Annual reports furnished by Governments.

The Committee, regarding the consideration of the annual reports from Governments as one of the most important parts of its work, regretted to note that a number of Governments had sent no reports for 1923 and 1924. It accordingly asked the Council to urge upon all Governments the great importance of furnishing the League with these reports at the earliest possible date.

During the discussion the representative of India stated that the Indian Government had decided to stop any exports of opium to Persia and to Macao.

Illicit Traffic.

The Committee had before it a large amount of information on the subject of illicit traffic, much of which was carried on between the Persian Gulf and various ports in the Far East. It noted that a number of important seizures had been made in Europe, in the Far East and in America, which threw a great deal of light on the extent of the traffic, on the people engaged in it and the methods by which it was pursued. The information disclosed the names of a number of firms and persons and showed the huge financial resources and the world-wide connections of which they disposed.

The Committee discussed the measures to be taken by the various Governments for the purpose of discovering traffickers and their operations. It adopted a general resolution to the effect that the Council should urge Governments to take the most energetic steps to discover persons engaged in the traffic, and mutually to communicate immediately information concerning such persons, together with a description of the consignments of opium or drugs smuggled, the names and addresses of the consignor and consignee, etc., so as to facilitate the seizure of the consignment and the arrest of the traffickers. The Committee also urged the importance of dealing severely with firms of licensed dealers who knowingly supplied drugs for the purpose of illicit traffic.

The Committee emphasised its opinion that the limitation of the manufacture of drugs to the amounts required for scientific and medicinal needs was essential if the problem was to be satisfactorily solved.

The Committee adopted a series of resolutions tending to secure more effective control over the opium traffic in the Persian Gulf. It recommended that all Governments concerned should adopt regulations with regard to shipment similar to those enforced by the British Government on vessels sailing under the British flag¹, and passed resolutions concerning the transference of vessels from the British to some other flag with a view to avoiding these regulations and the transshipment of consignments of opium.

Miscellaneous Questions.

Among other questions the Committee discussed the situation in China and suggested that a summary of all available information in regard to that country should be submitted to the Committee at each session since it was of the opinion that a misleading view of the opium situation would be given if no information were supplied in regard to the country which was in fact at the moment the chief producer of raw opium.

The Committee, on the suggestion of the Fifth Assembly, discussed the question whether it was desirable to prepare a scheme of propaganda against the use of dangerous drugs. After consultation with the Health Committee it recommended that no such scheme should be undertaken.

The Committee also discussed the rapid transmission of export authorisations between the responsible officials in the various countries, the extradition of offenders against the narcotic laws and the qualifications needed in the future for any assessors to the Committee who might be appointed.

II. PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN THE NEAR EAST

The fifth Assembly allocated the sum of 75,000 francs for the work of the Commission for the Protection of Women and Children in the Near East.

1. WORK IN ALEPPO.

The work in Aleppo has been carried out under the supervision of Miss Karen Jeppe on the lines of the scheme approved by the Assembly in 1922. The Commission's work is devoted to two main objects, first, the rescue of women and children, and secondly their subsequent education and settlement.

The work of the Commission has been divided as follows :

(a) *Rescue Work.*

The rescue work is carried out by various stations under the control of agents of the Commission, situated in the neighbourhood of Aleppo. During the past year many difficulties have been encountered. The Commission has regretfully to report the death of its agent in Deir-el-Zor, whose efforts had resulted in saving a large number of Armenian women and children. The station in this district will shortly be closed, as soon as conditions in the neighbouring district of Ras-el-Ain make it possible for the refugees collected at Hassidje to be transported direct to Aleppo.

¹ These regulations stipulate that the master of a ship with opium on board should, before obtaining clearance, be required to make an affidavit stating the real destination of the opium, produce an import certificate if the opium is destined for countries where such a system of certificates is in force, and enter into a bond for the delivery of the opium at the declared destination.

The Commission's station at Hassidje was closed at the beginning of the year for lack of funds, despite the great efforts made by the Commission's agent Vasil Sabagh, who has been murdered by Arabs near Hassidje. The Commission has now found it possible to re-open the station at Hassidje.

The closing of the Turkish frontier has also meant the closing down of the station at Djeraboulous.

The Commission is, however, able to report that adequate funds have become available, with the result that 250 persons have been rescued during the current year.

The Commission has extended its operations to cover the region around Ras-el-Ain, where the remnants of the Armenian deportation of 1916 still exist. It hopes to obtain the co-operation of the French authorities who are now occupying the town.

From January 1st to June 30th a total of £2,330 has been received from various private sources by the Commission.

(b) *Reception Houses and Education.*

The Commission reports that this work has continued undisturbed and that greater success has been achieved in finding the relatives of refugees, some seventy per cent being put in touch with their families, with the result that the reception houses are seldom overcrowded. The teaching of trades to boys and girls has also shown improvement, with the result that they are able to support themselves in a comparatively short time. On the educational side the Commission wishes to acknowledge the very great services rendered by Miss Jensen, of the Danish Friends of Armenia.

(c) *Colonisation Scheme.*

Owing to the bad winter and spring of 1924-25 the development of the colonisation scheme has been delayed. No new village has been established since last year, but the population of the one already in existence has been increased and a school established for the children. In general, the colony may be said to be showing signs of prosperity: but the Commission wishes to emphasise that, if Armenians are to be attracted to the region, it is essential to establish as many other colonies as possible. The Commission notes that private charity is becoming less inclined to assist Armenians in refugee camps but, were practical results to be achieved by the colonisation scheme, funds would be forthcoming. The rescue and establishment of 2,000 persons from the area of Ras-el-Ain, together with the maintenance of the refugees from ordinary sources would necessitate a subsidy from the League amounting to £10,000 in addition to contributions from elsewhere. If all the Armenian refugees at present in the camps in Aleppo, amounting to some 30,000 persons, were to be settled in villages, far larger funds would be required.

2. CONSTANTINOPLE.

The Commission in Constantinople reports as follows:

The work of the Commission in Constantinople is located in the League of Nations House, which contains a dormitory and dining-room for children as well as the office of the Commission. It has become a well-known centre where women and children detached from their families and suffering through war conditions, etc., may seek help, protection and advice. The work has developed upon purely international and humanitarian lines and the Commission has sought to carry out the instructions given it by the Assembly.

One thousand four hundred and fourteen children and 1,456 adults have received help during the past year. By means of outside financial aid the Commission has been able to co-operate with and secure support for some of the national charitable institutions.

Miss Caris E. Mills, the American Directress, has interested various organisations and individuals in the international work of the Commission, as a result of which financial support amounting to twice the amount of the appropriation of the Commission has been given. It has thus been found possible to advance small loans to aid in paying room rent for women and children as well as for starting them in work. In addition to other activities, the League of Nations House has helped women and children to dispose of their handwork.

The Commission has been able to give some help to the Home for Rescued Children. This Home was established three or four years ago and has been doing splendid work by rescuing and placing children found on the streets, as well as by dealing with child white slave traffic. Children of all nationalities are received in the Home and are subsequently placed in their own national institutions. A committee to extend this work is being formed, of which Miss Mills is to be a member.

The American Women's Hospitals have increased their donation for sick women and children from \$500 monthly to \$700 monthly, thus enabling care to be taken of more cases of destitute sick women. By means of this fund 620 women and 315 children have been given medical care, and the Russian sick in the city have been supported when other funds failed. The Commission has been informed that this fund will be continued as long as the need exists. At present it is the only outside medical relief in the city.

During the past year the British Save the Children Fund has sent through this Commission food and money to the value of £575 sterling, for the assistance of under-nourished children of all nationalities in Constantinople.

The Christian Science Relief of America has given an additional \$1,000 to be used to help all nationalities.

The total received from outside organisations and individuals amounts to \$14,417.89. This outside money, which has been spent in accordance with the requests of the donors, is utilised entirely to meet the direct needs of the women and children and not for overhead expenses.

The League appropriation makes it possible to carry on the work of the Commission and to help financially many additional women and children as well as institutions. The money received in the form of donations is used for medical aid, food, education, transportation, etc., for needy adults and children. The moral support of the League and the fact that donations are used to meet the direct needs of the women and children and not to cover overhead expenses are large factors in prompting these gifts.

Constantinople is perhaps the most international centre, where practically all nationalities are suffering from the effects of years of war, and the League of Nations House is the only international organisation there to which destitute women and children can turn for help, protection and advice. If the League could grant for one more year the same appropriation as before in support of the work, the scope of which would remain the same, a great need would be met and much good accomplished.

13.

MEASURES TO HELP REFUGEES.

WORK OF THE GREEK REFUGEE SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.

The Council on June 11th, 1925, noted the sixth report of the Refugees Settlement Commission.

THE FINANCIAL POSITION.

The total proceeds of the loan collected during the first quarter of 1925 amounted to £9,787,543. The Commission has paid to the Bank of England and to the National Bank of Greece in repayment of previous advances, the sum of £3,700,000, leaving a net sum of £6,274,543, on which to base its estimate for the development of its work.

In drawing up a plan of appropriation, the Commission, in agreement with the Greek Government, set aside a reserve fund of £800,000 for unforeseen expenses and for general expenditure up to the end of 1927, and it allocated a sum of £1,380,000 for the construction of houses in provincial towns for the urban refugees. The balance of the fund was appropriated for agricultural settlements in Macedonia, Thrace and other parts of Greece, where the Greek Government is supplying the Commission with arable land.

The number of families requiring settlement is steadily increasing owing to the continued exodus to Greece from Turkey and Bulgaria of persons exchanged under the treaties, as well as of persons who have found it impossible to continue residence in Turkey. The Commission, in drawing up its plans, has been obliged to refuse the application of some six thousand refugee families. It has also been obliged to make important reductions in the estimates submitted by the different colonisation centres and has had to reduce the allowance of each family to a strict minimum.

There are still some tens of thousands of refugee families without regular homes or regular occupation, and the Greek Government is considering the possibility of obtaining the funds necessary to complete the work of settlement.

The financial position of the Commission on April 30th was as follows :

	£	s.	d.
Expenditure for agricultural settlements	4,699,092	19	9
" " urban "	467,236	7	4
Cost of first settlement	2,038	2	5
General expenditure	31,622	5	10
Available at the National Bank of Greece	4,060,010	4	8
" " " Bank of England	502,543	14	0
Total	£9,762,543	14	0.

WORK OF THE COMMISSION

Up to March 31st, the number of families settled was 139,519. The total number of houses constructed amounted to 34,463. The total of the live-stock distributed by the Commission was 129,309. Ploughs, wagons, tools and seed grain were also distributed in large quantities.

The Greek Government has placed at the disposal of the Commission the following lands :

In Macedonia	5,010,445	stremmata, of which	3,673,604	are cultivable.
In Thrace	695,457	" " "	505,629	"
Other provinces	520,461	" " "	370,164	"
Grand total	6,226,363	" " "	4,549,397	"

No measurements have been taken, and the above figures are based on personal estimates and information collected by the agents of the Commission. It will be necessary, in the absence of large scale maps, to undertake a comprehensive survey next spring in order to determine the extent and value of these lands. On the above figures some 4½ million stremmata of cultivable land appear to be available out of the total of 5 million stremmata which the Government is under obligation to furnish.

The Commission has found it necessary to organise a health service and to arrange for the distribution of quinine to the colonists. Fifty-one dispensaries have been established in small agricultural centres. The cost of these dispensaries, together with that of the doctors, chemists and drugs are debited to each refugee individually in equal shares. The Commission expressed its deep gratitude to the American Red Cross, which has placed five tons of quinine at its disposal.

A decision has been reached in agreement with the Government regarding urban settlements. A credit of about £1,500,000 is allocated by the Commission for this purpose, of which £120,000 goes to a reserve fund, the remainder to be spent on buildings containing two-roomed dwellings at a flat rate of £120 and on general utility expenditure, particularly water supply.

The accounts up to December 31st, 1924, have been audited in accordance with the Protocol and were found to be in order.

The Commission concluded its report as follows :

“ Criticisms, even attacks, are certainly not wanting — they are, indeed, inevitable. Some are inspired by a real concern for the welfare of the refugees ; but most, dictated by considerations of every kind, sometimes hostile, by no means always disinterested, are generally quite unjustified ; at any rate, they do not always take sufficient account of the realities and difficulties of the work. In such a tremendous task as this, there will always, of course, be discontented people, but we must consider the work as a whole, the results already accomplished and those to be attained in the far-distant future. The results achieved and those to be achieved in the future augur well for the future of the country. ”

14.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION

The report submitted by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to the Council and the Assembly (A. 24. 1925. XII) contains a full statement of its work and the work of its Sub-Committees during its sixth session. The present chapter of the Supplementary Report merely gives a few additional details of the progress made by the Committee in its various fields of activity since the chapter on intellectual co-operation in the General Report on the Work of the Council (A. 7. 1925, pages 111 *et seq*) was written.

QUESTION OF SCIENTIFIC PROPERTY.

The last Assembly proposed that a Conference of Experts should be held in 1925. The Governments of certain important industrial countries have not yet made known their views on the Ruffini scheme, which is to be considered by a congress of Scandinavian jurists during the month of August. The Committee also thinks that it will be an advantage to consult industrial circles. The proposed Conference, therefore, will not be held until these various opinions have been obtained.

From the replies received from Governments a number of impressions emerge. The principle of the scheme meets with almost universal approval ; as to the means of putting it into practical effect, opinions differ. Briefly, the same objections have been encountered as were raised at an earlier date as regards the draft Convention on Industrial Property.

The Committee has taken the opportunity afforded by the establishment of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation at Paris to instruct the latter to make in the industrial world any preliminary enquiries which the Committee thinks necessary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The efforts of the Sub-Committee on Bibliography to co-ordinate the analytical bibliography of physics and allied sciences have resulted in a very satisfactory draft agreement negotiated by the representatives of the publications concerned, and the Committee can now turn its attention to other sciences in accordance with the programme approved by the last Assembly. This year, with the assistance of experts whom it has selected, it hopes to deal with the question of the co-ordination of analytical bibliography in the economic sciences.

In regard to the analytical bibliography of Greco-Roman antiquity, a preliminary enquiry is being carried out by correspondence under the direction of Professor Gilbert Murray, Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

As regards bibliography by titles, the co-ordination between the Committee and the Brussels International Institute of Bibliography, which was approved by the Assembly, has been arranged in accordance with the latter's wishes. The grant of 1,000 Swiss francs made to the Institute by the Assembly will be used for the publication, before the end of this year, of a first supplement to the *Index Bibliographicus*. The Institute has also undertaken to amplify on as large a scale as possible its valuable alphabetical list of authors in the form of a collective catalogue of the chief libraries of the world, showing where a copy of any given work is to be found. The corresponding catalogue by subjects, the importance of which was recognised by the fifth Assembly, is also to be amplified; the information service in connection with the separate national offices for scientific information will also be developed. It is to be hoped that important official and other institutions will assist the Brussels Institute in its work by kindly placing at its disposal all essential material, which the Institute will then classify and co-ordinate so that it can be generally used.

The Committee is also anxious to render easier of access those publications — often highly important — which are written in little-used languages. With this object in view it decided to ask for the help of the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation. Accordingly, it will enquire whether those Committees would be prepared to compile annually, in a widely used language, an analytical bibliography of the publications of their scientists and authors. The possibility of publishing abstracts of this kind in an international review has been considered.

In order to carry out the scheme for organising scientific information in which the United States experts on the Committee are specially interested, the Committee again decided to call upon the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation. The latter will be asked to consider the means of compiling and publishing a collective national catalogue of periodicals in the public libraries.

Various resolutions were also adopted with a view to promoting the loan of printed books and manuscripts between libraries in different countries and the international loan of records, both of which questions are of deep interest to historians and research workers.

The attention of the Sub-Committee on Bibliography was also drawn by the Belgian National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to the poor ink and paper that have been used almost universally in printing since the war, and to the danger of a large proportion of contemporary publications — particularly official publications — disappearing in a few years. The Committee referred this question to the International Institute in Paris for preliminary consideration.

Lastly, the Committee referred to the Sub-Committee on Bibliography the question of the unification of scientific nomenclature, which was laid before it by one of its South American members, M. de Castro. The latter laid stress on the fact that his proposal was designed to facilitate, in each country, the study of scientific works published in other countries.

The Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters set up by the Committee at its last session is to be entrusted with the preliminary examination of the question of the unification of archaeological terminology, which was raised in a note from M.A. Childe and submitted to the Committee by M. de Castro jointly with his own note on the unification of scientific nomenclature.

INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS.

The Sub-Committee on Inter-University Relations has continued to take an interest in the work of the International Students' Unions. The President of the *International Students' Federation* informed the Sub-Committee that the Federation had put into effect the scheme for an "International Student Card", of which other international associations will also be able to take advantage. Thus is fulfilled one of the Committee's recommendations designed to promote international exchanges of students and to provide them with facilities in travelling abroad.

The Sub-Committee also heard the views of the secretary of another international students' association, the *International Student Relief*, who proposed a Conference of representatives of all the international students' associations. The Sub-Committee agreed to convene this Conference, the primary object of which should be to organise the division of labour among the association on the most satisfactory lines.

The Sub-Committee also decided to study the question of assistance for young men engaged in post-graduate scientific research, particularly in the fields of history and literature.

The question of the international university, which was raised by the Spanish Government at the fourth Assembly, again came before the Sub-Committee in a somewhat different form. M. Barány, Professor in the University of Upsala, proposed, in a note submitted by M. Lorentz, that an international university should be established with the primary object of training diplomatists, editors, professors of law, etc. The Committee thought that the general idea of this scheme was of sufficient importance for the question to be more thoroughly considered. The International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation at Paris was requested to consider and report on the possibility of establishing one or two institutions on a more modest scale than was suggested in the proposal, or of taking appropriate steps with a view to educating a small body of persons in international questions.

PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL LOAN SUBMITTED BY THE
ROUMANIAN GOVERNMENT.

The Roumanian Government's proposal which was supported by the Polish Government and by the French National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, was explained to the Committee by M. N. Cantacuzène, the Roumanian representative. It was referred for preliminary examination to the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. In taking this decision, the Committee emphasised the importance — both for countries which might wish to share in the advantages of the proposal and for the progress of intellectual life in general — of the possibility of arranging, through the agency and under the supervision of the League of Nations, an international loan to supply the financial resources which are essential for the reorganisation or development of education and of civilisation as a whole.

MEASURES TO PREVENT INTERNATIONAL MISUNDERSTANDINGS.

At the end of the ordinary session of 1924, M. Lugones, one of the Latin American members of the Committee, had sketched an extensive programme for the reform of education with a view to promoting closer contact between nations. At the last session of the Committee, M. Bugro, acting as substitute for M. Lugones, explained and supported the latter's ideas, emphasising the progress which had been made in Latin America towards encouraging, through education, the formation of an international public opinion.

The members of the Committee listened with the keenest interest to this statement of the constructive ideas of the Latin American representatives. The Committee also carefully considered several proposals designed to promote closer contact between nations by eliminating the misunderstandings and errors which become fixed in the public mind — in many cases, through teaching and school text-books. The Committee expressed its sympathy with various definite proposals for the publication — with the help of authors belonging to different countries — of impartial treatises on history, geography and culture which would illustrate the part played by international co-operation in the development of civilisation.

The Committee also adopted a proposal made by M. Casares, acting as substitute for M. Torres y Quevedo, to the effect that the assistance of the National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation should be obtained in an attempt to delete or weaken passages in school text-books which might implant in the youth of a country the seeds of a fundamental lack of comprehension of other countries. Requests by one National Committee to another to make friendly representations privately in the hope of obtaining the correction of an error would only relate to questions of fact in connection with geography or culture and not to objective judgments on moral, political or religious subjects.

INSTITUTE OF INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

The French Parliament having voted the bill for the creation of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, the Committee, sitting under the Chairmanship of M. de Jouvenel (replacing M. Bergson), as the Governing Body of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, adopted texts embodying rules for the organisation of the Institute. These included rules of procedure, staff regulations and financial regulations, the last of these being subject to approval by the Council. It further appointed a Directing Board and the principal officials of the Institute. The Institute will be able to begin work this year.

The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation forms the Governing Body of the Institute, and when sitting as a Governing Body is presided over by a French member of the Committee. The Governing Body draws up the budget and determines the programme of work. It appoints the Directing Board, the Director and the Heads of Sections and Services.

The Directing Board is composed of five members of different nationalities and of the Chairman of the Governing Body. It will meet once every two months and supervise the execution of the programme established by the Governing Body, to whom it will submit a yearly report.

At its meeting of July 27th, the Governing Body appointed as members of the Directing Board M. Bergson (Chairman), M. de Reynold, Professor Lorentz, Professor Gilbert Murray, and Senator Ruffini, members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

The Institute has been divided into Sections corresponding to the principal spheres of activity of the Committee. It will also include Sections and Services of a general character. Thus, the questions dealt with by the Sub-Committee on Inter-University Relations will be studied by the Universities Section of the Institute, and questions which concern the Sub-Committee on Bibliography by the Section for Bibliography and Scientific Relations. The Legal Section will prepare the work of the Sub-Committee on Intellectual Property. There are two Sections of the Institute corresponding with the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters, which has been newly set up by the Committee, namely, the Section on Artistic Relations and the Section on Literary Relations. The Section for General Affairs will study the questions which do not belong or have not yet been assigned to other Sections. The Information Section will deal with the relations with the Press, and, when occasion arises, with certain questions relating to journalism or other intellectual activities of a similar character.

In the appointment of the higher staff, the Committee took into account the competence of the candidates presented and the necessity of ensuring as far as possible the international

character which the Assembly, the Council and the French Government desired to give to an Institute which will serve as an executive instrument of an international committee of the League.

The budget of the International Institute for the first year of normal working amounts to 2,100,000 French francs, of which 2,000,000 francs constitute a subsidy from the French State and 100,000 francs were given by Poland.

15.

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX.

INTERNATIONAL RELIEF BUREAUX.

The annual report of the International Relief Bureau, dated July 13th, 1925, has been presented to the Council of the League of Nations.

Founded in 1907 for the preparing of international conventions for reciprocal assistance, the Bureau undertook enquiries which led, in 1912, to the drawing up of a diplomatic protocol which has resulted in a certain number of conventions establishing international reciprocity in matters of relief. The Bureau was placed under the authority of the League of Nations by a resolution of the Council of June 27th, 1921.

Since the war, political and financial difficulties have postponed from year to year the convening of a new international relief congress, contemplated in 1915, and again, in 1925, to be held in London.

The Bureau, however, is continuing the collection and publication of information, in particular, information concerning the legislation on relief questions in the various countries. The Bureau is also taking steps to arrange systematically for the technical interpretation of the French term "assistance", and especially for its exact translation by experts into the various languages, since its interpretation varies in the different countries. The Bureau is also undertaking an enquiry into the existence and working of charitable institutions founded in the various countries by colonies of foreign residents.

16.

WORK OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN BUREAU.

In previous reports it has been the custom to devote a special note to the work of the Latin-American Bureau. The work done by the Bureau has continued this year to the full satisfaction of the Secretary-General, but inasmuch as, subject to the resolution passed by the last Assembly on the subject — a resolution which the Secretary-General is doing his utmost to execute as rapidly as possible — the Bureau has now become a regular and normal part of the working of the Secretariat, it is no longer considered necessary to describe it separately.

- V. Obscene Publications.
- VI. Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs.
- VII. Trade in Arms.
- VIII. Refugees.
- IX. The Permanent Court of International Justice.
- X. Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.
- XI. Arbitration Clauses in Commercial Matters.
- XII. Customs Formalities.
- XIII. Amendments to the Covenant of the League of Nations.
- XIV. Amendments to the Labour Part of the Treaties of Peace.

I. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONVENTIONS. ¹

(a)

1. Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the First International Labour Conference on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

AUSTRIA ²	June 12, 1924
BULGARIA	February 14, 1922
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24, 1921
GREECE	November 19, 1920
INDIA	July 14, 1921
ITALY	October 6, 1924
LATVIA	August 15, 1925
ROUMANIA	June 13, 1921

2. Convention concerning unemployment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the First International Labour Conference on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	February 20, 1924
AUSTRIA	June 12, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14, 1922
DENMARK	October 13, 1921
ESTHONIA	December 20, 1922
FINLAND	October 19, 1921
FRANCE	August 25, 1925
GERMANY	June 6, 1925
GREECE	November 19, 1920
INDIA	July 14, 1921
ITALY	April 10, 1923
JAPAN	November 23, 1922
NORWAY	November 23, 1921
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13, 1921
SPAIN	July 4, 1923
SWEDEN	September 27, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9, 1922

3. Convention concerning the employment of women before and after childbirth, adopted as a Draft Convention by the First International Labour Conference on November 29th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

BULGARIA	February 14, 1922
GREECE	November 19, 1920
ROUMANIA	June 13, 1921
SPAIN	July 4, 1923

¹ The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A. 10 (a), Annex. 1923) 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, Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy) and by all the States, bordering upon Austria, with whom the latter has economic relations (the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Poland, Switzerland, the Czechoslovak Republic and Hungary)"

4. Convention concerning the employment of women during the night, adopted as a Draft Convention by the First International Labour Conference, November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

UNION* OF SOUTH AFRICA	November 1, 1921
AUSTRIA	June 12, 1924
BELGIUM	July 12, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14, 1922
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24, 1921
ESTHONIA	December 20, 1922
FRANCE	May 14, 1925
GREECE	November 19, 1920
INDIA	July 14, 1921
ITALY	April 10, 1923
THE NETHERLANDS	September 4, 1922
ROUMANIA	June 13, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9, 1922

5. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment, adopted as a Draft Convention by the First International Labour Conference on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

BELGIUM	July 12, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14, 1922
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 24, 1921
DENMARK	January 4, 1923
ESTHONIA	December 20, 1922
GREECE	November 19, 1920
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9, 1922

6. Convention concerning the night work of young persons employed in industry, adopted as a Draft Convention by the First International Labour Conference on November 28th, 1919.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

AUSTRIA	June 12, 1924
BELGIUM	July 12, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14, 1921
BULGARIA	February 14, 1922
DENMARK	January 4, 1923
ESTHONIA	December 20, 1922
FRANCE	August 25, 1925
GREECE	November 19, 1920
INDIA	July 14, 1921
ITALY	April 10, 1923
THE NETHERLANDS	March 17, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	June 13, 1921
SWITZERLAND	October 9, 1922

(b)

7. Convention fixing the minimum age for admission of children to employment at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Second International Labour Conference on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

BELGIUM	February 4, 1925
GREAT BRITAIN	July 14, 1921
BULGARIA	March 16, 1923
DENMARK	May 12, 1924
ESTHONIA	March 3, 1923
JAPAN	June 7, 1924
THE NETHERLANDS	March 26, 1925
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	May 8, 1922
SPAIN	June 20, 1924
SWEDEN	September 27, 1921

8. Convention concerning unemployment indemnity in case of loss or foundering of the ship, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Second International Labour Conference on July 9th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
BELGIUM	February 4, 1925
BULGARIA	March 16, 1923
ESTHONIA	March 3, 1923
ITALY	September 8, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
SPAIN	June 20, 1924

9. Convention for establishing facilities for finding employment for seamen, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Second International Labour Conference on July 10th, 1920.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
AUSTRALIA	August 3, 1925
BELGIUM	February 4, 1925
BULGARIA	March 16, 1923
ESTHONIA	March 3, 1923
FINLAND	October 7, 1922
GERMANY	June 6, 1925
ITALY	September 8, 1924
JAPAN	November 23, 1922
NORWAY	November 23, 1921
POLAND	June 21, 1924
SWEDEN	September 27, 1921

(c)

10. Convention concerning the age for admission of children to employment in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 16th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
AUSTRIA	June 12, 1924
BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31, 1923
ESTHONIA	September 8, 1922
IRISH FREE STATE	May 26, 1925
ITALY	September 8, 1924
JAPAN	December 19, 1923
POLAND	June 21, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27, 1923

11. Convention concerning the rights of association and combination of agricultural workers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
AUSTRIA	June 12, 1924
GREAT BRITAIN	August 6, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31, 1923
ESTHONIA	September 8, 1922
FINLAND	June 19, 1923
GERMANY	June 6, 1925
INDIA	May 11, 1923
IRISH FREE STATE	June 17, 1924
ITALY	September 8, 1924
LATVIA	September 9, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27, 1923

12. Convention concerning workmen's compensation in agriculture, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 12th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

GREAT BRITAIN	August 6, 1923
BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
DENMARK	February 26, 1923
ESTHONIA	September 8, 1922
GERMANY	June 6, 1925
IRISH FREE STATE	June 17, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27, 1923

13. Convention concerning the use of white lead in painting, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 19th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

AUSTRIA	June 12, 1924
BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31, 1923
ESTHONIA	September 8, 1922
LATVIA	September 9, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
SPAIN	June 20, 1924
SWEDEN	November 27, 1923

14. Convention concerning the application of the weekly rest in industrial undertakings, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 17th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	August 31, 1923
ESTHONIA	November 29, 1923
FINLAND	June 19, 1923
INDIA	May 11, 1923
ITALY	September 8, 1924
LATVIA	September 9, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18, 1923
SPAIN	June 20, 1924

15. Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of young persons to employment as trimmers and stokers, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
DENMARK	May 12, 1924
ESTHONIA	September 8, 1922
INDIA	November 20, 1922
ITALY	September 8, 1924
LATVIA	September 9, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18, 1924
SPAIN	June 20, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14, 1925.

16. Convention concerning the compulsory medical examination of children and young persons employed at sea, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Third International Labour Conference on November 11th, 1921.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :

Date of Registration :

BULGARIA	March 6, 1925
ESTHONIA	September 8, 1922
INDIA	November 20, 1922

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
ITALY	September 8, 1924
JAPAN	June 7, 1924
LATVIA	September 9, 1924
POLAND	June 21, 1924
ROUMANIA	August 18, 1923
SPAIN	June 20, 1924
SWEDEN	July 14, 1925

(d)

17. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for accidents, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Seventh International Labour Conference on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
--	------------------------

18. Convention concerning workmen's compensation for occupational diseases, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Seventh International Labour Conference on June 10th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
--	------------------------

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 Seventh International Labour Conference on June 5th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
--	------------------------

20. Convention concerning night work in bakeries, adopted as a Draft Convention by the Seventh International Labour Conference on June 8th, 1925.

This Convention has been ratified by and is in force between :	Date of Registration :
--	------------------------

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON FREEDOM OF TRANSIT.¹

(Barcelona, April 20, 1921.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (October 8, 1921)	
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (November 15, 1923)	
BELGIUM		
BOLIVIA		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE, including New- FOUNDLAND (August 2, 1922)	Federated Malay States (States of Perak, Selangor, Negri, Sembilan and Pahang) (Au- gust 22, 1923). Non-Federa- ted Malay States (States of Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis Kelantan and Trengganu) (August 22, 1923)
		PALESTINE (British Mandate) (January 28, 1924)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (July 11, 1922)	
CHILE		
CHINA		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (October 29, 1923)	
—	—	FREE CITY OF DANZIG (April 13, 1925)
DENMARK	DENMARK (November 13, 1922)	
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (June 6, 1925)	
FINLAND	FINLAND (January 29, 1923)	
FRANCE	FRANCE (September 19, 1924)	
—	—	GERMANY (April 9, 1924)
GREECE	GREECE (February 18, 1924)	
GUATEMALA		
INDIA	INDIA (August 2, 1922)	
ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)	
JAPAN	JAPAN (February 20, 1924)	
LATVIA	LATVIA (September 29, 1923)	
LITHUANIA		
LUXEMBURG		
THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 17, 1924)	
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 2, 1922)	
NORWAY	NORWAY (September 4, 1923)	
PANAMA		
PERSIA		
—	—	PERU (September 15, 1924) <i>ad referendum</i>
POLAND	POLAND (October 8, 1924)	
PORTUGAL		
ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)	
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES		
—	—	SIAM (November 29, 1922)
SPAIN		
SWEDEN	SWEDEN (January 19, 1925)	
SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (July 14, 1924)	
URUGUAY		

2. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.²

(Barcelona, April 20, 1921.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (October 8, 1921)	
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (November 15, 1923)	
BELGIUM		
BOLIVIA		

¹ This Convention came into force on October 1, 1921, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See League of Nations *Treaty Series*, Vol. VII, p. 11; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XIX, p. 278; Vol. XXIV, p. 154; and Vol. XXXI, p. 244.

² This Convention came into force on October 1, 1921, ninety days after it had been ratified by five Powers. See League of Nations *Treaty Series*, Vol. VII, p. 35; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 306; Vol. XIX, p. 280; and Vol. XXIV, p. 156.

2. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN (*continued*).

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE, including NEW- FOUNDLAND (August 2, 1922)	Federated Malay States (States of Perak, Selangor, Negri, Sembilan and Pahang) (Au- gust 22, 1923). Non-Federa- red Malay States (States of Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Per- lis Kelantan and Trengganu) (August 22, 1923) PALESTINE (British Mandate) (January 28, 1924)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (July 11, 1922)	
CHILE		
CHINA		
—	—	COLOMBIA ¹ (April 7, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 8, 1924)	
DENMARK	DENMARK (November 13, 1922)	
ESTHONIA		
FINLAND	FINLAND (January 29, 1923)	
FRANCE		
GREECE		
GUATEMALA		
INDIA	INDIA (August 2, 1922)	
ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)	
LITHUANIA		
LUXEMBURG		
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 2, 1922)	
NORWAY	NORWAY (September 4, 1923)	
PANAMA		
—	—	PERU (September 15, 1924) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
POLAND		
PORTUGAL		
—	—	ROUMANIA (June 19, 1923, rati- fied May 9, 1924)
—	—	SIAM (November 29, 1922)
SPAIN		
SWEDEN		
URUGUAY		

3. ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN.²

(*Barcelona, April 20, 1921.*)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (October 8, 1921)	
—	—	AUSTRIA (April 7, 1923, ratified November 15, 1923)
BELGIUM		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE, including NEW- FOUNDLAND (August 2, 1922)	Nyasaland Protectorate and Tanganyika Territory (Au- gust 2, 1922) 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)

¹ Subject to ratification.

² The Convention being in force, this Protocol became operative after it had been ratified by two Powers. See League of Nations *Treaty Series*, Vol. VII, p. 65; Vol. XI, p. 406; Vol. XV, p. 308; Vol. XIX, p. 280, and Vol. XXIV, p. 156.

3. ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON THE REGIME OF NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN (*continued*).

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE, including NEW-FOUNDLAND (August 2, 1922)	Gibraltar Malta 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 Territory 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 2, 1922) Federated Malay States (States of Perak, Selangor, Negri, Sembilan and Pahang) (August 22, 1923) Non-Federated Malay States (States of Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis Kelantan and Terengganu) (August 22, 1923) PALESTINE (British Mandate) (January 28, 1924)
CHILE		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 8, 1924)	
DENMARK	DENMARK (November 13, 1922)	
FINLAND	FINLAND (January 29, 1923)	
GREECE		
INDIA	INDIA (August 2, 1922)	
NORWAY	NORWAY (September 4, 1923)	
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 2, 1922)	
—	—	PERU (September 15, 1924) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
PORTUGAL	—	ROUMANIA (June 19, 1923, ratified May 9, 1924)
—	—	SIAM (November 29, 1922)
SPAIN		
SWEDEN		

4. DECLARATION RECOGNISING THE RIGHT TO A FLAG OF STATES HAVING NO SEA-COAST¹
(Barcelona, April 20, 1921.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
—	—	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (October 31, 1922)
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (October 8, 1921)	
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (July 10, 1924)	AUSTRALIA (October 31, 1922),
—	—	
BELGIUM		
BOLIVIA		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE, including NEWFOUNDLAND (October 9, 1922)	
	BULGARIA (July 11, 1922)	CANADA (October 31, 1922)
BULGARIA	—	
—	—	
CHILE		
CHINA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 8, 1924)	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	DENMARK (November 13, 1922)	
	—	FINLAND (September 22, 1922)
DENMARK	—	
ESTHONIA	—	
—	—	
FRANCE ²		
GREECE		
GUATEMALA		
INDIA	INDIA (October 9, 1922)	
ITALY		
JAPAN	JAPAN (February 20, 1924)	
LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)	
LITHUANIA		
THE NETHERLANDS ²		
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (October 9, 1922)	
NORWAY	NORWAY (September 4, 1923)	
PANAMA		
PERSIA	—	PERU (September 15, 1924) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
—	—	
POLAND	POLAND (December 20, 1924)	
PORTUGAL	—	ROUMANIA (February 22, 1923)
—	—	
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES	—	SIAM (November 29, 1922)
—	—	
SPAIN		
SWEDEN	SWEDEN (January 19, 1925)	
SWITZERLAND ²		
URUGUAY		

5. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS
AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE³.

(Geneva, December 9, 1923.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
AUSTRIA		
BELGIUM		
BRAZIL		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29, 1924)	NEWFOUNDLAND (April 28, 1925) SOUTHERN RHODESIA (April 28, 1925)
BULGARIA		
CHILE		
—	—	CHINA ⁴ (January 21, 1925)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		

¹ See League of Nations *Treaty Series*, Vol. VII, p. 73 ; Vol. XI, p. 410 ; Vol. XV, p. 308 ; Vol. XIX, p. 280 ; Vol. XXIV, p. 158 ; and Vol. XXXI, p. 244.

² Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

³ The present Convention will not come into force until it has been ratified in the name of five States. 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 fifth ratification (Article 6). The Protocol will come into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates.

⁴ This adhesion is given for the Convention only and subject to ratification.

5. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF RAILWAYS AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE (*continued*).

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
FREE CITY OF DANZIG		
DENMARK		
ESTHONIA		
FINLAND		
FRANCE		
GERMANY		
GREECE		
HUNGARY		
INDIA	INDIA (April 1, 1925)	
ITALY		
JAPAN		
LATVIA		
LITHUANIA		
THE NETHERLANDS		
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (April 1, 1925)	
NORWAY		
—	—	PANAMA (July 31, 1925) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
POLAND		
PORTUGAL		
ROUMANIA		
SALVADOR		
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES		
SIAM	SIAM (January 9, 1925)	
SPAIN		
SWEDEN		
SWITZERLAND		
URUGUAY		

6. CONVENTION AND STATUTE ON THE INTERNATIONAL REGIME OF MARITIME PORTS AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE¹.

(*Geneva, December 9, 1923.*)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
—	—	AUSTRALIA (June 29, 1925)
BELGIUM		
BRAZIL		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29, 1924)	NEWFOUNDLAND (April 28, 1925) SOUTHERN RHODESIA (April 28, 1925)
BULGARIA		
CHILE		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		
DENMARK		
ESTHONIA		
—	—	FRANCE (December 1, 1924)
GERMANY		
GREECE		
HUNGARY		
INDIA	INDIA (April 1, 1925)	
ITALY		
JAPAN		
LITHUANIA		
THE NETHERLANDS		
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (April 1, 1925)	
NORWAY		
—	—	PANAMA (July 31, 1925) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
SALVADOR		
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES		
SIAM	SIAM (January 9, 1925)	
SPAIN		
SWEDEN		
SWITZERLAND		
URUGUAY		

¹ The present Convention will not come into force until it has been ratified in the name of five States. 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 fifth ratification (Article 6). The Protocol will come into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates.

7. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE TRANSMISSION IN TRANSIT OF ELECTRIC POWER AND
 PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE ¹.

(Geneva, December 9, 1923.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
AUSTRIA BELGIUM BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1, 1925)	NEWFOUNDLAND (April 28, 1925) SOUTHERN RHODESIA (April 28, 1925)
BULGARIA CHILE CZECHOSLOVAKIA FREE CITY OF DANZIG DENMARK FRANCE GREECE HUNGARY ITALY LITHUANIA NEW ZEALAND POLAND KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES SPAIN URUGUAY	NEW ZEALAND (April 1, 1925)	

8. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYDRAULIC POWER AFFECTING MORE
 THAN ONE STATE AND PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE ².

(Geneva, December 9, 1923.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
AUSTRIA BELGIUM BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (April 1, 1925)	NEWFOUNDLAND (April 28, 1925) SOUTHERN RHODESIA (April 28, 1925)
BULGARIA CHILE FREE CITY OF DANZIG DENMARK FRANCE GREECE HUNGARY ITALY LITHUANIA NEW ZEALAND POLAND KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES SIAM URUGUAY	NEW ZEALAND (April 1, 1925) SIAM (January 9, 1925)	

¹ "The present Convention will not come into force until it has been ratified in the name of three States. 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 third ratification" (Article 18). The Protocol will come into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates.

² "The present Convention will not come into force until it has been ratified in the name of three States. 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 third ratification" (Article 18). The Protocol will come into force on the same conditions as the Convention to which it relates.

This Convention came into force on June 30, 1925.

III. PROTECTION OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC MINORITIES ¹.

I. PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF GREEK MINORITIES IN BULGARIA ²,
Geneva, September 29, 1924.

II. PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF BULGARIAN MINORITIES IN GREECE ³,
Geneva, September 29, 1924.

This proposal has been rejected by the National Hellenic Assembly on February 3, 1925.

IV. TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN ⁴.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN ⁵.
(Geneva, September 30th, 1921.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (June 28, 1922)	
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (October 13, 1924)	
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (June 28, 1922)	
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (August 9, 1922)	
BELGIUM	BELGIUM (June 15, 1922)	
BRAZIL		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (June 28, 1922)	Bahamas, Trinidad, Kenya, Nyassaland, Ceylon, Hong- Kong, Straits Settlements, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Southern Rhodesia, Barbados, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vin- cent, Seychelles, Northern Rhodesia, British Honduras (September 18, 1922) British Guiana, Fiji (October 24, 1922) Leeward Islands, Jamaica, Mau- ritius (March 7, 1924) Falkland Islands (May 8, 1924) Gold Coast Colony (July 3, 1924) Iraq (May 15, 1925)
		BULGARIA (April 29, 1925)
CANADA	CANADA (June 28, 1922)	
CHILE		
CHINA		
COLOMBIA		
COSTA RICA		
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	

¹ The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A. 10 (a). Annex, 1923) contains, moreover, complete details concerning :

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.
4. Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Turkey, of July 24th, 1923.
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.
9. Germano-Polish Convention relating to Upper Silesia, of May 15th, 1922.
10. Declaration by Albania, of October 2nd, 1921.
11. Declaration by Finland as to the Aland Islands, of June 26th, 1921.
12. Declaration by Latvia, of July 7th, 1923.
13. Convention between Bulgaria and Greece respecting Reciprocal Emigration, Neuilly-sur-Seine, November 27th, 1919.
14. Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, of January 30th, 1923.

The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1924 (A. 8 (a). Annex, 1924) contains, moreover, complete details concerning :

1. Declaration concerning the Protection of Minorities in Lithuania, Geneva, May 12, 1923.
2. Convention between Poland and the Free City of Danzig, signed at Paris, November 9, 1920.

² See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXIX, p. 117.

³ See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, Vol. XXIX, p. 123.

⁴ The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1923 (A. 10 (a). Annex, 1923) contains, moreover, complete 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.

⁵ 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. 310 ; Vol. XIX, p. 282 ; Vol. XXIV, p. 162 and Vol. XXVII, p. 418.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 29, 1923)	DENMARK ¹ (March 12, 1923)
—	—	
ESTHONIA	GERMANY (July 8, 1924)	
GERMANY	GREECE (April 9, 1923)	
GREECE	HUNGARY (April 25, 1925)	
HUNGARY	INDIA (June 28, 1922)	
INDIA	ITALY (June 30, 1924)	Italian Colonies (July 27, 1923)
ITALY		
JAPAN	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)	
LATVIA		
LITHUANIA	THE NETHERLANDS (September 19, 1923)	
THE NETHERLANDS	NORWAY (August 16, 1922)	
NORWAY	NEW ZEALAND (June 28, 1922)	
NEW ZEALAND	—	PANAMA ¹ (September 6, 1922)
—	—	
PERSIA	—	PERU (September 15, 1924) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
—	—	
POLAND AND FREE CITY OF DANZIG	POLAND AND FREE CITY OF DANZIG (October 8, 1924)	
PORTUGAL	PORTUGAL (December 1, 1923)	
ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)	
SIAM	SIAM (July 13, 1922)	
—	—	SPAIN (May 12, 1924). (This adhesion does not include the Spanish possessions in Africa nor the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.)
SWEDEN	SWEDEN (June 9, 1925)	
SWITZERLAND	—	URUGUAY (October 21, 1924)
—	—	

¹ Subject to ratification.

V. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS.

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

(Geneva, September 12, 1923.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (October 13, 1924)	
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (January 12, 1925)	
BELGIUM		
BRAZIL		
BRITISH EMPIRE		
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (July 1, 1924)	
CHINA		
COLOMBIA		
COSTA RICA		
CUBA		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		
FREE CITY OF DANZIG		
DENMARK		
—		EGYPT (October 29, 1924)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 29, 1925)	
FRANCE		
GERMANY	GERMANY (May 11, 1925)	
GREECE		
HAITI		
HONDURAS		
HUNGARY		
INDIA		
IRISH FREE STATE		
ITALY	ITALY (July 8, 1924)	
JAPAN		
LATVIA		
LITHUANIA		
LUXEMBURG		
MONACO	MONACO (May 11, 1925)	
THE NETHERLANDS		
NEW ZEALAND		
PANAMA		
PERSIA		
—		PERU (September 15, 1924) (<i>ad referendum</i>)
POLAND		
PORTUGAL		
ROUMANIA		
SALVADOR		
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES		
SIAM	SIAM (July 28, 1924)	
SPAIN	SPAIN (December 19, 1924)	
SWITZERLAND		
TURKEY		
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, including South-West Africa (Mandate)		
URUGUAY		

¹ The present Convention came into force on August 7th, 1924, viz., on the thirtieth day following the one on which the deposit of the second ratification took place (Article 11). See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. XXVII, p. 213, and Vol. XXXI, p. 260.

VI. TRAFFIC IN OPIUM AND OTHER DANGEROUS DRUGS.

INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONVENTION OF JANUARY 23, 1912¹.

Schedule 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
GERMANY	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Dec. 15, 1913	Feb. 11, 1915
ARGENTINE	—	Oct. 17, 1912	—	—
AUSTRIA	—	—	July 16, 1920*	July 16, 1920*
BELGIUM ²	—	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*
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 ³	—	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*
DENMARK ⁴	—	Dec. 17, 1912	July 10, 1913	Oct. 21, 1921
FREE CITY OF DANZIG	—	Nov. 8, 1921	April 18, 1922	—
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	—	Nov. 12, 1912	June 7, 1923	—
ECUADOR	—	July 2, 1912	Feb. 25, 1915	August 23, 1923
SPAIN	—	Oct. 23, 1912	Jan. 25, 1919	Feb. 11, 1921
ESTHONIA	—	Jan. 9, 1923	April 20, 1923	—
FINLAND	—	April 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec. 1, 1922
FRANCE ⁵	Jan. 23, 1912	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
GREAT BRITAIN ⁶	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 15, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920*
GREECE	—	—	March 30, 1920*	March 30, 1920*
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*
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	—
LIBERIA	—	—	June 30, 1920*	June 30, 1920*

¹ See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations : Vol. VIII, p. 187 ; Vol. XI, p. 414 ; Vol. XV, p. 310 ; Vol. XIX, p. 282 ; Vol. XXIV, p. 162 and Vol. XXXI, p. 244.

² Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards Belgian Congo.

³ Subject to the approval of the Colombian Parliament.

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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 21, 1924.

⁶ 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, Southern Borneo, Nyassaland, 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.

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)
LITHUANIA	—	April 7, 1923	—	—
LUXEMBURG	—	June 18, 1912	Aug. 21, 1922	—
MEXICO	—	May 15, 1912	April 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
MONACO	—	May 1, 1923	Feb. 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
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	—	—
THE NETHERLANDS	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 28, 1914	Feb. 11, 1915
PERU	—	July 24, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
PERSIA ¹	Jan. 23, 1912	—	—	—
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	—
SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, (KINGDOM OF THE)	—	—	Feb. 10, 1920*	Feb. 10, 1920*
SIAM ²	Jan. 23, 1912	—	July 10, 1913	Jan. 10, 1920*
SWEDEN ³	—	Aug. 27, 1913	April 17, 1914	Jan. 13, 1921
SWITZERLAND ⁴	—	Dec. 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1925	Jan. 15, 1925
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	—	—	Jan. 10, 1920*	Jan. 10, 1920*
URUGUAY	—	March 9, 1914	April 3, 1916	Jan. 10, 1920*
VENEZUELA	—	Sept. 10, 1912	Oct. 28, 1913	—

FIRST OPIUM CONFERENCE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.
AGREEMENT, PROTOCOL AND FINAL ACT⁵.

(Signed at Geneva. February 11, 1925.)

Signatures	Ratifications	Signatures	Ratifications
BRITISH EMPIRE		THE NETHERLANDS	
INDIA		PORTUGAL	
FRANCE		SIAM	
JAPAN			

SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.
CONVENTION⁶.

(Geneva, February 11, 1925.)

Signatures	Ratifications	Signatures	Ratifications
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA		LATVIA	
ALBANIA		LUXEMBURG	
AUSTRALIA		THE NETHERLANDS	
BELGIUM		NICARAGUA	
BRAZIL		PERSIA	
BULGARIA		POLAND	
BRITISH EMPIRE		PORTUGAL	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES	
FRANCE		SIAM	
GERMANY		SPAIN	
GREECE		SUDAN	
INDIA		SWITZERLAND	
IRISH FREE STATE		URUGUAY	
JAPAN			

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 shall not come into force until it has been ratified by two Powers. 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 second ratification. (Article XIV.)

⁶ The present Convention shall not come into force until it has been ratified by ten Powers, including seven of the States by which the Central Board is to be appointed in pursuance of Article 19, of which at least two must be permanent Members of the Council of the League. 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 of the necessary ratifications. (Article 36.)

SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (*continued*).

• PROTOCOL.

(Geneva, February 19, 1925.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA		LATVIA	
ALBANIA		LUXEMBURG	
AUSTRALIA		NICARAGUA	
BRITISH EMPIRE		THE NETHERLANDS	
BULGARIA		PERSIA	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		PORTUGAL	
GERMANY		KINGDOM OF THE	
GREECE		SERBS, CROATS	
INDIA		AND SLOVENES.	
JAPAN		SIAM	
		SUDAN	

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

CONVENTION FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND IN IMPLEMENTS OF WAR¹.

(Geneva, June 17, 1925.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
ABYSSINIA		HUNGARY	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		—	
AUSTRIA		INDIA	
—		ITALY	
BRAZIL		JAPAN	
—		LATVIA	
BRITISH EMPIRE		—	
—		LUXEMBURG	
—		POLAND	
CHILE		—	
—		ROUMANIA	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		SALVADOR	
—		—	
ESTHONIA		KINGDOM OF THE	
FINLAND		SERBS, CROATS	
FRANCE		AND SLOVENES	
GERMANY		SPAIN	

PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE.

(Geneva, June 17, 1925.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
ABYSSINIA		ITALY	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		JAPAN	
AUSTRIA		LATVIA	
BRAZIL		—	
BRITISH EMPIRE		LUXEMBURG	
—		NICARAGUA	
CHILE		—	
—		THE NETHERLANDS	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		POLAND	
DENMARK		PORTUGAL	
—		ROUMANIA	
ESTHONIA		SALVADOR	
FINLAND		—	
FRANCE		KINGDOM OF THE	
GERMANY		SERBS, CROATS	
		AND SLOVENES	

¹ A first proces-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 proces-verbal by the Government of the French Republic to all signatory Powers (Article 41).

• PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE (continued).

• (Geneva, June 17, 1925.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
GREECE		SPAIN	
HUNGARY		—	
—		SWITZERLAND	
INDIA		TURKEY	
		URUGUAY	

DECLARATION REGARDING THE TERRITORY OF IFNI.

(Geneva, June 17, 1925.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
—		INDIA	
—		ITALY	
—		JAPAN	
ABYSSINIA		LATVIA	
AUSTRIA		—	
—		LUXEMBURG	
BRAZIL		—	
—		POLAND	
BRITISH EMPIRE		—	
—		ROUMANIA	
CHILE		SALVADOR	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		—	
ESTHONIA		KINGDOM OF THE	
—		SERBS, CROATS	
FINLAND		AND SLOVENES	
FRANCE		SPAIN	
—			

• PROTOCOL FOR THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE IN WAR OF ASPHYXIATING, POISONOUS OR OTHER GASES, AND OF BACTERIOLOGICAL METHODS OF WARFARE¹.

(Geneva, June 17, 1925.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
ABYSSINIA		—	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		JAPAN	
AUSTRIA		—	
—		LATVIA	
BRAZIL		LUXEMBURG	
—		THE NETHERLANDS	
BRITISH EMPIRE		—	
—		NICARAGUA	
CANADA		—	
CHILE		POLAND	
—		PORTUGAL	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		ROUMANIA	
—		SALVADOR	
DENMARK		—	
ESTHONIA		—	
—		KINGDOM OF THE	
FINLAND		SERBS, CROATS	
FRANCE		AND SLOVENES	
GERMANY		SPAIN	
—		SWITZERLAND	
GREECE		—	
INDIA		TURKEY	
ITALY		URUGUAY	

VIII. REFUGEES².

I. ADDITIONAL ACT TO THE PROTOCOL OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1923, RELATING TO THE SETTLEMENT OF GREEK REFUGEES, SIGNED AT GENEVA, SEPTEMBER 19, 1924³.

Signed by GREECE and ratified December 4, 1924.

¹ The present Protocol will come into force for each signatory Power as from the date of deposit of its ratification, and, from that moment, each Power will be bound as regards other Powers which have already deposited their ratifications.

² The Annex to the Supplementary Report for 1924 (A. 8 (a). 1924. Annex) contains, moreover, complete details concerning:

- (1) Arrangement with regard to the Issue of Certificates of Identity to Russian Refugees;
- (2) Protocol relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this purpose of a Refugee Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29, 1923;
- (3) Declaration relating to the Settlement of Refugees in Greece and the Creation for this purpose of a Refugee Settlement Commission, signed at Geneva, September 29, 1923.

³ See League of Nations *Treaty Series*, Vol. XXX, p. 413.

II. DECLARATION RELATING TO THE MODIFICATIONS MADE TO THE PROTOCOL OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1923, WITH REGARD TO THE SETTLEMENT OF REFUGEES IN GREECE, BY THE ADDITIONAL ACT OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1924. GENEVA, SEPTEMBER 25, 1924¹.

Signed by GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE and ITALY.

IX. PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE².

1. PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE, DATED DECEMBER 16, 1920.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 4, 1921)	ITALY	ITALY (June 20, 1921)
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (July 13, 1921)	JAPAN	JAPAN (November 16, 1921)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (August 4, 1921)	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (July 23, 1921)	LIBERIA	—
BELGIUM	BELGIUM (August 29, 1921)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (May 16, 1922)
BOLIVIA	—	LUXEMBURG	—
BRAZIL	BRAZIL (November 1, 1921)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (August 6, 1921)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 4, 1921)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 4, 1921)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (August 12, 1921)	NORWAY	NORWAY (August 20, 1921)
CANADA	CANADA (August 4, 1921)	PANAMA	—
CHILE	—	PARAGUAY	—
CHINA	CHINA (May 13, 1922)	PERSIA	—
COLOMBIA	—	POLAND	POLAND (August 26, 1921)
COSTA RICA	—	PORTUGAL	PORTUGAL (October 8, 1921)
CUBA	CUBA (January 12, 1922)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (August 8, 1921)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 2, 1921)	SALVADOR	—
DENMARK	DENMARK (June 13, 1921)	KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES	KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES (August 12, 1921)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	—	SIAM	SIAM (February 27, 1922)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (May 2, 1923)	SPAIN	SPAIN (August 30, 1921)
FINLAND	FINLAND (April 6, 1922)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (February 21, 1921)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 7, 1921)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (July 25, 1921)
GREECE	GREECE (October 3, 1921)	URUGUAY	URUGUAY (September 27, 1921)
HAITI	HAITI (September 7, 1921)	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (December 2, 1921)
HUNGARY	—		
INDIA	INDIA (August 4, 1921)		

2. THE OPTIONAL CLAUSE RECOGNISING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION AS DESCRIBED IN ARTICLE 36 OF THE STATUTE³.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
AUSTRIA ⁴	AUSTRIA (March 14, 1922)	LATVIA	—
BRAZIL ⁴	BRAZIL ⁵ (November 1, 1921)	LIBERIA	—
BULGARIA ⁴	BULGARIA (August 12, 1921)	LITHUANIA ⁴	LITHUANIA (May 16, 1922)
CHINA ⁴	CHINA (May 13, 1922)	LUXEMBURG ⁴	—
COSTA RICA	—	THE NETHERLANDS ⁴	THE NETHERLANDS (August 6, 1921)
DENMARK ⁴	DENMARK (June 13, 1921)	NORWAY ⁴	NORWAY (October 3, 1921)
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	—	PANAMA	—
—	ESTHONIA (May 2, 1923)	PORTUGAL	PORTUGAL (October 8, 1921)
FINLAND ⁴	FINLAND (April 6, 1922)	SALVADOR	—
FRANCE	—	SWEDEN ⁴	SWEDEN ⁶
HAITI	HAITI ⁶	SWITZERLAND ⁴	SWITZERLAND (July 25, 1921)
		URUGUAY	URUGUAY (September 27, 1921)

¹ See League of Nations *Treaty Series*, Vol. XXX, p. 421.

² See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, Vol. VI, p. 379; Vol. XI, p. 404; Vol. XV, p. 304; Vol. XXIV, p. 152, and Vol. XXVII, p. 416.

³ The jurisdiction of the Court is recognised as compulsory by the States signatories of the Optional Clause *ipso facto* and without a special agreement in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity.

⁴ This indicates that the Optional Clause has been accepted for a period of five years.

⁵ Subject to acceptance also by at least two of the Powers permanently represented on the Council.

⁶ Members having signed the Optional Clause or having adhered thereto without any reservation regarding ratification.

X. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.

PROTOCOL FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.¹

Annexed to the resolution adopted by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations on October 2nd, 1924.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
ALBANIA		HAITI	
BELGIUM		LATVIA	
BRAZIL		PARAGUAY	
BULGARIA		POLAND	
CHILE		PORTUGAL	
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		KINGDOM OF THE	
ESTHONIA		SERBS, CROATS	
FINLAND		AND SLOVENES	
FRANCE		SPAIN	
GREECE		URUGUAY	

XI. ARBITRATION CLAUSES IN COMMERCIAL MATTERS.

PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES².

(Geneva, September 24th, 1923.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
—	ALBANIA (August 29, 1924)	
AUSTRIA	BELGIUM (September 23, 1924)	
BELGIUM	BRITISH EMPIRE (Great Britain	NEWFOUNDLAND
BRAZIL	and Northern Ireland) (Sep-	(June 22, 1925)
BRITISH EMPIRE	tember 27, 1924)	Southern Rhodesia
		(December 18, 1924)
CHILE	DENMARK (April 6, 1925)	
DENMARK	FINLAND (July 10, 1924)	
FINLAND		
FRANCE	GERMANY (November 5, 1924)	
GERMANY	ITALY (July 28, 1924)	
GREECE		
ITALY		
JAPAN		
LATVIA		
LITHUANIA		
MONACO		
THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (August 6, 1925)	
NETHERLANDS INDIES,		
SURINAM AND CURAÇAO		
NORWAY		
PANAMA		
PARAGUAY		
ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (March 12, 1925)	
SALVADOR		
SIAM		
SPAIN		
SWITZERLAND		
URUGUAY		

¹ So soon as the majority of the permanent Members of the Council and ten other Members of the League have deposited or effected their ratifications, a proces-verbal to that effect shall be drawn up by the Secretariat.

After the said proces-verbal has been drawn up, the Protocol shall come into force as soon as the plan for the reduction of armaments has been adopted by the Conference provided for in Article 17 (Article 21).

² The present Protocol came into force on July 28, 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.

XII. CUSTOMS FORMALITIES.

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

(Geneva, November 3rd, 1923.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Adhesions</i>
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (March 13, 1925)	
AUSTRIA	AUSTRIA (September 11, 1924)	
BELGIUM	BELGIUM (October 4, 1924)	
BRAZIL		
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 29, 1924)	
BULGARIA		
CHILE		
CHINA		
CZECHOSLOVAKIA		
DENMARK	DENMARK (May 17, 1924)	
EGYPT	EGYPT (March 23, 1925)	
FINLAND		
FRANCE		
GERMANY	GERMANY (August 1, 1925)	
GREECE		
HUNGARY		
INDIA	INDIA (March 13, 1925)	
ITALY	ITALY (June 13, 1924)	
JAPAN		
LITHUANIA		
LUXEMBURG		
FRENCH PROTECTORATE OF MOROCCO		
THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (NETHERLANDS	
NETHERLANDS INDIES, SURINAM AND CURAÇAO	INDIES, SURINAM AND CURAÇAO) (May 30, 1925)	
NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 29, 1924)	
NORWAY		
PARAGUAY		
—	—	PERSIA (May 8, 1925)
POLAND		
PORTUGAL		
ROUMANIA		
KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES		
SIAM	SIAM (May 19, 1925)	
SPAIN		
SWEDEN		
SWITZERLAND		
REGENCE OF TUNIS (FRENCH PROTECTORATE)		
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 29, 1924)	
URUGUAY		

¹ The present Convention came into force on November 27, 1924, nine ty 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.

XIII. AMENDMENTS TO THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE ¹.

(Geneva, October 5th, 1921.)

1. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 4.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 3, 1923)	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (January 3, 1924)	LIBERIA	LIBERIA (May 1, 1924)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (February 3, 1923)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BOLIVIA	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (February 3, 1923)
BULGARIA	BRITISH EMPIRE (February 3, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CANADA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	PANAMA	—
CHINA	CANADA (February 3, 1923)	PARAGUAY	—
COLOMBIA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PERSIA	—
COSTA RICA	—	POLAND	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	ROUMANIA	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	—	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	—	SALVADOR (September 3, 1924)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SIAM	SIAM (December 4, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 27, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FRANCE	—	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (April 9, 1923)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	—	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)	VENEZUELA	—
INDIA	INDIA (February 3, 1923)	—	—
ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)	—	—
JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)	—	—

2. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6 (addition to the Annex to the Covenant) ².

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	—	ITALY	—
AUSTRALIA	—	JAPAN	—
BOLIVIA	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LATVIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	—	LIBERIA	—
BULGARIA	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	NEW ZEALAND	—
CANADA	—	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	—	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	—	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (December 4, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FRANCE	—	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	—	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)
HAITI	HAITI	—	—

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."

² At the request of the Third Assembly, the Council has notified the Members of the League that it is no longer necessary to ratify this amendment.

3. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6 (*last paragraph*)¹.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
ALBANIA	ALBANIA (January 3, 1924)	LATVIA	LATVIA (September 29, 1923)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA	LIBERIA	LIBERIA (May 1, 1924)
—	(November 23, 1922)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BOLIVIA	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS
—	—		(April 4, 1923)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND
	BRITISH EMPIRE		(November 23, 1922)
	(November 23, 1922)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	PANAMA	—
CANADA	CANADA (November 23, 1922)	PARAGUAY	—
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PERSIA	—
COLOMBIA	—	POLAND	POLAND (December 15,
COSTA RICA	—		1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA		PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
	(September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)		(September 5, 1923)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	—	SALVADOR
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)		(September 3, 1924)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
GREECE	GREECE (April 9, 1923)	SPAIN	SPAIN (January 31, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND
INDIA	INDIA (November 23, 1922)		(March 29, 1923)
ITALY	ITALY (June 13, 1924)	UNION OF	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)	SOUTH AFRICA	(November 23, 1922)
		—	URUGUAY
			(January 12, 1924)
		VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA
			(March 24, 1925)

4. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 6 (*adding a new paragraph*)².

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
ALBANIA	—	ITALY	—
AUSTRALIA	—	JAPAN	—
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LATVIA	—
BOLIVIA	—	LIBERIA	—
—	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	LITHUANIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	—	THE NETHERLANDS	—
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NEW ZEALAND	—
CANADA	—	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	—	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	PERSIA	—
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	—	POLAND	POLAND
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)		(December 15, 1922)
ESTHONIA	—	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SIAM	SIAM (December 4, 1922)
FRANCE	—	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
GREECE	—	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND
HAITI	HAITI		(March 29, 1923)
		VENEZUELA	—

¹ This amendment came into force August 13th, 1924, in accordance with Article 26 of the Covenant. See *League of Nations Treaty Series*, Vol. XXVII, p. 349, and Vol. XXXI, p. 260.

² At the request of the Third Assembly, the Council has notified the Members of the League that it is no longer necessary to ratify this amendment.

5. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 12¹.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (July 5, 1923)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (July 5, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
BOLIVIA	—	LIBERIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (July 5, 1923)	—	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
—	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	—	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (July 5, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (July 5, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	—	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
—	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SPAIN	SPAIN (September 26, 1924)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (August 20, 1923)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		
INDIA	INDIA (July 5, 1923)		

6. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 13¹.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 3, 1923)	HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)
ALBANIA	—	INDIA	INDIA (February 3, 1923)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (February 3, 1923)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
—	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	LIBERIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (February 3, 1923)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
—	—	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (February 3, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (February 3, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	PERSIA	—
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	POLAND	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
—	—	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SPAIN	SPAIN (September 26, 1924)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (August 20, 1923)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)

¹ These amendments came into force September 26, 1924, in accordance with Article 26 of the Covenant. See *League of Nations Treaty Series*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 67 and 73, and Vol. XXXI, p. 262.

7. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 15¹.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 3, 1923)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (February 3, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
BOLIVIA	—	LIBERIA	—
—	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	—	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (February 3, 1923)	—	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (February 3, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (February 3, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	—	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SPAIN	SPAIN (September 26, 1924)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (August 20, 1923)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		
INDIA	INDIA (February 3, 1923)		

8. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Sentence to be substituted for the latter part of the first paragraph of Article 16 of the Covenant.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12, 1924)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
ALBANIA	—	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (August 12, 1924)	LATVIA	—
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LIBERIA	—
BOLIVIA	—	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
—	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12, 1924)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 12, 1924)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CANADA	CANADA (August 12, 1924)	PANAMA	—
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PARAGUAY	—
COLOMBIA	—	PERSIA	—
COSTA RICA	—	POLAND	—
CUBA	—	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (December 4, 1922)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	—	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	—	VENEZUELA	—
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		
INDIA	INDIA (August 12, 1924)		

¹ This amendment came into force September 26th, 1924, in accordance with Article 26 of the Covenant. See *League of Nations Treaty Series*, Vol. XXIX, p. 79, and Vol. XXXI, p. 262.

9. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(First paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12, 1924)	INDIA	INDIA (August 12, 1924)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (August 12, 1924)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
—	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	LIBERIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12, 1924)	—	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	—	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (August 12, 1924)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 12, 1924)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
COLOMBIA	—	PANAMA	—
COSTA RICA	—	PARAGUAY	—
CUBA	—	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
—	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (January 20, 1925)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	—	VENEZUELA	—
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		

10. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Second paragraph to be inserted after the first amended paragraph of Article 16.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12, 1924)	INDIA	INDIA (August 12, 1924)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (August 12, 1924)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LATVIA	LATVIA (February 12, 1924)
—	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	LIBERIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12, 1924)	—	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	—	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (August 12, 1924)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 12, 1924)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
COLOMBIA	—	PANAMA	—
COSTA RICA	—	PARAGUAY	—
CUBA	—	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
—	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1922)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (January 20, 1925)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	—	VENEZUELA	—
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		

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.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (August 12, 1924)	HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)
ALBANIA	—	INDIA	INDIA (August 12, 1924)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (August 12, 1924)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LATVIA	—
—	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	LIBERIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (August 12, 1924)	—	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	—	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (August 12, 1924)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (August 12, 1924)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
COLOMBIA	—	PANAMA	—
COSTA RICA	—	PARAGUAY	—
CUBA	—	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
—	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (January 20, 1925)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	—	VENEZUELA	—

12. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 26.

(First paragraph.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 3, 1923)	HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)
ALBANIA	—	INDIA	INDIA (February 3, 1923)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (February 3, 1923)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LATVIA	LATVIA (December 16, 1923)
—	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	LIBERIA	—
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (February 3, 1923)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (February 3, 1923)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (February 3, 1923)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
COLOMBIA	—	PANAMA	—
COSTA RICA	—	PARAGUAY	—
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	PERSIA	—
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	POLAND	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
GREECE	GREECE (August 20, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
HAITI	HAITI	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
		VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)

13. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 26.

(Adding a new paragraph after the first paragraph.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 3, 1923)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (February 3, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LATVIA	LATVIA (December 10, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LIBERIA	—
—	BRAZIL (August 13, 1924)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (February 3, 1923)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (February 3, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (February 3, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	PERSIA	—
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	POLAND	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	—	PORTUGAL (October 5, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 11, 1922)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 28, 1922)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (August 20, 1923)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		
INDIA	INDIA (February 3, 1923)		

14. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 26.

(Second paragraph.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (February 3, 1923)	ITALY	ITALY (August 5, 1922)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (February 3, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (June 13, 1923)
—	BELGIUM (September 28, 1923)	LATVIA	LATVIA (December 10, 1923)
BOLIVIA	—	LIBERIA	—
—	BRAZIL (July 7, 1923)	LITHUANIA	LITHUANIA (March 13, 1925)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (February 3, 1923)	THE NETHERLANDS	THE NETHERLANDS (April 4, 1923)
BULGARIA	BULGARIA (October 4, 1922)	NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (February 3, 1923)
CANADA	CANADA (February 3, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (March 29, 1922)
CHINA	CHINA (July 4, 1923)	PANAMA	—
COLOMBIA	—	PARAGUAY	—
COSTA RICA	—	PERSIA	—
CUBA	CUBA (May 7, 1923)	—	POLAND (December 15, 1922)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 1, 1923)	—	PORTUGAL (October 3, 1923)
DENMARK	DENMARK (August 31, 1922)	ROUMANIA	ROUMANIA (September 5, 1923)
ESTHONIA	ESTHONIA (September 7, 1923)	SIAM	SIAM (September 12, 1922)
FINLAND	FINLAND (June 25, 1923)	SWEDEN	SWEDEN (August 24, 1922)
FRANCE	FRANCE (August 2, 1923)	SWITZERLAND	SWITZERLAND (March 29, 1923)
GREECE	GREECE (August 20, 1923)	—	URUGUAY (January 12, 1924)
HAITI	HAITI	VENEZUELA	VENEZUELA (March 24, 1925)
HUNGARY	HUNGARY (June 22, 1923)		
INDIA	INDIA (February 3, 1923)		

15. PROTOCOL OF AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 16.

(Geneva, September 27th, 1924.)

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	—	GREECE	—
ALBANIA	—	THE NETHERLANDS	—
BRAZIL	—	—	ROUMANIA (March 12, 1925).
BULGARIA	—	SALVADOR	SALVADOR (June 4, 1925)
CUBA	—	SIAM	—
ESTHONIA	—	URUGUAY	—

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 by the Fourth International Labour Conference, Geneva, November 2nd, 1922.¹)

Has been ratified by :

ALBANIA (November 26, 1924)
 AUSTRIA (October 9, 1924)
 BELGIUM (October 29, 1924)
 BULGARIA (March 6, 1925)
 CZECHOSLOVAKIA (September 30, 1924)
 FINLAND (March 25, 1924)
 GERMANY, (June 6, 1925)
 HAITI

Has been ratified by :

HUNGARY (May 14, 1925)
 IRISH FREE STATE (June 26, 1925)
 LATVIA (March 16, 1925)
 THE NETHERLANDS (August 14, 1924)
 ROUMANIA (July 19, 1923)
 SPAIN (July 5, 1924)
 SWEDEN (May 15, 1924)
 SWITZERLAND (November 1, 1924)

(b) PROTOCOL RELATIVE TO THIS AMENDMENT OPENED FOR SIGNATURE AT GENEVA ON JUNE 14th, 1923.

<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>	<i>Signatures</i>	<i>Ratifications</i>
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (October 20, 1923)	FRANCE	FRANCE (June 2, 1925)
AUSTRALIA	AUSTRALIA (October 20, 1923)	INDIA	INDIA (October 20, 1923)
BRITISH EMPIRE	BRITISH EMPIRE (October 20, 1923)	JAPAN	JAPAN (May 11, 1925)
CANADA	CANADA (October 20, 1923)	NORWAY	NORWAY (April 8, 1924)
CHINA		NEW ZEALAND	NEW ZEALAND (October 20, 1923)
CUBA		PARAGUAY	
DENMARK	DENMARK (June 20, 1924)	POLAND	POLAND (February 10, 1925)
		SIAM	SIAM (March 18, 1924)

¹ The amendment shall take effect when ratified by the States whose representatives compose the Council of the League of Nations and by three-quarters of the Members (Article 422 of the Treaty of Versailles).