大正五年十二月

大正二年五戰役

各國海戰關係法令

第十輯上

海軍大臣官房

凡例

一本書ハ今回ノ戰役ニ關スル各交戰國及中立國ノ法令等主トシテ海軍士官ノ參考ニ資スヘシト認メタルモノヲ纂錄シタリ

一本書中ニ揭ケタル我國ノ法令ハ主トシテ海軍省以外ニ於テ發布セラレタルモノノ中必要ト認メタルモノニ限リタリ

一本輯ハ第九輯編纂後卽チ大正五年十月一日ヨリ同年十二月末日迄ニ公表セラレ又ハ海軍大臣官房ニ於テ接手シタルモノヲ集錄シタリ

大正五年十二月末日

編者識

大正三—五年戰役

各國海戰關係法令第十輯上目次

帝國法令其他關係事項

英吉利國法令

大正三—五年戰役

各國海戰關係法令第十輯上目次終

帝國法令其他關係事項

大正三—五年戰役

各國海戰關係法令第十輯上

帝國法令其他關係事項

第一 輸出禁止品ノ件

（第一輯第一二頁以下、第三輯第一頁參照）

內務省令第十五號（十二月二十三日官報）

大正三年八月內務省令第十八號中左ノ通改正シ公布ノ日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

內務大臣 男爵後藤新平

第一條中保稅倉庫以下八十七字ヲ削除シ藥品名中「莪蓯」ノ次ニ左ノ藥品名ヲ加フ

硫黃、絆創膏、白蠟、乳酸、乳糖、硼酸、蜂蜜、ペプシン、ヘキサメチーレンテトラミン、ヂギタリス葉及其製品製劑、丁香油、硫化カリウム、黃蠟、ワセリン、カフエイン、甘草、含糖ペプシン、カ、オ脂、タンニン酸、タンニン酸アルブミン、炭酸アムモニウム、大風子油、茴香油、クレゾール石鹼液、枸櫞酸、枸櫞酸鐵アムモニウム、ゲンチア

ナ根及其製劑、桂皮、プロテイン銀、プローム及其鹽類、プローム樟腦、テレビン油、アセトアニリード、アセチールサリチール酸、アラビアゴム、アムモニア水、醋酸鉛、サツカリン、杏仁水、キナ皮、酒石酸、重炭酸ナトリウム、重酒石酸カリウム、蓖麻子油、セネガ根、丁幾劑(阿片丁幾ヲ除ク)、舍利別劑、軟膏劑及硬膏劑、乳酸菌及其製劑、ヂカキシヂアミドアルセノベンツオールクロールヒドラート及其製品、オリザニン、過酸化水素及其製品、河豚毒素及其製品、フアゴール、アロカイン、有機燐、ミドリアチン

第二　青島ニ於ケル取締ノ件

○青島守備軍司令官ノ軍軍令及軍告示竝青島守備軍傳染病豫防委員長ノ告示（十月七日官報）青島守備軍司令官ハ青島守備軍所管内在留者取締及夜間帆船ノ入港禁止竝入港帆船ノ檢疫ニ關シ左ノ軍軍令及軍告示ヲ公布シ青島守備軍傳染病豫防委員長ハ汽車檢疫ニ關シ左ノ告示ヲ公示セリ

軍軍令第二十七號(九月十三日)

青島守備軍在留者取締規則

第一條　青島守備軍所管内在留者ニシテ治安ヲ妨害シ又ハ風俗ヲ壞亂スルノ虞アルトキハ一年以上三年以内其ノ在留ヲ禁止ス

第二條　在留ヲ禁止セラレタルトキハ十日以内ニ守備軍所管地域外ニ退去スヘシ

第三條　退去期限内ニ退去セサル者又ハ禁止期限ヲ犯シタル者ハ一月以上一年以下ノ監禁又ハ二十圓以上五百圓以下ノ罰金ニ處ス

附　則

本規則ハ公布ノ日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

軍告示第百一號(九月十三日)

九月十五日ヨリ當分ノ内膠州灣及沙子口(登窰ヲ含ム以下倣之)ニハ夜間帆船(支那形船舶ヲ含ム以下倣之)ノ入港ヲ禁ス

入港帆船ハ左記各號ニ依リ檢疫ヲ受クヘシ

一、膠州灣入港帆船ハ游内山東方海上ニ停止シ游内山檢疫所(常ニ檢疫信號ヲ掲ク)ノ檢疫ヲ受クヘシ

二、沙子口入港ノ帆船ハ左記要圖ノ海上ニ停止シ檢疫ヲ受クヘシ

三、檢疫及其ノ他ニ關シテハ大正四年軍軍令第五十四號青島港則ヲ適用ス

(要圖省略)

軍豫防委員告示第三號(九月十二日)

一、九月十五日ヨリ左記停車場ニ於テ汽車檢疫ヲ施行ス

青島、坊子、濟南

○青島守備軍傳染病豫防委員長及青島軍政長官ノ告示(十二月九日官報)　青島守備軍傳染病豫防委員長ハ汽車檢疫廢止ニ付、青島軍政長官ハ內地ニ在ル獨墺人ニ宛テ財產賣買ニ關スル通信ニ付左ノ告示ヲ公示セリ

軍豫防委員告示第五號(十一月十四日)

本年九月十二日軍豫防委員告示第三號ノ汽車檢疫ハ十一月十六日限リ廢止ス

青島軍政署告示第三十八號(十一月十六日)

內地ニ在ル獨墺人ニ宛テ其ノ所有ニ係ル青島守備軍占領地域內ニ於ケル土地家屋其ノ他ノ財產賣買ニ關シ通信セムトスル者ハ先ツ軍政署ニ屆出テ該信書ニ認章ヲ受クヘシ

○青島守備軍司令官ノ軍告示(十二月十二日官報)　青島守備軍司令官ハ膠州灣並沙子口ニ夜間帆船ノ入港禁止及檢疫廢止ニ關シ去月二十二日左ノ軍告示ヲ公示セリ

軍告示第百十六號

大正五年九月十三日軍告示第百一號膠州灣並沙子口ニ夜間帆船ノ入港禁止及檢疫ノ件ハ大正五年十一月二十四日限リ之ヲ廢止ス

○青島守備軍司令官ノ軍告示及青島軍政長官ノ同署告示(十二月二十日官報)　青島守備軍司令官ハ青島近海通航禁止解除及青島埠頭徵發貨物賠償金請求ニ關シ左ノ軍告示ヲ、青島軍政長官ハ青島埠頭局ニ收容後六箇月ヲ經過シタル貨物ニ付左ノ告示ヲ公示セリ

軍告示第百二十一號(十一月三十日)

大正四年七月一日軍告示第二十二號青島近海通航禁止ニ關スル件ハ大正五年十二月一日限リ之ヲ解除ス

軍告示第百二十五號(十二月一日)

青島埠頭徵發貨物(獨墺人所有貨物ヲ除ク)賠償金請求心得書左記ノ通リ定ム

一、青島埠頭ニ於テ軍カ徵發セシ貨物(獨墺人所有貨物ヲ除ク)ニ對スル賠償金ノ請求ヲ爲サントスル者ハ本心得書ニ依リ其手續ヲ爲スヘシ

二、賠償金請求書ハ別紙第一號書式ニ依リ調製シ每週金曜日(休日ノトキハ繰下ク)午前中ニ青島埠頭局ニ提出スヘシ

但シ青島ニ住所ヲ有セサル者ハ青島ニ住所ヲ有スル代理人ヲ指定シ請求及受領ヲ爲サシムルヲ要ス

賠償金請求書ニハ次ノ書類ヲ添付スヘシ

(1)　日本人ニアリテハ市區町村長ノ印鑑證明書ヲ其他ノ國人ニ在リテハ各々自國領事ノ國籍證明書及華印證明書

(2)　當該貨物ノ船貨證券原本若ハ舊碼頭局受領證

但シ前項船貨證券中青島ヲ仕向地トシタルモノハ該貨物運送者ノ運賃仕拂濟ノ證明アルヲ要ス

（3）舊碼頭局賃貸ノ土地若クハ其倉庫内ニ在ル貨物ヲ徵發セラレタル者ハ其ノ土地若ハ倉庫ノ賃貸書若ハ賃借者ノ承認書

（4）代理人ニ在リテハ其委任狀（別紙第二號書式ニ據ル）

但シ委任狀ニモ本條第（1）項ノ證明書ヲ添付スルヲ要ス

三、賠償金ハ青島守備軍經理部ニ於テ仕拂フモノトス

四、賠償金ハ仕拂當日ニ於ケル公定相場ニ依リ銀ヲ以テ仕拂フモノトス

五、賠償價格ハ青島守備軍司令部ノ評定セシ額ニ據ルモノトス前項ノ價格ハ仕拂時期ヲモ顧慮シ適當ニ評定シアルニ付利子ハ別ニ之ヲ仕拂フコトナシ

注意

第一號及第二號書式ノ用紙ハ青島埠頭局ニ於テ交付ス

第一號書式

青島埠頭徵發貨物賠償金請求及受領證　受領證第　號

一金　圓　錢也

此銀換算（公定相場金壹圓ニ付銀　圓　錢ノ割　銀票　圓　錢也　支那銅錢　錢也）

（整理簿頁數）

記號及番號	箇數	品目	數量	所有權者氏名	賠償價格 單價	賠償價格 小計
					金　円	金　円

內譯

但シ大正　年　月　日青島守備軍ニ於テ徵發セシ青島埠頭殘留貨物ニ對スル賠償金仕拂如本文

添付一件書類左記ノ通

請求年月日大正　年　月　日

右金額正ニ受領候也

大正　年　月　日

本籍地
現住所
國籍氏名　㊞

右代理人本籍地
現住所
國籍氏名

青島守備軍司令官　殿

左記

第二號書式

委任狀

一、委任事項

青島埠頭ニ於テ徵發セラレタル貨物賠償金請求及受領ノ件

二、被委任者

本籍地
現住所

國籍氏名

三、委任年月日

大正　年　月　日

右委任ス

本籍地
現住所
國籍氏名

青島軍政署告示第四十一號（十二月二日）

左ニ記載ノ貨物ハ青島埠頭局ニ收容後六箇月ヲ經過シタルモノニ付青島埠頭假規則第二十六條ニ依リ公告ス

公告ノ日ヨリ一箇月以內ニ收容解除ノ申告ヲ青島埠頭局ニ爲サザルトキハ公賣ニ付セラルヘシ

左記

記號番號	品名	箇數	記號番號	品名	箇數
㊂	額縁	二箱	WT	空瓶	三包
㊀	不易糊	一箱	無記號	釜外	一箱
無記號	履物	一箱	同上	古衣	一包
同上	布團	一包	同上	空簞笥	二箱
中松	綿機械分岐用	一函	同上	鍋釜外	四箱
無記號	屑繭	二包	同上	古袋	一包
同上	雲母	一箱	同上	箸	一箱
同上	ピストル	一箱	同上	木炭	三百俵
同上	漬物	十五樽	同上	漬物	一樽
同上	夜具	一包	同上	鐵帶	一包
同上	臺紙	一箱	同上	衡器	一箱
尾	棕梠耳軸	一包	同上	塗料	一箱
無記號	燐寸箱板	一包	同上	礦油	一箱

○青島守備軍司令官ノ軍告示（十二月二十日官報）　青島守備軍司令官ハ虎列刺病豫防ニ關スル本年九月一日軍告示第九十六號及同月九日軍告示第百號ハ十一月三十日限リ之ヲ廢止スル旨去月二十八日軍告示第百二十號ヲ以テ公示セリ

第三　對敵通信禁止ニ關スル件

（一）內地ニ於ケル對敵通信禁止

遞信省令第六十三號（十二月十八日官報）

外國郵便物、日支郵便物、外國電報、日支電報、外國無線電報、日支無線電報及外國郵便爲替ノ取扱ニ左ノ制限ヲ加フ

本令ハ大正五年十二月二十五日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

大正五年十二月十八日　　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

一、敵國ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル物件及電報ハ郵便官署及電信官署ニ於テ之ヲ送達セス

二、敵國人ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル物件ハ之ヲ郵便禁制品トス

三、敵國人ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル電報ハ電信官署ニ於テ之ヲ送達セス

四、敵國人ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル郵便爲替ハ郵便官署ニ於テ之カ受拂ヲ爲サス

五、前四號ノ規定ハ帝國ニ派遣セラレタル外交官ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツルモノニ付之ヲ適用セス特ニ遞信大臣ノ許可シタルモノニ付亦同シ

前四號ノ規定ハ俘虜ニ關シテハ之ヲ適用セサルコトヲ得

六、外國歐文電報ハ其ノ本文末尾ニ發信人名ヲ明示スルコトヲ要ス

七、郵便物及郵便爲替ノ差出人若ハ受取人又ハ電報ノ發信人若ハ受信人ハ郵便官署又ハ電信官署ノ要求アルトキハ其ノ國籍及居所氏名ヲ證明スヘシ

八、本令中敵國トアルハ敵國ト看做スヘキモノヲ包含ス

敵國及敵國ト看做スヘキモノノ名稱ハ別ニ之ヲ告示ス

遞信省告示第千百四十一號(十二月十八日官報)

本年十二月遞信省令第六十三號ニ依ル敵國及敵國ト看做スヘキモノノ名稱左ノ如シ

大正五年十二月十八日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

獨逸及獨逸保護國、墺地利、洪爲利、「ポスニー、ヘルゼゴヴイヌ」、土耳古及勃爾瓦利

遞信省告示第千百四十二號(十二月十八日官報)

左記郵便物、電報及郵便爲替ノ取扱ニ付テハ本年十二月遞信省令第六十三號第一號乃至第四號ノ規定ヲ適用セス

大正五年十二月十八日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

一、在本邦俘虜ノ發受スル郵便物、電報及郵便爲替

二、在聯合國俘虜ノ發スル郵便物及郵便爲替

三、在聯合國俘虜情報局ノ發受スル郵便物及郵便爲替

四、在聯合國俘虜情報局ニ宛ツル電報

遞信省告示第千二百二十五號(十二月二十九日官報)

本年十二月遞信省告示第千百四十二號中「在本邦俘虜」ヲ「在本邦俘虜、俘虜情報局及俘虜收容所」ニ改ム

大正五年十二月二十九日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

遞信省告示第千百七十九號(十二月二十二日官報)

本年十二月遞信省令第六十三號第五號ニ依ル許可申請ヲ受理スヘキ郵便官署及電信官署並申請ノ方法左ノ如シ

大正五年十二月二十二日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

一、許可申請ヲ受理スヘキ官署

差出ニ付テハ申請者ノ居所ヲ配達區域トスル郵便官署及電信官署

但シ同一市內ニ在リテハ前記區域ニ拘ラス一等郵便局又ハ一等電信局ニ申請スルコトヲ得

到著ニ付テハ到著ノ通知ヲ爲シタル郵便官署ヘ文書又ハ口頭ヲ以テ申請スヘシ

一、申請ノ方法

(イ)通常郵便　差出ニ付テハ郵便ニ差出サムトスル物件ニ差出人居所、氏名及「許可申請」(又ハ For Permission)ナル文字ヲ記載シテ之ヲ郵便官署ニ提出シ文書又ハ口頭ヲ以テ申請スルコト但シ書狀ハ開封タルコトヲ要ス

到著ニ付テハ申請手續ヲ要セス但シ封緘シタルモノニ付テハ郵便官署ニ於テ定ムル書式ニ依リ申請書ヲ提出スルコトヲ要ス

(ロ)小包郵便　差出ニ付テハ通常郵便ノ例ニ倣ヒ郵便ニ差出サムトスル物件ヲ郵便官署ニ提出シ文書又ハ口頭ヲ以テ申請スルコト

到著ニ付テハ名宛人ヨリ文書又ハ口頭ヲ以テ申請スルコト

(ハ)電信　發信ニ付テハ電報ヲ提出シ文書又ハ口頭ヲ以テ申請スルコト

著信ニ付テハ申請手續ヲ要セス

(ニ)郵便爲替　差出ニ付テハ外國郵便爲替振出請求書ヲ提出シ文書又ハ口頭ヲ以テ申請スルコト

到著ニ付テハ申請手續ヲ要セス

(二)　朝鮮ニ於ケル對敵通信禁止

朝鮮總督府令第百一號(十二月二十七日官報)

外國郵便物、日支郵便物、外國電報、日支電報、外國無線電報、日支無線電報及外國郵便爲替ノ取扱ニ關スル制限左ノ通定ム

大正五年十二月二十二日　朝鮮總督　伯爵長谷川好道

第一條　敵國ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル物件及電報ハ郵便局所及電信局所ニ於テ之ヲ送達セス

第二條　敵國人ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル物件ハ之ヲ郵便禁制品トス

第三條　敵國人ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル電報ハ電信局所ニ於テ之ヲ送達セス

第四條　敵國人ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツル郵便爲替ハ郵便局所ニ於テ之カ受拂ヲ爲サス

第五條　前四條ノ規定ハ帝國ニ派遣セラレタル外交官ヨリ發シ又ハ之ニ宛ツルモノニ付之ヲ適用セス特ニ朝鮮總督ノ許可シタルモノニ付亦同シ

前四條ノ規定ハ俘虜ニ關シテハ之ヲ適用セサルコトヲ得

第六條　外國歐文電報ハ其ノ本文末尾ニ發信人名ヲ明示スヘシ

第七條　郵便物及郵便爲替ノ差出人若ハ受取人又ハ電報ノ發信人若ハ受信人ハ郵便局所又ハ電信局所ノ要求アルトキハ其ノ國籍及居所氏名ヲ證明スヘシ

第八條　本令中敵國トアルハ敵國ト看做スヘキモノヲ包含ス

敵國及敵國ト看做スヘキモノノ名稱ハ別ニ之ヲ告示ス

附則

本令ハ大正五年十二月二十五日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

朝鮮總督府告示第三百三十一號(十二月二十七日官報)

帝國法令其他關係事項

大正五年朝鮮總督府令第百一號ニ依ル敵國及敵國ト看做スヘキモノノ名稱左ノ如シ

大正五年十二月二十二日　朝鮮總督　伯爵長谷川好道

獨逸及獨逸保護國、墺地利、洪牙利、「ボスニー、ヘルゼゴヴイヌ」、土耳古及勃爾瓦利

朝鮮總督府告示第三百三十二號（十二月二十七日官報）

左記郵便物、電報及郵便爲替ノ取扱ニ付テハ大正五年朝鮮總督府令第百一號第一條乃至第四條ノ規定ヲ適用セス

大正五年十二月二十二日　朝鮮總督　伯爵長谷川好道

一　在本邦俘虜ノ發受スル郵便物、電報及郵便爲替

二　在聯合國俘虜ノ發スル郵便物及郵便爲替

三　在聯合國俘虜情報局ノ發受スル郵便物及郵便爲替

四　在聯合國俘虜情報局ニ宛ツル電報

第四　露西亞宛及羅馬尼宛小包郵便送達中止ノ件

遞信省告示第千二百九號（十二月二十六日官報）

當分ノ內露西亞宛及露國媒介小包郵便物並西比利亞經由羅馬尼宛小包郵便物ハ之ヲ送達スルコトヲ得ス

大正五年十二月二十六日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

第五　占領地ニ發著スル郵便物及電報ノ取扱ニ關スル件

（一）青島守備軍管內ニ發著スル郵便物及電報ノ取扱ニ關スル件

遞信省令第六十六號（十二月二十三日官報）

青島守備軍管內ト帝國郵便系トノ間及青島守備軍管內相互間ニ發著スル郵便物ノ取扱ニ關シテハ日支郵便規則ニ依ル但シ料金ニ付テハ青島守備軍管內ハ之ヲ關東都督府管內ニ準ス

本令ハ公布ノ日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

大正五年十二月二十三日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

遞信省令第六十七號（十二月二十三日官報）

青島守備軍管內ト帝國電信系（上海ヲ除ク）トノ間及青島守備軍管內相互間ニ發著スル電報ノ取扱ニ關シテハ場合ニ從ヒ日支電報規則又ハ日支無線電報規則ニ依ル但シ料金ニ付テハ青島守備軍管內ハ之ヲ關東都督府管內ニ準ス

本令ハ公布ノ日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

大正五年十二月二十三日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

（二）ヤップ島ニ發著スル電報ノ取扱ニ關スル件

遞信省令第六十九號（十二月二十三日官報）

大正五年六月遞信省令第三十號中左ノ通改正ス

本令ハ公布ノ日ヨリ之ヲ施行ス

大正五年十二月二十三日　遞信大臣　男爵田健治郎

第一項ヲ左ノ如ク改ム

帝國占領南洋ヤップ島ニ發著スル電報ノ取扱ニ關シテハ特ニ規定アル場合ノ外ハ左ノ規定ニ依ル

一　日支電報規則ヤップ島ト帝國電信系（上海ヲ除ク）トノ間ニ發著スル電報ノ場合

二　外國電報ニ關スル規定ヤップ島ト外國トノ間ニ發著スル電報ノ場合

第六　獨逸書籍本邦ヘ輸入方ノ件

○獨逸書籍本邦ヘ輸入方（十月五日官報）　英國政府ハ哲學、科學、工業竝ニ教育ニ關スル獨逸書籍ニ限リ（German works of a philosophical, scientific, technical or educational character only）其日本ヘ向ケ輸送セラルルモノニ對シテハ特ニ海上輸送許可證ヲ發給スルコトアルヘク尚ホ右許可ヲ與ヘタル書籍ニ關シテハ横濱正金銀行倫敦支店經由蘭國書店ヘノ代金支拂ヲ承認スル旨通知アリタルニ付本邦當業者ニシテ前記種類ニ屬スル獨逸書籍ヲ蘭國ヨリ輸入セントスル者ハ左記事項記載ノ明細表（英文ニテ認ムルコト）三通ヲ添ヘ其旨外務省通商局ニ申出テラルヘシ然ルトキハ同局ニ於テ審査ノ上右輸入ノ必要アリト認ムルモノニ付テハ在英帝國大使館ヲ經テ英國政府ヘ海上輸送許可證申請ノ手續ヲ取計フヘシ（外務省）

一　書籍名（原名ヲ用ヒ種類別ニ記載ノコト）、
　冊數及價格
一　總冊數及總價格
一　箱數
一　輸出港名
一　荷送人及荷受人名

英吉利國法令

英吉利國法令

第一　戰時禁制品品目表ニ關スル件

（一）　戰時禁制品品目表改正ノ件

（イ）　十月三日改正ニ關スル外務省告示

外務省告示第二十六號（十二月十六日官報）

今回ノ戰爭繼續中英國政府ニ於テ戰時禁制品トシテ取扱フヘキ品目ノ追加ニ關シ本年八月外務省告示第十五號ヲ以テ公示スル處アリタルカ更ニ左ノ通該品目ニ追加改正アリタル旨本年十月三日附ヲ以テ同國政府ヨリ公表アリタリ

大正五年十二月十六日　　外務大臣　法學博士子爵本野一郎

絕對的戰時禁制品中ニ追加ノ分

一、絕緣材料（生ノモノ及製造シタルモノ）

一、脂肪酸

一、「カドミウム」、「カドミウム」合金及「カドミウム」鑛

一、蛋白

絕對的戰時禁制品中改正ノ分

一、第六號「パラフインワツクス」ヲ『一切ノ「ワツクス」』ニ改ム

(ロ) 十月三日附改正勅諭

(十月三日ロンドンガゼット)

BY THE KING.

A PROCLAMATION

MAKING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO AND AMENDMENTS IN THE LIST OF ARTICLES TO BE TREATED AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.

GEORGE R. I.

Whereas on the 14th day of October, 1915, We did issue Our Royal Proclamation specifying the articles which it was Our intention to treat as contraband during the continuance of hostilities, or until We did give further public notice;

And whereas, on the 27th day of January, 1916, the 12th day of April, 1916, and the 27th day of June, 1916, We did, by Our Royal Proclamations of those dates, make certain additions to and modifications in the said list of articles to be treated as contraband;

And whereas it is expedient to make certain further additions to the said list:

Now, therefore, We do hereby declare, by and with the advice of Our privy Council, that during the continuance of the war or until We do give futher public notice, the following articles will be treated as absolute contraband, in addition to those set out in Our Royal Proclamations aforementioned:—

Insulating materials, raw and manufactured.

Fatty acids.

Cadmium, cadmium alloys and cadmium ore.

Albumen.

And We do hereby further declare that as from this date the following amendments shall be made in Schedule 1 of Our Royal Proclamation of the 14th day of October, 1915, aforementioned:—

For item 6, "paraffin wax," there shall be substituted "waxes of all kinds."

And We do hereby further declare that the following article shall as from this date be treated as conditional contraband in addition to those set out in Our Royal Proclamations aforementioned:—

Yeast.

Given at Our Court at *Buckingham Palace*, this Third day of *October*, in the year of our Lord One thousand nine hundred and sixteen, and in the

Seventh year of Our Reign.

GOD SAVE THE KING.

(八) 十一月二十三日附改正要領

(參田大使電報)

十一月二十三日附勅令ヲ以テ絶對的禁制品トシテ diamonds suitable for industrial purposes, silk in all forms, manufactures thereof, silk cocoons, artificial silk, manufactures thereof, quillaia bark, zirconium, cerium, thorium all alloys and compounds thereof, zirconia and monazite sand (?) ヲ追加シ昨年十月十四日附勅令第一付表第四項ヲ emery, corundum, carborundum, all other abrasine materials, natural or artificial manufactures thereof ニ改メ又本年四月十二日附勅令中 gold 以下 securities 迄ヲ gold, silver, paper money, securities, negotiable instruments, cheques, drafts, orders (?), warrants, coupons, letters of credit, delegation or advice, credit and debit notes or other documents, which in themselves or if completed of, if acted upon by recipient authorize, confirm or give effect to transfer of money, credit or securities ニ改メ尙條件附止品トシテ sponges, raw and prepared, glue, gelatin and substances used in manufacture thereof, empty barrels and casks of all kinds and their component parts ヲ追加セリ

(十一) 貨幣等ヲ戰時禁制品ト爲シタル件ニ關スル英國當憲ノ說明

(十一月二十五日ニューヨーク、ヘラルド)

HOLD $250,000,000 FROM THEIR FOES.

BRITISH EXPLAIN WHY THEY PREVENT NEUTRAL MONEY FROM REACHING CENTRAL POWERS.

[BY CABLE TO THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.]

LONDON, Friday, 8:22 P. M.—With reference to the royal proclamation issued yesterday making all financial instruments contraband, it is explained officially that the new proclamation is an amendment by the entente governments of the one issued in April. In order to introduce absolute certainty into neutral financial operations, it is declared, the entente governments frankly intend, if possible, to prevent every transaction calculated to assist the Teutonic allies to prosecute belligerent operations in any part of the world.

Hitherto it is asserted there have been attempts by the Central Powers to evade the terms of the previous proclamation. The new declaration defines the intentions

of the entente governments more clearly and, it is asserted, states frankly to the whole neutral world that the entente intends to try by every legitimate means to prevent any neutral from financially assisting their opponents. The official statement adds:—

"Money in the long run wins wars, and no one who realizes the power of money can regard our action as either illegitimate or unnecessary. To give one indication of the vast importance of this question, it is calculated roughly that since the Allies began examining the mails to neutrals contignous to Germany they have stopped about $250,000,000 which was going to banks or persons on enemy countries, and include large numbers of subscriptions to enemy war loans.

"If instruments of any kind whatever having the object of transferring such vast quantities of money to the enemy are not to be regarded as contraband, it is impossible to concede what can properly be so regarded."

第二　勃牙利國沿岸封鎖區域擴張ノ件

（第六輯第四七頁以下參照）

（九月二十二日ロンドン、ガゼット）

Foreign Office, September 20, 1916.

The limits of the blockade of the coast of the Aegean Sea, notified in the London Gazette of October 19, 1915, have been extended westwards as far as the mouth of the Struma River, in 40° 46′ North Latitude and 32° 53′ East Longitude. The blockade takes effect in the area thus added from the 16th instant.

Neutral ships already in ports or at places on the newly blockaded coast are being allowed until 8 a. m. on the 21st instant to leave the blockaded area.

第三　海戰法規ノ適用ニ關スル件

（一）瑞典領水內ニ於ケル水雷敷設ニ關シ聯合國ヨリ抗議ヲ提出シ瑞典國之ニ答ヘタル件

（第九輯下第三八七頁以下參照）

（十月三日ニューヨーク、ヘラルド）

SWEDEN INDIGNANT AT SUSPICION OF HER NEUTRALITY.

SENDS STIFF REPLY TO BRITISH NOTE IMPUGNING HER GOOD FAITH.

SAYS ALL SUBMARINES ARE TREATED AS WAR SHIPS UNLESS CHARACTER IS PROVED.

LONDON, September 22.—The relations between Sweden and the Entente Powers

are attracting unusual attention here, and there is every indication that the situation threatens to become somewhat tense. With the dispute as to mail seizures still unsettled, there has now arisen the charge by the Allies that the neutrality of Sweden is not so loyal and impartial as it should be. This has drawn from Stockholm a reply as tart and crisp as some of the notes in the mail controversy, which were characterized by Lord Grey as containing words not usually found in diplomatic correspondence.

Confidence is expressed in the tact and ability of the British Minister to Sweden, Sir Esmé Howard, to handle Great Britain's interests, for he already has done much to smooth over many points of friction that have arisen since the war began. Sir Esme has received full authority to act in the mails dispute and is co-operating with the other Entente diplomatists at Stockholm in making representations as to the latest matters in controversy.

The new point of contact with Sweden is the outgrowth of the practice of belligerent shipping in using Swedish territorial waters for all Baltic traffic. Within the safety of this neutral three mile limit British and other ships of the Entente nations have gone defiantly into and out of the Baltic, paying not the slightest heed to the Prussian fleet looking on from the outer waters. Similarly Prussian merchant ships have steamed up and down the east coast of Sweden, heavily laden with foodstuffs and iron ores, while Russian destroyers in the northern reaches of the Baltic have been impotent to act.

Sweden Kept Busy.

This practice placed a heavy responsibility upon Sweden and kept her fleet busy day and night patrolling the territorial waters in protection of the belligerent traders, despite which precaution there were several violations of Swedish neutrality. Public sentiment in Sweden was aroused and the government determined to mine the waters of Kogrund channel, leading out of the Sound into the Baltic. Sweden also served notice that her naval commanders had been instructed to fire upon all submarines found prowling within the three mile limit. This policy had scarcely been announced when news came of the successful trip of the Deutschland from Bremen to Baltimore, and there arose the question as to whether Swedish war ships would fire at sight at a merchant submarine or whether they would only fire at allied submarines, knowing these Powers were not using commercial underwater boats.

The situation was further complicated by a later determination of the Swedish government to close the Kogrund channel entirely to all except Swedish vessels. Then the Allies decided to protest.

According to reports received here, there was much excitement in Stockholm when the

Allies' note arrived, and it was promptly described by the pro-Prussian newspapers as an ultimatum. The Allies protested that in reserving exclusively to Swedish merchant ships the track across the mine fields established in the Kogrund channel Sweden had closed the only route by which English, French and other allied vessels could pass into and out of the Baltic protected from attack by Prussian naval forces. On the other hand, the note said the Swedish government not only left open in territorial waters, between Kalamar Strait and Lulea, a route which is accessible only to Swedish and Prussian ships under the new arrangement, but further assured to these vessels the protection of an escort against the Russian naval force.

SHARP ANSWER TO BRITAIN.

With regard to submarines the British protest declared that Sweden appeared to establish between under water boats armed for war purposes and other submarines a distinction in virtue of which so-called submarines of commerce, a type not employed by the Allies, might with impunity navigate Swedish territorial waters beneath the surface.

The reply of Sweden was characteristically stiff.

"You conclude that in the attitude adopted by the King's government regarding the two belligerent camps there is a signal difference which would seem imcompatible with the duties of a loyal and impartial neutrality," it said.

"It is the duty of the King's government to deny in the most formal manner that the opinion thus expressed has any foundation. It cannot enter into discussion on the sincerity and impartiality of its neutrality, which have been abundantly demonstrated throughout the war. It will, however, observe that an allegation of this nature is fundamentally vicious, being founded only on isolated facts imperfectly discernible."

The reply declared that all submarines are to be treated by Sweden as war submarines if their employment for commercial purposes is not established with certainty by common facts. It was asserted that all Sweden was doing was to safeguard her neutrality in the manner she found most appropriate to the object.

（二）郵便物ノ檢閲没收ニ關スル件

（イ）英國米國ヨリ中歐諸國ニ仕向ケタル小包郵便物ヲ解放スル件

（九月二十六日ニューヨーク、サン）

BRITAIN RELEASES PARCELS.

Consignors May Recover 1,200 Packages Sent to Teutons.

London, Sept. 25.—Twelve hundred parcels consigned from the United States to the Central Powers and held up by the British authorities have been released, and possession of them may now be obtained by their American consignors on their request.

According to the Foreign Office, this proceeding merely follows a long established policy of the Government in releasing non-contraband inward bound parcels to their orignal consignors. Such goods, being non-contraband, are held under orders in council, and in administering these the Government is merely concerned in keeping goods of the sort from entering belligerent territory. There is no desire, it was explained, to withhold them from their original owners, but the Government has no intention of releasing such parcels for forwarding to their original destination.

The parcels released this week consist mostly of clothing, false teeth and various articles which do not appear on the contraband list. It is expected that since the blockade administration is becoming more efficient further releases will be made frequently.

（ロ）英佛兩國郵便物檢閱手續ヲ緩和スルコトヲ米國ニ申入ンタル件

（十月十四日ニユヨーク、くらルド）

ALLIES WILL RELAX MAIL CENSORSHIP.

Pormise to Reduce to Minimum Delays and Inconveniences to Neutrals.

Washington, D. C., Friday.

It was learned to-day that the governments of Great Britain and France, in the identical note which they presented yesterday to the State Department in the mail censorship issue, have promised radical changes in treatment of the mails, which Entente diplomatists believe will prove sufficient to satisfy the demands of the United States.

The Entente governments do not recede from the position taken in principle as to their right to maintain a censorship of mails to search for all information of value to the enemy, but in their method of procedure such changes are announced or promised as are calculated, it is said, to reduce to a minimum the delays or inconvenien-

ces to neutrals. Details of the concessions made are withheld.

In its protest against the censorship the United States conceded the right of a belligerent to maintain a censorship over mails passing through his country, but contested the right of the two Entente governments to censor mail from ships which had been diverted from their ordinary course to enter their territorial waters, and also the United States set forth facts in several specific instances alleging that delays and losses had been caused by the censorship methods.

（ハ）郵便物檢閲問題ニ關スル英國瑞典國間ノ往復文書

（英國外交文書八月公表）

Correspondence with the Swedish Minister on the Subject of the Detention by the Swedish Government of the British Transit Mail to Russia as a Reprisal for the Search of Parcels Mail by His Majesty's Government.

No. 1.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign-Office, December 15, 1915.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Swedish steamship "Stockholm" has arrived at Kirkwall on her voyage from Gothenburg to New York.

This vessels is carrying fifty-eight bags of parcels mails from Malmö to Chicago and New York, which are being removed for examination, after which the vessel will be allowed to proceed at once to her destination.

I have, &c.

(For the Secretary of State),

Algernon Law.

No. 2.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received December 19.)

Légation de Suède, Londres,

le 18 *décembre*, 1915.

M. le Secrétaire d'État,

D'ordre de mon Gouvernement, j'ai l'honneur de porter ce qui suit à la connaissance de votre Excellence:

Le Gouvernement du Roi a été informé que les autorités à Kirkwall ont retenu

des colis postaux enfermés dans des sacs de poste adressés à la Suède des États-Unis d'Amérique et pris à bord le steamer danois le "Hellig Olaf" à son dernier voyage de New-York. Par la note que votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser en date du 15 de ce mois le Gouvernement du Roi a, de plus, été averti que cinquante-huit sacs de poste contenant des colis postaux de Suède pour les États-Unis avaient été pris à bord le steamer suédois le "Stockholm" et retenus à Kirkwall. Il y a tout lieu de croire que la plus grande partie de ces derniers colis postaux contenaient des cadeaux de Noël.

A plusieurs occasions, lorsque les autorités anglaises avaient pris contre la navigation et le commerce de la Suède des mesures qui paraissaient au Gouvernement Royal constituer une violation des règles internationales, telles qu'elles ont été sanctionnées par le droit des gens, il n'avait pris aucune mesure de représailles ou de rétorsion. Cette manière d'agir de la part du Gouvernement du Roi était motivée par sa conviction que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique trouverait juste et équitable d'apporter une rectification aux mesures dont il s'agissait.

La saisie des colis postaux *ex* le "Hellig Olaf" et le "Stockholm" donne pourtant l'impression comme si, loin de désirer de réduire les difficultés, les autorités anglaises se plaisaient à les augmenter.

Le Gouvernement du Roi, en même temps qu'il proteste de la manière la plus formelle contre la saisie des colis postaux en question, s'est vu, à son grand regret, dans la nécessité de prescrire à la Direction générale des Postes de Suède de retenir toutes les marchandises expédiées en colis postaux en transit par la Suède de ou pour l'Angleterre. Cette mesure sera maintenue de la part des autorités suédoises jusqu'à ce que cette affaire ait été réglée d'une manière que le Gouvernement du Roi jugera satisfaisante et que garantie ait été donnée contre la répétition de ce genre d'incident si contraire au droit international.

Je profite, &c.

WRANGEL.

(Translation.)

Swedish Legation, London,

December, 18, 1915.

Sir,

Under instructions from my Government, I have the honour to communicate the following to your Excellency:—

The Swedish Government have been informed that the authorities at Kirkwall

have detained postal parcels enclosed in mail-bags addressed to Sweden from the United States, which were taken from the Danish steamship "Hellig Olaf" during her last voyage from New York. In the note which your Excellency was good enough to send me on the 15th instant, the Swedish Government were further informed that fifty-eight mail-bags containing postal parcels from Sweden for the United States had been taken from the Swedish steamer "Stockholm" and detained at Kirkwall. There is every reason to believe that the majority of the latter parcels contained Christmas presents.

On several occasions, when the British authorities had taken measures against Swedish shipping and commerce which seemed to the Royal Government to constitute a violation of international rules as sanctioned by the law of nations, no measure of reprisals or retortion had been taken. This procedure on the part of the Swedish Government was due to their conviction that His Britannic Majesty's Government would consider it right and equitable to rectify the measures in question.

The seizure of the parcels on the "Hellig Olaf" and the "Stockholm" gives the impression, however, that the British authorities, far from wishing to minimise the difficulties, find pleasure in increasing them.

The Royal Government, while protesting in the most formal manner against the seizure of the parcels in question, have to their great regret felt constrained to direct the Postal Administration in Sweden to detain all goods from or to England sent by the parcels mail in transit through Sweden. This measure will be maintained by the Swedish authorities till the matter is settled in a manner which the Royal Government consider satisfactory, and a guarantee is given against the repetition of an incident of this nature, so contrary to international law.

I avail, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 3.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey—(Received December 28.)

Légation de Suède, Londres,

le 27 décembre, 1915.

M. le Secrétaire d'État,

Me référant à la note que, en date du 18 de ce mois, j'ai eu l'honneur d'adresser Votre Excellence, et conformément aux instructions reçues de mon Gouvernement, j'ai l'honneur de vous faire part, M. le Secrétaire d'État, de la protestation du Gouvernement du Roi contre de nouvelles infractions aux règles internationales concernant le

libre passage des correspondances et envois postaux. Les cas dont il s'agit sont les suivants:

1. Des colis postaux pour la Suède expédiés de New-York le 8 de ce mois-ci ont été saisis à bord le steamer danois le "Frederik VIII" à Kirkwall.

2. Le 21 de ce mois, les autorités anglaises ont saisi à bord le steamer néerlandais le "Tubantia" huit sacs postaux à provenance d'Espagne et six de Buénos-Ayres, tous les quatorze adressés à la Suède.

3. Les sacs postaux expédiés de Gothenbourg à New-York du 7 au 12 novembre passé ont été ouverts par les autorités britanniques; la plupart des envois postaux y enfermés ont été censurés et dix envois recommandés ont été retenus.

4. L'Administration des Postes Royales néerlandaises a informé le Gouvernement suédois que des sacs postaux contenant des lettres de la République argentine pour la Suède ont été saisies à bord le steamer néerlandais le "Frisia."

Pour ce qui regarde le cas mentionné sous No. 4, le fait contre lequel se dirige la protestation du Gouvernement Royal paraît être en contradiction directe avec les conventions internationales qui préscrivent l'inviolabilité des envois de lettres entre pays neutres à bord des vaisseaux neutres.

Dans ce dernier cas, le Gouvernement du Roi se réserve aussi de prendre des mesures ultérieures.

Je profite, &c.

WRANGEL.

(Translaiton.)

Swedish Legation, London,
December 27, 1915.

Sir,

With reference to the note that I had the honour to address to your Excellency on the 18th instant, and in accordance with instructions received from my Government, I have the honour to inform you of the protest of the Swedish Government against fresh infractions of the international rules respecting the free passage of correspondence and postal parcels. The cases in question are the following:—

1. Postal parcels for Sweden sent from New York on the 8th instant have been seized on board the Danish steamship "Frederik VIII" at Kirkwall.

2. On the 21st instant, the British authorities seized on board the Netherlands steamship "Tubantia" eight mail-bags coming from Spain and six from Buenos Aires, all fourteen being addressed to Sweden.

3. The mail-bags despatched from Gothenburg to New York from the 7th to the 12th November last were opened by the British authorities; the majority of the postal parcels therein contained were censored and ten registered parcels were retained.

4. The Netherlands Postal Administration has informed the Swedish Government that mail-bags containing letters from the Argentine Republic for Sweden have been seized on board the Netherlands steamship "Frisia."

As regards the case mentioned under No. 4, the action against which the protest of the Swedish Government is directed appears to be in direct contradiction of the international conventions which prescribe the inviolability of the letter post between neutral countries on board neutral vessels.

In the latter case, the Swedish Government reserve the right also to take further measures.

I have &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 4.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

The attached memorandum is transmitted with the compliments of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Foreign Office, December 30, 1915.

Memorandum.

Danish steamship "Hellig Olaf."

On examination of the parcels mail discharged from the above vessel at Kirkwall, 109 bags containing rubber were discovered and detained, all of them consigned from the Rex Chemical Company, 68, Broad Street, New York, to Jonsson and Kraft, of Gothenburg, and His Majesty's Customs have been requested to place this rubber in the Prize Court, on the ground that it is believed to be destined for Germany.

No. 5.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, January 1, 1916.

Sir,

I have received, and read with considerable surprise, your note of the 18th ultimo respecting the examination by the British authorities of the parcels mail found on board the Danish steamship "Hellig Olaf" and the Swedish steamship "Stock-

holm." You inform me that the Swedish Government protest against this interference with the parcels mail between Sweden and the United States, as contrary to international law.

It is difficult to understand this contention. The steamship "Hellig Olaf" was carrying a number of postal parcels as to which there was reason to suspect that some had an enemy destination. The ship was accordingly visited and searched in accordance with the well-known and well-established belligerent right. In order not to delay the ship unnecessarily, the suspected parcels were removed for examination, and the ship itself allowed to proceed. The result of the examination was to show that one-third of the parcels contained absolute contraband destined for Germany. These will be put into the Prize Court. The remainder of the parcels have been forwarded to their addresses. In the same way the steamship "Stockholm" was visited and searched. Suspected parcels were removed, and the ship sent on. In this case the parcels turned out to be unobjectionable from a belligerent point of view, and they too have been despatched to their destinations.

These are the plain facts of the incidents, and His Majesty's Government is at a loss to imagine what is the breach of international law suggested by the Swedish Government. It cannot surely be intended to dispute that a belligerent has a right

to visit and search a neutral ship and cargo where he suspects an invasion of his belligerent rights. The Swedish Government are far too familiar with international law to raise such a contention as that. Still less can it be supposed that the Swedish Government desire to throw doubt on the legality of seizure by a belligerent of contraband destined for an enemy country. Is it then suggested that the fact that the good in question were being transmitted by parcels post renders them immune from the operation of belligerent rights? I am unaware of any justification for such a suggestion. On the contrary, when, at the Second Peace Conference, it was agreed by the Powers which took part in it, to grant for the first time immunity in certain circumstances to postal correspondence found upon neutral ships on the high seas, it was expressly declared in the debate which led up to this decision that parcels were "certainly excluded from the privileged treatment accorded to postal correspondence." Indeed, it is obvious that any other decision would have practically destroyed belligerent rights with respect to contraband and blockade. It is further worthy of remark that the right of visit and search, even in the case of letter post, was expressly preserved, and that letters going to and coming from blockaded ports were exempted from the immunity in question.

The Swedish Government are, of course, perfectly cognisant of all these considera-

tions, and I can only suppose that the protest which you have been instructed to make is based on some misapprehension of the facts. That, too, must be the explanation of their otherwise inexplicable and, I must add, indefensible procedure in detaining the British transit mail to Russia. As I understand your note it is not pretended that the Swedish Government have any right to take such action except by way of reprisal or retortion. I must take leave to observe that for a friendly Government to proceed to reprisals or retortion without asking for or receiving any explanation of the alleged offence is a somewhat arbitrary procedure. At the least it imposes on the Government taking such drastic action the duty of making itself quite sure of its ground. In this case I feel convinced that after due consideration the Swedish Government will recognise that the action of His Majesty's Government has been perfectly correct. His Majesty's Government must therefore request the immediate release of the British mails, and would welcome any explanation which the Swedish Government may wish to offer.

I desire to add that His Majesty's Government much regret the delay which the exercise of its belligerent rights caused to the innocent parcels post by the steamships "Hellig Olaf" and "Stockholm," and to express the hope that no serious inconvenience was thereby caused. They have done their utmost to minimise delay and inconvenience.

I have, &c.

E. GREY.

No. 6.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, January 19, 1916.

Sir,

With reference to my note of the 1st instant, I have the honour to enquire when I may hope to receive the answer of the Swedish Government to my request for an explanation of their attitude in respect to the detention of the British transit mail to Russia.

You will allow me to observe that the failure of the Swedish Government to make any reply to my communication, and to continue the admittedly illegal detention of British mails, contrasts singularly with the efforts made by His Majesty's Government to minimise in every possible way the inevitable inconvenience to Swedish subjects involved in the exercise by Great Britain of her undoubted belligerent rights in dealing with the illicit abuse of Swedish mails by enemy traders.

If the Swedish Government consider it proper indefinitely to embargo British mails without any justification, His Majesty's Government do not see how they can be expected not to place a similar embargo on all Swedish mails.

I have, &c.

E. GREY.

No. 7.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey,—(Received January 22.)

Légation de Suède, Londres,

le 21 janvier, 1916.

M. le Secrétaire d'Etat,

Je n'ai pas manqué de porter à la connaissance du Governement du Roi la note que votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser le 1er de ce mois au subjet de l'arrêt des postes suédoises à bord les steamers "Hellig Olaf" et "Stockholm."

En réponse à cette note, j'ai reçu l'instruction de communiquer à votre Excellence ce qui suit:

Le Gouvernement du Roi se permet de faire remarquer, en premier lieu, que, comme base pour l'opinion émise par lui que les colis postaux dont il s'agit avaient été retenus et en partie saisis, en dépit du droit des gens, il n'a jamais pensé à se réclamer des prescriptions spéciales au sujet de l'inviolabilité des correspondances postales qui se retrouvent dans la 11e Convention de La Haye de 1907. Le Gouvernement Royal n'ignore point que les prescriptions en question visent seulement les lettres et non les colis postaux.

C'est sur d'autres bases que le Gouvernement Royal fonde son opinion et qu'il a pris, en conséquence, ses mesures.

Ainsi que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique le sait, le Gouvernement du Roi n'a, à aucun moment, admis la justification des saisies dans la forme et à l'étendue dans lesquelles elles ont été pratiquées par les autorités britanniques pendant la guerre actuelle.

Au contraire, le Gouvernement du Roi a présenté contre ces mesures des protestations et réclamations, aussi bien générales que spécifiques. Le fait que ces protestations et réclamations n'ont pas obtenu le résultat attendu ne saurait constituer pour lui un empêchement d'intervenir contre de nouveaux empiétements quand, par les circonstances, il s'y voit appelé.

Les cas dont il s'agit dans l'espèce sont des empiétements de nature très sérieuse. Une action qui est contraire aux droits des gens, lorsqu'il s'agit de marchandises en

général, est, à plus forte raison, encore moins excusable à l'égard de colis postaux.

Sous ce rapport, je prends la liberté de rappeler la tendance indiquée dans la convention de La Haye d'accorder un traitement spécial aux bâteaux-postes.

Outre cela, il paraît évident:

Que si une personne fait usage de la poste, c'est-à-dire des moyens de transport placés sous la garantie directe des autorités de l'Etat, elle est en droit de compter sur une expédition plus rapide et plus sûre en raison des droits de transport plus élevés payés par elle;

Que le contenu des colis postaux, comme règle, offre un caractère plus personnel que les envois de marchandises en général;

Et que, pour ces raisons, la saisie ou le retard de ce genre d'envoi se font spécialement ressentir lorsqu'il s'agit d'intérêts qui ne sont pas de nature exclusivement matérielle.

Si pour un instant le Gouvernement Royal voulait admettre—ce qui n'est pas le cas—que les nécessités de la guerre justifient des mesures qui en elles-mêmes sont injustifiables, il serait obligé de faire ressortir que, sous ce rapport, la saisie des colis postaux a infiniment moins d'importance que l'arrêt d'autres envois de marchandises pour ou de l'ennemi.

Pour ce qui est des colis postaux à bord le steamer "Hellig Olaf" le Gouvernement Royal n'a pas connaissance qu'avant la saisie il y ait eu lieu de suspecter la présence de marchandises constituant de la contrebande et ayant une destination ennemie au point de vue anglais. Quant à la destination des colis saisis, il est, au contraire, apparent que tous les paquets étaient adressés à la Suède et à des destinataires suédois.

Une suspicion générale de l'existence d'une organisation de transports réguliers de contrebande établie par voie de colis postaux entre l'Amérique et l'Allemagne par la Suède ne saurait offrir une justification acceptable et ne se trouve pas justifiée par les circonstances non plus.

Le nombre de colis postaux expédiés de Suède en Allemagne a été considérablement moindre pendant la guerre qu'avant. Tandis que le nombre des colis postaux du 1er juillet, 1913, au 30 juin, 1914, était de 40,442, le nombre expédié du 1er juillet, 1914, au 30 juin, 1915—la première année de la guerre—était seulement de 27,524.

Il a été dit qu'une partie des colis postaux saisis sur le "Hellig Olaf" contenaient du caoutchouc. Il faut rappeler ici que cette marchandise appartient, selon la Déclaration de Londres, à la liste dite "libre," c'est-à-dire à la catégorie des marchandises qui ne peuvent même pas être déclarées contrebande conditionnelle.

Mais, indépendamment de la Déclaration de Londres, il est évident que le caoutchouc, qui est d'un emploi courant et régulier pour des usages civils, ne saurait être considéré que, tout au plus, comme contrebande relative.

La décision anglaise elle-même par laquelle, malgré les circonstances dont je viens de faire mention, le caoutchouc a été déclaré contrebande de guerre, n'offre pas la justification nécessaire pour la saisie de ces colis postaux, puisque la présomption de la destination ennemie fait défaut; cela d'autant plus que le caoutchouc soit en colis postal, soit en d'autre envoi, est frappé de prohibition d'exportation en Suède et que, par conséquent, il n'y avait pas de raison pour arrêter et examiner ces colis.

Pour ce qui est des colis postaux adressés à l'Amérique à bord le steamer "Stockholm," il ne pourrait y avoir eu question de les traiter comme contrebande, vraie ou suspecte.

Le Gouvernement du Roi ne sait pas quels autres motifs le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique se croit en droit d'invoquer pour la saisie et l'examen de ces colis postaux et il ignore, par conséquent, aussi ce que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique entend en qualifiant ces paquets de "suspected" et "unobjectionable."

Si, comme cela paraît plausible, l'intention du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique était d'appliquer à ces colis postaux l'Ordonnance Royale du 11 mars, 1915, le Gouvernement du Roi, en se référant à sa protestation contre cette ordonnance Royale, se voit dans l'obligation de constater, de nouveau, qu'il ne saurait la reconnaître comme justifiée, ni valide.

De certaines expressions dans la note de votre Excellence il y a lieu de conclure que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique considère les règles du blocus, en quelque mesure, applicables dans les circonstances dont il s'agit. Ceci, non plus, le Gouvernement Royal ne peut l'admettre.

Il est superflu de faire remarquer que les conditions d'un blocus effectif, telles que ces conditions ont été définies dans l'acte solennel et international qui règle ces questions, n'existent point.

Ainsi qu'il l'a déjà fait observer dans une note de protestation adressée à Sir Esme Howard, le 12 novembre, 1914, le Gouvernement du Roi se plaît à croire qu'il viendra un jour où la Grande-Bretagne, aussi bien que d'autres Puissances belligérantes de l'heure actuelle, tiendront compte à la Suède de ce qu'elle n'ait pas cru devoir prêter son concours—même passif—à la mise de côté des traités conclus et des lois de droit international qui plus tard pourront reprendre leur valeur pour eux.

Si le Gouvernement Royal a cru devoir recourir à certaines mesures de rétorsion, sans avertissement préalable, cela a été motivé par le fait que les empiétements contre

lesquels elles étaient dirigées constituaient une répétition aggravée d'infractions contre lesquelles il avait eu à se plaindre, à plusieurs reprises.

Le Gouvernement du Roi a l'espoir que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique, à la suite de l'explication qui vient de lui être fournie, voudra bien comprendre le point de vue suédois et il a la conviction qu'à la suite de ce que je viens d'avoir l'honneur d'exposer, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique sera disposé à rendre justice aux demandes formulées dans la note du 18 décembre dernier.

Quant aux observations que le Gouvernement du Roi a cru devoir présenter au sujet de la saisie par les autorités anglaises de postes de lettres sur des navires neutres et adressées à la Suéde, auxquelles observations il n'a pas encore reçu de réponse, le Gouvernement du Roi ose également espérer qu'une solution satifaisante y sera donnée.

En priant votre Excellence d'agréer, &c.

WRANGEL.

(Translation).

Swedish Legation, London,

January 21, 1916.

Sir,

I did not fail to bring to the notice of the King's Government the note which your Excellency was good enough to address to me on the 1st instant respecting the seizure of the Swedish mails on board the steamships "Hellig Olaf" and "Stockholm."

In reply to that note, I have received instructions to communicate the following to your Excellency:—

The King's Government venture to point out, in the first place, that, in expressing the opinion that the postal parcels in question had been detained and in part seized contrary to international law, they never thought of founding themselves on an appeal to those special provisions regarding the inviolability of postal correspondence, which are found in the 11th Hague Convention of 1907.

The Royal Government are well aware that the provisions in question apply only to letters and not to postal parcels.

It is on other grounds that the Royal Government base their opinion, and have consequently taken their measures.

As His Britannic Majesty's Government are aware, the King's Government have at no time admitted that the seizures in the form and to the extent to which they have been carried out by the British authorities during the present war were justified.

On the contrary, the King's Government have presented protests and complaints, both general and specific, against these measures. The fact that these protests and complaints have not had the expected result cannot prevent them from intervening against fresh encroachments when they feel called upon by circumstances to do so.

The particular cases now in question constitute encroachments of a very serious nature. Action which is contrary to international law, when it is a question of goods in general, is, *à fortiori*, still less excusable with regard to postal parcels.

In this respect, I venture to recall the tendency shown in the Hague Convention to accord special treatment to mailb-oats.

Apart from this, it seems evident—

That if a person makes use of the post, *i.e.*, of the means of transport placed under the direct guarantee of the State authorities, he has the right to count on a more rapid and sure means of transmission by reason of the higher rate paid for transport;—

That the contents of postal parcels, as a rule, are of a more personal character than consignments of goods in general;

And that, for these reasons, the seizure or delay of this class of consignment makes itself especially felt when it is a question of interests which are not of an exclusively material nature.

If the Royal Government were for a moment willing to admit--which is not the case—that the necessities of war justify measures in themselves unjustifiable, they would be obliged to point out that in this respect the seizure of postal parcels is of nfinitely less importance than the detention of other consignments of goods for or from the enemy.

As regards the postal parcels on board the steamship "Hellig Olaf," the Royal Government are not aware that before the seizure there had been any reason to suspect the presence of merchandise constituting contraband, and having an enemy destination, from the British point of view. As to the destination of the parcels seized, it appears, on the contrary, that all the parcels were addressed to Sweden and to Swedish consignees.

A general suspicion of the existence of an organisation for the regular transmission of contraband by means of postal parcels between America and Germany through Sweden cannot be said to afford adequate justification, nor is it justified by the circumstances of the case.

The number of postal parcels despatched from Sweden to Germany has been considerably less during the war than before. While the number of postal parcels

from the 1st July, 1913, to the 30th June, 1914, was 40,442, the number despatched from the 1st July, 1914, to the 30th June, 1915—the first year of the war—was only 27,524.

It has been said that part of the postal parcels seized on the "Hellig Olaf" contained rubber. It should here be recalled that this merchandise belongs, according to the Declaration of London, to the socalled "free" list, *i.e.*, to the category of goods which may not even be declared conditional contraband.

But, independently of the Declaration of London, it is evident that rubber, which is for everyday and regular use for civil purposes, could not at the most be considered more than conditional contraband.

The British decision itself by which, in spite of the circumstances that I have just mentioned, rubber was declared contraband of war, does not afford the necessary justification for the seizure of these postal parcels, since the presumption of enemy destination is wanting; all the more so as the export from Sweden of rubber, whether in postal parcels or other form of consignment, is prohibited, and consequently there was no ground for stopping and examining these parcels.

As regards the postal parcels addressed to America on board the steamship "Stockholm," there could have been no question of treating them as either true or suspected contraband.

The King's Government are unaware upon what other motives His Britannic Majesty's Government consider themselves justified in relying for the seizure and examination of these postal parcels, and they are also ignorant, consequently, of what His Britannic Majesty's Government mean when referring to these parcels as "suspected" and "unobjectionable."

If, as would seem plausible, the intention of His Britannic Majesty's Government was to apply to these postal parcels the Order in Council of the 11th March, 1915, the King's Government would refer to their protest against that Order in Council, and find themselves obliged to reaffirm that they cannot recognise that Order as either justified or valid.

From certain expressions in your Excellency's note there is reason to conclude that His Britannic Majesty's Government consider the rules of blockade to be in some measure applicable in the circumstances. This cannot be admitted by the Swedish Government either.

It is superfluous to point out that conditions of an effective blockade such as they are defined in the solemn and international agreement regulating these questions, do not exist.

As they have already observed in a note of protest addressed to Sir Esme Howard on the 12th November, 1914, the King's Government are pleased to believe that a day will come when Great Britain, as well as the other belligerent Powers of the present day, will be grateful to Sweden that she has not thought it right to become a party—even passively—to the brushing aside of concluded treaties and of rules of international law which may at a later date regain their value for them.

If the Royal Government have felt themselves obliged to have recourse to certain measures of reprisal, without previous warning, that has been due to the fact that the encroachments against which those measures were directed constituted an aggravated repetition of infringements [of the law of nations] against which they had had to complain on repeated occasions.

The King's Government hope that His Britannic Majesty's Government, in consequence of the explanation now furnished, will understand the Swedish point of view, and they are convinced that, as a result of what I have just had the honour of setting forth, His Britannic Mejesty's Government will be disposed to do justice to the requests put forward in the note of the 18th December last.

As regards the observations which the King's Government have felt obliged to present respecting the seizure by the British authorities of letter-mails on board neutral vessels addressed to Sweden, to which they have not yet had a reply, the Swedish Government equally venture to hope that a satisfactory solution will be found.

I have, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 8.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, January 31, 1916.

Sir,

Your note of the 21st instant conveys to me the answer of your Government to my enquiry as to the grounds on which they impugn the action of the British authorities in searching the parcel mails on certain Danish and Swedish vessels, and seizing, for adjudication in the Prize Court, a number of parcels containing rubber.

2. The Swedish Government disclaim, as I felt confident they would, any intention of appealing in this matter to article 1 of the 11th Hague Convention of 1907, which they admit, is not applicable to parcel mails. They ground their protest on other considerations, which, so far as they can be gathered from your note, may be summarised as follows;—

(1.) That the convention referred to prescribes specially considerate treatment of mail boats;

(2.) That consignments by parcel post deserve more lenient treatment than other goods because this means of conveyance is placed under the direct guarantee of the State authorities;

(3.) That, more particularly, the parcels of rubber were not liable to seizure because—

(*a.*) There was, so far as the Swedish Government was aware, no reasonable ground for suspecting any enemy destination;

(*b.*) There could have been, in fact, no enemy destination, since the export of rubber from Sweden is prohibited;

(*c.*) According to the Declaration of London, rubber, being on the free list, could not be declared contraband;

(*d.*) In any case, rubber could not be more than conditional, and never absolute, contraband;

(4.) That, as regards the mail on board the "Stockholm," outward bound for America, the Swedish Government could not recognise any right of interference derived from the Order in Council of the 11th March, since

they did not admit the validity of that instrument.

3. The Swedish Government, pursuant to these considerations, claim credit for refusing to be a party, even passively, to the violation of binding treaties and of the law of nations. The charge implied in this suggestion is a grave one, unusual in diplomatic documents, and, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, I must repudiate it in the strongest and most categorical manner as altogether unwarranted. The invocation of concluded treaties is not, in fact, easy to understand in the present connection, unless it be that the reference is to the two treaties which are specifically mentioned in your note, namely, the 11th Hague Convention of 1907 and the Declaration of London.

4. The 11th Hague Convention is, in fact, invoked as stipulating for special consideration in favour of mail boats. I beg leave to make on this point a more general observation. By a note addressed as lately as the 14th instant by the Swedish Minister at Paris to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, which the latter has been good enough to communicate to me, the Swedish Government declared, in reference to the 13th Hague Convention of 1907, that it could not be regarded as operative during the present war because it had not been ratified by all the belligerent Powers, this being a condition on which the validity of the convention was made to

depend in virtue of a clause to this effect forming an essential part of the instrument itself. As the same clause, in identical terms, occurs in all the Hague Conventions of 1907 relating to the conduct of war, it follows that none of them are in force during the present war. That is the recorded opinion of the Swedish Government. Exactly the same opinion has been expressed by the German Government on more than one occasion, and particularly with reference to the very 11th Convention now in question, when the Norwegian Government called upon them to justify their action in seizing the letter mail on board certain neutral ships. On that occasion, it will be remembered, the German Government, whilst giving an assurance that they would in future refrain from such seizures, explicitly vindicated their perfect right to act as they had done, on the ground that neither this nor any other Hague Convention of 1907 was at present binding.

5. I do not propose here to discuss the question how far this argument can or should be held to be conclusive on the point, having regard to all the circumstances. But I may be permitted to express surprise that the British Government should be arraigned for the non-observance of a convention which her enemies have formally repudiated, by the Swedish Government, who, on their part, declare it does not bind them. The proposition is neither logical nor just. Whatever may be said of the

binding character of any Hague convention—and His Majesty's Government think a good deal could be said on this subject—it is clearly not for the Swedish Government, who hold them not to be binding, to call upon Great Britain to observe those conventions in her war against Germany.

6. The only other treaty referred to in your note is the Declaration of London. This is a document of which Sweden was not a signatory; which has been ratified by none of the Powers that did sign it; and which consequently has no validity as an international instrument at all. I should not, in the circumstances, have thought it possible that the Swedish Government, when reproaching His Majesty's Government with the violation of solemn treaties, could have intended to allude to the Declaration of London, were it not that your note specifically argues that rubber cannot properly be treated as contraband because it is included in the list of articles which the Declaration stipulates shall not be so treated. The Swedish Government are of course aware that whilst His Majesty's Government have, by the terms of an Order in Council, undertaken to consider themselves bound by the rules of international law embodied in certain of the clauses of the Declaration of London, the article setting up the free list was specifically excluded from that undertaking. The seizure of the rubber is justified on the doctrine of continuous voyage, which has been applied and

recognised by other nations before this war, and of the benefit of which the British Government ought not now to be deprived.

7. I therefore put aside the argument based on the Declaration of London as wholly irrelevant, and the first of the grounds on which the Swedish protest is based must surely be disposed of by the considerations set forth above.

8. The second proposition, which would derive a special degree of sanctity for the parcel post from the fact that it is sent under the direct guarantee of the neutral State, appears to His Majesty's Government to involve a novel and somewhat far-reaching doctrine. Coupled with the further argument that the enactment of a Swedish prohibition of the export of an article of contraband operates as a bar to the belligerent's right to seize such contraband, the proposition amounts to a claim that a belligerent should for the enforcement of his right of search and capture rely on a neutral Government. The belligerent right of Great Britain to seize contraband intended to pass into Germany is not affected by the existence of Swedish laws or regulations governing the export of the particular class of goods to that country. The right to stop contraband having an intended enemy destination cannot be taken away by any action on the part of a neutral Power which may make it unlikely that the intended destination will in fact be reached. It is a right which His Majesty's Government cannot possibly abandon, and against its proper exercise they cannot admit that international law entitles any neutral State to protest.

9. Turning to the objections raised to the seizure of the particular consignments, I note that the Swedish Government profess ignorance as to there having been any suspicion of the presence of contraband in the mails on board the "Hellig Olaf" before they were searched. In this respect it is not unnatural that His Majesty's Government should have had the advantage of the Swedish authorities. They did have information that contraband was being shipped in the mails by this and other neutral vessels. Events have shown how accurate was their information. But even if this practical test were not now at hand, it will surely not be contended that a belligerent's right to seize contraband is in abeyance unless and until the Government of the neutral country to which the goods were ostensibly consigned declare itself satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to suspect their innocence?

10. The British authorities have followed the course which is not merely sanctioned but prescribed by one of the most ancient and unquestioned rules of international law. The shipments on board a neutral vessel were searched, and the contraband found was placed in the Prize Court. A diplomatic protest against this procedure cannot claim to rest on any sanction of international law. On the contrary, it violates the cardinal

principle of the law of nations that the legality of the detention or capture of neutral ships or cargoes must be tested in the belligerent's Prize Court before it can properly be made the subject of diplomatic intervention.

11. As regards the parcel mail on board the steamship "Stockholm," I have already had the honour to inform you that none of the parcels subjected to examination were finally detained. All were forwarded to their destination with but slight delay. The Swedish Government will not, I feel sure, call in question the belligerent right of visit and search itself. That right is absolute, and, provided the search is carried out with the due regard for neutral interests which the circumstances permit, there is no warrant in international law or practice for claiming that the belligerent may be called upon to explain why in a particular instance he had thought it necessary to exercise his right.

12. In contrast with the scrupulously correct manner in which the British authorities have throughout acted in dealing with neutral parcels mails, the seizure by the Swedish Government of the Russian transit mail was a wholly and avowedly illegal act, all the more regretable since it affects not only the acknowledged rights of this country, against whom the Swedish action was frankly directed, but also the rights of Russia. Such action is a direct challenge not only to the belligerent rights, but to the national sovereignty of Great Britain. No Power has shown itself more sensitive to any infringement of national sovereignty than Sweden, and the Swedish Government will therefore easily understand the feeling of Great Britain in the matter.

13. His Majesty's Government do not suppose the Swedish Government deliberately meditated an unprovoked departure from their policy of neutrality of so grave a character for the purpose of creating friction with this country. His Majesty's Government, for their part, have gone out of their way to demonstrate by repeated overtures their sincere desire to arrive at some friendly arrangement with Sweden in order to alleviate and diminish the difficulties which the pursuit of any naval war unavoidably creates for neutral maritime commerce. It has been a matter of profound regret to His Majesty's Government that their persistent efforts in this direction have not been crowned with success. They have been given to understand that the difficulties encountered are to be explained very largely by the sensitiveness of the Swedish Government on a question believed to involve some interference of a foreign Government with internal Swedish concerns, which precludes the possibility of their concluding or sanctioning the conclusion of a practical working arrangement with the interests directly concerned such as is feasible in the case of other neutral countries. I am afraid there lies at the bottom of this apprehension a tendency to show a want of

appreciation of the fact that a belligerent has not only duties towards neutrals, but also rights as against his enemy, which are equally sanctified by all the prescriptions of international law, and that the difficulty in so regulating the exercise of those rights as to interfere as little as possible with *bonâ fide* neutral trade is best met by friendly co-operation between the belligerent Government and the neutral traders in order to facilitate the task of distinguishing genuine neutral trade from the illicit transactions which the belligerent is entitled to stop.

14. If in the exercise of the belligerent's undoubted rights, such as the right of visit and search, it is thought by a neutral Government that the British naval or other authorities have gone beyond what the law of nations enables them to do, I can only repeat that it would be more consonant with the principles governing the intercourse between two friendly Governments if, before resorting to an open violation of British rights as a counter-measure to a supposed grievance, the correctness of the assumption on which the neutral based his complaint were brought to the test in the manner and by the machinery prescribed for this purpose by the consensus of all authorities of international law, as well as by the precedents set in every modern naval war. The rule that the legality of any act or interference with neutral ships or cargoes on the high seas must in the first instance be tested in a Court of Prize is one to which Great Britain, when herself neutral, has never failed to show obedience, often at the cost of considerable inconvenience and loss to British subjects and important British interests. She cannot in fairness be asked to agree to a contrary course now that she herself is at war.

15. His Majesty's Government have the most absolute confidence that neutral claimants receive a fair and impartial hearing, and obtain full justice, in the British Prize Courts. I may, however, add that if nevertheless a neutral Government were to consider that the result of any particular judgment in the British Prize Court had in practice failed to give proper redress to one of their subjects, His Majesty's Government would be quite ready to listen sympathetically to any diplomatic representations on the subject, and they do not exclude the possibility of settling the controversy by some reference to arbitration after the conclusion of the war.

16. In view of the explanations which I have now given as to the true bearing of the incidents complained of by the Swedish Government—explanations which I need hardly assure them are offered in no controversial spirit—I feel sure they will understand the position of His Majesty's Government and recognise the justice and reason of their attitude, and I venture to express the earnest hope that orders will, without further delay, be given for the release of the detained Russian parcel mails.

17. I shall have the honour to address a further communication to you on the subject of the search of letter mails, to which reference is made in the concluding paragraph of your note under reply.

I have, &c.

E. GREY.

No. 9.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 12.)

Légation de Suède, Londres, le 11 février, 1916.

M. le Secrétaire d'État.—Ainsi que j'ai eu l'honneur de le faire connaître à votre Excellence en date du 1er de ce mois, je n'avais pas manqué de faire parvenir à mon Gouvernement la copie de la note qu'elle avait bien voulu m'adresser, le 31 janvier passé, au sujet de la saisie d'un certain nombre de colis postaux.

En réponse à cette dernière note, mon Gouvernement me charge de vous communiquer ce qui suit:

Si dans la note que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous remettre, le 21 janvier, le Gouvernement Royal a parlé de "mise de côté de traités conclus." &c., il ressort du contexte de la note qu'il songeait, en premier lieu, à l'éventualité où le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique voudrait, à l'appui de certaines mesures prises par lui, alléguer les règles du blocus. Le Gouvernement Royal estimait avoir désigné en termes suffisamment clairs la Déclaration de Paris du 16 avril, 1856, en parlant de "l'acte solennel et international qui règle ces questions." Il constate aujourd'hui avec satisfaction que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique ne fait même plus mention du blocus et ne met en avant, pour justifier la saisie des colis postaux sur le "Stockholm" allant en Amérique, que le droit général de visite appartenant aux belligérants, droit qui vise la contrebande. Il est vraiment difficile de concevoir comment des colis destinés à l'Amérique puissent être soupçonnés d'avoir une destination ennemie. Il n'est d'ailleurs, pas besoin de démontrer bien longuement que, d'une façon générale, les règles admises concernant la visite et la saisie ont été méconnues dans le cas présent, aussi bien que dans nombre d'autres cas. Aussi le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique paraît-il s'abstenir de contester ce fait. Ces règles ayant pour but de protéger d'une manière restreinte les intérêts idéaux et matériels des neutres, il faut constater que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique, loin de montrer des égards spéciaux pour les intérêts des neutres, a, au contraire, violé leurs droits. Si l'on voulait regarder les mesures britanniques au point de vue des représailles, légitimées par des mesures allemandes, cette justification manquerait de sens vis-à-vis des neutres.

Les représailles ne sauraient être dirigées que contre un adversaire; pour ces mêmes raisons, les droits des neutres ne sauraient être amoindris par une prétendue nécessité de guerre.

Dans la note à M. le Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de France que son Excellence M. le Secrétaire d'État aux Affaires Étrangères de Sa Majesté britannique mentionne dans sa réponse, nous ne faisions que constater le fait indéniable que la XIe Convention de La Haye ne s'applique pas, d'après sa teneur, à la guerre actuelle. Dans la même note, le Gouvernement Royal déclarait expressément ne pas vouloir insister sur ce point. Dans ces conditions et indépendamment de la question de la validité matérielle du document dontgil s'agit, rien ne saurait empêcher le Gouvernement Royal de s'appuyer sur ladite convention, qui a été invoquée contre la Suède par un des Alliés de l'Angleterre, sans aucun doute d'accord avec elle.

Quant à la Déclaration de Londres, il suffira de rappeler que, signée à Londres et sur l'initiative de la Grande-Bretagne, elle affirme dans le préambule "que les règles y contenues répondent, en substance, aux principes généralement reconnus du droit international." Cette assertion, que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique ne veut certainement pas démentir, est notamment indiscutable pour la règle en vertu de laquelle une marchandise "d'un emploi courant civil"—ce qui est le cas pour le caoutchouc—ne peut être qualifiée de contrebande absolue.

Le Gouvernement Royal ne parvient pas à comprendre que la détention de colis postaux sur territoire suédois puisse être considérée comme une atteinte à la souveraineté de la Grande-Bretagne, cependant que la souveraineté de la Suède n'est jugée affectée en rien par des opérations de saisie faites à bord d'un navire suédois que seules des mesures du Gouvernement britannique ont amené dans les eaux territoriales anglaises.

En ce qui concerne les autres points de la note anglaise, le Gouvernement Royal n'a pas été davantage convaincu par les raisons invoquées pour combattre sa manière de voir.

Mais il n'estime pas nécessaire d'aborder ici ce sujet, préférant chercher par une autre voie la solution des questions pendantes.

Le Gouvernement Royal, qui attache grand prix à conserver des relations amicales avec la Grande-Bretagne et qui, en vue de leur maintien, désire faire, pour sa part, tout ce qui est compatible avec les droits et les intérêts de la Suède, a pris connaissance avec vive satisfaction de la suggestion dans la note de Sir Edward Grey tendant à recourir à l'arbitrage pour arriver à une solution.

Pour y répondre et afin de témoigner de sa bonne volonté, le Gouvernement Royal est disposé à relâcher et à expédier à destination les colis postaux actuellement

retenus en Suède, à condition que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique, de son côté, se déclare prêt à soumettre, sans retard, à la décision d'un tribunal d'arbitrage, conformément à la Convention de La Haye et au Traité d'Arbitrage anglo-suédois du 11 aout, 1904, et renouvelé le 9 novembre, 1914, la question de la légitimité des mesures prises jusqu'à ce jour par la Grande-Bretagne à l'égard des colis postaux à destination de la Suède ou expédiés de ce dernier pays, ainsi que la question des conséquences qui doivent résulter de la solution donnée à la première question.

Si le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique est d'accord pour recourir à l'arbitrage, le Gouvernement Royal ose espérer que, le Gouvernement Royal, révoquant l'ordre de retenir la poste anglaise, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique renoncera également, dans l'attente de la sentence arbitrale, à prendre des mesures comme celles qui ont causé les divergences actuelles, et à provoquer ainsi de nouvelles contre-mesures.

Je profite, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 9.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received February 12.)

(Translation.)

Swedish Legation, London, February 11, 1916.

Sir,

As I had the honour to inform your Excellency on the 1st of this month, I did not fail to communicate to my Government a copy of the note that you were good enough to address to me on the 31st January last, on the subject of the seizure of a certain number of postal parcels.

In reply to the latter note, my Government instructs me to make to you the following communication:—

If, in the note which I had the honour to hand to you on the 21st January, the Royal Government spoke of "the brushing aside of existing treaties," &c., the context of the note shows that it was considering, in the first instance, the eventuality of the British Government's being desirous of pleading the rules of the blockade in support of certain measures adopted. The Royal Government considered that, when speaking of "the solemn international agreement regulating these questions," they had indicated sufficiently clearly the Declaration of Paris of the 16th April, 1856. It now recognises with satisfaction the fact that the British Government make no further mention of the blockade, and only put forward in justification of the seizure of postal parcels on board the "Stockholm," bound for America, the general right of search belonging to belli-

gerents, a right which has reference to contraband. It is really difficult to conceive how parcels destined for America could be suspected of having an enemy destination. There is, moreover, no need to demonstrate at any great length that, generally speaking, the recognised rules with regard to search and seizure were ignored in the present case, as in numerous other instances. The British Government appear, in fact, to refrain from contesting this fact. As these rules have for their object the protection, within limits, of the moral and material interests of neutrals, it must be pointed out that the British Government, far from showing special regard for the interests of neutrals, have, on the contrary, violated their rights. If it were desired to regard the measures taken by the British Government in the light of reprisals, justified by German measures, such justification would be void of meaning as towards neutrals. Reprisals can only be directed against an adversary; for this very reason, the rights of neutrals cannot be allowed to suffer through an alleged necessity of war.

In the note to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs which the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs mentions in his reply, we did no more than state the undeniable fact that the XIth Hague Convention does not, from its tenor, apply to the present war. In the same note the Royal Government expressly declared that they did not wish to insist on this point. In these circumstances, and quite independently of the question of the substantial validity of the document in question, the Swedish Government are in no way precluded from appealing to the Convention referred to, which has been invoked against Sweden by one of the Allies of England, undoubtedly in agreement with her.

As to the Declaration of London, it will be enough to recall the fact that the Declaration, which was signed in London on the initiative of Great Britain, affirms in the preamble that "the rules contained in it correspond in substance to the generally recognised principles of international law." This affirmation, which the British Government would certainly not deny, is specially more particularly beyond challenge so far as concerns the rule by which goods "of current civil use"—such as india-rubber—cannot be classed as absolute contraband.

The Royal Government are unable to comprehend how the detention of postal packets on Swedish territory can be considered as a violation of the sovereignty of Great Britain, while the sovereignty of Sweden is not considered to be affected by operations of seizure carried out on board a Swedish vessel which had only entered English territorial waters owing to the measures taken by the British Government.

As regards the other points in the English note, the Royal Government remain equally unconvinced by the reasons adduced in opposition to its point of view.

They do not, however, consider it necessary to touch upon this subject here, preferring to seek in another direction a solution of the questions at issue.

The Royal Government, attaching great importance to preserving friendly relations with Great Britain, and desiring, with this object in view, to do, on their part, everything compatible with the rights and interests of Sweden, have received with the greatest satisfaction the suggestion made in Sir Edward Grey's note, that recourse should be had to arbitration in order to arrive at a solution.

In response to this, and in order to show their goodwill, the Royal Government are ready to release and forward to their destination the postal parcels at present detained in Sweden, on condition that the British Government on their part declare themselves ready to submit without delay to the decision of an arbitration tribunal, in accordance with the Hague Convention and the Anglo-Swedish Arbitration Treaty of the 11th August, 1904, renewed on the 9th November, 1914, the question of the legality of the measures taken up to the present by Great Britain with regard to postal parcels destined for Sweden or forwarded from that country, as well as the question of the consequences which may devolve from the solution of the first question.

If the British Government agree to have recourse to arbitration, the Royal Government venture to hope that, whilst they revoke the order for the detention of the English mail, the British Government on their part will, pending the arbitral award, refrain from measures such as those which have brought about the present differences, and so avoid to provoke fresh counter-measures.

I avail, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 10.

Memorandum presented by Sir E. Howard to M. Wallenberg, Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

His Majesty's Government are anxious to do anything they reasonably can to arrange in an amicable way the question which has arisen between them and the Royal Swedish Government respecting parcel mails. It seems to them, however, impossible on account of many obvious difficulties to agree to the proposal that the question should be submitted to arbitration during the course of the war. His Majesty's Government consider that they have gone as far in the way of conciliation as it was possible to expect when they stated that they were ready to refer to arbitration after the conclusion of the war any question in which, in the opinion of the Royal Swedish Government, Swedish claims have not been justly dealt with by a judgment of the

British Prize Court.

It is true that the Royal Swedish Government at the time when the blockade measures, instituted under the British Order in Council of the 11th March, 1915, came into force, notified His Majesty's Government that they did not recognise their validity in international law. But that they should now, nine months after these measures have been in operation, demand their immediate abandonment on pain of reprisals against British transit of mails to Russia, reveals an attitude which, considering that no reprisals have ever been suggested against the methods of warfare adopted by the enemies of Great Britain, whereby many Swedish vessels have been illegally destroyed and many innocent Swedish lives lost, can hardly be considered as logical or equitable, nor looked upon as one of strict and impartial neutrality.

The detention of a certain number of British parcel mails is not a matter of any great intrinsic importance, and the hardship thus inflicted on individuals can no doubt be corrected in due course by adjusting their claims for compensation; but, as long as it continues, it keeps alight a smouldering fire of irritation which may at any moment cause serious difficulties.

His Majesty's Government are very sincerely anxious, and they hope that the Royal Swedish Government are equally so, to maintain and increase the friendliness

the relations between the two countries, and for this reason they desire to put an end to this dispute.

His Majesty's Government finally point out that the Swedish Government, in agreeing to accept a judicial decision on the cases in dispute, would certainly not be acting in a manner inconsistent with the sovereignty of a neutral State, more particularly in view of the fact that if they succeed in establishing their claims before the Prize Courts, Swedish subjects will receive full compensation for any loss they may have suffered, and that in case they do not succeed in so doing, it will always be open to the Royal Swedish Government to require the decision of the Prize Court to be renewed, and if found inequitable, reversed by a Court of Arbitration after the conclusion of the war.

Stockholm, February 28, 1916.

No. 11.

M. Boström, Swedish Chargé d'Affaires, to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 14.)

Légation de Suède, Londres, le 13 *mars*, 1916.

M. le Secrétaire d'Etat,—LE 28 féverier dernier, le Ministre de Sa Majesté britannique à Stockholm a transmis à M. le Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de Sa

Majesté le Roi de Suède un aide-mémoire contenant la réponse du Gouvernement britannique à la note de M. le Comte Wrangel du 11 février, 1916, relative à la question de la détention de certains colis postaux. Conformément aux instructions reçues, j'ai l'honneur de communiquer à votre Excellence ce qui suit en réponse à l'aide-mémoire susmentionné.

Le Gouvernement suédois s'associe pleinement au désir exprimé du côté anglais de maintenir et d'affermir les relations amicales existant entre les deux pays, et d'écarter les causes d'irritation.

C'était dans ce but que le Gouvernement du Roi s'était déclaré disposé à relâcher les colis postaux retenus en Suède, si le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique, de son côté, acceptait l'arbitrage sans délai, et qu'il exprimait, d'autre part, l'espoir que, dans l'attente de la sentence arbitrale, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique renoncerait à prendre des mesures susceptibles de provoquer de nouvelles divergences de vues et de nouvelles contremesures.

En effet, le gain serait minime si, les causes d'irritation actuelles ayant été écartées, il en surgissait aussitôt une série ininterrompue d'autres de la même espèce.

Il est malheureusement difficile de trouver, dans le mémorandum britannique du 28 février, 1916 l'admission de l'espoir, énoncé du côté suédois, d'un changement

dans les pratiques britanniques. Du point de vue suédois, les objections auxquelles se heurte l'idée de renvoyer jusqu'après la fin de la guerre le recours à un arbitrage n'en acquièrent que plus de force encore.

Quant à la suggestion, faite du côté britannique, de chercher une solution par la voie judiciaire, c'est-à-dire de la demander à un tribunal des prises anglais, le Gouvernement du Roi prend la liberté de présenter les considérations suivantes:

Tout d'abord, l'expérience a montré que—par suite de circonstances que le Gouvernement suédois s'abstient de juger—les décisions des tribunaux anglais des prises n'interviennent le plus souvent qu'après un temps considérable. C'est ainsi que, à la connaissance du Gouvernement suédois, aucune des affaires pendantes concernant la saisie de marchandises appartenant à des sujets suédois n'a encore reçu de solution définitive.

En second lieu, il a été soutenu devant le Tribunal des Prises, par le représentant du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique, que ce tribunal n'est pas compétent pour juger de la validité, en vertu des règles du droit international, des prescriptions du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique appliquées, dans une affaire à lui soumise, par les autorités britanniques militaires ou autres. Si cette thèse vient à prévaloir, il sera évidemment impossible, quelque haute opinion qu'on puisse avoir du

génie, de la science et de l'impartialité du Tribunal des Prises, d'espérer le succès d'une action fondée sur la non-validité, au point de vue du droit international, des prescriptions en question.

Troisièmement, les cas litigieux dont il s'agit comportent des points importants dont le Tribunal des Prises ne saurait connaître directement et qui ne pourraient à peine être examinés par lui dans les considérants. Si le Gouvernement du Roi est bien informé, l'examen du tribunal ne porte, en effet, que sur les questions à lui soumises par une autorité britannique, ce qui n'a pas été le cas, jusqu'à ce jour, pour la question, entre autres, des mesures britanniques contre la poste expédiée de Suède aux États-Unis d'Amérique.

Malgré ces objections, le Gouvernement du Roi salue avec sincère satisfaction la suggestion d'un règlement amical des difficultés actuelles et à venir que constitue la déclaration du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique affirmant qu'il est: "ready to refer to arbitration after the conclusion of the war any question in which, in the Royal Swedish Government, Swedish claims have not been justly dealt with by a judgment of the British Prize Court."

Se référant à cette déclaration aussi bien qu'à la Convention d'Arbitrage en vigueur entre les deux pays et du principe de laquelle la déclaration anglaise forme

l'application, le Gouvernement du Roi exprime l'espoir qu'un arrangement pourra intervenir sous peu qui reconnaisse expressément à la Suède le droit de porter, après la guerre, devant un Tribunal d'Arbitrage, conformément à la Convention de La Haye pour le réglement pacifique des conflits internationaux, d'une part:

Les questions indiquées dans la note suédoise du 11 février, 1916, et les questions de même nature survenues depuis lors ou qui pourront survenir, celles qui ont été ou seront soumisis à un Tribunal britannique des Prises, ne devant pas, toutefois, être l'objet de ce renvoi avant que le Tribunal des Prises ait rendu sa sentence; et.

D'autre part, d'une façon générale, toutes les questions intéressant la Suède ou des ressortissants suédois qui ont été ou seront tranchées, à l'occasion de la guerre actuelle, par un Tribunal britannique des Prises, et par rapport auxquelles le Gouvernement du Roi, estimera avoir lieu de se trouver non satisfait de l'arrêt prononcé.

A condition qu'il soit possible d'arriver à un tel arrangement, le Gouvernement du Roi est disposé à relâcher immédiatement, en vue de leur envoi à destination par les voies ordinaires, les colis postaux actuellement retenus en Suède. Le Gouvernement du Roi, qui doit se réserver, pour le cas où des mesures britanniques du genre de celles qui ont motivé la rétention continueraient d'être prises, de recourir aux contre-

mesures indiquées par les circonstances, croit devoir représenter au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique combien il serait désirable que, pour éviter de nouvelles causes d'irritation réciproque, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique voulût bien renoncer à de semblables mesures.

Le Gouvernement du Roi ose espérer que le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique voudra bien reconnaître qu'il a manifesté non seulement de sa bonne volonté d'écarter tous les obstacles contre les bonnes relations entre les deux pays, mais qu'il a aussi montré toute considération dépendant de lui et qui pourrait en être attendu, envers ler intérêts spéciaux qui ont eu à souffrir par la rétention en Suède des colis postaux en transit.

Veuillez, &c.

WOLLMAR BOSTRÖM.

No. 11.

M. Boström, Swedish Chargé d'Affaires, to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received March 14.)

(Translation)

Swedish Legation, London, March 13, 1916.

Sir,—ON the 28th February last His Britannic Majesty's Minister at Stockholm transmitted to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of His Majesty the King of Sweden a memorandum containing the reply of His Britannic Majesty's Government to Count Wrangel's note of the 11th February, 1916, relative to the detention of certain postal parcels. In accordance with instructions received, I have the honour to make the following communication to your Excellency in answer to the said memorandum.

The Swedish Government fully share the desire expressed by the British Government to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations between the two countries and to remove any grounds of friction.

It was with this view that the King's Government declared themselves prepared, if the British Government on their part accepted the proposal of arbitration without delay, to release the parcels mails detained in Sweden, and also expressed the hope that the British Government, pending the arbitral award, would refrain from taking measures which might cause new disputes and new counter-measures.

Very little would in fact be gained if, after the present grounds of friction had been removed, fresh cases of the same nature were immediately to arise and continue in uninterrupted sequence.

It is, unhappily, difficult to find in the British memorandum of the 28th February any ground for the hope expressed on the Swedish side of a change in the British

practice. From the Swedish point of view, this only lends additional force to the objections which the suggested postponement of a recourse to arbitration until after the war has encountered.

As to the suggestion put forward from the British side that a solution should be sought in legal process, *i.e.*, that the decision of a British Prize Court should be invoked, the King's Government beg to submit following considerations:—

Firstly, experience has proved that—owing to circumstances of which the Swedish Government refrain from judging—the decisions of the British Prize Courts are, as a rule, not given for a very considerable time. So far as the Swedish Government are aware, none of the pending cases concerning the seizure of goods belonging to Swedish subjects have as yet been finally decided.

Secondly, the counsel representing the Government of His Britannic Majesty has maintained in the Prize Court that the Court has no power to decide on the validity under international law of orders given by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, which applied in a case brought before it by the British military or other authorities. If this doctrine is upheld, there is evidently, however highly one may think of the spirit, learning, and impartiality of the Prize Court, no hope of success for a claim based upon the invalidity of such Orders under international law.

Thirdly, the questions now at issue involve important points which could not be the subject of a direct decision by the Prize Court, and which could hardly be taken indirectly into consideration by the Court among the grounds for a decision. If the King's Government are correctly informed, that Court has to consider only such questions as have been brought before it by some British authority, and this has up to now not been the case so far as concerns, among other things, the British measures against the mails from Sweden to the United States of America.

These objections notwithstanding, the King's Government have welcomed with sincere satisfaction the suggestion of a friendly solution of present and future difficulties which is expressed in the statement that the British Government declare themselves "ready to refer to arbitration, after the conclusion of the war, any question in which, in the opinion of the Royal Swedish Government, Swedish claims have not been justly dealt with by a judgment of the British Prize Court."

Referring to this statement, as well as to the Arbitration Convention in force between the two countries, the principles of which, in fact, the said statement merely translates into practice, the King's Government express the hope that an agreement will soon be arrived at recognising explicitly that Sweden has the right to submit, after the war, to a Court of Arbitration, in accordance with the Hague Convention

for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, the following questions, viz. :—

The questions mentioned in the Swedish note of the 11th February, 1916, as well as such questions of the same nature as have since arisen or may arise ; it being, however, understood that cases which have been or may be brought before a British Prize Court shall not be referred to arbitration until the judgment of the Prize Court shall have been given ; and.

Generally speaking, all cases touching the interests of Sweden or of Swedish subjects which have been or may be decided in connection with the present war by a British Prize Court, and in respect to which the King's Government may consider that they have reason to be dissatisfied with the judgment.

Provided that such an agreement can be arrived at, the King's Government are ready to release immediately the parcels mails now detained in Sweden with a view to their being forwarded by the usual route. In case British action of the kind which led to this detention should continue, the King's Government must reserve the right to take such counter-measures as the circumstances may demand. They must accordingly point out how desirable it is, in order to avoid new causes for mutual irritation, that the Government of His Britannic Majesty should discontinue such measures.

The King's Government hope His Britannic Majesty's Government will recognise that they have not only proved their good-will in desiring to remove anything standing in the way of good relations between the two countries, but that they have, so far as depended on them, also shown every consideration reasonably to be expected for the particular interests which have suffered through the detention in Sweden of parcels mails in transit.

I have, &c.

WOLLMAR BOSTRÖM.

No. 12.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, April 25, 1916.

Sir,—I Have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 13th March regarding the detention of the parcels mails.

Before proceeding to a general expression of the policy of His Majesty's Government on this subject, I desire to deal with one point as to which your note reveals some misapprehension. In paragraph 8 of that note, you are good enough to state that the arguments recently presented on behalf of the Crown to the Prize Court

preclude any possibility of a claim based upon the invalidity in international law of the Orders in Council being successfully made before that Court. In order to remove any misapprehension which may exist in the mind of the Swedish Government on this point, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note addressed to the United States Ambassador on the 31st July last,* which makes it clear that the attitude of His Majesty's Government is not that attributed to them in your note. To my declaration thus made to the United States Ambassador His Majesty's Government adhere.

There is one further point to which I must refer. You are good enough to refer in the 11th paragraph of your note to the Arbitration Convention in force between Great Britain and Sweden. I must point out that this convention is not a general one stipulating for the reference to arbitration of all cases in which a dispute exists between the two countries. It specifically recognises exceptions in the cases of matters involving the vital interests of either party, and I can conceive of no question more clearly partaking of this nature than the conduct of naval operations by the Allied Governments against their enemies in the present war.

Having dealt with these points, I wish to proceed in a spirit of conciliation to

* See "Misc., No. 14 (1916)," No. 10.

consider the general proposals put forward in your note in their relation to the policy consistently laid down by His Majesty's Government throughout the present discussion. In order to do so, it will be convenient to review the history of that discussion.

On the 18th December last you very courteously protested against the detention of the parcels mails on board the steamships "Hellig Olaf" and "Stockholm," and on the 27th of the same month you made a similar protest in regard to the removal of the parcels mails from certain other vessels. On the 1st January I was obliged to point out to you that I did not understand the grounds on which the contention of the Swedish Government was based, seeing that parcels mails were not entitled to any special treatment differing from that accorded to any other part of the cargo of neutral ships. On the 21st January you were good enough to answer this note, alleging that His Majesty's Government had violated certain various international agreements by their action.

In replying to this on the 31st January I had the honour to repudiate this charge, and to express the absolute confidence of His Majesty's Government in the justice of the British Prize Courts. With a sincere desire, however, to meet the Swedish Government, I made an offer in the following terms:—

"If, nevertheless, a neutral Government were to consider that the result of

any particular judgment of the British Prize Court had in practice failed to give proper redress to one of their subjects, His Majesty's Government would be quite ready to listen sympathetically to any diplomatic representions on the subject, and they do not exclude the possibility of settling the controversy by some reference to arbitration after the war."

This offer was referred to by His Majesty's Minister at Stockholm in his note of the 28th February in a passage which you are good enough to quote in the tenth paragraph of your communication under reply. That passage must be read in conjunction with the last paragraph of Sir E. Howard's note, which makes it clear that the cases to be referred to arbitration must be specific decisions of the British Prize Court, actually delivered, and both passages must be interpreted by the terms of the offer to which they refer, which I have quoted above, and which remains the final offer of His Majesty's Government. It is not one which they can extend at the present time. Indeed, it requires neither extension nor explanation, for it has already been made to other Government besides the Swedish Government, as you will observe from the conclusion of paragraph 6 of the note to the United States Ambassador enclosed herein.

The above sketch of the history of this discussion will make it clear that the question which His Majesty's Government believe themselves to be discussing is the detention of the parcels mails carried by Swedish ships, and not a test case involving the whole naval policy of His Majesty's Government and of the Allies in the present war. In the case of one of the vessels on which this controversy originally arose, viz., the "Stockholm," the mails were forwarded to their destination, and no question of a Prize Court decision can therefore arise thereon. With regard to the other cases, His Majesty's Government regard them, once they have been adjudicated by the Court, as subject to, and as safeguarded by, the general offer stated above. But His Majesty's Government are, in these particular cases, prepared to go further, and, as an exceptional proceeding arising out of their desire to be friendly to Sweden, they are ready to apply this offer specifically in advance of the decision of the Court to the parcels awaiting adjudication in the instances under discussion. They are ready to agree formally that, if the Swedish Government consider themselves aggrieved by the future decision of the Prize Court with respect to these parcels, they will submit that decision to arbitration after the war, provided the Swedish Government now release the parcels mails in transit for Russia.

This is the final extent of the arrangement which His Majesty's Government are prepared to offer in settlement of the present discussion. As against this, the Swedish

Government have considered themselves justified in demanding, first, that His Majesty's Government shall undertake to submit to arbitration after the war any question which the Swedish Government may desir so to submit; and, secondly, that meanwhile His Majesty's Government shall relinquish for the remainder of the war those very rights the exercise of which is to form the subject-matter of the contemplated arbitration. His Majesty's Government must confine themselves to the specific offer which they have made thereon. They do not admit the illegality of their action, nor can they give any promise limiting the future exercise of their belligerent rights.

I have, &c.

E. Grey.

No. 13.

Note verbale handed by His Majesty's Minister at Stockholm to the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

His Britannic Majesty's Minister was asked some time ago to give an interpretation of the precise meaning of the note addressed to the Swedish Minister in London on the 25th April last, upon the subject of the detention of the parcel post.

The interpretation was given verbally, but Sir E. Howard is now authorised to state that the views of His Majesty's Government agree substantially with those which he then gave as to the meaning of the note. The construction to be placed upon the note is, therefore, as follows:—

1. The offer therein made to the Royal Swedish Government respecting arbitration applies only to disputes about parcels mails carried on Swedish vessels.

2. As a general rule, His Majesty's Government could only entertain a proposal for arbitration in such cases, subjects to the following conditions:—

(*a.*) That the decision of the Prize Court should have been previously given.

(*b.*) That the Royal Swedish Government shall be dissatisfied with such decision.

(*c.*) That diplomatic discussions between the Governments shall have led to a settlement satisfactory to both parties.

3. In the case, however, of the steamship "Hellig Olaf," His Majesty's Government are prepared to consent forthwith to arbitration after the war upon the question of the parcels mails carried by this ship, if the Royal Swedish Government should find themselves dissatisfied with the Prize Court decision, which will be given in the case of these parcels mails.

Although no mention was made in the note above referred to, to the Anglo-Russian parcels detained by the Royal Swedish Government in transit through Sweden,

Sir E. Howard has the honour to add that, in view of the conciliatory attitude shown by the British Government in this matter, it is anticipated that the Royal Swedish Government will not object to refer to arbitration any claims which may be put forward by His Majesty's Government arising out of the detention of these parcels in Sweden, if such claims shall not previously have been settled by diplomatic discussions.

Stockholm, June 5, 1916.

No. 14.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, June 19, 1916.

Sir,—On the 25th April I had the honour to address a note to you regarding the contentions advanced by your Government against the action of His Majesty's Government in detaining for examination the parcels mails from Swedish ships.

I feel obliged to draw your attention to the fact that His Majesty's Government have as yet received no satisfaction in regard to the parcels mails from Great Britain in transit for Russia which have now been detained for months by the Swedish Government. I have already pointed out that this action is wholly illegal. These mails have been detained by the Swedish Government in contravention generally of the principles of international law, and specifically of the agreement between the British and Swedish Post Offices of the 10th and 26th May, 1904, and the only pretext on which it is sought to justify this breach of the agreement and of the law of nations is that it is a retaliation for the action of His Majesty's Government in exercising the belligerent right of examining parcels mails carried on Swedish ships.

As it is admitted by all neutral Governments that parcels mails are not entitled to any special immunities from the laws governing the naval action of belligerent Powers in regard to merchandise on the high seas, this pretext cannot be regarded as worthy of serious attention either by His Majesty's Government or by any impartial person in neutral countries.

His Majesty's Government must therefore demand that the Swedish Government shall without further delay release the parcels mails which they have detained, and I must further give notice that His Majesty's Government will claim damages for the loss suffered by British subjects owing to the action of the Swedish Government.

I have, &c.

E. Grey.

No. 15.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received June 30.)

Légation de Suède, Londres le 29 juin, 1916.

M. le Secrétaire d'État :—D'order de mon Gouvernement, j'ai l'honneur de faire à votre Excellence la communication suivante qui m'a été transmise télégraphiquement de Stockholm :

"Par une note du 25 avril, le Gouvernement britannique s'est prononcé concernant les questions qui se rattachent à la détention de certains colis postaux. Cette note vient d'être interprétée par une note verbale remise le 6 juin par Sir Esme Howard. Aux yeux du Gouvernement du Roi, il paraît impossible de concilier le contenu de ces documents avec les termes des déclarations faites antérieurement par le Gouvernement britannique au sujet du recours à l'arbitrage. Le Gouvernement du Roi était surtout fondé à croire aux énonciations faites dans une dépêche de Sir Edward Grey à la Légation britannique à Stockholm et communiquées au Gouvernement du Roi, le 28 février. Dans cette dépêche, on ne retrouve même point d'allusions à certaines restrictions posées maintenant. Si les promesses du Gouvernement britannique dépassaient le contenu de la note britannique du 31 janvier, le Gouvernement britannique était tout autorisé à interpréter, dans un sens large, cette note qui, du reste, dans le passage dont il s'agit, ne se borne aucunement ni aux colis postaux, ni aux navires suédois. Le Gouvernement du Roi persiste à croire que ces promesses n'étaient pas conformes à l'esprit de la Convention d'Arbitrage en vigueur. Même si les mesures prises contre les neutres pouvaient être qualifiées de 'conduct of naval operations by the allied Governments against thair enemies,' un jugement arbitral qui ne serait rendu qu'après la paix ne pourrait guère mettre en péril les intérêts vitaux d'un pays qui ne serait plus belligérant. De l'autre côté, c'est avec plaisir que le Gouvernement du Roi prend acte de la déclaration faite dans la note du 25 avril et portant que la validité des 'Orders in Council' d'après le droit international peut être contestée avec succès devant le 'Prize Court.' Le résultat final obtenu dans le procès concernant le 'Zamora' se trouve ainsi confirmé de la part du Gouvernement britannique. En outre, le Gouvernement du Roi constate avec satisfaction que même en restreignant la portée de l'offre spéciale faite dans la note du 25 avril, la note verbale explicative ne touche en rien au renvoi fait dans cette note à l'offre générale d'arbitrage adressée à d'autres Gouvenements neutres.

"Dans ces circonstances, le Gouvernement du Roi ne veut pas s'arrêter à l'insuffisance de l'offre spéciale et croit devoir accepter les propositions actuelles du Gouvernement britannique. Ce faisant, il fait observer expressément qu'il maintient entièrement son point de vue concernant les mesures prises tant par lui que par les autorités

britanniques. La révocation de l'ordre qui a amené la détention actuelle de certains colis postaux n'implique donc pas que le transit des colis postaux en général soit repris, mais seulement que les colis détenus soient expédiés à leur destination, pourvu que cette expédition ne rencontre pas d'obstacles dans les prohibitions générales d'exporter et de faire transiter certaines denrées. Tant que continuent les procédés britanniques, dont la Suède a le droit de se plaindre, au sujet des colis postaux et de la correspondance postale, le Gouvernement du Roi ne se voit pas à même de concéder de nouveau ce transit, et il doit se réserver de prendre, le cas échéant, d'autres mesures.

"Il se plaît cependant à espérer que de telles mesures ne seront pas nécessaires et que le Gouvernement britannique agira à divers égards dans le même esprit de conciliation dont le Gouvernement du Roi s'est inspiré en acceptant les propositions britanniques et en écartant ainsi un sujet de plaintes et, paraît-il, d'irritation. Les occasions ne manquent vraiment pas de manifester envers la Suède cet état d'esprit si désirable dans l'intérêt de bonnes relations entre les deux pays."

Je profite, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 15.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received June 30.)

(TRANSLATION.)

Swedish Legation, London, June 29, 1916.

Sir,

Under instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit the following communication which has been sent to me by telegraph from Stockholm:—

"In their note of the 25th April the British Government gave their views concerning questions connected with the detention of certain postal parcels. This note has been explained by a *note verbale* communicated by Sir Esmé Howard on the 6th June. In the view of the Swedish Government it appears impossible to reconcile the contents of these documents with the terms of the declarations previously made by the British Government on the subject of the recourse to arbitration. The Swedish Government had especially relied upon the declarations made in a telegram from Sir Edward Grey to the British Legation at Stockholm, which were communicated to the Swedish Government on the 28th February. In this telegram no allusion is to be found to certain restrictions which have now been laid down. If the promises of the British Government went beyond what was contained in the British note of the 31st

January, the King's Government might conclude that the British Government were fully entitled to give a wide interpretation to this note, which, moreover, in the passage in question, does not limit itself to postal packets or to Swedish vessels. The King's Government still believe that these promises were not in harmony with the spirit of the existing arbitration convention. Even if the measures taken against neutrals could be described as 'conduct of naval operations by the Allied Governments against their enemies,' an arbitral award which would not be pronounced till after the conclusion of peace, could in no way imperil the vital interests of a country no longer at war. On the other hand, the King's Government take note with satisfaction of the declaration made in the note of the 25th April, to the effect that the validity of the Orders in Council according to international law can be successfully contested before the Prize Court. The final result obtained in the case of the 'Zamora' is thus confirmed by the British Government. Further, the King's Government note with satisfaction that though limiting the scope of the special offer made in the note of the 25th April, the explanatory *note verbale* does not in any way affect the reference made in the above note to the general offer of arbitration addressed to other neutral Governments.

"In these circumstances, the King's Government do not wish to lay stress on the inadequacy of the special offer, and are prepared to accept the actual proposals of the British Government. In doing so they wish it to be expressly understood that they adhere entirely to their point of view with regard to the measures taken both by them and by the British authorities. The repeal of the order which had brought about the actual detention of certain postal parcels does not therefore imply the resumption of the transmission of postal parcels in general, but only that the parcels so detained will be forwarded to their destination, provided that there is no obstacle to this in the general prohibitions as to the export and transit of certain commodities. So long as the British Government maintains the measures, of which the Swedish Government is entitled to complain, with regard to postal parcels and postal correspondence, the King's Government do not see their way to renew permission for this transit, and must reserve to themselves the right to take other measures, should necessity arise.

"The Swedish Government hope, however, that such measures will not become necessary, and that the British Government will in certain respects act in the same conciliatory spirit as has inspired the King's Government in accepting the British proposals and in thus eliminating a cause of complaint and, as it appears, of irritation. There is, indeed, no lack of occasions for displaying towards Sweden this spirit, which is so greatly to be desired in the interest of good relations between the two

countries."

I avail, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 16.

Sir Edward Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, July 6, 1915.

Sir:

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 29th June, in which you convey to me the reply of the Swedish Government to the recent communications from His Majesty's Government in regard to the detention of mails.

In reply to your note, I have the honour to point out that the refusal of the Swedish Government to transit further parcels mails between the United Kingdom and Russia is a violation of the agreement concluded between the British and Swedish Post Offices in 1904 concerning the direct exchange of parcels by parcels post. This refusal, therefore, renders the present proposal of the Swedish Government entirely unsatisfactory as a reply to the demand which I had the honour to make in my communication of the 19th June.

While, therefore, taking note of the promise of the Swedish Government to release the parcels at present detained by them, I have the honour to inform you that unless the Swedish Government engage to carry out their obligations under the agreement of 1904 in the case of future parcels despatched from the United Kingdom or from Russia through Sweden, His Majesty's Government must withdraw all the offiers of arbitration they have made.

His Majesty's Government maintain all their rights under the agreement of 1904, and especially the right to claim damages under article 13, which they now hereby claim, together with such additional damages, over and above the sums provided for in that article, as may be due under the general provisions of international law and the requiremen's of international comity.

I have, &c.

E. GREY.

No. 17.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received July 25.)

Légation de Suède, Londres, le 24 *juillet,* 1916.

M. le Secrétaire d'Etat,—En réponse aux notes qu'en date des 19 juin dernier et

6 de ce mois votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser concernant la détention de certains colis postaux, l'arbitrage, &c., j'ai été autorisé à lui faire la communication suivante:

Dans une note datée le 19 juin, 1916, vous avez demandé, au nom de votre Gouvernement, que le Gouvernement du Roi fasse relâcher sans retard ultérieur les colis postaux détenus en Suède par ordre du 16 décembre, 1915. En même temps vous avez annoncé, l'intention du Gouvernement britannique de réclamer des dommages-intérêts qui seraient dus à des sujets britanniques à cause de cette mesure.

Avant que cette note eût pu parvenir à Stockholm, le Gouvernement du Roi avait déjà pris la décision de répondre d'une manière affirmative aux notes britanniques du 25 avril et 5 juin, en acceptant purement et simplement les propositions y formulées. Sir Esme Howard avait été informé de cette décision, qui avait même été mise en exécution par des ordres donnés à l'Administration des Postes. Dans ces circonstances la demande faite dans la note du 19 juin ne paraissait plus avoir d'objet, et il semblait inutile d'entamer une discussion sur les motifs que le Gouvernement brittanique a cru devoir invoquer à l'appui de cette demande.

Ce n'est pas sans étonnement que le Gouvernement du Roi a pris connaissance de la note du 6 juillet dont j'ai déjà eu l'honneur de vous accuser réception. Le Gouvernement du Roi a eu le droit de croire que, les propositions britanniques sur

l'arbitrage et sur la libération des colis postaux détenus en Suède ayant été acceptées sans réserve par le Gouvernement du Roi, il ne restait plus que la tâche de donner une forme plus solennelle à la convention conclue virtuellement, ce qui ne pourrait être difficile. Il n'a donc pas hésité de procéder immédiatement à la libération des colis postaux détenus.

Le Gouvernement britannique, de son côté, a cru pouvoir subordonner l'acceptation de la "proposition" suédoise à la condition que le Gouvernement du Roi s'engage à remplir les obligations découlant de l'accord intervenu en 1904, entre les Administrations des Postes suédoise et britannique, en permettant le transit futur de colis postaux entre le Royaume-Uni et la Russie.

Cette condition est nouvelle. Nulle part dans la correspondance sur l'arbitrage elle n'a été posée ni mentionnée. Au contraire, le Gouvernement du Roi a exprimé plus d'une fois son espoir que le Gouvernement britannique, lui épargnerait par la cessation de ses mesures contestées, la nécessité de prendre des contre-mesures. Cet espoir ne paraît pas se réaliser. Le Gouvernement britannique ayant préféré conserver sa liberté d'action ne pourrait s'étonner de ce que le Gouvernement du Roi réclame pour lui la même liberté. Il faut rappeler que, de fait, les envois en question ont cessé complètement depuis plusieurs mois, les colis postaux ayant été dirigés par

d'autres voies.

En outre, la condition posée est de nature à préjudicier entièrement l'arbitrage, qui ne serait plus qu'une vaine forme. Si le Gouvernement du Roi admettait que l'Accord de 1904 l'empêche de refuser, dans les circonstances dont il s'agit, le transit des colis postaux, la cause renvoyée au tribunal d'arbitrage serait jugée d'avance.

Il va de soi, finalement, qu'aucun Gouvernement indépendant ne pourrait renoncer, pour des éventualités futures et indéfinies, à son droit de prendre, les cas échéant, les mesures nécessaires. Ce qui peut être concédé sans difficulté, c'est que le cas spécial qui est soumis à un tribunal d'arbitrage ne donnera pas lieu à de nouvelles mesures. Le Gouvernement du Roi est même prêt à déclarer, pour donner une nouvelle preuve de son esprit de conciliation, qu'il n'aura pas recours à des contre-mesures à cause des mesures à son avis illégales qui ont ou qui auront été prises à l'égard des communications postales par les autorités britanniques jusqu'au temps où cette note sera remise. Il espère vivement que le Gouvernement britannique appréciera cette concession et qu'il ne trouvera pas d'obstacles à poursuivre l'accord sur l'arbitrage.

Quant aux dommages-intérêts réclamés par le Gouvernement britannique, le Gouvernement du Roi croit pouvoir se borner pour le présent à dire que, à son avis, ces réclamations doivent être considérées en connexion avec des réclamations suédoises correspondantes, et qu'elles dépendront évidemment en dernier lieu de la légitimité des mesures britanniques qui ont ou qui auront provoqué, de la part de la Suède, les contre-mesures en question.

Le Gouvernement du Roi se propose de faire publier, le cas échéant, toute la correspondance sur la détention des colis postaux et sur la question de l'arbitrage. Cette publication pourrait être nécessaire pour donner au public suédois l'occasion de se former une opinion juste au sujet de l'action du Gouvernement du Roi dans cette affaire. Le Gouvernement du Roi rappelle que le Gouvernement britannique a plus d'une fois exprimé son désir de publier les documents y afférents et que le Gouvernement du Roi ne s'y est jamais opposé.

Je profite, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 17.

Count Wrangel to Sir Edward Grey.—(Received July 25.)

(TRANSLATION.)

Swedish Legation, London,

July 24, 1916.

Sir,

In reply to the notes which your Excellency was good enough to address to me on the 19th ultimo and the 6th instant, concerning the detention of certain postal packets, arbitration, &c., I have been authorised to make the following communication to you:—

In a note dated the 19th June, 1916, you asked in the name of your Government that the King's Government should release, without further delay, the postal packets detained in Sweden by the Order of the 16th December, 1915. At the same time, you announced the intention of the British Government to claim such damages as might be due to British subjects as a result of this measure.

Before this note could reach Stockholm, the King's Government had decided to reply in the affirmative to the British notes of the 25th April and 5th June, simply accepting the proposals formulated therein. Sir Esme Howard had been informed of this decision, which had even been put into execution by orders given to the Postal Administration. In these circumstances, the demand made in the note of the 19th June seemed to have no futher object, and it appeared useless to start a discussion on the motives that the British Government thought it necessary to invoke in support of this demand.

The King's Government have taken note with surprise of the communication dated the 6th July which I have already had the honour of acknowledging. The King's Government had the right to believe that as the British proposals regarding arbitration and the release of the postal packets detained in Sweden had been accepted by the Swedish Government without reserve, nothing remained but to give a more official form to the convention which was virtually concluded, a task that could not have been difficult. They therefore did not hesitate to proceed immediately with the release of the postal packets which had been detained.

The British Government, on their part, thought themselves entitled to subordinate the acceptance of the Swedish "proposal" to the condition that the King's Government would engage to carry out the obligations arising from the agreement come to in 1904 between the Swedish and British Postal Administrations, by permitting in future the transit of postal parcels between the United Kingdom and Russia.

This is a new condition. It was neither put forward nor mentioned anywhere in the correspondence regarding arbitration. On the contrary the King's Government expressed on more than one occasion their hope that the British Government would, by ceasing the disputed measures, save them the necessity of resorting to retaliation. This hope does not appear to be realised. The British Government having preferred

to retain their liberty of action cannot be surprised at the Swedish Government claiming for themselves the same liberty. It must be remembered that the consignments in question have in fact completely ceased for several months, the postal parcels having been sent by other routes.

Besides, the condition laid down is of a nature to completely prejudice the arbitration, which would be nothing more than an empty form. If the King's Government were to admit that the Agreement of 1904 prevents them from refusing the transit of postal parcels in the circumstances in question, the case to be laid before the Court of Arbitration would be decided in advance.

Finally, it goes without saying that no independent Government could renounce, for future and indefinite contingencies, its right to take necessary measures, should occasion arise. What can be conceded is that the special case which is submitted to an arbitral tribunal will not be made the occasion of new measures. The King's Government, in order to give a fresh proof of their conciliatory spirit, are even prepared to declare that they will not have recourse to retaliation on account of the measures, which have or may have been taken, as they believe illegally, by the British authorities with regard to postal communications, up to the time of the delivery of this note. The King's Government earnestly hope that the British Government will

appreciate this concession, and will find no obstacles to prevent them proceeding with the agreement on the subject of arbitration.

With regard to the question of damages claimed by the British Government, the King's Government think they may confine themselves for the present to declaring that in their opinion these claims must be considered in connection with corresponding Swedish claims, and that they will clearly depend in the last resort on the legality of the British measures which have, or may have, provoked, on the part of Sweden, the retaliation in question.

The King's Government propose, should the occasion arise, to publish the whole correspondence concerning the detention of postal parcels and the question of arbitration. This publication may be necessary to give the Swedish public an opportunity of forming a correct opinion as to the action of the King's Government in this matter. The King's Government recall the fact that the British Government have several times expressed a desire for the publication of the documents bearing on the subject, and that the King's Government have never opposed it.

I avail, &c.

WRANGEL.

No. 18.

Viscount Grey to Count Wrangel.

Foreign Office, August 2, 1916.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 24th July, in which you convey the reply of the Swedish Government to my notes of the 19th June and 6th July regarding the question of the parcels mails.

I have the honour to inform you that, if and so long as the Swedish Government forward parcels between the United Kingdom and Russia and elsewhere in the regular way, and otherwise carry out the Post Office Agreement of 1904, the offers of arbitration made in my note of the 25th April, as interpreted by the *note verbale* handed to the Swedish Government by His Majesty's Minister at Stockholm on the 5th June, will remain open.

With regard to the considerations urged in the 6th paragraph of your note under reply, I have the honour to inform you that His Majesty's Government merely asked for a statement whether the Swedish Government will henceforward cease to interfere with the transit of all parcels despatched to or from the United Kingdom across Sweden. I should be glad to receive an answer to this question as soon as possible, and I trust that on receipt of it our two Governments may be able to regard this correspondence as closed and the questions at issue as finally settled.

I have, &c.

GREY OF FALLODON.

(二) 瑞典國經由ノ小包郵便ニ關シ英瑞兩國ノ交渉要領

（九月十一日ニユーヨーク、くラルド）

DEADLOCK WITH SWEDEN ON MAILS.

BRITAIN INSISTS ON PROMISE OF PARCELS POST IMMUNITY

STOCKHOLM REFUSES.

LONDON, Sunday.—There has been a further and rather sharp exchange of notes between Great Britain and Sweden in regard to the difficulties brought about by the Allied blockade and Sweden's retaliatory seizure of mails in transit between England and Russia. No solution of the problem is in sight.

The British Foreign Secretary, Lord Grey, insists that as a condition to sub-

mitting the matter to arbitration Sweden must promise not to interfere again with English parcel post matter in transit across Sweden. The Swedish government apparently is determined not to make such an engagement.

It is noticeable that until now the correspondence has been conducted almost wholly between Lord Grey and the Swedish Minister in London, Count Wrangel, but Lord Grey's latest note to Count Wrangel says the Count's communication is not understood, and that the British Minister at Stockholm is being directed to present the matter to the Swedish government. Count Wrangel has now gone to the Continent, and it is announced he will remain there for several weeks.

Count Wrangel's letter, given out to-day, says Sweden shares the hopes expressed by Lord Grey that the correspondence may bring definite solution of the questions at issue, and that Sweden "would warmly congratulate itself on the application of the fertile principle of international arbitration." The Count says further he is glad the British government appears to recognize it is an impossibility for the Swedish government "to renounce in advance the right to take measures which regrettable circumstances might render necessary." The letter concludes with the statement that Sweden recognizes fully the binding character of the postal agreement of 1904, but maintains the right to suspend the agreement under the conditions in question.

In reply Lord Grey says the meaning of this communication is not clear, and that he has instructed the British Minister at Stockholm to indicate to the Swedish government that Great Britain "must as a condition precedent to any arrangement involving recourse to arbitration have assurances that the Swedish government will definitely cease to interfere with the transit of parcels to and from the United Kingdom across Sweden."

（三）英國船長フライアット銃殺ニ關スル獨逸側ノ公報

（外事彙報大正五年第九號）
（大正五年七月三十一日附報告）

七月二十八日伯林發「ウォルフ」通信社經由ノ本件公報左ノ如シ

獨逸ノ捕獲シタル英國汽船「ブルッセルス」號船長フライアット被告事件審問ハ七月二十二日「ブルーク」海軍野戰裁判所ニ於テ行ハレタリフライアット ハ英國海軍ニ屬シ居ラサルニ拘ハラス千九百十五年三月二十八日午後二時半ムース河ノ船上燈臺ノ近傍ニ於テ獨逸潛水艇「ユー、第三十三號」ヲ蹴破セント試ミタル事件ニ付告發セラレタリ

被告並ニ同汽船ノ一等士官並ニ機關長ハ右ノ行爲ニ對シ當時英國海軍省ヨリ彼等ノ勇敢ヲ賞スル所ノ褒美トシテ金時計ヲ受領シ且ツ英國下院ハ彼等ヲ賞賛シタリ

被告ハ潛水艇ニ會合シタルトキ潛水艇カ信號ヲ以テ停船シ且ツ旗ヲ揭ケヨト命シタルモ之ニ從ハスシテ好時機ヲ見計ラヒ全速力ヲ出シテ潛水艇ニ向ヒ突進シ來レリ潛水艇ハ直チニ水中ニ潛入シタル爲メ僅カニ數米突ノ所ニテ右汽船ノ衝突ヲ避クルコトヲ得タリ

被告ハ海軍省ヨリ受ケタル訓令ニ依リ右ノ通リ行動シタルモノナルコトヲ自白セリ彼ハ死刑ノ宣告ヲ受ケ千九百十六年七月二十七日銃殺セラレタリ

斯クシテ英國商船カ獨逸海軍ノ艦艇ニ對シ義勇兵「フランチラール」ノ遣ルカ如キ方法ニテ行ヒ來リタル幾多ノ犯罪行爲ノ一ハ遲シト雖モ而カモ正當ニ處罰セラレタリ

（四）英國官憲ノ蘭國漁船抑留問題

（外事彙報大正五年第十一號）
（大正五年九月十五日附報告）

本年七月初旬以來北海ノ漁業（多クハ鯡漁業）ニ從事スル蘭國漁船ニシテ戰時禁制品タル漁獲物ヲ運搬シタリトノ理由ノ下ニ或ハ漁業禁制區域内ニ於テ間斷ナク漁業ニ從事シタリトノ理由ノ下ニ英國海軍ノ引致スル所トナリ積荷共捕獲セラレテ同國港ニ抑留セラルルモノ頻出スルヤ關係諸漁業組合（フラールヂンゲン、海牙、カトヴイグ、アイマイデン等ノ漁業組合）ニ於テハ緊急總會ヲ開キ各々其ノ代表者ヲ英國ニ派シテ同國政府ト交渉セシムル所アリシカ其ノ結果英國政府ハ既ニ六十隻ノ蘭國漁船ヲ差押ヘ居リ而モ同政府ニ於テハ今後共蘭國漁船ハ凡テ之ヲ差押ヘタル上捕獲審檢所ニ送ルヘク又蘭國漁船ニシテ休業スルトキハ毎年ノ利益ニ相應スル額ヲ賠償スヘキ意向ナル旨右代表者ヨリ電報シ來リ爲ニ蘭國輿論ハ沸騰シ右諸漁船組合ハ勿論在「ロツテルダム」水夫組合和蘭漁業奬勵協會等ハ各々會合ヲ催シ何レモ英國ノ措置ノ國際法違反ニシテ爲ニ蘭國ノ歷史的産業タル鯡漁業ノ蒙ルヘキ損害ノ莫大ナルヲ指摘シ且右措置ハ小國保護ヲ以テ任スル英國ノ立場ト矛盾スル所アリトノ趣旨ヲ以テ强硬ナル反對決議ヲ爲シ一方當國政府ニ訴フルト同時ニ他方當國駐在ノ英國公使ニ對シテモ直接間接右決議ノ趣旨ヲ通牒セリ尙同時ニフラールヂンゲン、海牙、カトワイク、フエルゼン各商業會議所ハ倫敦商業會議所ニ依賴シテ英國政府ノ反省ヲ促シ又蘭國社會黨或ハ祖國倶樂部ノ如キ政治團體ニ於テモ反對演說會其ノ他反對的決議ヲ以テ被害蘭國漁業者ノ立場ニ聲援ヲ與ヘ就中社會黨議員スピークマン氏ノ如キハ蘭國第二院ニ於テ本問題ニ付政府ノ採リタル處置ニ關シ外務大臣ニ質問スル所アリ之ニ對シ同大臣ハ大要左ノ如キ答辯ヲ與ヘ蘭國政府モ亦英國政府ニ對シ抗議スル所アリタル旨ヲ明ニシ居レリ

英國政府ハ在蘭國同國公使ヲ通シテ北海漁産物ノ獨逸ニ供給セラルルニ對シ本大臣ニ抗議シ來リ若シ右供給ニシテ繼續セラルルニ於テハ英國政府ハ和蘭漁船ヲ捕獲審檢ニ付スヘク若シ又右供給ニシテ中止セラルルニ於テハ從來或ハ危險區域ニ於テ漁業ニ從事セル理由ニ依リ或ハ戰時禁制品タル魚類ヲ運搬セル理由ニ依リ夫々英國港ニ抑留セラレ居ル漁船ヲ解放シ今後前記區域ニ於テ漁獲セサル限リ蘭國漁船ニ干涉スルコトナカルヘシトノ通牒ヲ送リ來レリ

右ニ對シ本大臣ハ英國公使ニ書面ヲ送リ和蘭産魚類ノ獨逸ニ對スル輸出停止ニ關スル要

求ハ一九〇七年海牙條約ノ規定ニ反スルモノニシテ右規定ニ依レハ中立國ハ交戰國ノ一方ニ仕向ケラレタル貨物ノ輸出ヲ制止スルノ義務ナキ旨ヲ通知シ尙漁船ノ抑留ニ關シ(一)危險區域ニ於ケル漁業ニ基ク抑留ニ關シテハ假令英國政府ハ北海ノ一部ヲ危險區域ト宣言シタリト雖右ハ全區域內ニ於テ船舶臨檢ノ權利ヲ行使スルニ付一般ニ認メラレタル國際法ノ規定ニ從フヘキ義務ヲ解除スルモノニアラス而シテ右船舶ヲ英國港ニ抑留スルノ權利ハ英國政府ノ有セサル所ナルヲ指摘シ(二)戰時禁制品ノ運搬ニ基ク抑留ニ關シテハ本大臣ノ嘗テ爲シタル抗議ノ參照ヲ促シ其ノ場合ヲ指示セリ卽チ國際法ニ從ヘハ條件附戰時禁制品タル食料品ニシテ中立港ヲ仕向先トスル中立國船舶ニ積載セラレタル場合ニハ交戰者ニ依リ差押ヲ受クルコトナシ唯此ノ種禁制品ハ交戰國政府若クハ其ノ軍隊ヲ仕向先トスル場合ニノミ差押ヲ受クヘキモノニシテ蘭國漁船ハ苟モ其ノ漁獲物ノ一部ト雖交戰國軍艦ニ供給シタルコトナク常ニ全部之ヲ和蘭國港ニ持チ來ルモノナル旨ヲ述ヘタリ

尙本大臣ハ蘭國ニ於ケル北海漁業ノ古キ歷史ヲ有スル國民的產業ニシテ其ノ存在ノ戰爭狀態ヲ俟テ生シタルモノニアラス從テ交戰國ノ一方ノ特殊需要ニ應シテ生シタル國際運輸商業ト同一視スヘキモノニアラスシテ本產業ノ妨害ハ啻ニ直接漁業ニ干與スル者ノミナラス之ト關聯スル職業ニ從事スル蘭國多數人民ノ確定的生計手段ニ影響ヲ及ホスコト甚大ナリ若シ英國政府ニシテ蘭國漁產ノ大部分ノ獨逸ニ賣渡サルルニ付不都合ヲ感スルニ於テハ當國開放市場ニ於テ獨逸ト競爭スルハ其ノ自由ナリト述ヘタリ

此外本大臣ハ英國公使ニ對シ本問題交涉ノ爲招カレタル蘭國利害關係者代表委員ニ對シ倫敦ニ於テ提出セラレタル英國政府ノ要求ニ關スル報道カ蘭國輿論ノ反對ヲ釀シタルヲ指摘シ若シ右要求ニシテ事實トセハ之レ殆ント我北海漁業ノ全部及之ニ關聯セル職業ヲ中絕セシムルト同樣ノ結果ヲ生スヘキモノナルヲ述ヘ右要求ノ報道ニ關シテハ蘭國政府ハ未タ官的確報ニ接セサル旨ヲ附加シ且蘭國政府ハ英國政府カ本件解決ニ當リ斯ル不法ナル方法ニ依ルコトナカルヘキヲ確信スル旨ヲ述ヘ最後ニ以上ノ理由ニ依リ蘭國政府ハ目下抑留セラレ居ル船舶ヲ遲滯ナク解放セラルヘキヲ豫期スル旨ヲ附言セリ

抑モ英國官憲ニ於テ蘭國漁船ノ抑留ヲ開始スルニ至レル所以ハ右外務大臣ノ答辯ニ徵スルモ明ナルカ如ク和蘭漁船ノ漁獲セシ緋其他ノ魚類カ大部分獨逸ニ供給セラレテ英國ノ獨國ニ對スル封鎖政策ノ妨害トナルヲ阻止セムトスルニ在ルヘクセシル卿カ當國「アルヘメーンハンデルスプラト」紙通信員ニ語リタルモノトシテ同紙ニ揭載スル所ニ依ルモ元來蘭國漁業者ヲ苦シメムトスルノ目的ニ出テタルモノニアラサルヲ以テ英國政府ハ當初ヨリ其ノ措置ノ爲蘭國漁船ノ蒙ルヘキ損害ニ對シテハ同國漁業代表者ト交涉ノ上解決ノ方法ヲ講スヘシトノ意向ヲ漏シ前記ノ如ク蘭國漁船組合ヨリハ各々代表者ヲ派遣シテ交涉セシムル所アリタリト雖英國政府ノ提議ハ甚タ苛酷ナリトテ徒ラニ和蘭國輿論ノ激昂ヲ促シタルニ止マリ右代表者ノ承服スル所トナラス其後ノ英國側ノ提議ニ於テモ英國政府ノ提出シタル保證ハ極メテ低額ニシテ數千ニ上ル從業勞働者ノ貧窮ニ陷ルヲ防クニ由ナカリシト云フ斯クテ交涉ノ爲メ荏苒日ヲ重ヌル中一方漁船積荷ノ始末ニ關シ他方乘組漁夫ノ歸蘭セサル爲メ

其家族ノ救助ニ關シ面倒ナル問題ヲ生スルニ至レリ乃チ前者ニ關シテハ抑留漁船ヨリ積卸シタル魚類及鹽等ハ英國海軍省ノ命令ニ依リ同省計算ノ下ニ之ヲ英國市場ニ於テ賣却シタル由ナレトモ後者ニ關シテハ元來英國政府ニ於テハ乘組漁夫ノ歸蘭ニ對シ何等反對ヲ唱ヘタルニアラス唯船主ニ於テ乘組員ノ退去ト共ニ船舶自身モ失ハルルコトアルヘキヲ恐レ右歸國ニ反對シタリトノコトナルモ當初其邊ノ消息詳カナラス新聞紙上一時漁夫家族ノ紛擾ヲ傳フルモノアリシカ後右ノ内情明トナリ船主ニ於テモ遂ニ其ノ漁夫家族ニ對スル扶養義務アルヲ自認スルニ至リ「フラールヂンゲン」漁船組合ノ如キハ漁船ノ抑留セラレタル日ヨリ漁夫ノ歸蘭ニ至ルマテ毎週一定ノ金額ヲ其ノ家族ニ支給スヘキヲ定メタリ然ルニ此等ノ措置ト前後シテ八月末旬ニ入リ倫敦ニ於ケル諸漁船組合代表者ト英國政府トノ間ノ交渉ハ愈々滿足ナル條件ヲ以テ解決ヲ告ケ茲ニ右漁船組合所屬船舶ハ歸港ヲ許サレ次テ從來組合員ニアラサリシ漁船所有者モ右組合ニ加入シ其ノ漁船ハ右ト同一條件ノ下ニ抑留ヲ解カルルニ至レリ今漁船組合代表者ト英國政府トノ間ニ成立セル協定トシテ新聞紙上ニ現ハレタルモノヲ見ルニ要領左ノ如キモノアリ

一　捕獲魚類ハ依然トシテ之ヲ公開市場ニ於テ賣却スルヲ得ト雖モ從來ノ如ク獨國ニ輸出スルコトヲ得ヘキ額ハ其ノ二割以下ニシテ他ノ二割ハ蘭國自身ノ需要ニ供セラルヘク其他ノ六割ハ蘭國以外ノ中立諸國ニ賣却セラルヘキモノトス

一　英國政府ハ右六割ノ中立國ニ對スル賣却ニ當リ蘭國漁船所有者ニ對シ魚一桶（一一五基瓦）ニ付三〇志ノ割增金ヲ支拂フヘシ

一　右條件ノ下ニ目下抑留セラレ居ル船舶ハ可成速ニ之ヲ解放スヘク漁船組合ニ屬セサル三十隻ノ抑留船舶ハ右條件ヲ承認スルニ於テハ組合所屬船ト同一方法ヲ以テ之ヲ解放スヘシ

一　漁船組合ハ抑留漁船ノ英國港ニ於ケル遲延ヨリ生シタル損害ニ對シテハ賠償ヲ要求セサルモ船舶ノ引致ニ基ク漁網ノ喪失其他ノ損害及抑留期間ニ生シタル損害ニ對シテハ之レカ賠償ヲ請求スルコトヲ得

一　英國政府ハ最惠國條款ニ從ヒ漁船漁網等ノ修理ニ必要ナル材料ノ蘭國ニ對スル輸出ヲ許可スヘシ

一　本協定ハ九月一日ヨリ施行セラレ獨國トノ戰爭終了若クハ英國政府ニ於テ明示ノ通告ヲ爲スマテ其ノ效力ヲ有スルモノトス

一　英國ニ於テ賣却セラレタル鯡鹽等ノ賣上代金ハ其ノ所有者ニ歸スヘク右賣價ノ蘭國ニ於ケル市價ニ達セサル額ニ付キ賠償ヲ要求スルコトヲ得

卽チ右協定ニ依リ蘭國側ニ於テハ從來同樣北海ノ漁業ニ從事スルヲ得ヘク英國側ニ於テハ從來蘭國漁獲物ノ八、九割マテ獨國ニ輸出セラレシヲ二割以下ニ制限スルコトヲ得テ雙方極メテ滿足ナル結果ヲ得シカ之レ恰モ獨國ノ好マサル所ニシテ同國官民ハ本件問題ニ利害關係深キ丈ケ當初ヨリ種々ノ中傷若クハ煽動的記事ヲ散布シテ蘭國人ノ英國ニ對スル敵愾心ヲ煽ラント勉メシカ今回遂ニ圓滿ナル解決ヲ見タルニ當リ數日前蘭國新聞紙「ニユーウエロテルダムスクーラント」紙上ニ獨國モ亦本協定ニ滿足ノ意ヲ表シタリトノ浮說傳ハル

ヤ在蘭國獨國公使館ハ態々之ヲ否認スルノ記事ヲ掲ケ獨國新聞紙「キヨルニセツアイツン、グ」ノ報スル所ニ依レハ近日同國エルバーフエルドニ開カレタル西方獨國食物供給組合代表者會議ニ於テハ英蘭兩當事者ノ間ニ前記協定ノ成立セルヲ遺憾トシ平時ニ於テ獨國カ蘭國鯡ノ顧客タルヲ指摘シ平和克復後蘭國鯡業者ニシテ再ヒ市場ヲ獨國ニ求メントスルモ獨國ニ於テハ最早之ヲ購求セサルヘシトノ警告的決議ヲ通過シ尚ホ同會合ハ右決議ヲ蘭國當業者ニ知ラシムルノ必要アルヲ認メタリト云フ

（五）スカンヂナビヤ諸國及和蘭國宛輸入物件ノ制限ニ關スル件

（イ）スカンヂナビヤ諸國及和蘭國宛米國貨物ノ輸送ヲ制限スルコトニ關シ英國封鎖大臣ノ說明

（九月十六日ニユーヨーク、ヘラルド）

ENGLAND FORBIDS EXPORTS OF SOME AMERICAN GOODS.

REFUSES TO PASS CERTAIN SHIPMENTS TO SCANDINAVIAN AND HOLLAND PORTS.

LONDON, Friday.—Lord Robert Cecil, Minister of War Trade, to-day explained the recent orders of the British government refusing to allow Holland to accept further consignments of American goods and refusing letters of assurance that American shipments would reach Scandinavia. He said the orders applied only to certain prohibited articles and not to trade in general.

Great Britain has forbidden the export of various articles to European neutrals on the ground that they have already received, in the first seven months of this year, more than an ordinary year's supply. Lord Robert said it was not logical to forbid such exports from Great Britain and to permit them from America and other neutral sources.

Lord Robert explained that one neutral nation, taking normally 18,000 tons of coffee, in seven months of this year already has imported 50,000 tons, so that further imports of coffee to that country are looked upon as likely to reach an enemy destination. The list of prohibited articles, he said, varies with different countries, according to what they already had imported, all allowances being made for imports formerly made to German ports.

BRITISH ASSURANCES NEEDED.

The plan of rationing the neutral countries of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and

Holland, under which no further licenses will be granted for the present to British exporters, has thus been extended to apply to the United States. The Netherlands Oversea Trust, under the order, may not accept further American consignments, nor will England grant letters of assurance for American shipments destined for these countries. In consequence some American shipments for Holland will be stopped absolutely, while the regular transportation companies trading between the United States and Scandinavia will not take cargoes without assurances by the British authorities. Furthermore, tramp steamships are hardly likely to risk the landing in the prize court of any cargo they might accept.

Neutral diplomatists here believe two reasons induced the British government to take this action. The first is the simplicity of the scheme, which enables the government to control supplies at the source. The second is the growing bill with which Great Britain is being pressed by neutral governments for demurrage and other expenses incurred by taking suspected ships into Kirkwall and other ports for examination.

So far as is known, no machinery exists at present for adjusting these claims, as many of these cargoes never actually reach the prize court. When shippers ask for compensation they are referred to the prize court, which thus far has declined to consider their claims, on the ground that they have no standing in court.

WASHINGTON PROTEST LIKELY.

It is expected that Washington will make an inquiry in regard to this matter, especially concerning the American schooners which were taken into Lerwick and released after being detained for several weeks. No charges were preferred against them.

Another blockade measure which also probably will interest Washington is the recent arrangement under which bureaus were set up in England and France for granting licenses for exchange of goods which figure on the list of prohibited imports. The American authorities contend that under the British-American commercial treaty of 1815 such prohibitions must be enforced equally against all countries. Consequently any privileges granted to France and not extended to the United States are held to be in violation of that treaty.

（ロ）英國スカンヂナビヤ諸國及和蘭ニ對スル輸入物件ヲ制限スル件

（九月十七日ニューヨーク、くラルド）

BLOCKADE RULING NOT NEW POLICY.

Washington Gets Report That British All Along Have Restricted Neutral Exports.

The State Department received to-day a report from Mr. Robert P. Skinner, American Consul General at London, explaining in detail the restrictions on trade to neutral European countries declared by the British government and reported in press despatches from London yesterday.

Mr. Skinner's report shows that the British announcement is not a departure in practice but is in accordance with the procedure of the British government from practically the outset of the blockade.

Whenever the neutral European countries have purchased in excess of the supplies required for home consumption the British government has declined to issue further assurances for the unhindered passage of such goods to those countries until it has become apparent that further supplies are needed for neutral consumption within those countries.

It is now found that Holland and the Scandinavian countries have purchased in excess of the need for home consumption in many commodities, and hence a temporary refusal to issue further assurances has been declared.

The commodities included in the British order are shown by the report of Mr. Skinner, which reads as follows:—

"Announcement has been made that no further export licenses or other facilities will be given until October 1, or until further notice by the British government, for the shipment of the following goods to the countries named:—

"Denmark—Animal oils and fats, apricot kernels, borate of lime, borax and boron compounds, bristles, egg yolk and albumen, grass seeds, hair, meat, sago, starches, sulphur, powdered talc, tapioca, tea, vegetable fibres, vegetable oils and oil seeds (excluding soya seeds).

"Norway—Beef casings, borax and borax compounds, cocoa, coffee, nickel, pitch, sheepskins, powdered talc, tar and tar oil.

Sweden—Antimony, apricot kernels, binder twine, bristles, carnauba wax, casein, casing, cocoa, corkwood, coffee, dried fruit, gums (except shellac) hair, honey, leather, margarine (raw materials used in manufacture of), meat, peach kernels, plum kernels, rice, rosin, spices, starches, sisal, steel (high speed), tea, turpentine and turpentine oil.

Netherlands—Biscuit, bristles, eggs, egg yoke and egg albumen, fish oil, fruit, nuts

and kernels, gums, hair, honey, matches, pitch, preserved and canned goods, sulphur, spirits, spices, starches, rubber and balata, powdered talc, tar, vegetable fibres and yeast.

"Holders of unexhausted licenses for the shipment of goods named are directed to communicate with the War Trade Department. The foregoing restrictions have been agreed to by the Allies and applied to shipments from the United States. The articles mentioned are those which have been supplied to the countries concerned in quantities alleged to exceed the normal requirements of such countries. As stocks decline articles will be removed from the list of prohibition.

"The Netherlands Overseas Trust has been advised to issue no further permits for goods covered by this notice. It is presumed that American goods already covered by letters of assurance will not be stopped."

Absolutely no change of policy has been made by England in months, according to officials of the British Embassy.

The scheme to allow only enough imports into neutral States contiguous to Germany to provide them with such a stock of goods as they consumed before the war, the British officials say, has been in operation many months.

(二八) 英蘭間ノ交通

間ノ交通(十月十二日官報) 本件ニ關シ蘭國駐劄落合特命全權大使ヨリ本年八月十八日附ヲ以テ左ノ如ク報告アリ(本年八月二十一日本欄内參看)(外務省)

從來英蘭間郵便物及旅客ノ運送ニ當レル「ゼーランド」會社ノ持船「コーニンギン、ウイルヘルミナ」(Koningin Wilhelmina)ハ客月三十一日英國ニ向フノ途上水雷ニ觸レ沈沒シルカ是ニテ同會社ハ「プリンセス、ユリアナ」(Prinses Juliana 本年二月一日水雷ニ罹リ沈沒)及「メクレンブルヒ」(Mecklenburg 本年二月二十七日水雷ニ觸レテ沈沒)ト共ニ前後三隻ヲ失ヒタル結果一時英蘭間ノ航通ヲ中止スルノ已ムヲ得サルニ至リ尤モ其中船都合付キ次第航通ヲ再開スヘキモ其場合ニモ旅客ハ之ヲ謝絶シ或ハ郵便物ノ運送ノミニ限ラルヘシトノ風説モアリタル位ニテ兎ニ角右「コーニンギン、ウイルヘルミナ」沈沒以後ハ他ノ會社即チBatavier Line其他ノ持船ニ於テ不定期ニ英蘭間旅客及郵便物ノ運送ニ從事シ居リ是レ亦設備不完全ニシテ極テ僅カノ旅客ヲ搭載シ得ルニ止マリ(「バタビア」會社ノ汽船ハ乘客約二十人ヲ載セ得ルノミ)當時當館館員ノ實地諸方面ニ就キ取調ヘタル所ニ依レハ九月中旬マテハ右不完全ナル船室スラモ皆約束濟ニテ新ニ申込ムトモ之ヲ得ルコト確ナラストノコトニテ英蘭間旅客ノ往來ハ其危險ナルハ勿論事實頗ル不便且ツ困難ナル狀態ナリシカ蘭國ト海外諸國トノ郵便物ハ凡テ英蘭間ノ交通ニ依賴セサルヘカラサルノ現況ニ鑑ミ政府其他ニ於テ多少ノ犧牲ヲ拂フモ兩國間ノ定期交通ヲ速ニ再開スルノ必要ヲ説ク者アリタルカ結局右「ゼーランド」會社ハ本月十六日ヨリ「カラニヱ、ナサウ」(Oranje Nassau)「コーニンギン、レヘンテス」(Koningin Regentes)及「プリンス、

ヘンドリック」(Prins Hendrik)ハ三隻ニテ從前通一週三回英國間郵便物及旅客ノ運送ヲ
スル旨發表セリ尤モ英國間氷雷ノ浮流スルモノ多ク往來ノ危險尠カラス此種ノ危險ハ戰爭
ノ經過ト共ニ多少宛增加シ來リタルモノニテ今後モ局面現在ノ儘ナルニ於テハ增加スル
コトアルモ輕減スルコトナカルベシト考ヘラル

第四　俘虜ニ對シ報復手段ヲ取ルコトニ關スル赤十字國際委員會ノ申出及之ニ對スル英國ノ回答

(英國外交文書)

CORRESPONDENCE WITH HIS MAJESTY'S MINISTER AT BERNE RESPECTING THE QUESTION OF REPRISALS AGAINST PRISONERS OF WAR.

No. 1.

Mr. E. Grant Duff, His Majesty's Minister at Berne, to Sir Edward Grey.—

[*(Received July* 20.)

Berne, July 19, 1916.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a letter addressed to His Majesty's Government by the International Committee of the Red Cross, drawing attention to the barbarous practice of reprisals against prisoners of war practised by some of the

oelligerent Government.

I have, &c.

EVELYN GRANT DUFF.

Enclosure in No. 1.

Translation of Letter from the International Red Cross Committee to Belligerent and Neutral Countries.

The Red Cross, which, we are happy to say, has greatly developed during the present war, and which has exercised widely among belligerents, with the assistance of neutral Powers, its beneficent influence, was founded with one object, that of humanity.

Its creation was inspired by the desire to mitigate to some extend the hardships of war, particularly among these whom wounds, though not fatal, have rendered weak and harmless.

In the course of this war the vast number of combatants has produced a class of unfortunates of an almost novel type; for, if that class existed before, it never attained its present proportions. We refer to the prisoners of war. These, too, are powerless, incapable of resistance, delivered to the tender mercies of the enemy, who

has compelled them to lay down their arms and to plead for their lives.

The prisoner who has emerged from the battle unscathed is certainly less to be pitied than the soldier who has been wounded and is confined to a hospital bed. Nevertheless, captivity, that involuntary exile, far from home, far from kindred, with whom communications are rare and uncertain, combined with prolonged idleness, causes moral torture, which grows as the war continues.

We recognise that in general the belligerents have done what they could to make the lives of the prisoners bearable and to avoid adding physical hardships to their unhappy lot. The tours of inspection by our delegates have revealed great improvements both in the organisation of the camps and in the treatment of the prisoners. But we have recently observed that a principle has been asserted, the application of which tends to become daily more vigorous: the principle of reprisals on prisoners of war.

Should a belligerent State have reason to believe that its soldiers in the hands of the enemy are not treated as they should be or that one of them has received unmerited punishment, it does not attempt to appeal to its adversary's feelings of generosity, nor does it address itself to the neutral Powers with the request that they will impress on the enemy concerned the considerations of humanity and justice. It has immediate recourse to the law of retaliation and acts in excess of its grievances. It hopes that the severity of the reprisals will compel the adversary to yield; and if the adversary, on the contrary, proceeds to further steps, they are countered by still more rigorous measures. And then occurs what we see to-day, the development of the practice of reprisals into a barbarous competition of which the motive is vengeance, and of which the incidence is borne by those who are both innocent and powerless, until their cry of suffering touches their Government and compels it to renounce the measures taken against the prisoners in its hands. These reprisals are all the more unjust and cruel in that they are often provoked by inaccurate information.

The International Red Cross Committee cannot remain indifferent before that spectacle, before the repudiation of the principle on which the Red Cross is founded. War is in itself a scourge enough without increasing by inhuman practices and by useless severity the evils it brings in its train. Again, after the termination of hostilities, if the nations hope to attain a lasting peace, will not reconciliation be much more difficult after hatred has been fomented not so much by open and straightforward [illegible] as by the suffering inflicted in cold blood on unhappy defenceless prisoners?

We therefore, true to the duty which the status of the International Committee imposes on us, implore the belligerents to abandon the practice of reprisals on

prisoners of war, and to renounce the principle which inspires it. Do not endeavour, we say, to exercise pressure on your enemies by the chastisement you inflict on those of their people who are at your mercy. Is not that a reversion to methods of barbarism unworthy of nations which have given to the Red Cross the position it occupies in their armies?

You are greatly concerned for the wounded, on whom you lavish cares, no matter under what flag they have fought. In that respect all testimony is unanimous. Why then should prisoners be treated in an entirely different manner? You complain that your people suffer unjustly in their captivity; why then not appeal to your opponent's sense of justice? Why not offer, should he respond to your appeal, to accord to his people a like favour? And, if you have difficulty in approaching him, why not send him that message through a neutral? Those are the ideals which should, as it seems to us, in the place of the present practice of reprisals, stimulate your rivalry: the rivalry of justice and of humanity, which, leaving behind memories of gratitude, would help to extinguish the fires of hatred, the great obstacle to peace.

Accordingly we do not hesitate to move the belligerents to adopt in the treatment of prisoners of war the methods indicated above. In giving effect on the prisoners' behalf to the motto of the Red Cross, "Inter arma caritas," the nations would render war less cruel, and would give a new impetus to civilisation.

Geneva, July 12, 1916.

No. 2.

Viscount Grey to Mr. E. Grant Duff.

Foreign Office, August 11, 1916.

Sir,

With reference to your despatch of the 19th ultimo, I transmit to you herewith the reply of the His Majesty's Government to the letter from the International Red Cross Committee which accompanied your despatch.

I have to request you to communicate that reply to the International Committee.

I am, &c.

GREY OF FALLODON.

Enclosure in No. 2.

Memorandum communicated to International Red Cross Committee.

The International Red Cross Committee have addressed to belligerent and neutral nations a letter, dated the 12th July, 1916, in which the Committee plead the cause

of prisoners of war and deprecate the adoption by belligerents of the policy of reprisals.

His Majesty's Government have throughout the period of hostilities discountenanced that policy on account of its indiscriminating and unjust operation.

A succession of outrages has, however, been perpetrated by the orders, or with the cognisance and approval, of the German Government, of which the cumulative effect has been to strain the temper and patience of the British people to the breaking point and to create a situation of the utmost gravity.

It is unnecessary to attempt an exhaustive enumeration of those outrages, but among them may be mentioned the sinking, in contravention of the law of nations and the usages of war and in defiance of the most elementary principles of humanity, of the vessels "Lusitania" and "Sussex," whereby hundreds of defenceless civilians, many of them women and children, were sent to their deaths to the unconcealed satisfaction of the German press and people; the brutal execution of Nurse Cavell, whose sex and the fact that she had spent a blameless life devoted to the alleviation of suffering, and since the war had even nursed wounded German soldiers, should have been sufficient to secure a mitigation of her sentence; the criminal desertion by the German authorities of the camps for prisoners of war at Wittenberg and Gardelegen

at a time when the unfortunate captives interned there were stricken with disease, itself aggravated, if not initiated, by callous disregard on the part of those in charge for the ordinary hygienic precautions which are essential in a crowded concentration camp; the confiscation by the German Government of about 20 per cent, of the remittances sent to British prisoners of war (combatant and civilian) interned in Germany; and the execution of the captain of the steamship "Brussels" after he had been sentenced to death for having committed an act of self-defence well recognised by the laws of war on sea.

The International Committee appeal to the belligerent Powers not to attempt to obtain redress for their grievances by resort to reprisals, but to request the neutral Powers to impress on the enemy concerned the considerations of humanity and justice.

His Majesty's Government readily respond to that appeal, being confident that the neutral Powers and the International Committee will recognise that the demand for reprisals grows in volume and urgency with the recurrence of abuses, and that the surest means of avoiding reprisals is to promote the abandonment of the policy which inspires them.

Foreign Office, August 11, 1916.

[The above reply was also communicated to the Governments of the Allied and

neutral Powers through His Majesty's Representatives.]

第五　輸出禁止品ノ件

(一)　英本國ノ輸出禁止品目改正

○英本國輸出禁止品目改正　(通商公報第三六〇號)　(外務省通商局)

英本國輸出禁止品目改正ニ關スル英國敕令寫在倫敦山崎總領事代理ヨリ送附アリタルニ付本誌第三百五十一號掲載同品目表ニ左ノ通加除改正ヲ加フ

(一)(B)　Rope made of steel wire, and Steel hawsers; トアルヲ左ノ如ク改ム

(A)　Rope made of steel wire, and steel hawsers;

(二)(C)　Sodium carbonate and bicarbonate; トアルヲ左ノ如ク

(C)　Sodium bicarbonate;

(B)　Sodium carbonate;

(三)左記各項ヲ追加ス

(C)　Asphalt, coal tar;

(A)　Boilers;

(A)　Calves' stomachs;

(C)　Citric acid;

(C)　Honey;

(C)　Pitch, coal tar;

(C)　Pitch, rosin;

(C)　Pitch, wood;

(C)　Syrups which may be used as food for man, and molasses produced from cane sugar;

(以上千九百十六年五月二十五日敕令)

(一)左記各項ヲ削除ス

(A)　Acetone and its compounds and preparations;

(B)　Electric lamps;

(C)　Emery, corundum, natural or artificial (such as alundum) carborundum and crystolon and manufactures thereof;

(C)　Hemp, the following manufactures of:—

Binder and reaper twine;

(C)　Linen manufactures, the following:—

Ducks woven;

(C)　Potatoes and potato flour;

(B)　Woollen scarves, jerseys, cardigan jackets, socks, and men's woollen gloves and

underwear;

(二)左記各項ヲ追加ス

(A) Acetones and their compounds and preparations;

(B) Electric lamps, except carbon filament lamps and arc lamps for street lighting;

(B) Emery, corundum, natural or artificial (such as alundum) carborundum and crystolon and manufactures thereof;

Hemp, the following manufactures of;

(B) Binders and reaper twine

Linen manufactures, the following:—

(B) Ducks, woven;

(A) Potatoes;

(C) Potato flour;

(B) Scarves, jerseys, cardigan jackets, socks, men's gloves and underwear, manufactured wholly or partly of wool;

(B) Jute cordage and twine;

(C) Tale;

(B) Varnishes containing lac;

(以上千九百十六年六月七日勅令)

(一)左記各項ヲ削除ス

Woods, the following:—

(C) Lignum vitae;

(C) Mahogany;

(二)左記各項ヲ追加ス

(C) Bristles;

(A) Cape garnets or rubies;

(A) Copper stamps used for stamping woven piece goods;

(A) Fire bricks and fire clay;

(C) Insulating materials, the following:—

Leatheroid;

Oiled cloth and tape;

Vulcanised fibre;

(C) Rattan, woven;

(C) Tea;

(C) Varnishes, spirit, containing gum;

(B) Vinegar containing not more than 6 per cent, of acetic acid;

(A) Vinegar essence and similar preparations containing more tnan 6 per cent, of

acetic acid;

(A) Wire, barbed, and galvanised wire;

Woods, the following;—

(A) Beefwood;

(A) Birch;

(A) Boxwood;

(A) Dogwood;

(A) Greenheart;

(A) Hickory;

(A) Lancewood;

(A) Lignum vitae;

(A) Mahogany;

(A) Padouk;

(A) Sabicu;

(A) Teak;

(A) Whitewood;

(三)千九百十六年七月十七日以後左記品目ヲ削除ス

(A) Bays and sacks made of jute;

(A) Jute wrappers (Surrat tares);

千九百十六年七月十七日以後左記品目ヲ追加ス

(A) Bags, wrappers or sacks made of jute, other than any such bags, wrapppers or sacks as constitute the coverings of goods to be shipped for exportation and are allowed by the Commissioners of Customs and Excise to be shipped as such Coverings;

(以上千九百十六年六月二十八日敕令)

(一)左記各項ヲ削除ス

Provisions and victuals which may be used as food for man, the following:—

(C) Meats of all kinds (except poultry and game), not including beef and mutton, fresh or refrigerated;

(C) Resins and resinous substances (except such as contain caoutchouc);

(二)左記各項ヲ追加ス

(C) Bamboo;

(C) Feathers and down;

(C) Felspar;

Provisions and victuals which may be used as food for man, the following:—

(C) Meat of all kinds, not including beef and mutton, fresh or refrigerated;

(C) Poultry and game;

(A) Rennet powder, rennet extract and other preparations of rennet;

(C) Resins, resinous substances (except such as contain caoutchouc) and articles containing resins and resinous substances;

(C) Tobacco;

(以上千九百十六年七月四日敕令)

(一)左記各項ヲ削除ス

(C) Absinthe;

(A) Arrack;

(C) Black plates and flack sheets under ⅛ inch thick;

(A) Cape garnets or rubies;

Chemicals, drugs, etc., the following:—

(A) Anthracene oil;

(A) Coal tar, all products (except creosote) obtainable from and derivatives thereof, suitable for use in the manufacture of dyes and explosives, whether obtained from coal tar or other sources, and mixtures containing such products or derivatives;

(C) Creosote;

(A) Green oil;

(A) Sulphuric acid;

(B) Files;

(A) Jute piece goods;

Metals and ores:—

(A) Steel plates and Sheets ⅛ inch thick and over;

(C) Oils, creosote, except wood tar oil;

(C) Pitch, coal tar;

(C) Pitch, rosin;

(C) Pitch, wood;

(B) Pitches derived from fats, greases, oils or fatty acids;

(C) Rum and imitation rum;

Shipbuilding materials:—

(C) Iron plates and sectional materials for shipbuilding;

(B) Stockinette;

(C) Syrups which may be used as food for man, and molasses produced from cane sugar;

(二)左記各項ヲ追加ス

(A) American cotton ties varnished or blacked;

(C) Black plates for tinning exported in boxes;

(A) Cast iron pipes;

Chemicals, drugs, etc., the following:—

(C) Anthracene oil and mixtures and preparations containing anthracene oil;

(A) Coal tar, all products obtainable from and derivatives thereof, suitable for use in the manufacture of dyes and explosives, whether obtained from coal tar or other sources, and mixtures and preparations containing such products or derivatives (except anthracene oil and green oil and mixtures and preparations containing these oils);

(C) Creosote and creosote oils (except wood tar oil) and mixtures and preparations containing such creosote or creosote oils;

(C) Green oil and mixtures and preparations containing green oil;

(A) Sulphuric acid and mixtures containing sulphuric acid;

(A) Galvanised corrugated and galvanised flat sheets;

(A) Iron and steel plates and sheets (except black plates for tinning exported in boxes, tin plates, terneplates, and lead-coated sheets);

(C) Japanese tissue paper;

(A) Jute piece goods and piece goods mainly composed of jute;

(A) Molasses;

(A) Motor ploughs and motor tractors for agricultural use;

(B) Pickled grains and fleshes;

(C) Pitches and all mixtures, preparations and commodities of which pitch forms an ingredient;

(C) Potable spirits of a strength of less than 43 degrees above proof;

(B) Quercitron bark extract;

Shipbuilding materials, the following:—

(C) Sectional materials for shipbuilding;

(A) Small tool, the following:—

Boring cutters;

Chucks;

Files;

Hacksaws;

Lathe tools;

Measuring tools;

Milling cutters;

Reamers;

Screwing tackle;

Slitting saws;

Thread milling hobs;

Twist drills;

(B) Stockinette composed wholly or partly of wool;

(C) Syrups which may be used as food for man.

(以上千九百十六年七月二十六日敕令)

(一)左記各項ヲ削除ス

(C) Black plates for tinning exported in boxes;

(C) Cork and cork dust and articles wholly manufactured from cork or cork dust or both;

(C) Feathers and down;

(C) Fibres, vegetable, not otherwise specifically prohibited, and yarns made therefrom;

(A) Iron and steel plates and sheets (except black plates for tinning exported in boxes, tin plates, terne plates, and lead-coated sheets);

(C) Railway material, both fixed and rolling stock (except railway waggons and their component parts, steel rails, steel sleepers, steel springs, wheels, axles and tyres);

(B) Railway waggons and their component parts (except steel springs and wheels, axles and tyres);

(C) Sparking plugs;

(C) Terne-plates and receptacles made from terne-plates;

(C) Tin plates and receptacles made from tin plates.

(二)左記各項ヲ追加ス

(A) Bearings, ball and roller, and steel balls and rollers suitable for bearings;

(B) Cadmium, alloys of cadmium and cadmium ore;

(C) Cork and cork dust and articles manufactured from cork and cork dust;

(A) Cryolite;

(A) Curry combs;

(A) Dandy brushes;

(C) Feathers and down, except wing and tail feathers of the ostrich,

(C) Fibres, vegetable, not otherwise specifically prohibited, and cordage, twine, and yarns made therefrom;

(A) Iron and steel plates and sheets;

(A) Lead-coated sheets;

(C) Linoleum;

(A) Railway carriages, locomotives, and waggons, and their component parts;

(C) Railway material (except railway carriages, locomotives, and waggons and their component parts, steel rails and steel sleepers);

(B) Silicon-spiegel;

(A) Sparking plugs;

(A) Terne-plates and receptacles made from terne-plates;

(A) Tin plates and receptacles made from tin plates.

(以上千九百十六年八月十六日敕令)

○九月八日附改正

(九月八日ロンドンガゼット)

At the Council Chamber, *Whitehall*, the 8th day of *September*, 1916.

By the Lords of His Majestys Most Honourable Privy Council.

Whereas it is provided by Section 2 of the Customs (Exportation Prohibition) Act, 1914, that any Proclamation or Order in Council made under Section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, as amended by the Act now in recital, may, whilst a state of war exists, be varied or added to by an Order made by the Lords of the Council on the recommendation of the Board of Trade:

And whereas it is provided by Section 2 of the Customs (Exportation Restriction) Act, 1914, that any Proclamation made under Section 1 of the Exportation of Arms Act, 1900, may, whether the Proclamation was made before or after the passing of the Act now in recital, be varied or added to, whilst a state of war exists, by an Order made by the Lords of the Council on the recommendation of the Board of Trade:

And whereas by a Proclamation, dated the 10th day of May, 1916, and made under Section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, and Section 1 of the Exportation of Arms Act, 1900, and Section 1 of the Customs (Exportation Prohibition) Act, 1914, the exportation from the United Kingdom of certain articles to certain or all destinations was prohibited:

And whereas by subsequent Orders of Council the said Proclamation was amended and added to in certain particulars:

And whereas there was this day read at the Board a recommendation from the Board of Trade to the following effect:—

That the Proclamation, dated the 10th day of May, 1916, as amended and added

to by subsequent Orders of Council, should be further amended by making the following amendments in and additions to the Schedule to the same :—

(1) That the following headings should be deleted :—

(C) Bleaching powder;

(C) Brewers' dried yeast;

(C) Cloth manufactured wholly or partly of wool or hair except khaki woollen or worsted cloth;

(B) Gloves, fingerless sheepskin;

(B) Gloves, with leather palms;

(C) Grindstones;

(C) Hacksaw blades;

(B) Hair, animal, tops, noils, and yarns of;

Provisions and victuals which may be used as food for man, the following :—

(C) Egg, yolk and liquid, and albumen;

(B) Scarves, jerseys, cardigan jackets, socks, men's gloves and underwear, manufactured wholly or partly of wool;

(A) Small tools, the followings :—

Files,

(C) Strontium sulphate;

(B) Waxes, mineral and vegetable (except carnauba), and composite waxes;

(B) Wool, raw (sheep's and lamb's) and mixtures thereof.

(2) That the following headings should be added :—

(C) Albumen;

(A) Bleaching powder;

(C) Boots and shoes, other than heavy boots for men;

(C) Felt, carpets, and carpet rugs;

(B) Gloves made wholly or partly of leather;

(C) Gramophone record compositions;

(B) Grindery, the following articles of :—

Brads;

Metal toe tips;

(A) Grindstones;

(A) Hacksaw blades;

(B) Hair, animal, and tops, noils, mixtures, waste, and yarns thereof;

(A) Iron wire;

(A) Iron wire rods;

(C) Leather, not otherwise prohibited;

(A) Leather, sole;

Provisions and victuals which may be used as food for man, the following:—

(C) Egg, yolk and liquid;

(B) Scarves, shawls, jerseys, cardigan jackets, socks, men's gloves and under wear, manufactured wholly or partly of wool;

(B) Shoemakers' tools, the following:—

Awls;

Awl hafts,

Chisels, hand coid, 8 inches by $\frac{3}{4}$ inch;

Files, seat;

Hammers, single and double faced;

Irons, forepart, glazing, lap, seat wheel and waist;

Knives;

Nippers, cutting;

Pincers;

Pliers, eyelet;

Punches, spring;

Rasps;

Welt ploughs, runners and mills;

(A) Small tools, the following;

Files, other than shoemakers' seat files;

(B) Steel rivets, bifurcated;

(B) Strontium sulphate;

(C) Tissues manufactured wholly or partly of wool or hair, except khaki woollen or worsted cloth;

(A) Umbrella ribs, tubes and tube frames;

(B) Waxes, animal, mineral, and vegetable (except carnauba) and composite waxes:

(C) Woollen gloves and hosiery not otherwise prohibited;

(C) Woollen underwear not otherwise prohibited;

(B) Wool, raw, and mixtures thereof;

(C) Yeast.

(3) That on and after the 1st day of October, 1916, the exportation of "steel

hoops" should be prohibited to all destinations.

(4) That on and after the 9th day of October, 1916, the heading "(C) Bags and sacks not otherwise specifically prohibited (except paper bags)" should be deleted and there be substituted therefor the heading "(C) Bags, wrappers or sacks not otherwise specifically prohibited (except paper bags) other than any such bags, wrappers or sacks as constitute the coverings of goods to be shipped for exportation and are allowed by the Commissioners of Customs and Excise to be shipped as such coverings."

Now, therefore, Their Lordships, having taken the said recommendation into consideration, are pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the same be approved.

Whereof the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs and Excise, the Director of the War Trade Department, and all other persons whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Almeric FizeRoy.

○九月二十九日附改正

(九月二十九日ロンドンガセツト)

At the *Council Chamber, Whitehall*, the 29th day of *September*, 1916.

By the Lords of His Majesty's Most

Honourable Privy Council.

Whereas it is provided by Section 2 of the Customs (Exportation prohibition) Act, 1914, that any Proclamation or Order in Council made under Section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, as amended by the Act now in recital, may, whilst a state of war exists, be varied or added to by an Order made by the Lords of the council on the recommendation of the Board of Trade:

And whereas it is provided by Section 2 of the Customs (Exportation Restriction) Act, 1914, that any Proclamation made under Section 1 of the Exportation of Arms Act, 1900, may, whether the Proclamation was made before or after the passing of the Act now in recital, be varied or added to, whilst a state of war exists, by an Order made by the Lords of the Council on the recommendation of the Board of Trade:

And whereas by a Proclamation, dated the 10th day of May, 1916, and made under Section 8 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1879, and Section 1 of the Exportation of Arms Act, 1900, and Section 1 of the Customs (Exportation Prohibition) Act, 1914, the exportation from the United Kingdom of certain articles to certain or all destinations was prohibited:

And whereas by subsequent Orders of Council the said Proclamation was amended and added to in certain particulars:

And whereas there was this day read at the Board a recommendation from the Board of Trade to the following effect:—

That the Proclamation, dated the 10th day of May, 1916, as amended and added to by subsequent Orders of Council, should be further amended by making the following amendments in and additions to the Schedule to the same:—

(1) That the following headings should be deleted:—

(C) Feathers and down, except wing and tail feathers of the ostrich;

(A) Flax fabric, suitable for aircraft;

Linen manufactures, the following:—

(C) Canvas;

(C) Drills, woven;

(B) Ducks, woven;

(C) Linen piece goods woven from bleached yarns, but not bleached in the piece;

(C) Union cloths containing cotton in the proportion of 25 per cent. or upwards;

Metals and ores, the following:—

(A) Iron and steel plates and sheets;

(B) Steel, and steel articles containing chrome, cobalt, nickel or vanadium;

(A) Steel flats, rounds, and squares (except carbon steel for tools and steel for mining purposes);

Provisions and victuals which may be used as food for man, the following:—

(C) Fruit, fruit preserves, and nuts used as fruit;

(C) Poultry and game;

(B) Rubber, gutta-percha or balata, goods made wholly or partly of.

(2) That the following headings should be added:—

Chemicals, etc., the following:—

(B) Molybdic acid and its salts;

(C) Feathers and down, except ornamental feathers;

(B) Gauze manufactured of copper or its alloys;

(C) Hemp braid;

Linen manufactures, the following:—

(B) Cloth unbleached woven from bleached or unbleached flax yarns, whether the cloth or yarn is pure or mixed with any other material,

(i.) being of a weight per square yard exceeding 8 ounces, or

(ii.) if of a weight per square yard of 8 ounces or less, aggregating 96 threads or more per inch warp and weft combined;

(C) Cloth woven from bleached or unbleached flax yarns not otherwise specifically prohibited whether the cloth or yarn is pure or mixed with any other material;

(C) Matches;

Metals and ores, the following:—

(B) Steel article containing chrome, cobalt, nickel or vanadium;

(A) Steel flats, rounds, and other sections, with the following exceptions:—

(i.) When made from crucible cast steel;

(ii.) Carbon steel for tools not manufactured in the United Kingdom by the Siemens or Bessemer processes;

provided such crucible or carbon steel does not contain more than 5 per cent. of chrome, cobalt, nickel or vanadium;

(A) Iron and steel plates and sheets except when made from crucible cast steel or from carbon steel not manufactured in the United Kingdom by the Siemens or Bessemer processes; provided such crucible or carbon steel does not contain more than 5 per cent. of chrome, cobalt, nickel or vanadium;

Provisions and victuals which may be used as food for man, the following:—

(C) Fruit, fruit preserves (other than jam), and nuts used as fruit;

(B) Jam;

(C) Poultry and game (except venison);

(C) Sauces and condiments (except table salt) not otherwise prohibited;

(C) Vegetables, canned;

(B) Venison;

(B) Rubber, gutta-percha or balata, goods made wholly or partly of (except rubber hose covered with steel wire);

(A) Rubber hose covered with steel wire;

(A) Valves, gas, steam and water;

Woods, the following:—

(A) Rock elm;

(A) Wood-screws, made of brass, iron, or steel.

Now, therefore, Their Lordships, having taken the said recommendation into con-

sideration, are pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the same be approved.

Whereof the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs and Excise, the Director of the War Trade Department, and all other persons whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Almeric FitzRoy.

(二) 香港ノ輸出禁止品

○香港輸出禁止品目改正

（通商公報第三六一號）（外務省通商局）

香港政廳ハ九月二十三日及同月二十九日官報ヲ以テ輸出禁止品目（本誌第三五〇號本欄參照）ノ削除及追加ヲ公布セル趣ヲ以テ在香港帝國總領事代理領事高橋新治ヨリ大正五年九月二十五日及十月三日附ヲ以テ右官報送附アリシニ付左ニ譯載ス

一、左記品目ヲ削除ス

(丙)「アブシンス」

(丙)「アラツク」酒

(丙) 黑金屬厚板及厚サ八分ノ一吋以下ノ黑金屬薄板

(乙)喜望峰產柘榴石又ハ「ルビー」

左記化學藥、藥材等

(乙)「アンツラセン」油

(乙)染料及爆發物ノ製造用ニ適スル「コールタール」ヨリ得ラルヘキ各種生產品（「クレオソート」ヲ除ク）及其誘導藥（「コールタール」又ハ他ノモノヨリ得タルモノ及ヒ斯ノ如キ生產物又ハ誘導藥ヲ含ム混合物）

(丙)「クレオソート」

(乙)「グリーン」油

(乙)硫酸

(丙)「コルク」及「コルク粉」竝全部「コルク」又ハ「コルク」粉或ハ其兩者ヨリ製セラレタル物品

(丙)羽毛及幼羽毛

(丙)植物纖維（特ニ禁止セラレシ以外ノモノ）及其レヨリ製セラレタル纖絲

(乙)鑢

左記金屬及鑛石

(乙)厚サ八分ノ一吋以上ノ鋼鐵板

(丙)甘蔗糖ヨリ取リタル糖蜜

(丙)「クレオソート」油（木「タール」油ヲ除ク）

(丙)「コールタールピッチ」

(丙)樹脂「ピッチ」
(丙)「ウードピッチ」
(乙)脂油及脂酸ヨリ誘導セラレタル「ピッチ」
(丙)鐵道用材料(固定セルモノ及車輛共但シ無蓋貨車及其組成品、鋼製軌條、鋼製枕木、鋼製彈機、車輪、車軸竝「タイヤー」ヲ除ク)
(乙)鐵道用無蓋貨車及其組成品(鋼製彈機、車輪及車軸竝「タイヤー」ヲ除ク)
(丙)「ラム」酒及僞造「ラム」酒
左記造船材料
(丙)造船用鐵板及部分材料
(丙)發動機ノ發火裝置
(乙)莫大小
(丙)「ターンプレート」及「ターンプレート」製容器
(丙)錫板及錫板製容器
二、左記ノ品目ヲ追加ス
(乙)木綿帶鐵(「ワニス」塗又ハ否ラサルモノ)
(乙)球入又ハ「コロ」入承軸(ベアリング)竝承軸ニ適スル鋼製球及「ローラー」
(乙)「カドミウム」、「カドミウム」合金及「カドミウム」鑛
(乙)鑄造鐵管

左記化學藥、藥材等
(丙)「アンツラセン」油竝「アンツラセン」油ヲ含ム混合物及調劑
(乙)染料及爆發物ノ製造用ニ適スル「コールタール」ヨリ得ラルヘキ各種生產品及其誘導藥(「コールタール」又ハ他ノモノヨリ得タルモノ竝斯ノ如キ生產物又ハ誘導藥ヲ含ム混合物及調劑)(但シ「アンツラセン」油、「グリーン」油及此等ノ油ヲ含ム混合物及調劑ヲ除ク)
(丙)「クレオソート」及「クレオソート」油(木タール油ヲ除ク)竝「クレオソート」及「クレオソート」油ヲ含ム混合物及調劑
(丙)「グリーン」油竝「グリーン」油ヲ含ム混合物及調劑
(乙)硫酸及硫酸ヲ含ム混合物
(丙)「コルク」及「コルク」粉竝「コルク」又ハ「コルク」粉ヨリ製セラレタル物品
(乙)水晶石
(乙)馬櫛
(乙)鯨骨製馬匹用刷毛
(丙)羽毛及幼羽毛但シ駝鳥ノ翼及尾ノ羽毛ヲ除ク
(丙)植物纖維(特ニ禁止セラレシ以外ノモノ)竝其レヨリ製セラレタル繩索、撚絲及纖絲
(乙)亞鉛引波板及亞鉛引平板
(乙)鐵鋼板

(丙)日本製薄紙(チッシュペーパー)

(戊)黃麻、主トシテ黃麻ヨリナル反物

(乙)被鉛板

(丙)「リノリウム」

(乙)糖蜜

(乙)農業用機械鋤(モーターブロー)及「モーター、トラクター」

(丙)鹽漬ノ穀類及肉類

(丙)「ピッチ」竝「ピッチ」ヲ其一成分トスル各種ノ混合物、調劑及物品

(丙)飲用酒精(强度四十三度以下ノモノ)

(乙)「ケルシトロンバーク」、越幾斯

(乙)鐵道客車、機關車、貨車竝其組成品、

(丙)鐵道材料(鐵道客車、機關車及客車竝其組成品又ハ鋼製軌條及鋼製枕木ヲ除ク)

左記造船材料

(丙)造船用部分材料

(乙)左ノ小器具

穿孔刄

抱器(チアク)

鑢

金屬用鋸

旋盤用具

測定器

旋削刄(ミリングカッター)

擴孔錐(リーマー)

「スクリウイング、タッシクル」

截鐵鋸

「スレッド、ミリング、ホップ」

螺旋錐

(乙)全部又ハ一部羊毛ヨリナレル莫大小

(丙)人ノ食用ニ供シ得ヘキ「シロップ」

(乙)シリコン、スピーケル

(乙)發火栓(發火尖頭)

(乙)「ターンプレート」及「ターンプレート」製容器

(丙)錫板及錫板製容器

○香港輸出禁止品目改正

(通商公報第三七一號)(外務省通商局)

香港政廳ハ十月二十七日附官報ヲ以テ輸出禁止品目表（本誌第三五〇號本欄參照）ノ削除竝追加ヲ公布シタル趣ヲ以テ右官報ヲ在香港帝國總領事代理領事高橋新治ヨリ送附アリシニ付左ニ譯載ス

（一）左ノ品目ヲ削除ス

（丙）袋囊（特ニ禁止セラレシ以外ノモノ但シ紙袋ヲ除ク）

（丙）漂白粉

（丙）釀造用乾酵母

（丙）全部又ハ一部羊毛又ハ獸毛ニテ製セラレタル布但シ紡毛絲又ハ梳毛絲製「カーキー」布ヲ除ク

（乙）羊皮製指ナシ手袋

（乙）掌面皮製手袋

（丙）砥石

（丙）枘鋸

（乙）獸毛ノ「トップ」、梳屑及織絲

「人ノ食料ニ供シ得ヘキ左記各種食料品及其粗製原料但シ他ノ項ニ掲クルモノヲ除ク」ノ項中

（丙）卵、蛋黃及液體蛋黃竝蛋白

（乙）全部又ハ一部羊毛ヨリ製セラレタル「スカーフ」、「ジャージー」、「カーヂガンジヤケット」、靴下、男子用手袋及襯衣

（乙）「左ノ小器具」ノ項中

濾

（丙）硫酸「ストロンチウム」

（乙）鑛物性及植物性蠟（「カーノーバ」蠟ヲ除ク）竝混成蠟

（乙）羊毛（綿羊毛及仔羊毛）及其混合品

（二）左記ノ品目ヲ追加ス

（丙）蛋白

（丙）特ニ禁止セラレシ以外ノ袋、包裝布又ハ囊（紙袋ヲ除ク）但シ輸出入監督官ニヨリ輸出品ノ包被用トシテ船積ヲ許サレタル袋包裝布又ハ囊ヲ除ク

（乙）漂白粉

（丙）長靴及短靴但シ男子用堅牢長靴以外ノモノ

（丙）地氈及旅氈

（乙）全部又ハ一部皮ニテ製シタル手袋

（丙）蓄音器用音譜板組成品

（乙）左記皮革製品製造業者用材料

折釘

金屬製「ツーチプ」

(乙)砥石
(乙)枘鋸
(乙)獸毛及「トップ」、梳屑、混合物、屑及其織絲
(乙)鐵線
(乙)鐵竿
(丙)他項ニ於テ禁止セラレシ以外ノ皮革
(乙)靴底革
「人ノ食料ニ供シ得ヘキ左記各種食料品及其粗製原料但シ他ノ項ニ掲クルモノヲ除ク」ノ項中
(丙)卵、蛋黃及液體蛋黃
(乙)全部又ハ一部羊毛ヨリ製セラレタル「スカーフ」、肩掛、「ジャージー」、「カーヂカンジャケット」、靴下、男子用手袋及襯衣
(乙)左記製靴用器具
大針
突錐ノ柄
幅八吋、厚サ四分三吋ヲ有スル鑿
据附鑪
鐵槌(打ツ面單一ノモノ、及兩面ノモノ)

靴ノ前部ニ用フル鏝、磨キニ用フル鏝、皮ヲ重ヌルニ用フル鏝、据附車附鏝及中央腰括ニ用フル鏝
小刀
切斷用具
釘拔
紐孔又ハ釦穴打貫用鉗子
彈機附打貫器
大目鑪
靴底ト上部トノ間ニ附クル柔革ヲ附著セシムル器具、轆轤及磨機
(乙)「左記ノ小器具」ノ項中
鑪(製靴用据附鑪以外ノモノ)
(乙)鋼製ノ櫛
(乙)鋼製兩叉「リヘット」
(乙)硫酸「ストロンチウム」
(丙)全部又ハ一部羊毛或ハ獸毛ヨリ製セラレタル織物但シ紡毛絲又ハ梳毛絲製「カーキー」布ヲ除ク
(乙)洋傘用骨及下轆轤(シモ)
(乙)動物性、鑛物性及植物性蠟(「カーノーバ」蠟ヲ除ク)竝混成蠟