Reply Sent to France, Great Britain, Russia and Japan Following Trip of Deutschland is Made Public by State Department—United States Reserves Liberty of Action in All Cases.

(Special Despatch to the Herald)

Washington D. C., Tuesday.

The State Department to-night made public the substance of the reply of this government to the identical memoranda of the Entente Allies requesting that the United States deny the use of its waters to both merchant and fighting submarines of belligerent Powers. This the United States declines to do. The note of the Entente Allies was made public in London last night.

The United States in its reply declares the Allied Powers have not "set forth any circumstances, nor is the government of the United States at present aware of any circumstances, concerning the use of war or merchant submarines which would render the existing rules of international law inapplicable to them."

The State Department directed that this interchange of notes be given to the public at this time to explain why the Prussian merchant submarine Deutschland and the fighting snbmarine U-53, which went forth to prey on commerce off the American coast, were permitted to use American waters under the usual rules governing merchantmen and belligerent cruisers.

The interchange of notes took place in August, but their publication was withheld. The note of the Entente Allies was received August 23, and the reply of the United States was despatched August 31.

The publication of the notes at this time is considered here as an indication that the Wilson administration has no present intention of changing its decision in this matter, despite the urging of the Entente Allies.

America Reserves Liberty of Action

However, the way is left open by the announcement to the Entente Allies that the United States government "reserves its liberty of action in all respects and will treat such vessels as, in its opinion, becomes the action of a Power which may be said to have taken the first steps toward establishing the principles of neutrality, and which for a century has maintained those principles, in the traditional spirit and with the high sense of impartiality in which they were conceived."

That the reply of the United States will be displeasing to the Entente Allies and correspondingly pleasing to the Teutonic allies goes without saying.

There is a sign of impatience discernible in the reply of the administration when

it declares that it is the duty of belligerent Powers to distinguish between belligerent and neutral submarines and that responsibility for any conflict that may arise rests entirely upon the "negligent Power." This is reply of the Wilson administration to the warning of the Entente Allies that in operation against Teutonic submarines it may be hard for their war ships to distinguish between them and neutral submarines which may be cruising in the vicinity.

Here is the text of the statement made public by the State Department to-night:—

"The governments of the United States has received the identical memoranda of the governments of France, Great Britain, Russia and Japan, in which neutral Governments are exhorted 'to take efficacious measures tending to prevent belligerent submarines, regardless of their use, to avail themselves of neutral waters, roadsteads, and harbors.' These governments point out the facility possessed by such craft to avoid supervision or surveillance or determination of their national character and their power 'to do injury that is inherent in their very nature,' as well as the 'additional facilities' afforded by having at their disposal places where they can rest and replenish their supplies.

RULES FOR NOVEL SITUATION.

"Apparently on these grounds, the allied governments hold that submarine vessels must be excluded from the benefit of the rules heretofore accepted under international

law regarding the admission and sojourn of war and merchant vessels in neutral waters, readsteads or harbors; any submarine of a belligerent that once enters a neutral harbor must held there,' and, therefore, the allied governments 'warn neutral powers of the great danger to neutral submarines attending the navigation of waters visited by the submarines of belligerents.'

"In reply the government of the United States must express its surprise that there appears to be an endeavor of the allied Powers to determine the rule fo action governing what they regard as a 'novel situation' in respect to the use of submarine in time of war and to enforce acceptance of that rule, at least in part, by warning neutral Powers of the great danger to their submarines in waters that may be visited by belligerent submarines.

"In the opinion of the government of the United States, the allied Powers have not set forth any circumstances, nor is the government of the United States at present aware of any circumstances, concerning the use of war or merchant submarines which would render the existing rules of international law inapplicable to them.

RESPONSIBILITY PLACED ON BELLIGERENTS.

"In view of this fact and of the notice and warning of the allied Powers announced in their memoranda under acknowledgment, it is incumbent upon the

government of the United States to notify the governments of France, Great Britain, Russia and Japan that, so far as the treatment of either war or merchant submarines in American waters is concerned, the government of the United States reserves its liberty of action in all respects and will treat such vessels as, in its opinion, becomes the action of a Power which may be said to have taken the first steps toward establishing the principles of neutrality and which for over a century has maintained those principles in the traditional spirit and with the high sense of impartiality in which they were conceived.

"In order, however, that there should be no misunderstanding as to the attitude of the United States the government of the United States announces to the allied Powers that it holds it to be the duty of belligerent Powers to distinguish between submarines of neutral and belligerent nationality, and that responsibility for any conflict that may arise between belligerent war ships and neutral submarines on account of the neglect of a belligerent to so distinguish between these classes of submarines must rest entirely upon the negligent Power."

(七) 獨艦「ウー」五十三號ノ暴行ヲ海上船舶ニ警告シタル件ニ付テ米國海軍卿調査ヲ命スル件

(十二月八日ヨリヨーク、クトルド)

TO INVESTIGATE NAVY WARNING OF THE U-53 RAIDS.

MR. DANIELS ORDERS INQUIRY INTO VIOLATION BY DEPARTMENT OFFICE OF ITS OWN NEUTRALITY REGULATIONS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Thursday.—An investigation of the Navy Department's violation of its own neutrality regulations through the sending out by radio to vessels at sea of news of the U-53's raids off Nantucket Lightship was ordered to-day by Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy.

The office of communications of the Navy Department, which "files" the Associated Press news senu out every night from Arlington to ships at sea, states emphatically that no news of the U-53's operation was sent out.

Records of the news despatches sent out from Arlington on the night of October 8 are being searched to-night for evidence to established this fact.

The HERALD's assertion that the Navy Department had violated its own neutrality regulations in the U-53 case, for which Secretary Daniels sought to punish the HERALD, caused much amusement here to-day. Nothing serious has developed or is

expected to develop from this incident. The German Embassy, zealous in its protection of every inch of German rights, has not seen fit to make any protest.

However, Mr. Daniels' action in ordering a censor to the HERALD radio station for sending out this news has of course required him to take decided steps in dealing with the same action by the Navy Department.

（八）「フライ」號事件ヲ仲裁裁判ニ付スルコトニ關スル米國ノ千九百十五年十月十二日附提議ニ對シ獨國ノ千九百十五年十一月二十九日附回答（米國外交文書）

（第六輯第七六一頁以下及第七輯第八六六頁以下參照）

File No. 462. 11 Se 8/54.

Ambassador Gerard to the Secretary of State.

No. 1964.)

AMERICAN EMBASSY.

Berlin, December, 2, 1915.

SIR: With reference to my telegram of even date and to previous correspondence on the subject of the claim for damages for the sinking of the American merchantman *William P. Frye*, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith a copy and translation of a note received from the Imperial Foreign Office, dated November 29, 1915, which replies to a note which I addressed to the Imperial Foreign Office on October 14, 1915, pursuant to the instructions contained in your telegram No. 2291, of October 12, 1915.

A copy and translation of the draft of *a compromis* submitted by the Imperial German Government is likewise transmitted herewith.

I have, etc.,

GERARD.

(INCLOSURE-TRANSLATION)

The German Minister for Foreign Affairs to Ambassador Gerard.

BERLIN, *November* 29, 1915.

The undersigned has the honor to inform His Excellency, Mr. James W. Gerard, Ambassador of the United States of America, in reply to the note of October 14, F. O. No. 5671, relative to indemnity for the sinking of the American merchant vessel *William P. Frye*, as well as to the settlement by arbitration of the difference of opinion which has arisen on this occasion, as follows:

With regard first to the ascertainment of indemnity for the vessel sunk, the German Government is in agreement with the American Government in principle that the amount of damages be fixed by two experts, one each to be nominated by the German and the American Governments. The German Government regrets that it can not comply with the wish of the American Government to have the experts meet in Washington, since, the expert nominated by it, Dr. Greve, of Bremen, director of the North German Lloyd, is unable to get away from here, and furthermore would be exposed to the danger of capture during a voyage to America in consequence of the conduct of maritime war by England contrary to international law. Should the American expert likewise be unable to get away, the two experts might perhaps get in touch with each other by correspondence.

The German Government likewise regrets that it can not assent at this time to the nomination of an umpire as desired by the American Government, for apart from the fact that in all probability the experts will reach an agreement in the case of the *William P. Frye* with the same facility as was the case with similar negotiations with other neutral Governments, the assent of the German Government to the consultation of an umpire would depend materially upon whether the differences of opinion between the two experts pertained to questions of principle or merely to the appraisement of certain articles. The consultation of an umpire could only be considered at all in the case of appraisement of this nature.

Should the American Government insist on its demand for the meeting of the experts at Washington or the early choice of an umpire, the only alternative would be to arrange the fixing of damages by diplomatic negotiation. In such an event the German Government begs to await the transmission of a statement of particulars of the various claims for damages accompanied by the necessary proofs.

With regard to the arbitral treatment of the difference of opinion relative to the interpretation of certain stipulations of the Prussian-American commercial treaties, the German Government has drawn up the inclosed draft of a *compromis*, which would have to be worded in the German and English languages and drawn up with due consideration of the two alternating texts. It is true that the draft does not accommodate the suggestions of the American Government so far as it is not in accordance with the rules of summary procedure provided by chapter 4 of The Hague Arbitration Convention, but with the rules of regular procedure. The summary procedure is naturally intended only for differences of opinion of inferior importance, whereas the German Government attaches very particular importance to the interpretation of the Prussian-American treaties which have existed for over 100 years. Pursu-

ant to the agreement made, any proposed amendments would have to be discussed between the Foreign Office and the American Embassy, and oral discussions would appear to be advisable.

Until the decision of the permanent court of arbitration, the German naval forces will sink only such American vessels as are loaded with absolute contraband, when the preconditions provided by the Declaration of London are present. In this the German Government quite shares the view of the American Government that all possible care must be taken for the security of the crew and passengers of a vessel to be sunk. Consequently, the persons found on board of a vessel may not be ordered into her lifeboats except when the general conditions, that is to say, the weather, the condition of the sea, and the neighborhood of the coasts afford absolute certainty that the boats will reach the nearest port. For the rest the German Government begs to point out that in cases where German naval forces have sunk neutral vessels for carrying contraband, no loss of life has yet occurred.

The undersigned begs to give expression to the hope that it will be possible for the two Governmens to reach a complete understanding regarding the case of the *William P. Frye* on the above basis, and avails himself of this opportunity to renew to His Excellency, the Ambassador, the assurance of his highest consideration.

I have, etc.,

VON JAGOW.

(TRANSLATION.)

ARBITRATION COMPROMIS.

The Imperial German Government and the Government of the United State of America having reached an agreement to submit to a court of arbitration the difference of opinion which has arisen, occasioned by the sinking of the American merchant vessel *William P. Frye* by a German warship, in respect of the interpretation of certain stipulations of the Prussian-American treaties of amity and commerce, the undersigned, duly authorized for this purpose, have agreed to the following *compromis:*

ARTICLE I.

A court of arbitration composed in accordance with the following stipulations is charged with the decision of the legal question:

Whether according to the treaties existing between the parties, in particular

Article XIII of the Prussian-American treaty of amity and commerce of July 11, 1799, the belligerent contracting party is prevented from sinking merchant vessels of the neutral contracting party for carrying contraband when such sinking is permissible according to general principles of international law.

ARTICLE II.

The court of arbitration shall be composed of five arbitrators to be chosen from among the members of the permanent tribunal of arbitration at The Hague.

Each government will choose two arbitrators, of whom only one may be a national of such country, as soon as possible, at the latest within two weeks from the day this *compromis* is signed. The four arbitrators thus nominated shall choose an umpire within four weeks after they have been notified of their nomination; in case of an equal vote the president of the Swiss federal council shall be requested to select the umpire.

ARTICLE III.

On March 1, 1916, each party shall transmit to the bureau of the permanent tribunal of arbitration 18 copies of its argument with authenticated copies of all documents and correspondence on which it intends to rely in the case. The bureau will arrange without delay for the transmission to the arbitrators and to the parties, each arbitrator to receive two copies, each party three copies. Two copies shall remain in the archives of the bureau.

On May 1, 1916, the parties shall deposit their countercases with the supporting evidence and their statements in conclusion.

ARTICLE IV.

Each party shall deposit with the the international bureau at the latest on March 1, 1916, the sum of 3,000 gulden of The Netherlands toward the costs of the arbitral procedure.

ARTICLE V.

The court of arbitration shall meet at The Hague on June 15, 1916, and proceed immediately to examine the dispute.

ARTICLE VI.

The parties may make use of the German or the English language.

The members of the court may use the German or the English language as they may choose. The decisions of the court shall be written in both languages.

ARTICLE VII.

Each party shall be represented by a special agent whose duty shall be to act as an intermediary between the party and the court. These agents shall

furnish the court any explanations which the court may demand of them; they may submit any legal arguments which they may consider advisable for the defense of their case.

ARTICLE VIII.

The stipulations of the convention of October 18, 1907, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, shall be applied to this arbitral procedure, in so far as nothing to the contrary is provided by the above *compromis*.

Done in duplicate at Berlin on the——day of——.

(九) 「アラビヤ」號撃沈ニ關シ獨國政府ノ米國ニ對スル十二月四日附通牒

(十二月八日ニユーヨーク、ヘラルド)

SEES IN THE ARABIA CASE CRISIS OF SUBMARINE ISSUES WITH PRUSSIA.

WASHINGTON BROUGHT TO POINT WHERE IT MUST ABANDON CONTENTION OF "VISIT AND SEARCH" OR ADMIT BERLIN'S PLEA OF MISTAKE AND OFFER OF INDEMNITY.

WASINGTON, D, C., Thursday.

The submarine issue was suddenly and unexpectedly brought to a point to-day where a decision by the administration regarding its readiness to accept an 'expression of regret, money indemnity and punishment of the submarine commander as adequate reparation for illegal attacks on merchant vessels seems to be unavoidable.

In a note regarding the submarine attacks upon the Peninsular and Oriental passenger steamship Arabia Berlin sets up a defence which the United States could not accept without abandoning all pretext of adherence to the rule of "visit and search" at sea. It is this rule which from the beginning has been the keystone of the American case in defence of neutral rights and lives at sea.

Prussia defends the attack upon the Arabia, admittedly an attack without warning, on the ground that the Arabia was a transport. She then gives as the reason for her judgment that the Arabia was a transport the following facts, ascertained through the periscope investigation of her submarine commander:—

1. The steamship's superstructure was painted a different color from that usually worn by Peninsular and Oriental passenger line vessels.

2. The steamship was following a lane of travel used during the period of the war by transports.

3. There were large batches of Chinese and colored persons observed on board, presumably workmen used behind the front by the Entente governments.

4. The women and children on board the Arabia were not observed from the periscope of the submarine.

5. The submarine's commander drew the conclusion from the above periscope observations that the ship was engaged in the transport of troops, although no mention is made of seeing any soldiers in uniform nor any save the Chinese and colored persons "in their native costumes" presumed to be workmen soldiers.

It is clear that the determination of a ship's status by such an investigation could not possibly be accepted by the United States without abandonment of all pretext of adherence to the rule of "visit and search."

AN ESSENTIAL RULE

The fourth reason set forth above shows clearly just why the United States has adhered to this rule as essential to the preservation of neutral and non-combatant lives at sea. It is stated that the submarine commander did not observe the women and children aboard the Arabia. The rule is that he should have searched the Arabia to make certain that there were no non-combatants aboard her. That it is insufficient for the preservation of neutral and non-combatant lives

merely to take observations through a peri-cope is proved incontrovertibly by this case.

Thus has Prussia forced upon the United States a defence of her action which cannot be accepted without abandonment of a rule of law which would henceforth jeopaardize all neutral life at sea.

As an alternative Prussia offers to pay indemnity, express regret or disavowal as being an act not authorized by orders to submarine commanders and to punish the offending submarine commander.

Inasmuch as the United States cannot accept the defence without gross faithlessness to law and humanity, it seems to be unavoidable for the administration to decide now whether it will be content to allow Prussia to continue these attacks with no more retribution exacted of her than an expression of regret and money indemnity.

Here is the text of the Berlin note:—

BERLIN'S LAST NOTE.

FOREIGN OFFICE, Berlin, Dec. 4. 1916.

The undersigned has the honor to inform Mr. Grew, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States of America, in reply to the note of the 21st ultimo, that the

investigation conducted by the German government concering the sinking of the British steamship Arabia has led to the following results:—

On the morning of November 6 a German submarine encountered a large steamship coming from the Corigo Straits, one hundred nautical miles west of the Island of Corigo. The steamship was painted black and had a black superstructure and not, as is otherwise the case, with Peninsular and Oriental line superstructures, a light color. The steamship, which was identical with the Arabia, was not travelling on the route regularly used by the passenger steamships between Port Said and Malta, as is made plain on the enclosed map, but was taking a zigzag course toward the west, 120 nautical miles north of that route. This course, on which the submarine passed three similar steamships at the same spot on the same morning, leads from the Aegean to Malta, so that the Arabia was moving on the transport route Corigo-Malta, used solely for war purposes, according to the experience until now.

The commander of the submarine further ascertained that there were large batches of Chinese and other colored persons in their national costumes on board the steamship. He considered them to be workmen soldiers, such as are used in great numbers behind the front by the enemies of Germany, in spite of the clear

weather and carful observation he did not perceive any women and children.

In the circumstances the commander of the Submarine was convinced that in the case of this steamship he was concerned with a transport ship for troops in the service of the British government, which is to be considered as an auxiliary war ship according to international law and can, therefore, be treated like a war ship. He accordingly considered himself justified in attacking the steamship without delay and sank it.

Should the American government give the official data showing that the Arabia was at the time of the torpedoing an ordinary passenger steamship the action of the commander would not have been in accordance with the instructions given him, since these instructions are now, as before, in agreement with the assurances of the German note of May, 1916. This would then be a case of a regrettable mistake from which the German government would promptly draw the appropriate consequences.

（十）「マリナ」號擊沈事件

（イ）「マリナ」號ノ性質ニ付テ米國英國ニ質問スル件

（十二月三日ニューヨーク、くラルド）

THE MARINA'S CASE IS UP TO BRITAIN.

Admiralty Is Asked to Inform Washington of Fxact Status of Ship and Crew.

Washington, D. C., Saturday.

The British government to-day was requested by the State Department to furnish to the United States complete information regarding the relationship of the British Admiralty to the steamship Marina and with American citizens serving aboard the Marina, who lost their lives in the destruction of the ship by a Prussian submarine.

It is the understanding of the State Department that the Marina was chartered by the British Admiralty to carry horses from America to England and that the owners of the Marina operated her, hired and paid her officers, crew and supercargo, including the American citizens killed.

The Berlin government, in defending the attack on the Marina, has alleged that she was a transport, taken over for operation by the British Admiralty, and that the Americans aboard her had entered into the service of the British Admirlty.

Such service, of course, would be unneutral and would rob the Americans, during the period of service, of the protection of their government. That is what Berlin is trying to prove—that these Americans did not deserve the protection of their government.

(ロ)「マリナ」號ノ性質ニ關シテ英國政府ヨリ回答アリタル件

(十二月九日ニユーヨーク、ヘラルド)

SUBMARINE CRISIS REACHES POINT OF ABJECT SURRENDER OR A BREAK WITH GERMANY.

Information Received from British Government Leaves No Doubt Whatever Regarding the Status of the Marina—She Was Not Connected with British Admiralty Service.

Washington, D. C., Friday.

Through information supplied to the State Departemnt to-day by the British government regarding the case of the steamship Marina the submarine issue was

brought to a point where a crisis with Germany cannot possibly be avoided save by action from the United States which would have to be tantamount to an abject surrender to Germany and a surrender of all pretence to support of that basic principle of law which protects the lives of non-combatants at sea—the law of visit and search.

The Wilson administration apparently forces a crisis wherein must come another "surrender to force" or a break in diplomatic relations with Germany.

This extremely critical situation was discussed by President Wilson and Mr. Lansing, Secretar yof State, to-day. What decision, if any, was reached cannot be learned, but there exists some evidence that the United States is likely to choose surrender, thinly veiled under a meaningless diplomatic victory.

The information from the Britsh government stated that the steamship was not connected with the British Admiralty service as a public vessel or a transport and was under character to neither the Admiralty nor under requisition. This means that the Marina was a private merchant vessel immune from attack without warning.

CASE OF THE MARINA.

The Marina was sunk without warning by fire from two Prussian submarines while en route from England to the United States. The attack occurred approximately one hundred miles from shore in a heavy sea. No effort was made by the submarines to

succor the survivors left in their small boats.

Six American citizens following their rightful avocation on the free high seas and entitled to the protection of their government were killed by the attack of the submarines upon this vessel. Germany gave only one ground of defence for her action, namely that the Marina was a transport of the British Admiralty. The information received by the State Department to-day absolutely disproves that contention and leaves no possible ground of defence for the Germans.

Germany has offered to make reparation in the event that the killing ef the Americans on board the Marina is proved illegal by expressing regret or disavowing the act, paying indemnity and punishing the guilty submarine commander.

Obviously only two courses lie ahead of the United States—to accept or reject the offer of reparation. If the offer is accepted the case will be settled and Germany will continue her submarine operations in the same circumstances that led to the illegal sinking of the Marina with the expressed toleration of the United States. If that offer of reparation is accepted it will signify the readiness of the United States to tolerate this form of submarine warfare, with periodical acceptances of money indemnity and expressions of regard for the murder of American citizens whenever "mistakes" are made by Prussian submarine commanders.

THE LAW IS ABSOLUTE.

The rule of law which has existed for centuries and which the United States set out to uphold when Von Tirpitz first announced his submarine campaign would make it absolutely impossible for such "mistakes" to occur. That is the rule of visit and search. When war ships visit and search merchants at sea there is no possibility of their mistaking merchant ships for transports or of their failing to observe that women, children and American citizens are on board. Hence if the United States tolerates the continuance of these "mistakes," as it will have to do if it accepts Germany's offer of reparation in this case, it will abandon the rule of visit and search, the most important principle to-day in the entire code of the law of nations.

Of course it is not meant to suggest here that if the United States rejects Germany's offer of reparation these illegal acts will stop. They will continue. Where there is an incorrigible will to violate the law such violations can be stopped only by breaking the power of the offender.

But there will be this difference. If the United States accepts the reparation it will be an accomplice in the crime. If it rejects the reparation and refuses to tolerate an abandonment of this vital principle of law, upon which rests the safety of American citizens at sea, it will declare its adherence to this principle, its conviction of the right to life of neutrals on the high seas.

(十一) 米國抑留獨艦ヘ抑留地ヲ變更スル件

(九月二十六日ニューヨーク發)

U. S. WILL CONVOY TWO GERMAN SHIPS.

INTERNED CRUISERS PRINCE EITEL AND WILLHELM TO PASS ALLIED WARSHIPS.

NORFOLK, Va., Sept. 25.—Flying the German flag and convoyed by three American battleships the interned German cruisers Prince Eitel Friedrich and Kronprinz Wilhelm will pass in full view of allied warships off the Virginia Capes next week when they leave this port for Philadelhpia.

The fifth division of the Atlantic fleet, composed of the Michigan, South Carolina, Minnesota and Vermont, has been ordered to convoy the German ships to Philadelphia. The Michigan will not be able to go with the expedition, having already arrived at Philadelphia to be repaired following the explosion of a twelve inch shell which destroyed one of her guns.

The German ships are ready to leave, but as the American battleships are engaged in target practice off the Capes they are obliged to wait until this is completed, which will be not later than Sunday.

（十二）新任駐米墺國大使通行券附與ノ件

（イ）米國墺國大使ニ通行券ヲ附與センコトヲ請求スル件

（十一日三十日ニユーヨーク、ヘラルド）

WASHINGTON ASKS ALLIES TO PASS AUSTRIAN ENVOY.

Requests Great Britain and France to Reconsider Their Refusal to Issue a Safe Conduct Through Their Blockade Lines for Count Tarnowski.

Washington, Wednesday.—The United States has sent notes to Great Britain and France, it became known to-day, requesting reconsideration by those governments of their refusal to issue a safe conduct through their blockade lines for Count Tarnowski, new Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to this country, and speaking of the unfortunate effect that a continued refusal would have on opinion here.

The notes declare that it is an inalienable right of sovereign nations to exchange Ambassadors and insist that a third nation, even in time of war, is not justified in denying that right.

Great care is taken to base the representations solely on the grounds of international right as distinguished from mere international courtesy, making it clear that the United States is not asking a favor or assuming the attitude of a pleader.

Care also is taken not to put the government in the position of having changed its attitude since the last communication on the subject, which was merely the transmission of the Austrian government's request for a safe conduct. It was intended at first, when the rebuff was received, to drop the position of being a messenger of Austria and make a formal demand in the name of the United States.

It was decided, however, that it was unnecessary to take such action at this stage of the negotiations, when it is hoped that a firm statement of the general principles of international law in the case will cause a reconsideration by the Allies. If the present note meets with an unsatisfactory response it is admitted that a very difficult situation will be developed.

The Allied Embassies are deeply concerned over the resentment felt by the Washington government and are taking unusual care to keep their governments fully informed. It is not known that they have forwarded any direct representations to their governments except in so far as the nature of their information is in itself a recommendation. Nevertheless, officials have every hope that this informal action by the diplomatic representatives on the ground will go far toward influencing a change of attitude on the other side.

Early replies to the American notes are expected, owing to the fact that Count Tarnowski hoped to leave Rotterdam on the Dutch steamship Nieuw Amsterdam on December 16.

Should the replies prove unfavorable the United States might send a final note notifying the Allies to disturb the Austrian envoy at their own risk, or it might be decided to send an American merchantman or war ship to some neutral port to receive the Ambassador and bring him across the Atlantic. As yet, however, such a contingency has hardly been contemplated in view of the confident belief that the Allies will yield.

(ロ) 英國先ツ米國ヘ請求ヲ拒絶スル件

(十二月二十八日ニユーヨーク、くトルド)

BRITAIN DEFINITELY REFUSES TO GRANT A SAFE CONDUCT TO THE NEW AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN ENVOY.

American Ambassador in London Informed That Count Adam Tarnowski von Tarnow Will Not Be Allowed to Reach America—Washington Sees Affront in Refusal.

(By Cable to the Associated Press.)

London, Monday, 5: 19 P. M.

The Foreign Office has sent to the American Ambassador, Mr. Walter Hines Page, a note definitely refusing to grant a safe conduct to Count Adam Tarnowski von Tarnow, the new Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to the United States.

The reason for the refusal may be paraphrased as follows:—

Even if international law forbade the refusal of such a safe conduct, the action of Austrian and German Embassies and consulates abroad has been so much in excess of regular diplomatic functions that the British government feels justified

in withholding its consent for such diplomatists to travel to their posts.

REFUSAL OF GREAT BRITAIN, IF PERSISTED IN, MIGHT BE AN AFFRONT TO THE UNITED STATES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Monday

An intimation was given at the State Department to-day that if Great Britain carries out the threat to detain Count von Tarnow, the new Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to the United States, during his journey overseas the United States might consider the action as an affront to itself.

This intimation was indirectly given through a comparison of Great Britain's threatened action with the celebrated Trent affair, in which an American naval officer removed two commissioners of the Confederacy from a British merchant ship on the high seas. In that case Great Britain protested the action as being an affront to the British flag, and the Confederate commissioners were released by order of William H. Seward, Secretary of State.

It is admitted, however, that in this instance a very different case would be

presented, because Count von Tarnow does not intend to cross the ocean on board an American vessel. Just how good a basis for protest the United States could find if the Ambassador were taken from a ship of another nationality is not clear.

MIGHT TRY THE DEUTSCHLAND.

If Count von Tarnow could make the voyage on board an American ship the problem would be solved; but that does not seem feasible, since he must go on board the ship at some Continental port.

About the only other way for him to make certain of his passage would seem to be for him to cross by the submarine merchant ship Deutschland. He probably would be obliged to curtail his retinue of servants and to put up with cramped quarters, but otherwise, at least, he seems doomed to capture by the British.

In the Trent case Secretary Seward held that "contraband persons" were subject to seizure on the high seas just as contraband goods are. The American naval officer who took the Confederate commissioners off the Trent reported that he looked up precedents to uphold his action, and, finding that contraband despatches were subject to seizure, he held that these commissioners "were the embodiment of contraband despatches," and hence also subject to seizure. Mr. Seward ordered their release, not because of the illegality of their seizure, but because they had not

received a trial in the courts to prove their contraband character.

With this American precedent before them the British might very well defend their action in seizing the Austrian Ambassador as "a contraband person," although they might be required to try him in British courts.

INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE CASE.

Although the Ambassador would have diplomatic immunity in the United States, precedents do not make it clear that he would be entitled to such immunity on the high seas and at the hands of his enemies. In fact, many authorities on international law sustain the right of a belligerent to thus interfere with an enemy person on the way to perform services in a foreign country which it is to the military advantage of the belligerent to stop.

It was learned to-day that the State Department so far has not made a formal request for the safe conduct of the Ambassador, but has confined itself to a transmission of the request of the Austrian government for such a courtesy. Therefore it is probable that if the issue is to be made up it will be necessary for the United States now to make such request on its own account.

Great Britain's attitude, if adhered to, would prevent a new Turkish Ambassador and successors to Captains Boy-Ed and Von Papen, formerly Naval and Military Attachés of the German Embassy, from reaching the United States.

Negotiations regarding a new Turkish Ambassador are said to have been under way for some time. It is understood, however, that the German government has no intention at this time of sending new Naval and Military Attachés, because of the belief that upon their arrival in this country they would immediately become subjects of suspicion and investigation.

(八) 聯合國米國ヘ請求ヲ諾スルヘ件

(十一月二十九日ロンドンヨリ)

AMERICAN REQUEST MAY BE HONORED.

INTIMATION IN WASHINGTON THAT NEW ENVOY, AFTER ALL, MAY BE ALLOWED TO CROSS SEA.

WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY.

An intimation was given from an official source to-day that Great Britain and France would honor a request from the United States, made on its own behalf, for safe conduct for the passage overseas of Count Tarnovsky von Tarnow, the

newly appointed Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to the United States.

Whether the United States will make such a request has not been decided. Thus far it has only forwarded to London and Paris a request for safe conduct presented to the State Department by the Austro-Hungarian government.

Official communications from both the governments of France and Great Britain reached the State Department to-day stating that safe conduct would not be granted to the Austrian Ambassador en route to the United State for the reason that Austrian and German diplomatic officers in neutral countries have engaged in so many activities in excess of their diplomatic functions that they must be regarded as contraband persons bound on belligerent service, and as such subject to seizure on the high seas.

The later intimation that a request for safe conduct from the United States government on its own behalf might be honored is presumed to be based upon the idea that the United States would assume responsibility for the strictly diplomatic character of the mission.

（十二）白耳義人强制移轉ニ關スル件

（本輯白耳義國法令第一參照）

（イ）米國非公式ニ白耳義人强制移轉ニ關シ獨國ニ抗議スル件

（十一月十六日ニユーヨーク、サン）

PROTEST TO BERLIN MADE FOR BELGIUM.

SECRETARY LANSING SAYS REPRESENTATIONS BY THE U. S. ARE PURELY INFORMAL.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 15.—Secretary Lansing explained to-day the position which this Government has taken regarding the deportation of civilians in Belgium by the German military authorities. As stated in THE SUN last Saturday, the United States is deeply concerned and has made representations to Germany on the subject, but Mr. Lansing said he wished to correct the published reports of to-day that the State Department had officially protested to Berlin.

The action, he explained, was informal and was brought about by the fact that the United States is to a certain extent responsible for the welfare of the Belgian civil population on account of the supervision being exercised by the American commission of relief. The Belgian authorities here brought the matter to

the attention of the State Department, and technically Mr. Lansing's representations took the form of transmitting the Belgian complaint informally to the Berlin Foreign Office.

It is known that President Wilson and Secretary Lansing are both closely watching the situation, and regard the German action as a violation of the rules of civilized warfare. They wish to know what defence Germany can offer, and are not satisfied with the vague statement that it is "military necessity" or for the benefit of the Belgians themselves.

Secretary Lansing conferred to-day with the French Ambassador, M. Jusserand, and the Russian Ambassador, M. Bakhmeteff. It is said the deportation of Belgians was one of the matters under discussion.

The United States, on behalf of Belgium, is endeavoring to ascertain what becomes of the Belgians after they are deported. Reports that they are made to dig trenches behind the firing line and are used to help in the manufacture of war munitions are not confirmed.

（ロ） 白國白耳義人ヘ强制移轉問題ニ關シテ米國ヘ盡力ヲ求ムル件

（十一月十七日ニヨーク、サンス）

BELGIUM ASKS U. S. TO HALT GERMANY

Minister Havenith Communicates More Informaton on Deportations.

Washington, Nov. 16.—Germany's action in deporting civilians from Belgium has aroused the Belgian Government to make an emphatic protest through the American State Department. E. Havenith, the Belgian Minister, has communicated further information on the subject to Secretary Lansing with the understanding that it will be cabled to Berjin.

The Belgian Legation made public to-night this communication which Mr. Havenith sent to Secretary Lansing:

"The German Governor-General in Belgium is forcing thousands of Belgian workmen who are unemployed or without work to go to Germany to work in the quarries in manufacturing concrete and in the lime kilns under pretext that they are a charge upon public charity.

"The Belgian Government protests energetically against this coercive measure, which is contrary to the law of nations and the laws of humanity.

"The Government of the King asks the active intervention of the Government of the United States to obtain the cessation of this deportation of Belgian workmen into Germany and to obtain the liberation of those who have been already deported.

"The Germans claim that these workmen are not employed in war industries. It should be remarked, however, that they are employed in industries directly connected with the war and that the employment of this Belgian labor releases a great number of German workmen who are sent to the front. Thus these Belgian workmen are compelled practically to fight against their own country."

Another statement from the Belgian Legation adds:

"The Belgian Minster calls attention to the fact that the unemployment of Belgian workmen is due entirely to the action of the German Government, which has requisitioned all the supplies of raw materials and destroyed the industrial plants by removing the machinery.

"The German Government has absolutely paralyzed all business in Belgium; furthermore, the German Government, which claims to try to encourage Belgian industry, has imposed a war tax of 40,000,000 francs a month (about twenty times the normal amount of Belgian taxation) for the past two years upon a country which is without business and which Germany herself has impoverished by war and devastation.

"At the beginning of the war the German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, acknowledged that Germany was doing a great wrong in invading Belgium, but in spite of this confession of guilt Germany is every day adding to her crimes against this innocent and small country."

(八) 獨國占領地ヘ白耳義人强制移轉其他ニ對スル白國外務大臣ノ抗議

(十一月二十四日リヨーヨーカラくトンドン)

FORCE BELGIANS TO BUILD TRENCHES OR MAKE MUNITIONS.

FOREIGN MINISTER CALLS METHODS OF PRUSSIAN CONQUERORS.

TREASON TO HUMANITY.

SAYS MACHINERY IS TAKEN FROM COUNTRY.

DEPORTATIONS NOW MORE THAN 350,000—APPEALS TO VATICAN AND SPAIN TO PROTEST.

[By Cable to the Associated Press.]

HAVRE, Thursday.

The following telegram has been sent by the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Belgian Ministers to the Vatican and Spain, to be communicated to Pope Benedict and King Alfonso:—

"The situation in Belgium is becoming day by day more frightful. The raids on valid Belgians now extend throughout the whole country. If they are not sent to work in Germany in munitions factories they are sent to the occupied parts of France to work on systems of trenches and the strategic railways of Lille, Aulnay and Givet. The Germans boast of already having deported 350,000 men.

"Requisitions of materials continue with the object of hindering after peace a resumption of work, to suppress competition and ruin the country. Machines which could be used have been carried off or sold as old iron.

"The Governor General pretends in declarations made to a reporter of the New York Times that deportations in mass pass without incident and even that the Belgians go joyfully. In reality they suffer at the same time moral torture and the physical pains of slavery. The German government tries to excuse itself by the necessity of combating the unemployment which they themselves created by forbidding the communes to employ unemployed without their authorization and by preventing them, as in Luxemburg, from being used for public works or in exploiting the coal fields of Limburg.

"Belgium is delivered over to the violence of the military ahthorities, while the civil authorities approve and stand aside.

"I insist strongly that the government to which you are accredited invite the German government to reflect on the consequences of the treason to humanity committed in its name. Germany before she is forced to abandon our country wants to leave it in the condition of a corpse, but while thus engaged in torturing it she is putting herself under the ban of nations and instead of imposing peace on her adversaries by terror she is only raising the civilized world against her.

"BEYENS."

（ニ）白國人强制移轉ニ對スル英國政府ノ抗議

（十二月五日ニユーヨーク、タイムズ）

RELIEF WORK IN BELGIUM NOW IMPERILLED BY DEPORTATIONS ENFORCED THERE BY PRUSSIANS.

British Government Issues Protest Against the Slave Raids by Military Authorities and Declares That Measures to Feed the Population Are in Danger of Failing.

[By Cable to the Associated Press.]

London, Monday.

The British government, in conjunction with Great Britain's allies, has issued a "declaration regarding the present state of Belgium," in which protest is made to the civilized world against the "slave raids" conducted by the German authorities in Belgium, and a warning given to the world that "the work of relief which neutrals have built up is in danger of falling."

The document, after reciting the assistance the Entente Allies have given in the past in the work of relief in Belgium, says:—

"The Allies stipulated that the Germans should equally draw no advantage from the operations of the neutral commission; that they should not seize imported or native supplies, and that the distribution of relief should not be used for the purpose of coercing Belgian workmen against their consciences. These conditions, which the Germans were pledged to obey, have been frequently violated. But the infractions in the past have been disavowed by the German government, and the Allies have been content to rely upon the neutral commission to watch and enforce the fulfilment of the conditions under which it worked.

"Now however, the situation is changing. The Germans have abandoned all pretence of respecting personal freedom in Belgium. They have deliberately ordered the suspension of the public relief works supported by the commission and openly aimed at creating unemployment, which furnishes them an excuse for deportations. They have become themselves the organizers and co-operators in man hunts which they pledged themselves by the Brussels Convention of 1890 to put down in Africa. The machinery of Belgian industry is now totally destroyed, and exports of Belgian foodstuffs have again begun on a large scale.

"The Allies must therefore warn the world of what is about to take place. The Central Empires, as their own situation grows more desperate, intend to tear

up every guarantee on which the work of the Relief Commission rests. They intend to cast aside all their promises and use Belgian foodstuffs and Belgian labor to support their own failing strength.

"The work of relief which the neutrals have built up for two years is about to lose its foundation and is in danger of falling.

"The Allies do not intend to change their policy or desert the oppressed population of Belgium in this most critical moment of the war, but, as it will be impossible for the relief work to continue if its basic guarantees are destroyed, they appeal to the civilized world, not on their own behalf, but on behalf of innocent civilians who cannot protect themselves, to see that this great work of international benevolence and co-operation, which has grown up amidst the war and for which the Allies have advanced money, shall not be endangered by treachery or destroyed by violence.

"But they remind the world that the German policy which stands revealed is being carried out not only in Belgium, but in North France and all the occupied territories. The Allies pledge themselves not to seek in the future, any more than in the past, any advantage from the operations of this purely neutral commission."

(ホ) 白國人强制移轉ニ對スル米國政府ノ抗議

〈十一月廿九日特電〉

（十二月九日ニユーヨーク、くラルド）

DEPORTATIONS IN BELGIUM BASIS OF AMERICAN PROTEST.

CONTRARY TO HUMANE PRINCIPLES OF CIVILIZED NATIONS, WASHINGTON TELLS BERLIN.

WOULD BE FATAL TO WORK OF RELIEF.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY, UNDER INSTRUCTIONS, READ NOTE, BUT CHANCELLOR MADE NO PROMISE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Friday.

The American government's formal protest to Germany against the deportation of Belgians for forced labor as a violation of the principles of humanity was made public to-day by the State Department. It was in the form of a note, cabl-

ed to Mr. Grew, secretary of the American Embassy at Berlin, with instructions that he seek an interview which the German Chancellor and read it to him, and was given out by the department with the terse comment:—

"The interview has taken place."

Officials refused to add to this statement, and, so far as could be learned to-night, there has been no reply from Germany. All information available, however, indicates that the deportations are continuing, and it is known that through earlier informal representations Mr. Grew learned that the German position was that the policy was a military necessity and not in violation of international law.

With the failure of America's efforts, as well as those of Spain, Holland and the Vatican, the only action which officials here apparently believe this government can take is the full publication of the facts in its possession. Admittedly diplomatic procedure has been exhausted. The United States does not represent Belgium at Berlin, and is declared by officials to have gone even beyond the conventional diplomatic rights in the matter.

The American note was put on the cable on November 29, the night of the day Ambassador Gerard saw President Wilson preparatory to his return to Berlin, and the night the Associated Press announced that the United States had made

further representations on its own behalf on the broad grounds of humanity. Its text follows:—

"The government of the United States has learned with the greatest concern and regret of the policy of the German government to deport from Belgium a portion of the civilian population for the purpose of forcing them to labor in Germany, and is constrained to protest in a friendly spirit, but most solemnly, against this action, which is in contravention of all precedents and of those humane principles of international pracitice which have long been accepted and followed by civilized nations in their treatment of non-combatants.

"Furthermore, the government of the United States is convinced that the effect of this policy, if pursued, will in all probability be fatal to the Belgian relief work, so humanely planned and so successfully carried out, a result which would be generally deplored and which, it is assumed, would seriously embarrass the German government."

The Belgian deportations, which first began months ago, assumed seriousness last August, when official reports to the department indicated their whalesale extent. Mr. Grew discussed the matter with the then Under Secretary, Herr Zimmerman, on several occasions, but without result. On October 26 he was directed to take it up personally with Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg, an unusual procedure, and to say

what an unfortunate effect the continuance of the deportations would have on neutral opinion, particularly in America, which country had the interests of Belgian civilians very much at heart.

Mr. Grew reported that the Chancellor had heard his presentation of the case, but had offered neither explanation nor promise. Thereupon a series of conferences followed in Washington between President Wilson, Secretary Lansing, Mr. Gerard and Colonel E. M. House, with the result that the formal protest was despatched.

During that time also Belgium had protested officially to this government and requested active intervention on the basis of statements that more than one hundred thousand persons had been deported to Germany and that the daily rate was nearly three thousand. England later in an official statement threatened the discontinuance of American relief work unless the deportations ceased.

Information in the hands of the department confirms press despatches and statements of the Belgian and British governments showing that whole sections of Belgium have been systematically stripped of workmen.

(イ) 右ニ對スル獨國回答ノ要領

(十二月四日ニヲケル「ヂスパチ」)

TO BLAME ENGLAND FOR BELGIAN EXILES.

Germany Will Plead Necessity of Providing Work for Unemployed.

Washington, Dec. 3.

Germany's reply to the American protest against the deportation of Belgian civilians will be to plead that internal condition in Belgium warrant the action of the Imperial Government and that the infringement of Greece's sovereignty by the Entente is a far greater violation of internationl law than the measures which Germany has taken.

The Berlin Foreign Office will also charge that Great Britain's illegal blockade is responsible for barring raw materials from Belgium, thereby causing the unemployment which the German authorities have found it necessary to deal with.

The general tenor of Berlin's reply, according to an explanation from a well informed source made to The Sun correspondent to-day, will be that Germany cannot meet the desires of the United States but is anxious to correct misstatements concerning the situation which have been made by Germany's enemies and to present the matter to the Government and people of the United States in a

new light.

Real Facts Beclouded.

Germany's contention is that sympathy which the American Government and people have very properly had for Belgium has clouded the real facts which now confront the Imperial Government. Belgium, according to the German viewpoint, has in reality suffered less and been the least devastated of the weaker nations during the war.

Belgium never came to the point of enlisting men, as the war was practically over, so far as Belgium was concerned, in two weeks. The Belgian army fought bravely, it is admitted, but the sacrifices which Belgium has made were insignificant compared to what devastated Poland went through or Serbia, according to German opinion.

Germany lays stress on the alleged fact that Belgium is now (together with Saxony) the most thickly populated area in Europe. Comparison is made between Poland and Serbia, where the majority of able bodied men have fallen in the fighting, and Belgium, where it is claimed the great majority of the able bodied men have simply remained idle in the country, a drain on the resources and an impediment to the reforms which the German military authorities have wished to

put into effect.

"If Great Britain or France were dominating Belgium what would happen to these men? They would be in the trenches fighting. From a humanitarian standpoint they are better off working in Germany."

Now Working on Munitions.

This statement, reflecting the German view, is made for the purpose of justifying the fact that civilians in Belgium are being sent to Germany to work. German officials claim that Belgians are working under healthy and proper conditions and are being paid for the work they do. Denial is made that they are working in the munition factories or behind the trenches.

"The factories in Belgium have not been used to make munitions for the very reason that Germany did not wish to force Belgians to do work which might be regarded as directed against their own country."

It is claimed that the Belgian factories could have been used for munitions, but not for their regular industries, because Great Britain by her command of the sea has barred the necessary raw materials from reaching the country.

After presenting its side of the situation in Belgium the German Government will, it is understood, invite the attention of the United States to a comparison between

Germany's attitude toward Belgium and the Entente Allies' attitude toward Greece.

"All we asked of Belgium was to be allowed to march through. We did not ask Belgium to help us or to fight with us. The Entente in Greece has entered the country despite protest, fomented a revolution, despoiled the people and now wants to make them fight actively on their side in the prosecution of the war."

This summarizes the German position.

（十四）獨墺兩國占領地住民救護ニ關スル件

（イ）波蘭ノ食料問題ニ關シ米國大使ノ檄文ニ對スル英國ノ回答譯文

（第九輯下第三〇四頁參照）

（外事彙報大正五年第十二號）

（一九一六年七月二十八日「ロンドン、デイリイ、メイル」所載）

交戰各國協約ヲ結ヒテ波蘭ヲ救濟センコトヲ欲求セル米國大使ノ檄文ニ對シ英國外務省ハ左ノ回答書ヲ發セリ

『英國政府ハ敵軍ノ占領スル地域ニ食料品ヲ輸入セントスル問題ノ解決ヲ希望シ次ノ提案ヲ爲ス

獨墺兩國政府ハ其陸軍ノ占領スル白耳義、北佛地方、波蘭、塞比亞、モンテネグロ、アルバニアニ產出スル農作物、畜類、食料品、芻草及ヒ肥料ハ之ヲ全部其住民ノ使用ニ供スル爲メ保留シ合衆國大統領カ任命シテ食料分配ノ全權ヲ委任セル中立國人カ前記ノ各地ニ入ルヲ許シ且必要ニ應シテ剩餘品ヲ各地ニ轉送スルニ同意シ及ヒ合衆國大統領亦右代辨人ヲ選定スルノ決心アラハ英國政府ハ獨墺兩國ノ協定遵守ヲ條件トシ右代辨者ヲ補助シ且前記各地ヘ食料品ヲ輸入シ住民ノ需要ヲ充サントスルニ同意ス

若シ此提議ニシテ拒絕セラルヽカ或ハ獨墺兩國政府其占領區域內ノ作物收獲ヲ始ムルニ先チテ回答セサルカ或ハ聯合國政府ノ告知ニ對シ右救濟問題ニ關スル態度ヲ公式的ニ宣明スルコトナケレハ英國政府ハ前記占領地ノ住民營養不足ノ爲メ死亡スルニ對シ獨墺兩國政府ハ其責ニ任セサル可ラスト主張ス又聯合軍ハ獨墺兩國ヨリ强徵シ得ル限リノ賠償金若クハ中立諸國ノ輿論カ强制スルヲ至當トスル如キ賠償金ヲ兩國ニ賦課スヘシ

此提案ヲ實行シテ效力ヲ生セシメント欲セハ一刻モ猶豫スヘカラス收獲ハ近ク終ラントス然ラハ占領地域ノ住居ヲ利セントセハ收獲物ヲ中立諸國ニ管理セシメ獨墺兩國民ヲ利スルヲ妨ケサル可ラス』

第三　雜件

（一）米國對英佛諸新借款成立

○米國對英佛諸新借款成立（十一月二十九日官報）本件ニ關シ米國駐劄佐藤特命全權大使

ヨリ去月二十六日附ヲ以テ左ノ如ク報告アリ（外務省）

本年九月ニ終ル過去一箇年間ニ於テ米國輸出入貿易總額ハ七十二億八千萬弗（內輸出總額四十九億七千二百萬弗、輸入總額二十三億八百萬弗卽チ輸出超過額二十六億六千四百萬弗）ニ達シ過去ニ於ケル世界最大貿易額タリシ一九一三年度英國輸出入額七十億千八百萬弗ヲ凌駕スルニ至リ同一箇年間正金流入超過額モ四億五千六百萬弗ノ多キニ及ヒ本年十月一日調査米國正金保有總額モ亦二十六億三千六百萬弗ノ巨額ニ達シ一九一四年八月一日ノ調査ニ比シ七億四千九百萬弗ヲ增加セリト云フ而モ右輸出超過正金超入ノ形勢ハ近時益々甚シキモノアリ去ル九月中ニ於テ前者ハ三億四千九百萬弗、後者ハ八千六百萬弗ニ達セリ

事情此ノ如キヲ以テ當國財業者ハ正金流入ニ依リ通貨ノ膨脹ヲ來サンヨリハ（商務長官ハ此程戰爭ノタメ米國生活費ノ上ニ約三割五分方ノ暴騰ヲ生シタリト言ヘル由右ハ穀價其他一般勞銀昂騰ノ結果ニモ基クナランモ通貨ノ膨脹モ其一因ナラン）寧ロ輸出入ノ決濟ハ外債ノ應募ニ依ルヲ可トスルノ議論ニ傾キ居レル力曩ニ二億五千萬弗ノ英國借款成立後更ニ今日ニ至ルマテ四億五千萬弗ノ英佛借款引受ケラレタル旨公表セラレタリ卽チ其要領ヲ摘錄スレハ左ノ如シ

一、九月十九日公表　巴里市債發行額五千萬弗　期限五箇年　發行價格九十八3/4　利率六分ｏ引受銀行 Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

二、十月二十日公表　佛國工業信用貸付　金額一億弗　期限十八箇月以內　利率約六分五厘　引受銀行 Guaranty Trust Co, Banker's Trust Co, William P. Bonbright Co.

（備考）佛國ヘノ借款全額六億六千萬弗ト爲ル

三、十月二十五日公表　英國政府國庫債券　發行額三億弗　期限半額ハ三箇年他半額ハ五箇年　發行價格前者九十九1/4後者九十八3/4　利率五分五厘　擔保株券　英國政府ヨリ提供ノ米國諸會社並ニ加拿陀及他ノ英國殖民地、埃及、印度、南米諸國、キューバ、日本等ノ株券債券價額三億八千萬弗　引受銀行 J. P. Morgan Co. 等

（備考）英國對米借款全額八億五千萬弗ト爲ル

（二）三億弗ノ英米借款成立

（通商公報第三七六號）
（大正五年十月三十日附在紐育帝國總領事代理領事赤松祐之報告）

當地「ジエー、ピー、モルガン」商會其他ヨリ成ル米國資本團ハ今次英國政府トノ間ニ米貨三億弗ノ新借款ヲ締約セシ由ニテ右ニ關シ「モルガン」商會ノ公表スルトコロニ據レハ內容大要左ノ如シ

米國資本團ハ英國政府ニ對シ利子年五分五厘ヲ以テ米貨三億弗ヲ貸付スヘク內一億五千萬弗ハ償還期限三ヶ年手取リ九十九四分一ニシテ投資額ニ對スル純利廻リ年五分七厘五毛ニ當リ殘リ一億五千萬弗ハ期限五ヶ年手取リ九十八二分一ニシテ純利廻リ五分八厘五毛ニ當

ル英國政府ハ右借受金ニ對シ證券額面ヲ千弗、五千弗及一萬弗ノ三種ニ別チ各本年十一月一日附チ以テ證券ヲ發行スヘク元金及利子ハ證券保持人ノ希望ニヨリ或ハ在紐育「モルガン」商會ヨリ米貨ニテ仕拂ヲ受ケ又ハ倫敦ニ於テ一磅ニ付四弗八十六仙二分一ノ確定相場ニ據リ英貨ヲ以テ仕拂ヲ受クル事ヲ得ヘキモノトシ尙右借款ノ擔保トシテ英國政府ハ借入額ノ二割增ニ當ル高卽チ時價見積額三億六千萬弗ヲ下ラサル各種證券ヲ紐育「ガランチトラスト」會社ニ供託スヘシ而シテ右擔保ハ之ヲ二部類ニ分チ其一半卽チ一億八千萬弗ハ米國諸會社商會ノ株券社債券其他及加奈陀聯邦政府各州各市又ハニューフアウンドランドノ公債竝ニ之レニ類似ノ各種證券ヨリ成リ殘リ一半ハ濠洲聯邦、南亞聯邦、ニュージーランド、亞爾然丁、智利、玖馬、埃及、印度及日本ノ公債證券竝ニ或種英國鐵道會社ノ社債券ヨリ成ルモノトス英國政府ハ右擔保證券ヲ何時ニテモ任意ニ賣捌ク事ヲ得ヘシト雖該賣上金ハ前揭「トラスト」會社ニ提供シテ證券ノ買上ケ償還ニ充ツルヲ要シ又右擔保證券ノ市價低落シテ前記二割增ノ限度ヲ降ル時ハ更ニ其之レニ達スルマテヲ增塡スヘキモノトス又借款償還ノ割合ニ應シテ擔保證券ヲ撤回シ又ハ「モルガン」商會ノ同意ヲ俟チ證券ヲ取リ替フルコトヲ得ルモ此等ノ場合ト雖前記擔保二種類別相互ノ割合ニ變更ヲ及ホスナキヲ要ス本借款證券ノ一般ニ對スル賣出價格ハ前記ノ如ク九十九四分一及九十八二分ノ一ナルカ米國資本團ノ引受價格ハ更ニ一「パーセント」二分一安ノコトトシ內八分一「パーセント」ハ發賣ノ費用及手數料ノ仕拂ニ充テ殘リハ資本團引受者ノ利得ニ屬セシムルモノノ由ナリ

本借款ハ米國ニ於テ戰後正貨地金ノ流入相繼キ資本潤澤ヲ極メ正貨過剩ノ弊害ヲ生セントスル虞アルニ付正貨ノ流入ヲ少クスル目的ヲ以テ卽チ寧ロ米國資本家側自衞ノ爲メニ借款引受ヲナスニ至リシモノ、由ナルカ是ニテ開戰後英國カ外資ヲ當國ニ仰ケルモノ總額八億五千萬弗ニ達シタリト云フ

（通商公報第三七四號本欄『米國對英佛新借款成立』參照）

（三）米國ニ於ケル佛國「クレヂット」ノ成立

（通商公報第三七五號）

（大正五年十月二十九日附在紐育帝國總領事代理領事赤松祐之報告）

當地「ガランティー、トラスト」會社「バンカース、トラスト」會社及「ウイリアム、ピー、ポンプライト」會社ヨリ成ル一資本團ハ今次佛國政府仲介ノ下ニ同國輸入業者トノ間ニ總額一億弗ヲ超ヘサル範圍內ニ於テ佛國向ケ米國輸出品ノ代價仕拂ニ充ツル爲メ米國ニ「クレヂット」ヲ置クヘキ事ヲ協定セシ由ニテ右ニ關シ前記「ガランティー、トラスト」會社ノ公表シタル處ニ據レハ本借款ハ二十五乃至五十ノ有力ナル佛國輸入業者ヲシテ一覽後三月拂ノ手形ヲ振出サシメ同手形ハ滿期日ニ至リ五回同一期限ヲ以テ書キ替ヘヲ爲シ得ヘキ事ヲ約定シタルモノナリト云フ今要領ヲ摘記スレハ左ノ如シ

（一）「クレヂット」ノ金額ハ米貨一億弗ヲ超ヘス

（二）右「クレヂット」ハ佛國輸入業者ヨリ本件米國資本團加入各銀行宛弗爲替手形振出ノ方

法ニ據テ之レヲ利用ス

(三)右手形ハ佛蘭西輸入業者各自個々ノ直接責任トシ滿期日ニ至リ紐育ニ於テ米貨ヲ以テ仕拂フ

(四)右手形ハ一覽後三ヶ月拂トシ同一期限ニテ五回之レヲ書キ替ヘ得ヘキニ付キ「クレヂット」ノ期限ハ通計十八ヶ月トナル

(五)米國側加入諸銀行ハ各自引受金額ノ範圍内ニ於テ是等手形ヲ引受ケ平價ヲ以テ買受クヘシ而シテ之レカ報酬トシテ第一次引受ノ際及爾後ニ於ケル書替ヘノ時毎ニ割引料ニ相當スル額ヲ申受クル事トシ更ニ引受ノ時毎ニ其第一次タルト爾後ノ書替ヘタルトニ論無ク引受料トシテ四分一「パーセント」ニ相當スル金額ヲ收得スル事トス卽チ貸付金額ニ對シ年六分五厘ノ利廻リニ當ルヘキ計算ナリ

(六)右手形代リ金ハ米國ニ於テ佛國向輸出商品ノ代價仕拂ニノミ充當セラルヘキモノトス

(七)滿期日ニ於ケル決濟確保ノ手段トシテ佛國商社側ハ(イ)右「クレヂット」滿期日以後十五日間内ニ米貨ヲ以テ紐育ニ於テ仕拂ハルヘキ佛國政府ノ國債證券ヲ「クレヂット」總額ト同額丈ケ紐育ニ於ケル「ガランティー」トラスト」會社及「バンカース、トラスト」會社ニ供託シ猶ホ(ロ)中立國ニ於テ又ハ中立國ニ依テ發行セラレタル各種證券ニシテ本件米國資本團ノ同意ヲ得タル種類ノモノヲ時價ニ計算シテ總「クレヂット」額ノ二割ヲ下ラサル高迄巴里佛蘭西銀行ニ供託スヘキモノトス

(八)右融通額ハ紐育ニ於テ米貨ヲ以テ之レヲ償還スヘキモノナルカ同時ニ米國「シンジケート」ノ「マネージャース」ハ米貨一弗ニ對シ佛貨五法七十「サンチーム」ノ協定相場(平價ハ五法十八ナリ)ノ下ニ融通總額又ハ一部ヲ佛貨ニテ仕拂フ事ヲ求メ得ヘキ選擇權ヲ留保シ居リ則チ若シ償還ノ時ニ於テ弗法ノ相場「パー」ナランカ、結局一割ノ利益ヲ收メ得ヘシ尤モ「マネージャー」ニ於テ右樣法貨ニテ仕拂ヲ受クル事ニナシタル場合ハ「マネージャース」ハ其仕拂額ノ四分一「パーセント」ニ當ル金額ヲ特別報酬トシテ爲替相場ノ差ニヨリテ得ヘキ增收額ヨリ貰ヒ受クルノ權利アルモノナリト云フ

因ニ歐洲大戰後佛國カ米國ニ仰ケル外資ノ總額ハ當地「ジョーナル、ヲブ、コンマース」紙ノ計算ニヨレハ巴里市債ヲ合シテ總計六億六千萬弗ニ達スル由ニテ其内譯左ノ如シ尤モ内九千萬弗ハ既ニ償還ヲ了セルモノヽ由

英佛借款ノ半部	二億五千萬弗
擔保附三ヶ年五分利附借款	一億弗
一ヶ年五分利附大藏省證券借受(償還濟)	千萬弗
同　上　(同上)	三千萬弗
「ロスチヤイルド」借款(同上)	三千萬弗
商業資金融通借款(同上)	二千萬弗
同　上	二千五百萬弗
「ポンブライト」引受借款	千五百萬弗
同　上	千五百萬弗

北米合衆國法令

同上　四二四

巴里市債　千五百萬弗

今次ノ「クレヂット」　五千萬弗

（通商公報第三六七號本欄『米國對英佛新借款成立』參照）　一億弗

和蘭國法令

和蘭國法令

第一　中立態度ニ關スル件

（一）　航空機ノ蘭領印度國境通過禁止ニ關スル法令

Tokio, 22 Novembre 1916.

LÉGATION ROYAL.
DES.
PAYS-BAS.
No: 1660.

Monsieur le Vicomte,

Par Son décret du 12 Octobre 1916 No. 633, promulgué le 21 Octobre suivant, le Gouverneur-Général des Indes-Néerlandaises interdit le passage des frontières du territoire à tout aérostat ou aéroplane dirigé par des personnes non appartenant aux armées de terre ou de mer de la Colonie.

Exception est faite pour les personnes bénéficiant d'une invitation ou d'une autorisation spéciale préalable.

Toute infraction à ces dispositions est passible de pénalités prévues par

le Décret en question qui est entré en vigueur le 1 Novembre 1916.

J'ai l'honneur de porter ces dispositions à la connaissance de Votre Excellence à toutes fins d'information des Autorités compétentes.

Je saisis cette occasion d'offrir à Votre Excellence, Monsieur le Vicomte, les assurances de ma plus haute considération.

Signé: D. Asbeck.

Son Excellence.
Monsieur le Vicomte Motono Ichiro,
Ministre des Affaires-Etrangères.
& & &
Tokio.

(二) 蘭領印度ニ於ケル「ブラック、リスト」記載商社貨物運送拒絶

（通商公報第三五五號）
（大正五年八月二十四日附在「バタビヤ」帝國領事松本幹之亮報告）

當地汽船會社「ネーダーランド」、「ロッテルダムロイド」、「オセアン」、太洋汽船、支那「ミユーチユアル」汽船及和蘭亞米利加線ノ六汽船會社ハ各會社ヨリノ命令トシテ英國政府ノ發表セル對英取引拒絶名簿（「ブラツク、リスト」）ニ記載セラレタル商社又ハ個人ヨリ申込メル貨物又ハ同名簿ニ記載セラレタル商社又ハ個人ニ宛テタル貨物ノ運送ハ八月十四日以後之レヲ引受ケス隨テ無記名ノ船荷證券ヲ發行セサルコトヲ公告セリ

右ニ付直接損害ヲ受クヘキ商社ハ在留獨逸人ナルハ勿論ナルカ其重要取扱品ノ中砂糖、護謨、煙草、珈琲、茶等ノ輸出品、諸器械、食料品、雜貨等ノ輸入品ハ歐洲戰亂ト共ニ歐洲トノ貿易不振ニ陷リタルタメ弘ク米國トノ取引ヲ開始シ近來好況ヲ呈シ來レル矢先前記ノ通告ハ敵國取引商ニ對スル一大打擊ナリト云フヘシ

(三) 蘭船「チユバンシヤ」號爆沈事件ノ解決

（外事彙報大正五年第十二號）
（大正五年九月二十九日附報告）

本件ニ關シ獨國側ニ於テ其ノ責任ヲ回避スルノ態度ニ出テタル爲メ一時解決ノ望ミアルカ如ク見受ケラレタル蘭獨間ノ交渉モ一頓挫ヲ來スニ至リタル處其ノ後蘭國側ニ於テ引續キ本件解決ノ方法ニ關シ種々努力スル所アリタル結果今回兎ニ角兩國間意思ノ一致ヲ見ルニ至リタル趣ニテ十月二十五日發刊蘭國新聞紙「ガゼット、ド、オランド」ニ依ルニ蘭國政府ハ本件ニ付キ左ノ如ク公表シタリ

「チユバンシヤ」號ノ沈沒原因ニ關スル蘭國政府ノ意見ハ既ニ一般ニ知ラレ居ルカ如ク獨

國政府ノ右ニ關スル意見ト一致ヲ見ルコト能ハサリキ而シテ兩國政府ノ本件ニ關スル意見ノ交換ハ引續キ行ハレタルカ何等滿足ナル結果ニ到達スルヲ得サリシヲ以テ蘭國政府ハ獨國政府ニ對シ本件ヲ一九〇七年十月十八日海牙ニ於テ締結セラレタル國際紛爭平和的處理條約ノ規定ニ從ヒ國際審査委員會ニ附スルコトヲ提議シタリ獨國政府ハ本提議ヲ容認シタルモ講和締結前右國際審査ヲ行フノ不可能ナル旨ヲ申越セリ蘭國政府ハ右講和締結後國際審査ニ着手スヘシトノ意見ニ對シ同意ヲ表セリ

右ニ依リ三月中旬本件勃發以來半歲餘ニ亙リシ案件モ一先ツ一段落ヲ告ケ本件解決ノ方法ヲ協定シ得タル次第ナリ

第二　蘭船ノスエス航路復舊

○蘭領印度通ヒ和蘭汽船航路復舊（十一月八日官報）　本件ニ關シ蘭國駐劄落合特命全權公使ヨリノ去月二十九日著電報左ノ如シ（外務省）

客年十二月中喜望峯廻航ニ變更セラレタル「ロッテルダム、ロイド」及「ネデルランド」兩汽船會社ノ蘭領印度通ヒ客船ハ明年二月ヨリ蘇士廻リニ復舊スル由

瑞典諾威及丁抹國法令

瑞典諾威及丁抹國法令

第一　諾威國領水內ニ交戰國武裝潛水艇航入禁止ノ件

（一）　右ニ關スル十月十三日勅令要領

（內田公使十月十九日發電）

潛水艇取扱ニ關スル覺書ニ對シ諾威政府ハ十月十三日勅令ヲ以テ交戰國ノ武裝セル潛水艇ハ海難ノ場合ヲ除ク外諾威領水內ニ入ルヲ禁シ潛水商船ハ晝間水上ニ現出シ其ノ國旗ヲ揭クルトキハ諾威領水ニ入ルヲ得ルト規定シ十月二十日ヨリ施行スル旨十月十六日附ヲ以テ回答セリ

（二）　諾威ノ交戰國潛水艇取扱規則制定

（外事彙報大正五年第十二號）

（大正五年十月十七日附報告）

從來諾威ハ交戰國潛水艇カ諾威領水ヲ通過シ又ハ之ニ碇泊スルヲ禁止セス只潛水艇ハ此ノ場合ニ水面ニ顯出シ且其ノ所屬國國旗ヲ揭揚スヘキヲ規定シタリシカ本年九月末ヨリ十月初旬ニ亙リ約十日間ニ諾威船ノ獨逸潛水艇ノ爲擊沈サレタルモノ十五隻ニシテ此內四隻ハ

佛國近海及地中海(此ノ中一隻ハ墺國潛水艇ニ擊沈サル)ニ於テ擊沈サレタルカ他ノ十一隻ハ總テアルカンゲル港ニ航行中北氷洋方面ニ於テ擊沈サレ其ノ戰時海上保險金額千數百萬「クローネ」ニ上リ之カ爲諾威 Nordenfield 汽船會社ハ其ノ經營セル「アルカンゲル」航路ヲ一時停止シ英露艦隊ノ北氷洋方面ニ出動ヲ見ルニ至リ諾威ノ輿論激昂甚シク「テーデンス、タイン」新聞ハ十月三日紙上ニ於テ獨國潛水艇ノ所爲ハ倫敦宣言ノ規定ニ違反セルノミナラス人道上ノ問題ニシテ英國カ諾威ノ信書ヲ差押フルト獨逸潛水艇カ諾威領水ヲ通過シテ諾威商船ノ擊沈ニ向ヒ而カモ北氷洋上ニ於テハ諾威船乘組員ヲ小舟上ニ遺シ去リタルトヲ比較セハ其ノ差雲泥モ啻ナラス獨逸潛水艇カ故サラニ諾威船ヲ目懸ケテ攻擊スルハ兩國間ノ政治上ノ關係ニ影響スヘク獨國カ如斯行爲ヲ續行セハ諾威ノ輿論ニ深キ印象ヲ與フヘシト論シ獨逸政府側ハ『獨逸國民ヲ困メントスル英國ノ不當ナル封鎖ニ對シ敵國行ノ戰時禁制品ノ輸送ニヨリ巨利ヲ博シタルト同時ニ之ニヨリ生スル危險ヲ負擔セサルヘカラス諾獨兩國ノ關係上獨逸カ故ラニ諾威船ヲ攻擊シタリトハ全ク根據ナシ諾威船カ戰時禁制品ヲ輸送セサル限リ獨逸ハ之ニ危害ヲ加ヘサルヘシ獨逸潛水艇ハ倫敦宣言ノ規定ニ遵據シ乘組員ノ生命ヲ安全ナラシムル方法ヲ講シタル後商船ヲ破壞セリ獨逸潛水艇ハ諾威領海ヲ以テ其ノ作戰根據地トナシタルコトナシ』トノ意味ヲ半官的ニ辯明シタルカ諾威政府ハ十月十一日同國ノ輿論ヲ鎭靜スル爲『最近獨逸潛水艇カ諾威船ヲ擊沈シタルニ際シ乘組員ノ安全ノ爲充分ノ措置ヲ取リタルヤニ付キ政府ハ愼重ナル調査ヲ行フヘク其ノ結果ニ基キ獨逸官憲ノ國際法違反ニ對シリ同國政府ニ交渉スル所アルヘシ同時ニ諾威船ノ乘組員カ北氷洋上ニ端舟ノ上ニ遺シ去ラレタリトノ報道カ諾威國民ニ與ヘタル印象ヲ獨國政府ニ指示スヘシ倫敦宣言ニ依レハ中立國商船ヲ擊沈スルハ特例ナルモ現今ハ之ヲ以テ通則トサル、如ク而モ此等ノ場合ニ果シテ倫敦宣言カ遵守サレタルヤヲ調査スルコト困難ナリ然レトモ諾威政府ハ最近多數ノ諾威船カ擊沈セラレタルニ關シ獨逸潛水艇指揮官カ諾威船ニ對シ他ノ中立國商船ト異ナル取扱ヲナスヘキ訓令ヲ受ケ居ラサルコト並ニ獨逸潛水艇カ北氷洋ニ出動シタル際諾威領水ヲ通過セサリシコトノ證言ヲ受ケタリ然レトモ諾威政府ハ潛水艇ノ諾威領水ニ進入スルヲ制限スル新規則ヲ制定スル必要ヲ認メタリ中立國船舶ハ戰時禁制品ヲ輸送スル場合ノ外之ヲ擊沈スルヲ得ス而シテ戰時禁制品目ニ關シテハ諾威政府ハ倫敦宣言ノ規定ヲ以テ現行國際法ノ規則ト認ムルコトヲ各交戰國ニ對シテ主張シ現今交戰國カ實行スル如キ廣汎ナル規定ヲ認メス』トノ「コンミュニケ」ヲ發シ獨逸政府ハ之ニ對シ更ニ『獨逸潛水艇ハ戰時禁制品ヲ輸送スル諸威船ヲ原則トシテ擊沈スルモノニアラス獨逸港ニ引致スルコト可能ナル場合ニハ之ヲ引致スヘキ訓令ヲ受ケ居レリ而シテ獨逸潛水艇カ遠隔ナル海上ニ於テ已ムヲ得ス擊沈シタル商船ノ數カ英國海軍ノ擊沈シタルモノヨリモ多數ナルハ一般ノ戰況上已ムヲ得サル所ナリ諾威商船ノ乘組員ヲ救助スル爲ニハ獨逸潛水艇指揮官ハ之ヲ最近ノ諾威海岸迄送致スル爲自己ノ危險ヲ顧ス多大ノ盡力ヲナシタリ』トノ辯駁ヲ公表シタリ

諾威政府ハ十月十三日附ヲ以テ交戰國潛水艇取扱規則ヲ制定シタルカ獨逸新聞尙之ニ對シテ不滿ヲ表シ諾威カ本問題ニ關シ協商側ノ要求ヲ容レタルハ公然獨逸ニ對シ敵意ヲ示スモ

ノナリト評シ或ハ諾威ハ經濟的ニ協商側ニ屈從スルニ至リタルト同時ニ政治上ニ於テモ諾威政府ノ本意ナルト不本意ナルトニ拘ラス協商側ノ外交上、軍事上ノ利益ヲ以テ自己ノ利益ト一致スルモノト認ムルノ已ムヲ得サルニ至ルヘシト論セリ

尙開戰以來諾威船舶ノ戰時損失左ノ通リ

一九一四年		八隻
一九一五年		四三隻
一九一六年一月		二隻
同　二月		二隻
同　三月		五隻
同　四月		九隻
同　五月		三隻
同　六月		五隻
同　七月		二隻
同　八月		九隻
同　九月		二五隻
九月分ノ損失登簿總噸數		四二、六一四噸
戰時海上保險		二六、四四〇、〇〇〇「クローチ」
一九一六年　計		六二隻
此ノ戰時海上保險		四八、八四三、〇〇〇「クローチ」
總　計		一一三隻
此ノ登簿總噸數		一七八、九四九噸
戰時海上保險		七一、三二四、五〇〇「クローチ」

尙右ノ外十月八日迄ノ損害七隻此ノ戰時保險約八百二十萬「クローネ」アリ

此ノ外帆船及運艀船ノ損害

一九一六年九月迄ノ計		四八隻
此ノ登簿噸數		四一、〇〇〇噸
戰時保險	約	三、〇〇〇、〇〇〇「クローネ」

第二　瑞諾發英國行客船航行狀況

○瑞諾發英國行客船航行狀況(十一月二十二日官報)　本件ニ關シ瑞典國駐劄內田特命全權公使ヨリノ本月十七日發二十一日著電報左ノ如シ(外務省)

Bergen, Newcastle 間旅客船 Vega 十一月十六日英國ヘ航行中 Stavangeer 沖ニ於テ獨逸潛水艇ニ擊沈セラレタルカ人命ハ救助セラル右航路ハ未タ停止セラレサルモ何等情報アラハ電報スヘシ尙ホ每週水土曜 Gothenburg 發 Newcastle 行客船航路ハ今日マテ故障ナシ

○ベルゲン、ニューカッスル間航路繼續（十一月二十八日官報）　本件ニ關シ瑞典國駐劄內田特命全權公使ヨリ本月二十二日發ヲ以テ左ノ如ク電報アリ（本月二十二日本欄內參看）（外務省）

Vega 擊沈ハ英國行荷物ヲ搭載セルタメニシテ Bergen, Newcastle 旅客船ハ今後旅客ノミ取扱フコトトシ航路ハ依然繼續セリ

西班牙國法令

西班牙國法令

第一　佛獨兩國ニ在ル獨佛俘虜ニ對スル兩國政府ノ報復及課刑中止方ニ關シ西國皇帝ノ斡旋

（外事彙報大正五年第十二號）
（大正五年九月十三日附報告）

西國政府ハ曩キニ佛獨兩國ニ在ル獨佛俘虜ニ對スル兩國政府ノ報復手段中止並ニ現戰爭終局マテ懲役執行ノ停止方ニ關シ同國皇帝陛下ニ於テ直接斡旋ノ思召アル趣ヲ前記兩國政府ニ申入レ置キタル所其後交渉審議首尾ヨク進捗シ此程兩國政府ハ西國政府仲介ノ下ニ自國内ニアル前記敵國俘虜ニ對スル報復及課刑ヲ中止スヘキ旨ヲ協定シ右ニ關シ西國外務省ハ九月十二日左ノ公文書ヲ發表セリ

一九一五年四月西國政府ハ佛獨兩國政府ニ對シ此等兩國内ニ獨佛俘虜（軍人及ヒ軍人ニ非ラサル一般人民ヲモ含ム）ニ對スル報復中止並ニ現戰爭終結マテ課刑執行中止方ニ關シ西國皇帝ハ自ラ斡旋ノ任ニ當リタキ思召アル趣ヲ申入レタリ

越ヘテ本年六月初旬佛國政府ハ右ニ關スル西國政府ノ提議ヲ同想シ右斡旋ヲ受諾スル趣ヲ回答セリ玆ニ於テ西國外務省ハ之レカ交渉ヲ開始シ在獨及在佛西國大使ニ對シ夫々右ニ適

應スル訓令ヲ發シタリ而シテ西國政府ノ爲セル該提議ニ對シテハ最初獨佛兩國共ニ大體其趣旨ニ同意ヲ表シタルニ係ラス其後交渉ノ進ムニ從ヒ幾多ノ曲折ヲ見タリ

其後六月二十七日獨國政府ハ西國政府ニ對シ若シ佛國政府ニシテ其俘虜タル獨逸士官ニ對シテ課シタル報復ヲ中止スルニ於テハ自國政府モ直チニ同樣ノ處置ニ出ツヘキ旨ヲ回答セリ茲ニ於テ事件ハ益々進捗シテ遂ニ八月十日ニ至リ獨逸政府ハ大體右ニ關スル佛國政府ノ提案ヲ受諾スルニ至リタリ最モ獨逸政府ハ或ル點ニ關シテハ意見ヲ附記スル所アリタレトモ右意見ハ八月十七日佛國政府ノ承認スル所トナリ茲ニ兩國政府ハ前記敵國俘虜ニ對シテ當ニ目下執行中ノ報復懲役ノミナラス今後犯罪事實ニ基キ課刑シ得ヘキ一切ノ刑罰ニ對シテモ其執行ヲ中止スル旨ヲ協定スルニ至レリ尙八月二十一日在獨西國大使ハ自國外務大臣ニ對シ獨逸政府ヨリ佛國俘虜ニ對スル報復ヲ中止セシ旨通報アリタル趣ヲ報告シ在佛西國大使モ亦同樣ノ報告ヲ爲シタリ

之レヲ以テ該件ニ關スル西國政府ノ交渉ハ一切終局ヲ告ケタリ

第二　輸出禁止品ノ件

○西班牙國輸出禁止品(十二月四日官報)　本件ニ關シ在同國臨時代理公使堀口九萬一ヨリ去月二十九日發ヲ以テ左ノ如ク電報アリ(外務省)

西國政府ハ今回勅令ヲ以テ左記物貨ノ輸出ヲ禁止セリ

米　麥　各種粉類　「ガルバンソ」豆・隱元豆　小豆　野菜　一切ノ乾物類　馬鈴薯　砂糖　鷄卵　鹽豚其他一切ノ鹽肉　「パタ」　腸詰類　一切ノ鳥類　一切ノ家畜　一切ノ馬糧

瑞西國法令

瑞西國法令

第一　瑞西ノ馬鈴薯最高價格制定

（通商公報第三六九號）
（大正五年九月十八日附在瑞西帝國特命全權公使三浦藤五郎報告）

普通人民ハ牛乳、「チーズ」、馬鈴薯ヲ常食トスルヲ以テ瑞西ニ於テモ馬鈴薯問題ハ喧シク議論セラレシカ當國公共經濟省ハ九月十四日馬鈴薯最高價格ヲ左ノ通リ規定シ九月二十五日ヨリ施行スルコトトナレリ

一、生産者ヨリ仲買人ニ賣渡ス場合ハ現場渡百基瓦ニ付十七法停車場渡同十八法
二、生産者ヨリ直接消費者ニ賣渡ス場合ハ現場渡五十基瓦以上ハ百基瓦ニ付十八法ノ割
三、生産者又ハ商人カ消費者ノ住宅ニテ渡シ又ハ市場ニテ賣ル場合ハ同二十法、五十基瓦以下ノ場合ハ一基瓦ニ付二十二「參」、商店ニテ賣ル場合ハ一基瓦ニ付二十三「參」
四、各州及郡官憲ハ地方ノ狀況ニ依リ前記一基瓦ノ價格ヲ二「參」增減スルコトヲ得、又他ノ例外ノ場合ハ馬鈴薯中央事務局ニテ決定セラルヘシ
五、本則ニ違反シタル者ハ一萬法以下ノ罰金又ハ三ケ月以下ノ禁錮ニ處ス

大正三—五年戰役

各國海戰關係法令第十輯下終

大正六年四月二十二日印刷
大正六年四月二十五日發行

海軍大臣官房

印刷者　東京市下谷區二長町一番地　井上源之丞

印刷所　東京市本所區番場町四番地　凸版印刷株式會社分工場

明治四十五年大正元年十二月二十五日印刷
大正六年四月二十五日發行
大正六年四月二十二日印刷

海軍大臣官房

所　東京市本郷區駒込千駄木町四番地
發行者　上原文亟
印刷者　東京市牛込區二葉町一番地