

移民法第三條ノ定義ニ從ヒ移民タラサル者即チ「(一) 政府ノ官吏並其ノ家族從者婢僕及雇人(二) 一時的ニ旅行者トシテ又ハ一時的ニ用務若ハ觀光ノ爲ニ合衆國ニ渡來スル外國人(三) 合衆國ヲ横リテ繼續的ニ通過ヲ爲ス外國人(四) 適法ニ合衆國ニ入國ヲ許可セラレタル後同國ノ一地方ヨリ接境外國領土ヲ通過シテ他ノ地方ニ赴ク外國人(五) 合衆國ノ港ニ到着スル船舶ニ從業スル善意ノ外國人海員ニシテ單ニ其ノ職務ノ爲一時的ニ合衆國ニ入國セムトスル者(六) 現行通商航海條約ノ規定ニ準據シ單ニ商業ヲ營ム目的ヲ以テ合衆國ニ入國シ得ル外國人」

第四條(B)(D)又ハ(E)項ノ下ニ非歩合移民トシテ入國シ得ル者即チ(B)前ニ適法ニ合衆國ニ入國ヲ許可セラレタル移民ニシテ一時外國ニ赴キタル後歸還スル者(D)合衆國入國出願直前少クトモ二年間引續キ執レノ宗派タルヲ問ハス布教師ノ職ニ在リシ者又ハ大學、專門學校、宗教學校又ハ綜合大學教授ノ職ニ在リシ者ニシテ單ニ其ノ職ニ從事スル目的ヲ以テ入國セムトスル移民並其ノ同伴シ若ハ呼寄セタル妻及十八歳未滿ノ未婚ノ子(E)十五歳以上ノ善意ノ學生ニシテ單ニ公認セラレタル學校、大學、專門學校、宗教學校又ハ綜合大學ニ於テ勉學ノ爲入國セムトスル移民特ニ右學校ハ本人自ラ之ヲ指定シ勞働長官ノ認可ヲ經タルモノタルコトヲ要ス又右

學校ハ各移民學生ノ就學終了ヲ勞働長官ニ報告方承諾シモノニシテ之ヲ怠リタル場合ニハ右認可ハ直ニ取消サルルモノトス尙前記第四條(D)項ノ下ニ入國ヲ許可セララルル移民ノ妻及十八歳未滿ノ未婚ノ子

此等例外ノ者ヲ考慮ニ入ルトキハ本件條項ハ其ノ實際ノ運用上又ハ之ニ基ク政策上日本勞働者ノ合衆國移住ヲ阻止スルニ付日本政府ト合衆國政府トノ協力ノ基礎ヲナセル紳士協約中ニ包含セラルル了解ト大差ナキコトヲ認メ得ヘシ此ノ多年ニ互リ確立セラレタル政策ヲ遂行スルニ當リ日本政府ノ提供シタル助力ハ吾人ノ十分多トシ且感謝スル所ニシテ右政策ノ樹立ヲ促セル經濟上ノ事由ニ付テハ言及スルノ必要ナキモノト思惟ス右政策ハ日本國民及其ノ特性並業績ニ對シ何等尊敬ノ念ヲ缺如セルコトヲ表示セシニアラス其ノ妥當ナリシコトハ日本政府カ自發的ニ之カ遂行ニ助力シタルコトニ依リテ何等思議セラレタルコトナク却テ之カ確認ヲ受ケタルモノト云フヘシ現行協定ト本移民法ノ規定トノ實質的相異ハ蓋シ大統領ノ聲明セル如ク本移民法ニ在リテハ議會カ移民ノ取締ヲ國際間ノ協定ニ委セスシテ立法ニ依リ之ヲ定ムルノ權能ヲ實行セムトスル決意ヲ表明シタルニ存ス

右權能ハ疑問ノ餘地ナキノミナラス「各國ノ版圖内ニ於ケル移民入國ノ制限及取締カ國家固有ノ

主權ニ屬スルコトハ專口貴國政府ノ明ニ承認セララル所ニシテ日本政府ニ於テモ外國人移入ノ許否、其ノ領土内ニ於ケル定住ノ條件及場所等ノ決定上適宜此ノ機能ヲ行使シ居ルモノト信セラ

元來大統領ハ日本政府トノ現行協定ノ存續ヲ希望シ又之ニ對シ望マシキ修正ヲ爲サムカ爲商議セムコトヲ欲シタルモ之ト同時ニ米國政府ハ此ノ如キ國際協定ニ制限セラレ又ハ現行協定ニ依リ若ハ米國政府ヲ從來日本政府ト商議シ來リタルヲ理由トシテ本件ニ關シ其ノ本來有スル行爲ノ自由ヲ失ヒ又ハ毀損セラレタリト思考スルモノニアラス此ノ移民取締ノ自由タルヤ主權ノ要素ヲ爲スト同時ニ我國國際關係ノ基調タル友誼的感情ト全然相容ルルモノニシテ米國政府ハ從來如上ノ商議ニ際シ常ニ十分之ヲ留保シ來レリ

仍テ千八百九十四年日本ト締結セラレタル通商航海條約第二條中ニ次ノ明示的規定ヲ設ケタリ

但シ本條及前條ノ規定ハ兩締盟國ノ各方ニ於テ商業、勞働者ノ移住、警察及公安ニ關シ現ニ行ハレ又ハ將來制定セラレヘキ法律勅令及規則ニハ何等ノ影響ヲ及ホスコトナシ

千九百十一年條約締結商議ノ際日本政府カ前記規定ヲ削除セムコトヲ希望シ又千九百七—八年紳士協約ニ基キ米國ニ於ケル日本勞働者ノ員數ノ實質的增加ヲ阻止スルニ適當ナリト豫期セラレ

タル禁遏手段ヲ遂行シ來レルニ鑑ミ米國政府ニ於テモ日本政府ノ提議ニ同意シタルハ事實ナリ千九百十一年條約改竊ニ際シ日本政府ハ同條約附屬宣言ノ形式ニ據リ右協定ヲ更新セリ然レトモ米國政府ハ之ニ同意スルニ當リ其ノ裁量ヲ以テ移民ノ制限ヲ行フ完全ナル權利ヲ毀損セントスル意向ヲ否認スルニ注意セリ此等ノ商議ニ關シ貴輪中ニ陳述セラレタル所ニ顧ミ當時行ハレタル意見ノ交換ニ言及セントス貴官ノ承知セララル如ク日本大使館ハ千九百十年十月十九日附覺書中ニ於テ當時考慮中ノ條約改正ノ一重點ニ關シ左ノ如ク記述セラレタリ

米國行勞働移民問題ノ調節ニ關シ帝國政府カ過去二年有半ニ互リ勵行シ來レル手段方法ハ間然スル所ナク且移民禁止ノ手段ヨリモ遙ニ有效ナルコトヲ立證セルモノト信セラレ而シテ此ノ如キ制限手段ハ勞働移民問題ニ關シ兩國間ニ論爭異論ノ發生スルコトヲ防止スル爲日本政府ノ自發的ニ執リタル所ニ係リ事難ノ必要トスル限り之ヲ持續セムトスルモノナルコトヲ茲ニ附言ス

斯ノ如キ實情ニ鑑ミ帝國政府ハ右留保條款ハ當ニ不必要ナルノミナラス之ヲ將來ニ存スルニ於テハ困難ヲ排除スルノ資トナラスシテ却テ誤解ヲ招致スルノ因タルヘシト信ス蓋シ此ノ如キ規定ハ國民的感情ニ不快ヲ與フルコト自然ノ數ナリト謂フヘシ此ノ如キ事情ヨリシテ日本政府ハ新條約ニ於テハ上述ノ留保條款ヲ全然排除シ勞働移民問題ニ關シテハ條約上ノ規定ニ俟ツコト

オノ名實共ニ兩國政府ノ友誼的解決ニ倚賴セムコトヲ希望スルモノナリ尤モ日本政府ハ此ノ希望ヲ達フルニ當リテハ米國政府カ移民問題ニ關シ種々難關ニ苦心シ居ラルルコトヲ看過スルモノニアラサルヲ以テ若シ米國政府ニシテ希望セラルルニ於テハ新條約ハ何時ト雖六箇月ノ豫告ヲ以テ之ヲ廢止シ得ルコトト爲スモ異議ヲ存セス

日本大使館ハ如上ノ廢止條款ヲ存置スル場合移民問題ノ關スル限リ兩締約國カ保持スル行爲ノ自由ハ現存留保條款ヲ廣義ニ解スル場合ヨリモ實際上遙ニ廣汎ナルコトニ満足スルモノナリ右提議ノ回答トシテ國務省ハ千九百十一年一月二十三日日本大使ニ送付シタル覺書ニ於テ同省ハ次ノ基礎條件ノ下ニ於テ新通商航海條約締結ノ商議ヲ爲スヘキ旨宣明セリ

前掲覺書ヲ以テ日本政府ノ爲シタル提議ハ即チ現行條約中移民ニ關スル條項ノ削除ヲ爲スハ勞働者ノ米國移住ニ關シ日本政府カ過去二箇年半實行シ來リタル制限及取締カ所有事情ノ下ニ於テ適當ナル調節手段ナリト兩國政府ノ認メタル理由ニ基クモノニシテ新條約ノ效力存續期間日本政府カ從來ト均シク有效ニ維持シ兩國政府ハ其ノ目的遂行ノ爲必要ノ協力ヲ爲スヘク又該條約ハ六箇月ノ豫告ヲ以テ消滅スヘシトノ點ニ在リト國務省ニ於テ了解シ且其ノ了解ヲ維持スルモノナリ

更ニ日本政府ハ條約調印ノ際前記ノ趣旨ヲ正式ニ宣言シ米國政府ハ其ノ裁量ニ依リ之ヲ公表シ得ヘシト了解ス

米國政府ハ兩國ノ領域又ハ屬領ニ來ルヘキ移民ノ制限及取締ヲ爲スヘキ兩國固有ノ主權ニ關シ一切ノ必要ナル留保ヲ爲シ該主權ヲ毀損ヤサルモノトシテ右提議ヲ兩國間移民問題解決ノ基礎トナスコトヲ承認ス

千九百十一年二月八日日本大使館ハ其ノ覺書ニ於テ日本政府ハ同大使館ノ提議シ且國務省ニ於テ前ニ引用セル留保ヲ條件トシテ同意セル所ニ從ヒ商議スヘキ旨同省ニ通告シ更ニ次ノ如ク述ヘタリ

日本政府ハ本年一月二十三日附前記公文ニ陳述セル移民問題ニ關スル提議ニ付テノ了解ニ一致ス

前述ノ如ク千九百十一年條約ハ自國ノ領域又ハ屬領ニ來ルヘキ移民ノ制限及取締ヲ爲スヘキ兩國固有ノ主權ヲ何等毀損スルモノニ非ストノ明確ナル了解ノ下ニ締結セラレタルモノナリ而シテ米國政府ハ法律制定ヲ必要ナカラシメムカ爲考案セラレタル手段ヲ日本ニ於テ實行スヘシトノ協定ニ同意シタルモ此ノ種法律制定ノ要否ノ決定ハ當然米國政府ノ立法權ノ範圍ニ屬スヘキモノナリトセリ而シテ今ヤ議會ハ右立法權ヲ行使シテ本件條項ヲ制定シタル以上此ノ立法行爲ハ行政部ニ

對シテ命令的ノモノニシテ該法律ニ表明セラレタル議會ノ意思ヲ遂行スルニ當リ行政的裁量ノ餘地ヲ存セス

移民法ノ規定ニ據レハ貴官ノ言及セラレタル本法第十三條(C)項ハ千九百二十四年七月一日ヨリ實施セラルヘシ而シテ米國ニ於テ移民取締ニ關スル立法權ノ行使ヲ自制スルハ是レ日本政府カ米國ニ至ルヘキ勞働者ノ移住制限ニ關スル千九百七十八年紳士協約中ニ包含セララルル協定ヲ履行スルコトヲ以テ其ノ條件トシタルカ故ニ移民法第十三條(C)項ノ實施期日以後ハ前記協定ニ據ルノ責ニ任セサルヘシトノ日本政府ノ見解ニ對シ米國政府ハ之ニ同意セサルヲ得ス

本官ハ此ノ機會ニ於テ紳士協約ヲ實行スルニ當リ貴國政府ノ盡シタル自發的協力ハ米國政府ノ深ク多トスル所ナルコトヲ反覆力説スルト同時ニ移民制限ニ關スル兩國立法權ノ承認ハ終始兩國間ノ特徴タリシ相互的行爲及厚誼ヲ些タリトモ毀損スルモノニアラサルコトヲ述ヘムトス
本官ハ茲ニ重テ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表ス

千九百二十四年六月十六日

華盛頓國務省ニ於テ

「チャールズ・メイ・ヒューズ」

日本駐大使

塙原正直閣下

A REPLY OF SECRETARY OF STATE HUGHES TO AMBASSADOR
HANIHARA ON JUNE 16.

Department of State,

Washington, June 16, 1924

Excellency: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note under date of May 31st

containing a memorandum, stating the position of the Japanese Government with respect to the provision of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

I take pleasure in noting your reference to the friendliness and candor in which your communication has been made and you may be assured of the readiness of this Government to consider in the same spirit the views you have set forth.

At the time of the signing of the Immigration bill, the President issued a statement, a copy of which I had the privilege of handing to you, gladly recognizing the fact that the enactment of this provision "does not imply any change in our sentiment of

admiration and cordial friendship for the Japanese people, a sentiment which has had and will continue to have abundant manifestation." Permit me to state briefly the substance of the provision. Section 13 (c) related to all aliens ineligible to citizenship. It establishes certain exceptions, and to these classes the exclusion provision does not apply, to wit:

Those who are not immigrants as defined in Section 3 of the Act, that is "(1) a government official, his family, attendants, servants, and employees, (2) an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business or pleasure, (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States, (4) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory, (5) a bona fide alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter temporarily the United States solely in the pursuit of his calling as a seaman, and (6) an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing Treaty of Commerce and Navigation.

Those who are admissible as non-quota immigrants under the provisions of subdivision (b) (d) or (e) of Section 4, that is "(b) An immigrant previously lawfully admitted to the United States, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad"; "(d) An immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the

time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of Minister of any religious denomination or professor of a college, academy, seminary, or university, and his wife, and his unmarried children under 18 years of age, if accompanying or following to join him; or (e) An immigrant who is a bona fide student at least 15 years of age and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at an accredited school, college, academy, seminary or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Secretary of Labor, which shall have agreed to report to the Secretary of Labor the termination of attendance of each immigrant student and if any such institution of learning fails to make such reports promptly the approval shall be withdrawn."

Also, the wives, or unmarried children under 18 years of age, of immigrants admissible under subdivision (d) of Section 4, above quoted.

It will thus be observed that, taking these exceptions into account, the provision in question does not differ greatly in its practical operation, or in the policy which it reflects, from the understanding embodied in the Gentlemen's Agreement under which the Japanese Government has cooperated with the Government of the United States in preventing the emigration of Japanese laborers to this country. We fully and gratefully appreciate the assistance which has thus been rendered by the Japanese Govern-

ment in the carrying out of this long established policy and it is not deemed to be necessary to refer to the economic considerations which have inspired it. Indeed, the appropriateness of that policy, which has not evidenced any lack of esteem for the Japanese people, their character and achievement, has been confirmed rather than questioned by the voluntary action of your Government in aiding its execution.

The point of substantial difference between the existing arrangement and the provision of the Immigration Act is that the latter has expressed, as the president has stated, 'the determination of the Congress to exercise its prerogative in defining by legislation the control of immigration instead of leaving it to international arrangement.' It is not understood that this prerogative is called in question, but, rather, your Government expressly recognizes that 'it lies within the inherent sovereign power of each state to limit and control immigration to its own domains', an authority which it is believed the Japanese Government has not failed to exercise in its own discretion with respect to the admission of aliens and the condition and location of their settlement within its borders.

While the President would have preferred to continue the existing arrangement with the Japanese Government, and to have entered into negotiations for such modifications as might seem to be desirable, this Government does not feel that it is limited to such an international arrangement or that, by virtue of the existing understanding

or of the negotiations which it has conducted in the past with the Japanese Government, it has in any sense lost or impaired the full liberty of action which it would otherwise have in this matter. On the contrary that freedom with respect to the control of immigration which is an essential element of sovereignty and entirely compatible with the friendly sentiments, which animate our international relations, this Government in the course of these negotiations always fully reserved.

Thus in the treaty of Commerce and Navigation concluded with Japan in 1894 it was expressly stipulated in Art. 2:

"It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding Article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances or regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of laborers, police and public security which are in force or which may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries."

It is true that at the time of the negotiation of the Treaty of 1911 the Japanese Government desired that the provision above quoted should be eliminated and that this Government acquiesced in that proposal in view of the fact that the Japanese Government had, in 1907-08, by means of the Gentlemen's Agreement, undertaken such measures of restriction, as it was anticipated would prove adequate to prevent any substantial increase in the number of Japanese laborers in the United States. In connection with the treaty revision of 1911, the Japanese Government renewed this under-

taking in the form of a Declaration attached to the Treaty. In acquiescing in this procedure, however, this Government was careful to negate any intention to derogate from the full right to exercise in its discretion control over immigration. In view of the statements contained in your communication with respect to these negotiations I feel that I should refer to the exchange of views then had.

You will recall that in a memorandum of October 19, 1910, suggesting a basis for the treaty revisions then in contemplation, the Japanese Embassy stated:

"The measures, which the Imperial Government have enforced for the past two and a half years in regulation of the question of emigration of laborers to the United States, have, it is believed, proved entirely satisfactory and far more effective than any prohibition of immigration would have been. Those measures of restraint were undertaken voluntarily, in order to prevent any dispute or issue between the two countries on the subject of labor immigration, and will be continued, it may be added, so long as the condition of things calls for such continuation.

"Accordingly, having in view the actual situation, the Imperial Government are convinced that the reservation in question is not only not necessary, but that it is an engagement which, if continued, is more liable to give rise to misunderstandings than to remove difficulties. In any case it is a stipulation which, not unnaturally, is distasteful to national sensibilities. In these circumstances the Imperial Government

desire in the new treaty to suppress entirely the reservation above mentioned, and to leave, in word as well as in fact, the question to which it relates, for friendly adjustment between the two Governments independently of any conventional stipulations on the subject. In expressing that desire they are not unmindful of the difficulties under which the United States labor in the matter of immigration and they will accordingly, if so desired, be willing to make the proposed treaty terminable at any time upon six months' notice.

"The Japanese Embassy is satisfied that in the presence of such a termination clause the Contracting States would actually enjoy greater liberty of action so far as immigration is concerned, than under the existing reservation on the subject, however liberally construed."

Replying to these suggestions the Department of State declared in its memorandum sent to the Japanese Ambassador on January 23, 1911, that it was prepared to enter into negotiations for a New Treaty of Commerce and Navigation on the following basis:

"The Department of State understands, and proceeds upon the understanding, that the proposal of the Japanese Government made in the above-mentioned memorandum is that the clause relating to immigration in the existing Treaty be omitted for the reason that the limitation and control which the Imperial Japanese Government has enforced for the past two and a half years in regulation of emigration of laborers to

the United States, and which the two Governments have recognized as a proper measure of adjustment under all the circumstances, are to be continued with equal effectiveness during the life of the New Treaty, the two Governments when necessary cooperating to this end; the Treaty to be made terminable upon six months' notice."

"It is further understood that the Japanese Government will at the time of signature of the Treaty make a formal declaration to the above effect, which may in the discretion of the Government of the United States be made public."

"In accepting the proposal as a basis for the settlement of the question of immigration between the two countries, the Government of the United States does so with all necessary reserves and without prejudice to the inherent sovereign right of either country to limit and control immigration to its own domains or possessions."

On February 8, 1911, in a memorandum informing the Department of States of the readiness of the Japanese Government to enter upon the negotiations which had been suggested by the Embassy and to which the Department had assented subject to the reservation above quoted, the Japanese Embassy stated that,

"The Imperial Government concur in the understanding of the proposal relating to the question of immigration set forth in the above mentioned note of January 23 last."

It was thus with the distinct understanding that it was without prejudice to the in-

herent sovereign right of either country to limit and control immigration to its own domains or possessions that the treaty of 1911 was concluded. While this Government acceded to the arrangement by which Japan undertook to enforce measures designed to obviate the necessity of a statutory enactment, the advisability of such an enactment necessarily remained within the legislative power of this Government to determine. As this power has now been exercised by the Congress in the enactment of the provision in question, this legislative action is mandatory upon the executive branch of the Government and allows no latitude for the exercise of executive discretion as to the carrying out of the legislative will expressed in the statute.

It is provided in the Immigration Act that the provision of section 13 (c) to which you have referred shall take effect on July 1, 1924. Inasmuch as the abstention on the part of the United States from such an exercise of its right of statutory control over immigration was the condition upon which was predicated the undertaking of the Japanese Government contained in the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907-08 with respect to the regulation of emigration of laborers to the United State, I feel constrained to advise you that this Government cannot but acquiesce in the view that the Government of Japan is to be considered released as from the date upon which Section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act comes into force from further obligation by virtue of that understanding. In saying this I desire once more to emphasize the appreciation on the part of this

Government of the voluntary cooperation of your Government in carrying out the Gentlemen's Agreement and to express the conviction that the recognition of the right of each Government to legislate in control of immigration should not derogate in any degree from the mutual good will and cordial friendship which have always characterized the relations of the two countries."

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

His Excellency Mr. Masanao Hanihara, (Signed) Charles E. Hughes.

Japanese Ambassador.

The Japanese Ambassador has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the letter of the American Government and to express his appreciation of the interest and attention which the American Government has shown in the relations of the two countries. He has the honor to inform you that the Japanese Government has already taken the necessary steps to carry out the provisions of the Gentlemen's Agreement and to express the conviction that the recognition of the right of each Government to legislate in control of immigration should not derogate in any degree from the mutual good will and cordial friendship which have always characterized the relations of the two countries.

欠

MISSING

日白通商條約調印

願ミルニ帝國ト白耳義國トノ通商條約締結ノ問題ハ明治四十三年以來ノ懸案ニシテ當時帝國ハ諸外國トノ間ニ存セシ通商條約ニ對シ一般的改正ヲ企テ之カ爲白耳義國ニ對シテモ明治二十九年六月二十三日調印ノ條約ヲシテ明治四十四年七月十六日限リ其ノ效力ヲ終了セシムルノ措置ヲ執リ而シテ右舊條約失効前ニ新條約ヲ成立セシムルコトニ付最善ノ努力ヲ試ミシモ先方政府ヨリ白耳義國ノ特產物タル窓硝子等ニ對シ關稅協定ヲ強硬ニ主張セシ爲終ニ條約ノ締結ヲ見ルニ至ラス從テ兩國ノ通商關係ヲシテ無條約ノ狀態ニ陥ラサシムル爲明治四十四年七月八日簡單ナル暫定取極ヲ締結シ以テ舊條約ノ失効期タル同年七月十七日以後新條約ノ締結實施ニ至ルマテ通商航海及關稅ニ關スル事項ニ付相互ニ最惠國待遇ヲ付與スヘキコトヲ約スルコトトセリ

爾來歐洲大戰等ノ事變アリ懸案中ノ新條約締結ノ交渉ハ何等進捗スルヲ得サリシカ戰後彼我兩國間貿易關係モ次第ニ回復セル外一方白耳義ハ「ルクサンプルダ」トノ關稅同盟ヲ完成シ又白耳義

シテ對シ關稅自主權ヲ掌握スルニ至リ他方本邦對外通商條約政策上白耳義國ノ如キ主要列國トノ間ニ正式ノ通商航海條約ヲ有セサルコトハ別國トノ擬合ニ考フルモ面白カラサルモノアルヲ以テ去ル大正十年我安達大使ノ就任ト共ニ白國政府トノ間ニ新條約締結ニ關スル交渉ヲ再開セシメタルカ右交渉上ノ難關タリシ關稅協定問題モ本邦戰後ニ於ケル通商產業上ノ大變革ニ順ミ先方政府ニ於テ漸ク思ヒ止リ結局相互ニ最惠國待遇ヲ許與スルコトニ妥結シ其ノ他一般締約國民ノ入國旅行、居住權ノ確保、其ノ他領事官ノ特權並通商及船舶ニ關スル諸般ノ規定ニ付大體現行日英通商條約ニ準シ最モ自由且衡平ナル主義ヲ以テ一貫セル成案ヲ得六月二十七日終ニ之カ調印ヲ了スルコトナレリ尙本條約ハ批准交換後一定期間ノ經過ヲ俟テ實施シ五年後ハ六月ノ豫告ヲ以テ何時ニテモ之ヲ廢棄シ得ヘク只關稅ニ關スル條項ハ戰後ニ於ケル不安定ナル經濟狀況ニ適應シ得ル爲實施後一年ヲ經過シタルトキハ他ノ條項ニ關係ナク何時タリトモ六月ノ豫告ヲ以テ廢棄シ得ヘキモノトス因ニ「ルクザンブルグ」ハ其ノ白耳義國トノ關稅同盟ノ關係上白耳義國カ最近締結セル諸條約ト同様本條約ニ於テモ其ノ當事國トナリ本條約ハ兩國トモ植民地及管治セル一切ノ地域ニ完全ニ適用アルモノニシテ英佛等トノ條約ニ於ケルカ如ク植民地ヲ條約適用區域ヨリ除外セルカ如キコトナシ

公表第十五號

(七月二十五日)

日英通商航海條約第八條及同附屬稅表廢止

現行日英通商航海條約第八條及同附屬稅表ヲ明年三月十日限廢止スルコトニ關シテハ日英兩國政府間ニ交渉纏リタル旨並右ニ關シテハ何レ改メテ正式ノ公文交換行ハルヘキ次第ハ去ル四月十五日附外務省公表第二號ヲ以テ公表シタル所ナルカ愈本月二十三日在英林大使ト英國外務大臣トノ間ニ於テ右第八條及同附屬稅表ヲ大正十四年三月十日限り失效セシムル趣旨ノ七月十四日附公文交換ヲ了セリ

(九月二十二日)

對支不干涉ニ關スル出淵亞細亞局長談

帝國政府ノ支那ニ對スル態度ニ付テハ過般臨時議會ニ於テ幣原外務大臣ヨリ演說セラレタ通支那ノ内政ニ干與セサル方針ヲアルコトハ今更事新シク言フヲ俟タナイ所テアル從テ今回ノ内亂ニ對シテモ不干涉ノ方針ヲ執リ儼ニ公正ナル態度ヲ持シテ居ル次第テアル尙諸外國中ニ支那ノ内政ニ干涉スル計畫カアルトカ又ハ直隸派援助ノ陰謀カアルトカ言フカ如キ風評カ往々傳ヘラレテ居ルケレトモ右ハ何レモ所謂一片ノ浮説テアツテ毫モ信ヲ措クニ足ラナイノテアル支那ニ於テ今回ノ如キ動亂ヲ見ルニ至ツタノハ帝國政府ノ甚々遺憾トスル所テアツテ吾人ハ支那官民カ克ク時局ノ重大ナルコトヲ自覺シ速ニ于戈ヲ戢メ秩序ノ恢復ニ努ムコトヲ希望シテ已マナイモノテアル

Printed and Published for the Proprietor by the Japanese Press Co. Ltd. at No. 101, Nishi-Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan.

513958

INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE PRESS BY MR. DEBUCHI, DIRECTOR
OF THE ASIATIC BUREAU.

September 22, 1924.

In a speech delivered before the Imperial Diet in its last session, the Foreign Minister explicitly stated that Japan has adopted and will follow a policy of absolute non-interference in the internal affairs of China. It is therefore superfluous to say that the Japanese Government will strictly adhere to this policy of non-intervention in the present civil war and will assume an attitude of impartiality toward any of the warring parties.

Although reports to the effect that some of the Powers are contemplating interfering in the domestic affairs of China at this juncture or that some are designing to give help to the Chihhi party are circulated from time to time, they are purely rumours deserving of no credence. The Japanese Government deeply regret that the present disturbance has occurred in China and cannot help hoping that the Chinese authorities and people will fully realize the gravity of the situation and unite their best efforts speedily to put an end to the internecine war and to restore peace and order in their territory.

公表第十七號 (十月十日)

日祕通商條約調印

日本國祕露國間ニ明治二十八年三月調印セラレタル通商航海條約ハ大正十一年十月十一日附祕露國政府ノ廢棄通告ニ由リ同條約第十八條ニ從ヒ十二箇月後ニ失效セムトセシモ大正十二年十一月二日附公文交換及其ノ後ニ於ケル屢次ノ公文交換ニ依リ暫行的ニ現行條約ノ效力ヲ本年十二月三十一日マテ延長セシムルト共ニ正式通商航海條約ノ締結ニ付兩國代表者間ニ銳意交渉ヲ進メタル結果今回九月三十日附ヲ以テ之カ調印ヲ了セリ

新條約ハ現存日本國「エクスアドル」國間通商航海條約ニ倣ヒ入國居住旅行ノ自由ヲ始メ其ノ他通商及航海ニ關スル諸般ノ事項ニ付相互ニ歐洲人又ハ北米人ト同一ノ待遇ヲ規定セルモノナリ
尙新條約ハ批准交換後直ニ之ヲ實施シ五年ノ据置期滿了後ハ何時ニテモ一年ノ豫告期間ヲ以テ廢棄シ得ヘキコトトセリ

第五回國際聯盟總會ニ於テ可決セラレタル
平和議定書譯文

公法第十卷 (十月十日)

本表第十八號

(十月十一日)

第五回國際聯盟總會ニ於テ可決セラレタル 平和議定書譯文

第五回國際聯盟總會ハ十月二日全會一致左ノ決議ヲ以テ平和議定書ヲ可決シタリ決議文及議定書全文左ノ如シ

一、決議

決議第一

- 聯盟總會ハ左ノ事項ヲ決議ス
- 一、議定書ヲ慎重審議スルコトヲ一切ノ國際聯盟國ニ對シ勸告スルコト
 - 二、右議定書ハ其ノ定ムル條件ニ從ヒ即時ニ署名シ得ル聯盟國ノ代表者ノ署名ヲ直ニ許シ又他
 - 三、一切ノ國ニ對シテモ之ヲ許スコト

三、議定書中ニ定メラレタル規約ノ修正案文ノ作成ヲ擔當スル委員會ヲ遲滯ナク任命スルコトヲ聯盟理事會ニ要求スルコト

四、左記議定書第十七條ノ諸規定ニ從ヒ「ジュネーヴ」ニ於テ會合セラルヘキ國際軍備縮少會議ノ招集ヲ聯盟理事會ニ依頼スルコト

國際軍備縮少會議招集ノ準備トシテ聯盟理事會ハ本議定書第十一條及第十三條ニ定ムル約束ヲ尊重シ同會議ニ提出セラルヘキ軍備ノ縮少及制限ニ關スル一般の議題ヲ作成スヘシ右議題ハ成ルヘク早キ期日ニ且遲クトモ同會議會合ノ三月前ニ之ヲ各國政府ニ通告スヘシ

千九百二十五年五月一日マテニ少クモ聯盟理事會ノ常任國ノ半數及他ノ十箇國ノ聯盟國カ批准書寄託ヲ爲ササルトキハ聯盟事務總長ハ直ニ右招集ヲ取消スヘキヤ又ハ單ニ所要ノ批准書カ寄託セラルマテ該會議ヲ延期スヘキヤニ付聯盟理事會ト協議スヘシ

五、議定書第十二條ノ規定ヲ今後實施セムコトヲ聯盟理事會ニ依頼スルコト

聯盟總會ハ常設國際司法裁判所規程第三十六條第二項ノ規定ニ關スル第一委員會ノ報告ヲ了知シ右報告ハ前記第三十六條第二項ノ規定カ諸國ニ對シ其ノ必要缺クヘカラスト認ムル留保ヲ爲シタ

ル上右規定ノ爲作成セラレタル特別議定書ニ加入スルコトヲ許スモノト解釋スルノ餘地アルコトヲ審査シタル結果作成セラレタルモノナルコトヲ思ヒ

右報告ハ國際正義ノ進歩ニ關係シ且前記裁判所ノ義務的管轄權ヲ出來得ル限りノ廣キ範圍ニ於テ最大多數ノ國ヲシテ受諾セシメトスル輿論ノ期待ト適合スルモノナルコトヲ確信シ諸國カ成ルヘク速ニ前記裁判所規程第三十六條第二項ニ依リ許サレタル特別議定書ニ加入セムコトヲ勸告ス

(註) 國際司法裁判所規程第三十六條ハ議定書第三條ノ註ニ掲出セリ

一一、國際紛爭平和的處理ニ關スル議定書

諸國ノ生存、獨立又ハ領土カ脅カサルルカ如キ場合ニ於テ一般の平和及該國ノ安全ノ維持ヲ確保セムトスル鞏固ナル希望ニ促カサレ國際團體ニ屬スル諸國ノ連帶關係ヲ認メ

侵略的戰爭ハ右連帶關係ヲ侵害シ且國際的罪惡ヲ構成スルモノナルコトヲ確認シ

國家間ニ於ケル紛爭ノ平和的處理ノ爲國際聯盟規約ニ規定セル制度ノ完全ナル適用ヲ容易ナラシメ且國際的罪惡ノ抑制ヲ確保セムコトヲ欲シ

且該規約第八條ニ定ムラレタルカ如ク國ノ安全及國際義務ヲ協同動作ヲ以テスル強制ニ支障ナキ
最低限度マテ國ノ軍備ノ縮少ヲ實現セシムル目的ヲ以テ
下名ハ之カ爲正當ナル委任ヲ受ケ左ノ如ク協定セリ

(註) 國際聯盟規約第八條

聯盟國ハ平和維持ノ爲ニハ其ノ軍備ヲ國ノ安全及國際義務ヲ協同動作ヲ以テスル強制ニ支障ナキ最低限度マテ縮少スルノ
必要アルコトヲ承認ス

聯盟理事會ハ各國政府ノ審議及決定ニ資スル爲各國ノ地理的地位及諸般ノ事情ヲ參酌シテ軍備縮少ニ關スル案ヲ作成スヘ
シ

該案ハ少クトモ十年毎ニ再審議ニ付セラレヘク且更正セラレヘキモノトス

各國政府前記ノ案ヲ採用シタルトキハ聯盟理事會ノ同意アルニ非サレハ認案所定ノ軍備ノ限度ヲ超ユルコトヲ得ス

聯盟國ハ民衆ニ依ル兵器彈藥及軍用器材ノ製造力重大ナル非備ヲ免レサルモノナルコトヲ認ム仍テ聯盟理事會ハ該製造ニ

件ヲ弊害ヲ防遏シ得ヘキ方法ヲ具申スヘシ尤モ聯盟國中其ノ安全ニ必要ナル兵器彈藥及軍用器材ヲ製造シ得サルモノノ需

要ニ關シテハ相當斟酌スヘキモノトス

聯盟國ハ其ノ軍備ノ規模陸海及空軍ノ企業並軍事上ノ目的ニ供用シ得ヘキ工業ノ狀況ニ關シ十分ニシテ隔意ナキ製造ヲ交

換スヘキコトヲ約ス

第一條

署名國ハ左記諸條ニ定ムル規定ノ趣旨ニ基キ聯盟規約ニ改正ヲ加フルコトヲ確保スル爲出來得ル

限リ一切ノ努力ヲ爲スヘキコトヲ約ス署名國ハ右規定カ本議定書ノ實施期日ヨリ相互間ニ拘束力
ヲ生スヘキコト並署名國ノ關スル限リ國際聯盟ノ總會及理事會ヲシテ本議定書ニ依リ與ヘラレタ
ル一切ノ權利ヲ行使シ且一切ノ義務ヲ履行スルノ權能ヲ有セシムルコトニ同意ス

第二條

署名國ハ相互間ニ於テ又ハ事件發生ノ場合以下ニ定ムル一切ノ義務ヲ受諾スル國ニ對シ如何ナル
場合ニ於テモ戰爭ニ訴ヘサルコトニ同意ス但シ侵略行爲ニ抵抗スル場合又ハ聯盟規約及本議定書
ノ規定ニ從ヒ國際聯盟ノ理事會又ハ總會ノ同意ヲ得テ行動スル場合ハ此ノ限ニ在ラス

第三條

署名國ハ常設國際司法裁判所規程第三十六條第二項ニ掲クル事件ニ付該裁判所ノ管轄權カ當然ニ
且特別ノ合意ナクシテ義務的ナルコトヲ承認スルコトヲ約ス但シ同條ニ規定セラレ且千九百二十
年十二月十六日署名ヲ許サレタル特別議定書ニ加入スルニ際シ各國カ前記條項ニ牴觸セサル留保
ヲ爲スノ權利ハ之ヲ妨ケサルモノトス
千九百二十年十二月十六日署名ヲ許サレタル特別議定書ニ對スル加入ハ本議定書實施ノ翌月内ニ
之ヲ爲スコトヲ要ス

本議定書實施後之ニ加入スル國ハ其ノ加入ノ翌月内ニ前記ノ義務ヲ履行スルコトヲ要ス

(註一) 常設國際司法裁判所規程第三十六條

裁判所ノ管轄ハ當事國カ裁判所ニ付託スル一切ノ事件及現行諸條約ニ特ニ規定スル一切ノ事項ニ及フ

國際聯盟ノ聯盟國及聯盟規約附屬書所載ノ諸國ハ左ニ關スル法律的紛争ノ全種類又ハ各種類ニ付裁判所ノ管轄ヲ同一ノ義務ヲ受諾スル他ノ聯盟國又ハ國ニ對スル關係ニ於テ當然ニ且特別ノ合意ナクシテ義務的ナリト認ムルコトヲ本規定ノ添附

セラルル議定書ノ調印若ハ批准ノ時又ハ其ノ後ニ於テ宣言スルコトヲ得

(イ) 條約ノ解釋

(ロ) 國際法上ノ問題

(ハ) 國際義務ノ違反ト爲ルヘキ事實ノ存否

(ニ) 國際義務ノ違反ニ對スル賠償ノ性質又ハ範圍

前記宣言ハ無條件ニテ多數若ハ或聯盟國若ハ國トノ相互條件ニテ又ハ一定ノ規同ヲ附シテ之ヲ爲スコトヲ得

裁判所カ管轄ヲ有スルヤ否ヤニ付等アル場合ニ於テハ裁判所ノ裁判ニ依リ之ヲ決定ス

(註二) 千九百二十年十二月十六日議定書(日本ハ之ニ参加ス)

署名議定書

正當ノ委任ヲ受ケタル下名ノ者ニ依リ代表セラレタル國際聯盟ノ聯盟國ハ千九百二十年十二月十三日「ジュネーヴ」ニ於

ケル聯盟總會ニ於テ全員 致ニテ可決セラレタル添附ノ常設國際司法裁判所規程ヲ受諾スルコトヲ宣言ス

依テ右諸國ハ前記規程ノ條項及條件ニ從ヒ裁判所ノ管轄ヲ受諾スルコトヲ茲ニ宣言ス

千九百二十年十二月十三日ノ國際聯盟總會ノ爲シタル決定ニ從ヒ作成セラレタル本議定書ハ批准ヲ要ス各國ハ其ノ批准書

ナ國際聯盟事務總長ニ送付ス事務總長ハ右批准ヲ他ノ署名國ニ通告スル爲必要ナル手續ヲ執ルヘシ批准書ハ國際聯盟ノ事務局ノ記録中ニ寄託セラルヘシ

本議定書ハ國際聯盟ノ聯盟國及聯盟規約附屬書所載ノ諸國ノ署名ノ爲開キ置クヘシ

裁判所規程ハ前記ノ決定ニ定ムル所ニ從ヒ之ヲ實施ス

「ジュネーヴ」ニ於テ本書一通ヲ作成ス佛蘭西語及英吉利語ノ本文ヲ以テ共ニ正文トス

千九百二十年十二月十六日

各國代表署名

第四條

聯盟規約第十五條第四項、第五項、第六項及第七項ノ規定ヲ一層完全ナラシムル爲署名國ハ左ノ手續ニ從フコトニ同意ス

一、聯盟理事會ニ付託セラレタル紛争カ前記第十五條第三項ニ定ムルカ如ク理事會ニ依リ解決

セラレサル場合ニ於テハ理事會ハ當事國ヲシテ右紛争ヲ司法的解決又ハ仲裁裁判ニ付セシム

ルコトヲ説得スルニカムヘシ

二、(イ) 當事國カ右ニ關シ合意ヲ遂クルコトヲ得サル場合ニ於テハ少クトモ右當事國中ノ一

國ノ請求ニ依リ仲裁委員會ヲ構成スヘシ該委員會ハ成ルヘク當事國間ノ合意ニ依リ之ヲ構成

スヘシ

(ロ) 聯盟理事會ノ定メタル期間内ニ當事國カ仲裁委員ノ數、氏名及權限並手續ニ關シ其ノ全部又ハ一部ニ付合意ヲ達スルヲ得サル場合ニ於テハ聯盟理事會ハ未決ノ點ヲ解決スヘシ聯盟理事會ハ成ルヘク急速ニ當事國ト協議ノ上國籍、人格及經歷上其ノ能力及公平ノ點ニ於テ最高ノ保障ヲ與フルモノナリト認ムル者ノ中ヨリ委員及議長ヲ選任スヘシ

(ハ) 當事國ノ要求ノ作成セラレタル後仲裁委員會ハ孰レカノ當事國ノ請求ニ基キ聯盟理事會ノ仲介ヲ經テ常設國際司法裁判所ニ對シ該紛争ノ法律上ノ争點ニ付勸告的意見ヲ求ムヘシ斯カル場合右裁判所ハ成ルヘク急速ニ會合スヘシ

三、何レノ當事國モ仲裁ヲ依頼セサルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ再ヒ該紛争ヲ審査スヘシ聯盟理事會カ紛争當事國代表者ヲ除ク他ノ會員全部ニ依リ同意セラレタル報告書ヲ作成スルニ至リタル場合ニ於テハ署名國ハ右報告書中ノ勸告ニ從フヘキコトニ同意ス

四、聯盟理事會カ紛争當事國ノ代表者ヲ除キ他ノ會員全部ニ依リ同意セラレタル報告書ヲ作成スルヲ得サル場合ニ於テハ右理事會ハ該紛争ヲ仲裁ニ付託スヘシ聯盟理事會ハ自ラ仲裁委員會ノ構成、權限及手續ヲ定ムヘク且仲裁委員ノ選定ニ付テハ前記第二項(ハ)ニ定ムル能力及公平ノ保障ニ留意スヘシ

五、如何ナル場合ニ於テモ既ニ關係當事國ノ一國ニ依リ受諾セラレタル聯盟理事會全會一致ノ勸告アリタル解決方法ハ再ヒ之ヲ争フコトヲ得ス

六、署名國ハ與ヘラレタル司法判決又ハ仲裁判定ヲ誠實ニ履行シ且前記第三項ニ定メラレタルカ如ク聯盟理事會ニ依リ勸告セララル解決方法ニ從フヘキコトヲ約ス一國カ右約束ヲ履行セサル場合ニ於テハ聯盟理事會ハ之カ遵守ヲ確保スル爲一切ノ盡力ヲ爲スヘシ聯盟理事會カ右盡力ニ依ルモ其ノ效ナキトキハ同理事會ハ聯盟規約第十三條ノ末項ニ定ムル規定ニ從ヒ之ヲ履行セシムル爲如何ナル處置ヲ執ルヘキヤヲ提議スヘシ一國カ前記約束ヲ無視シテ戦争ニ訴フルカ如キ場合ニ於テハ聯盟規約第十六條ノ定ムル制裁ハ本議定書中ニ提示セララルカ如キ解釋ノ下ニ直ニ之ヲ適用セララルヘシ

七、本條ノ規定ハ署名國ノ一國又ハ二國以上カ聯盟理事會又ハ聯盟總會ノ同意ヲ得テ執リタル戦争手段ノ結果生スル紛争ノ處理ニハ之ヲ適用セス

(註一) 國際聯盟規約第十五條

聯盟國同ニ國交斷絶ニ至ルノ虞アル紛争發生シ第十三條ニ依リ仲裁裁判ニ付セラレサルトキハ聯盟國當該事件ヲ聯盟理事會ニ付託スヘキコトヲ約ス何レノ紛争當事國モ紛争存在ヲ事務總長ニ通告シ以テ前記ノ付託ヲ爲スコトヲ得事務總長ハ之カ取調及審理ニ必要ナル一切ノ準備ヲ爲スモノトス

此ノ目的ノ爲メ紛争當事國ハ成ルヘク速ニ當該事件ニ關スル陳述書ヲ一切ノ關係事實及書類ト共ニ事務總長ニ提出スヘク
 聯盟理事會ハ直ニ其ノ公表ヲ命スルコトヲ得
 聯盟理事會ハ紛争ノ解決ニ力ムヘク其ノ努力致テ喪シタルトキハ其ノ適當ト認ムル所ニ依リ當該紛争ニ關スル事實及陳
 述其ノ解決條件ヲ記載セル調査ヲ公表スヘシ
 紛争解決ニ至ラサルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ全會一致又ハ過半数ノ表決ニ基キ當該紛争ノ事實ヲ述ヘ公正且適當ト認ムル勸
 告ヲ載セタル報告書ヲ作成シ之ヲ公表スヘシ
 聯盟理事會ニ代表セラルル聯盟國ハ何レモ當該紛争ノ事實及之ニ關スル自國ノ決定ニ付陳述書ヲ公表スルコトヲ得
 聯盟理事會ノ報告書カ紛争當事國ノ代表者ヲ除キ他ノ聯盟理事會員全部ノ同意ヲ得タルモノナルトキハ聯盟國ハ該報告
 書ノ勸告ニ應スル紛争當事國ニ對シ戰爭ニ訴ヘサルヘキコトヲ約ス
 聯盟理事會ニ於テ紛争當事國ノ代表者ヲ除キ他ノ聯盟理事會員全部ノ同意アル報告書ヲ得ルニ至ラサルトキハ聯盟國ハ
 正義公道ヲ維持スル爲メ必要ト認ムル處置ヲ執ルノ權利ヲ留保ス
 紛争當事國ノ一國ニ於テ紛争カ國際法上專ラ該當事國ノ管轄ニ屬スル事項ニ付生シタルモノナルコトヲ主張シ聯盟理事
 會ニ付是認シタルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ其ノ旨ヲ報告シ且之カ解決ニ關シ何等ノ勸告ヲモ爲ササルモノトス
 聯盟理事會ハ本條ニ依ル一切ノ場合ニ於テ紛争ヲ聯盟總會ニ移スコトヲ得紛争當事國一方ノ請求アリタルトキハ亦之ヲ
 聯盟總會ニ移スヘシ但シ右請求ハ紛争ヲ聯盟理事會ニ付託シタル後十四日以内ニ之ヲ爲スコトヲ要ス
 聯盟理事會ノ行動及權限ニ關スル本條及第十二條ノ規定ハ聯盟總會ニ移シタル事件ニ關シ總テ之ヲ聯盟總會ノ行動及權
 能ニ適用ス但シ紛争當事國ノ代表者ヲ除キ聯盟理事會ニ代表セラルル聯盟各國代表者及留餘過半数聯盟國ノ代表者ノ同
 意ヲ得タル聯盟總會ノ報告書ハ紛争當事國ノ代表者ヲ除キ他ノ聯盟理事會員全部ノ同意ヲ得タル聯盟理事會ノ報告書ト

同一ノ效力ヲ有スヘキモノトス

(註二) 國際聯盟規約第十三條

聯盟國ハ聯盟國間ニ仲裁裁判ニ付シ得ト認ムル紛争ヲ生シ其ノ紛争カ外交手段ニ依リテ満足ナル解決ヲ得ルコト能ハサ
 ルトキハ當該事件全部ヲ仲裁裁判ニ付スヘキコトヲ約ス
 條約ノ解釋、國際法上ノ問題、國際義務ノ違反ト爲ルヘキ事實ノ存否該違反ニ對スル賠償ノ範圍及性質ニ關スル紛争
 ハ一般ニ仲裁裁判ニ付シ得ル事項ニ屬スルモノナルコトヲ聲明ス
 審理ノ爲メ紛争事件ヲ付託スヘキ仲裁裁判所ハ當事國ノ合意ヲ以テ定メ又ハ當事國間ニ現存スル條約ノ規定ノ定ムル所ニ
 依ル

(註三) 國際聯盟規約第十六條

聯盟國ハ一切ノ仲裁判決ヲ誠實ニ履行スヘク且判決ニ服スル聯盟國ニ對シテハ戰爭ニ訴ヘサルコトヲ約ス判決ヲ履行セ
 サルモノアルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ其ノ履行ヲ期スル爲メ必要ナル處置ヲ提議スヘシ
 第十二條、第十三條又ハ第十五條ニ依ル約束ヲ無視シテ戰爭ニ訴ヘタル聯盟國ハ當然他ノ總テノ聯盟國ニ對シ戰爭行爲
 ヲ爲シタルモノト看做ス他ノ總テノ聯盟國ハ之ニ對シ直ニ一切ノ通商上又ハ金融上ノ關係ヲ斷絶シ自國民ト違約國國民
 トノ一切ノ交通ヲ禁止シ且聯盟國タルト否トヲ問ハス他ノ總テノ國ノ國民ト違約國國民トノ間ノ一切ノ金融上通商上又
 ハ個人的交通ヲ防遏スヘキコトヲ約ス
 聯盟理事會ハ前項ノ場合ニ於テ聯盟ノ約束擁護ノ爲メ使用スヘキ兵力ニ對スル聯盟各國ノ陸海又ハ空軍ノ分擔程度ヲ關係
 各國政府ニ提議スルノ義務アルモノトス
 聯盟國ハ本條ニ依リ金融上及經濟上ノ措置ヲ執リタル場合ニ於テ之ニ基ク損失及不便ヲ最少限度ニ止ムル爲相互ニ支持

スヘキコト、聯盟ノ一國ニ對スル違約國ノ特殊ノ措置ヲ抗拒スル爲相互ニ支持スヘキコト並ニ聯盟ノ約束條約ノ爲協力スル聯盟國軍隊ノ版圖内通過ニ付必要ナル處置ヲ執ルヘキコトヲ約ス
聯盟ノ約束ニ違反シタル聯盟國ニ付テハ聯盟理事會ニ代表セララルル他ノ一切ノ聯盟國代表者ノ聯盟理事會ニ於ケル一致ノ表決ヲ以テ聯盟ヨリ之ヲ除名スル旨ヲ聲明スルコトヲ得

第五條

聯盟規約第十五條第八項ノ規定ハ依然聯盟理事會ノ手續ニ之ヲ適用スヘシ

前記第四條ニ定メラレタルカ如キ仲裁裁判ノ手續中ニ於テ當事國ノ一國カ紛争又ハ其ノ一部カ國際法上專ラ該國ノ國內管轄ニ屬スル事項ヨリ生シタルモノナルコトヲ主張スルトキハ仲裁委員ハ此ノ點ニ付聯盟理事會ノ仲介ヲ經テ常設國際司法裁判所ノ意見ヲ求ムヘシ該裁判所ノ意見ハ仲裁委員ヲ拘束スヘク仲裁委員ハ右意見カ肯定的ナルトキハ其ノ判定中右ノ旨ヲ宣言スルニ止ムヘシ

前記裁判所又ハ聯盟理事會カ該事項ヲ以テ專ラ該國ノ國內管轄ニ屬スルモノナリト認ムル場合ト雖モ右決定ハ聯盟理事會又ハ聯盟總會カ聯盟規約第十一條ニ基キ事態ヲ審査スルコトヲ妨ケサルモノトス

(註) 國際聯盟規約第十一條

戰爭又ハ戰爭ノ脅威ハ聯盟國ノ何レカニ直接ノ影響アルト否トチ即チ總テ聯盟全體ノ利害關係事項タルコトヲ証ニ聲明ス仍テ聯盟ハ國際ノ平和ヲ擁護スル爲適當且有效ト認ムル措置ヲ執ルヘキモノトス此ノ種ノ事態發生シタルトキハ事務總長ハ何レカノ聯盟國ノ請求ニ基キ直ニ聯盟理事會ノ會議ヲ招集スヘシ

國際關係ニ影響スル一切ノ事態ニシテ國際ノ平和又ハ其ノ基礎タル各國間ノ良好ナル了解ヲ擾亂セムトスル虞アルモノニ付聯盟總會又ハ聯盟理事會ノ注意ヲ喚起スルハ聯盟各國ノ友誼的權利ナルコトヲ併セテ茲ニ聲明ス

第六條

聯盟規約第十五條第九項ニ從ヒ紛争カ聯盟總會ニ移サレタルトキハ聯盟總會ハ右紛争處理ノ爲聯盟規約第十五條第一項、第二項及第三項並前記第四條第一項ニ定ムル方法ニ依リ當事國ヲ和解セシムルニカムルニ付聯盟理事會ニ與ヘラレタル一切ノ權限ヲ有スヘシ

聯盟總會カ平和的處理ヲ達成セサルトキハ左ノ措置ヲ執ルヘシ
當事國ノ一國カ仲裁ヲ依頼スルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ前記第四條第二項(イ)、(ロ)及(ハ)ニ定ムル方法ニ依リ仲裁委員會ヲ構成スヘシ

何レノ當事國モ右仲裁ヲ依頼セサルトキハ聯盟總會ハ再ヒ該紛争ヲ審査スヘク此ノ場合聯盟理事會ト同一ノ權限ヲ有スヘシ聯盟總會ノ報告書中ニ包含セララルル勸告ハ右報告ハ聯盟規約第十五條第十項末段ニ定ムルカ如キ同意ヲ得タル場合ニ於テハ本議定書中ニ定ムル一切ノ事項ニ關

以前條第四條第三項ニ定ムル如ク聯盟理事會ノ採用シタル報告書中ニ包含スル勸告ト同一ノ價値及效力ヲ有スヘシ

必要ナル多數ヲ得ル能ハサルトキハ該紛争ハ之ヲ仲裁裁判ニ付託スヘク聯盟理事會ハ第四條第四項ニ定ムルカ如ク仲裁委員會ノ構成、權限及手續ヲ決定スヘシ

第七條

二國又ハ二國以上ノ署名國間ニ紛争生シタルトキハ此等ノ諸國ハ右紛争カ平和的處理手續ニ付託セラルル前又ハ其ノ手續中本議定書第十七條ニ定ムル軍備縮少會議ニ依リテ確定セラルヘキ現状ヲ變更スルカ如キ軍力及戰鬥力ノ増加ヲ爲ササルコト、陸軍、海軍及空軍、產業又ハ經濟ノ動員ニ關スル何等ノ措置ヲモ執ラサルコト及一般ニ紛争ヲ擴大シ又ハ之ヲ一層銳敏ナラシムルカ如キ種類ノ一切ノ行動ヲ執ラサルコトニ同意ス

紛争當事國ノ一國又ハ二國以上カ聯盟理事會ニ對シ前記約束ノ違反ニ關スル訴ヲ爲シタルトキハ理事會ハ聯盟規約第十一條ノ規定ニ從ヒ之ヲ審査スルノ義務ヲ有ス聯盟理事會ハ右訴カ調査ヲ要スルモノナリト認ムル場合ニ於テ一國又ハ二國以上ノ關係國內ニ於テ審査及調査ヲ爲スヲ便宜ナリト認ムルトキハ右手段ニ依ルヘシ右審査及調査ハ成ルヘク急速ニ之ヲ行フヲ要シ署名國間之カ

實行ノ爲一切ノ便宜ヲ供與スヘキコトヲ約ス

聯盟理事會ノ執ルヘキ上ニ定ムル措置ノ唯一ノ目的ハ紛争ノ平和的處理ヲ容易ナラシムルニアリ故ニ該措置ハ決シテ最後ノ處理ヲ豫斷スルヲ得ス

前記ノ審査及調査ノ結果本條第一項ノ規定ノ違反ヲ確定シタルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ右違反ヲ爲シタル一國又ハ數國ニ對シ其ノ違反ノ事實ヲ除去セムコトヲ督促スルノ義務ヲ有スヘシ前記ノ一國又ハ數國カ右督促ニ從ハサルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ此等ノ國カ聯盟規約又ハ本議定書ニ違反セルコトヲ宣言シ且世界ノ平和ヲ脅カスヘキ性質ノ事態ヲ成ルヘク速ニ終止セシムル爲執ルヘキ措置ヲ決定スヘシ

本條ノ爲ニスル聯盟理事會ノ決定ハ三分ノ二ノ多數決ニ依ルヘシ

第八條

署名國ハ他國ニ對シ侵略ノ脅威ヲ構成スルカ如キ行動ヲ抑止スルコトヲ約ス署名國中ノ一國カ他國ニ於テ戰爭ノ準備ヲ爲シツツアリト認ムルトキハ該國ハ右事項ニ付聯盟理事會ノ注意ヲ喚起スルノ權利ヲ有スヘシ

聯盟理事會ハ右ノ事項カ事實ナルコトヲ確メタルトキハ第七條第二項、第四項及第五項ニ定ムル

如キ措置ヲ執ルヘシニテハ、本議定書第九條ニ依リ、

非武装地帯ノ存在ハ侵略ヲ防止シ且下記第十條ニ定ムルカ如キ性質ノ確實ナル認定ヲ容易ナラシムルモノト認メラルルニ付本議定書違反ノ防止手段トシテ互ニ同意スル國家間ニ於テ右地帯ヲ設置セムコトヲ勸告ス

既ニ條約ノ規定ニ基キテ現存シ又ハ將來互ニ同意スル國家間ニ於テ設定セラルルコトアルヘキ非武装地帯ハ接壤國ノ一國又ハ數國ノ請求及其ノ費用ニ依リ聯盟理事會ニ依リ構成セラルヘキ一時的又ハ常設的ノ監督機關ノ下ニ之ヲ置クヲ得ヘシ

第十條

聯盟規約又ハ本議定書ニ定ムル約束ニ違反シ戰爭ニ訴フル一切ノ國ハ侵略國トス
非武装地帯ニ關スル規則ノ違反ハ戰爭ニ訴ヘタルト同様ナリト看做サルヘシ
敵對行爲ノ開始セラレタル場合ニ於テ全會ニ致テ以テ採用セラルルヲ要スル聯盟理事會ノ決定カ然ラスト宣言スル場合ノ外左記ニ該當スル國ハ侵略國ト推定セラルヘシ

一、紛争ヲ聯盟規約第十三條及第十五條ニ規定セラレ本議定書ニ依リ擴張セラレタル平和的處

理手續ニ付託シ又ハ司法判決仲裁判定若ハ聯盟理事會全會一致ノ勸告ニ從フコトヲ拒絕シ又

ハ該國及他ノ交戰國間ノ紛争カ國際法上專ラ右他ノ交戰國ノ國內管轄ニ關スル事項ヨリ生シ

タルモノナルコトヲ認ムル聯盟理事會全會一致ノ報告、司法判決又ハ仲裁判定ヲ無視シタル

二、國但シ最後ノ場合ニ於テハ該國ハ右事項ヲ聯盟規約第十一條ニ從ヒ豫メ聯盟理事會又ハ聯盟

總會ニ付託セザリシ場合ニ限り侵略國ト推定セラルルモノトス

三、本議定書第七條ニ定ムル手續ノ進行期間中聯盟理事會ノ命スル一時的措置ニ違反シタル

交戰國

本條第一項及第二項ニ定ムル場合以外ニ於テ聯盟理事會カ直ニ侵略國ヲ決定スルヲ得サルトキハ理事會ハ交戰國ニ對シ休戰ヲ命シ必要ノ場合ニハ三分ノ二ノ多數ニ依リ右休戰ノ條件ヲ決定シ且之カ履行ヲ監督スルノ義務ヲ有ス

右休戰ノ受諾ヲ拒絕シ又ハ其ノ條件ニ違反シタル交戰國ハ侵略國ト看做サルヘシ

聯盟理事會ハ本議定書第十一條ノ定ムル制裁ヲ侵略國ニ對シ直ニ適用スルコトヲ署名國ニ要求スヘシ右要求ヲ受ケタル署名國ハ之ニ依リ交戰權ヲ行使スルコトヲ得ヘシ

第十一條

聯盟理事會カ本議定書第十條末項ニ定ムル制裁ヲ適用スヘキコトヲ署名國ニ要求スルトキハ聯盟規約第十六條第一項及第二項ニ定ムル一切ノ種類ノ制裁ニ關スル右署名國ノ義務ハ該制裁カ侵略國ニ對シ直ニ適用セララルル爲即時ニ其ノ效力ヲ發生スヘシ

右義務ハ各署名國カ聯盟規約ヲ支持スル爲並其ノ地理上ノ地位及其ノ軍備ニ關スル特殊狀態ノ許ス程度ニ於テ侵略行爲ニ抵抗スル爲誠實ニ且有效ニ協力セサルヘカラサルコトヲ意味スルモノト解釋セララルヘシ

署名國ハ聯盟規約第十六條第三項ニ從ヒ攻撃セラレ又ハ脅威セララルル國ヲ援助シ又各種ノ原料品及軍需品ノ補給、信用制度ノ開始並運輸及通過ニ關シ便宜ノ供給及相互の交換ノ方法ニ依リ相互の支持ヲ與ヘ且右目的ノ爲ニハ攻撃セラレ又ハ脅威セララルル國ノ陸路及海路ニ由ル交通ノ安全ヲ維持スル爲出來得ル限りノ一切ノ措置ヲ執ルヘキコトヲ共同シテ又ハ各別ニ約ス

第十條ニ照シ兩紛爭當事國カ侵略國ナルトキハ右兩國ニ對シ經濟上及財政上ノ制裁ヲ適用スヘシ

第十二條

聯盟理事會カ經濟上及財政上ノ制裁ニ關シ本議定書第十一條ニ定ムル職務ノ執行ヲ要求セララルル

場合ニ於ケル條件ノ複雜ナルニ鑑ミ且本議定書カ署名國ニ與フル保障ヲ一層確實ニ決定スル爲理事會ハ財政上及經濟上ノ制裁ノ實行ノ爲執ルヘキ處置ノ性質並聯盟規約第十六條及本議定書第十一條ニ定ムル協力ノ手段ニ付審査シ且報告セシムル爲國際聯盟ノ經濟及財政ノ機關ヲ直ニ招集スヘシ

右報告アリタルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ其ノ權限アル機關ヲ通シ左ノ計畫ヲ作成スヘシ

一、侵略國ニ對シ經濟上及財政上ノ制裁ヲ適用スル爲ノ行動ニ關スル計畫

二、攻撃セラレタル國ト之ヲ援助スル他國トノ間ノ經濟上及財政上ノ協力ニ關スル計畫

尙右計畫ハ之ヲ聯盟國及他ノ署名國ニ通告スヘシ

第十三條

聯盟規約第十六條及本議定書第十一條ニ依リ定ムル陸軍、海軍及空軍ヲ以テスル制裁ヲ適用スルカ如キ場合アルニ於テハ聯盟理事會ハ諸國ニ對シ該國カ聯盟規約及本議定書ノ定ムル制裁ニ關スル義務ノ履行ヲ確保スル爲直ニ出動セシメ得ヘキ陸軍、海軍及空軍ノ兵力ヲ決定スヘキ約束ヲ爲サシムルコトヲ得ヘシ

尙聯盟理事會カ前記第十條ノ末項ニ定ムル制裁ヲ適用スヘキコトヲ署名國ニ要求シタルトキハ該

國ハ該國カ豫メ締結シタル協定アル場合ニ於テハ右ニ從ヒ其ノ陸軍、海軍及空軍ノ兵力ヲ以テ侵略ヲ受ケタル特定ノ國ヲ援助スルコトヲ得ヘシ

前項ニ記載セル協定ハ之ヲ國際聯盟事務局ニ依リ登録セラレ且公表セラレヘシ右協定ハ之ニ加入セムト欲スル一切ノ聯盟國ノ加入ヲ許スヘシ

第十四條

制裁ノ適用ヲ停止シ且常態ヲ再設スヘキコトヲ宣言スルハ專ラ聯盟理事會ノ權能ニ屬スヘシ

第十五條

本議定書ノ精神ニ從ヒ署名國ハ本議定書ノ規定ニ基キ侵略抑壓ノ爲行ハレタル一切ノ陸軍、海軍又ハ空軍ノ行動ニ依リ生シタル全部ノ費用並非軍人タルト軍人タルトヲ問ハス個人ノ蒙リタル一切ノ損害及兩當事者ノ前記ノ行動ニ依リ生シタル一切ノ物質上ノ損害ニ對スル賠償ヲ侵略國ヲシテ其ノ能力ノ許ス極限マテ負擔セシムルコトニ同意ス

但シ聯盟規約第十條ニ鑑ミ如何ナル場合ニ於テモ本議定書ニ定ムル制裁ノ適用ニ依リ侵略國ノ領土保全又ハ政治的獨立ニ影響ヲ及ホスコトヲ得ス

(註) 聯盟規約第十條

聯盟國ハ聯盟各國ノ領土保全及現在ノ政治的獨立ヲ尊重シ且外部ノ侵略ニ對シ之ヲ擁護スルコトヲ約ス右侵略ノ場合又ハ其ノ脅威若ハ危險アル場合ニ於テハ聯盟理事會ハ本條ノ義務ヲ履行スヘキ手段ヲ具申スヘシ

第十六條

署名國ハ其ノ一國又ハ數國ト本議定書ニ署名セス且國際聯盟ノ聯盟國ニ非サル一國又ハ數國トノ間ニ紛争生シタル場合ニ於テハ右非聯盟國ニ對シ聯盟規約第十七條ニ定ムル條件ニ從ヒ平和的處理ノ爲本議定書ノ署名國ニ依リ受諾セラレタル義務ニ服スヘキコトヲ勸誘スヘキコトニ同意ス
右勸誘セラレタル國ニシテ前記ノ條件及義務ヲ受諾スルコトヲ拒絶シ署名國ニ對シ戰爭ニ訴ヘタルトキハ本議定書ニ依リ解釋セラレタル聯盟規約第十六條ノ規定ヲ該國ニ適用スヘシ

(註) 聯盟規約第十七條

聯盟國ト非聯盟國トノ間又ハ非聯盟國相互ノ間ニ紛争生シタルトキハ此ノ種紛争解決ノ爲聯盟國ノ責フヘキ義務ヲ該非聯盟國カ聯盟理事會ノ正當ト認ムル條件ヲ以テ受諾スルコトヲ之ニ勸誘スヘシ勸誘ノ受諾アリタル場合ニ於テハ第十二條乃至第十六條ノ規定ハ聯盟理事會ニ於テ必要ト認ムル修正ヲ加ヘテ之ヲ適用ス

前項ノ勸誘ヲ爲シタルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ直ニ紛争事情ノ審査ヲ開始シ當該事情ノ下ニ於テ最善且最有效ト認ムル行動ヲ勸告スヘシ

勸誘ヲ受ケタル國カ此種紛争解決ノ爲聯盟國ノ責フヘキ義務ノ受諾ヲ拒ミ聯盟國ニ對シ戰爭ニ訴フル場合ニ於テハ第十六條ノ規定ハ該行動ヲ執ル國ニ之ヲ適用ス

勸誘ヲ受ケタル紛争當事國ノ雙方カ此ノ種紛争解決ノ爲聯盟國ノ責フヘキ義務ノ受諾ヲ拒ム場合ニ於テハ聯盟理事會ハ敢
斷行爲ヲ防止シ紛争ヲ解決スヘキ措置及勸告ヲ爲スコト

一一六

第十七條

署名國ハ聯盟理事會ニ依リ招集セラレ且千九百二十五年六月十五日曜日ニ「ジュネーヴ」ニ於
テ會合スヘキ國際軍備縮少會議ニ參加スヘキコトヲ約ス聯盟國タルト然ラサルトヲ問ハス一切ノ
國ハ右會議ニ招請セラレヘシ

右會議招集ノ準備トシテ聯盟理事會ハ本議定書第十一條及第十三條ニ定ムル約束ヲ尊重シ同會議
ニ提出セラレヘキ軍備ノ縮少及制限ニ關スル一般の議題ヲ作成スヘシ右議題ハ成ルヘク早キ期日
ニ且遅クトモ同會議會合ノ三月前ニ之ヲ各國政府ニ通告スヘシ

千九百二十五年五月一日マテニ少クトモ常任聯盟理事國ノ過半数及他ノ聯盟國ノ十箇國カ批准書
寄託ヲ爲ササルトキハ聯盟事務總長ハ右招集ヲ取消スヘキヤ又ハ單ニ所要數ノ批准書カ寄託セラ
ルルマテ該會議ヲ延期スルニ止ムヘキヤニ付聯盟理事會ト協議スヘシ

第十八條

本議定書第十條又ハ其ノ他ノ規定ニ於テ聯盟理事會ノ決議ヲ要スルモノト爲シタル場合ニ於テハ

聯盟規約第十五條ニ照シ即チ紛争當事國代表者ノ投票ハ全會一致又ハ所要多數ノ表決ニ數ヘラレ
サルモノト之ヲ解釋スヘシ

第十九條

本議定書ハ其ノ條項ニ依リ明ニ定メラレタルモノヲ除キ聯盟規約ニ依リ定メラレタル聯盟國ノ權
利及義務ニ何等ノ影響ヲ及ボササルヘシ

第二十條

本議定書ノ解釋ニ關スル一切ノ紛争ハ常設國際司法裁判所ニ之ヲ付託スヘシ

第二十一條

本議定書ハ佛蘭西語及英吉利語ヲ以テ共ニ其ノ正文トシテ批准ヲ要ス批准書ノ寄託ハ成ルヘク速
ニ國際聯盟事務局ニ於テ之ヲ爲スヘシ

政府ノ所在地カ歐羅巴以外ニアル國ハ其ノ批准書ノ旨ヲ國際聯盟事務局ニ通報スルニ止ムコトヲ
得ヘシ此ノ場合ニ於テハ該國ハ成ルヘク速ニ批准書ヲ送付スルコトヲ要ス

常任聯盟理事國ノ過半数及他ノ聯盟國ノ十箇國カ其ノ批准書ヲ寄託シ又ハ批准ヲ爲シタルトキハ
前記事務局ハ直ニ之ニ關スル調査ヲ作成スヘシ

一一七

本議定書ハ前記調査カ作成セラレタル後軍備縮少ニ關スル計畫カ第十七條ニ定ムル會議ニ依リ採用セラレタルトキニ於テ直ニ實施セララルヘシ

軍備縮少ニ關スル計畫カ採用セラレタル後前記會議ニ依リ定メラルヘキ期間内ニ右計畫カ實行セラレサルトキハ聯盟理事會ハ其ノ旨ノ宣言ヲ爲スヘシ右宣言ハ本議定書ノ效力ヲ失ハムシヘシ

聯盟理事會ハ國際軍備縮少會議ニ依リ作成セララル計畫カ實行セラレス且其ノ結果本議定書カ效力ヲ失ヒタルコトヲ宣言スルヲ得ルノ要件ハ該會議自ラ之ヲ定ムヘシ

前記會議ニ依リ定メラルル期間滿了ノ後同會議ニ依リ採用セララル計畫ニ同意セサル署名國ハ本議定書ノ規定ニヨリ生スル利益ヲ享有スルコトヲ得ス

右證據トシテ之カ爲正當ニ委任ヲ受ケタル下名ハ本議定書ニ署名セリ

千九百二十四年十月二日「ジュネーヴ」ニ於テ本書一通ヲ作成シ聯盟事務局ノ記録ニ之ヲ保存ス

同事務局ハ其ノ實施ノ日ニ於テ之ヲ登録スヘシ

I. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE FIFTH ASSEMBLY BY
THE FIRST AND THIRD COMMITTEES.

Draft Resolution No. 1.

THE ASSEMBLY,

Having taken note of the reports of the First and Third Committees on the questions referred to them by the Assembly resolution of September 6th, 1924,

Welcomes warmly the draft Protocol on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes proposed by the two Committees of which the text is annexed to this resolution, and

DECIDES:

- (1) To recommend to the earnest attention of all the Members of the League the acceptance of the said draft Protocol;
- (2) To open immediately the said Protocol in the terms proposed for signature by those representatives of Members of the League who are already in a position to sign it and to hold it open for signature by all other States;
- (3) To request the Council forthwith to appoint a Committee to draft the amendments to the Covenant contemplated by the terms of the said Protocol;
- (4) To request the Council to convene an International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments, which shall meet at Geneva as provided by the following stipulations of Article 17 of the draft Protocol:

"In preparation for the convening of the Conference, the Council shall draw up, with due regard to the undertakings contained in Articles 11 and 13 of the present Protocol, a general programme for the reduction and limitation of the armaments which shall be laid before the Conference and be communicated to the Governments at the earliest possible date, and at the latest three months before the Conference meets.

"If by May 1st, 1925, the ratifications have not been deposited by at least a majority of the Permanent Members of the Council and ten other Members of the League, the Secretary-General of the League shall immediately consult the Council as to whether he shall cancel the invitations or merely adjourn the Conference until a sufficient number of the ratifications have been deposited."

(5) To request the Council to put into immediate execution the provisions of Article 12 of the draft Protocol.

Draft Resolution No. 2.

THE ASSEMBLY,

Having taken cognizance of the report of the First Committee upon the terms of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice;

Considering that the study of the said terms shows them to be sufficiently wide to permit States to adhere to the special Protocol, opened for signature in virtue of Article 36, paragraph 2, with the reservations which they regard as indispensable;

Convinced that it is in the interest of the progress of international justice, and consistent with the expectations of the opinion of the world, that the greatest possible number of States should, to the widest possible extent, accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Court,

RECOMMENDS:

States to accede at the earliest possible date to the special Protocol opened for signature in virtue of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

II. PROTOCOL FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.

Animated by the firm desire to ensure the maintenance of general peace and security of nations whose existence and independence of territories may be threatened;

Recognizing the solidarity of the members of the international community; asserting that a war of aggression constitutes a violation of this solidarity and an international crime;

Desirous of facilitating the complete application of the system provided in the covenant of the League of Nations for the pacific settlement of disputes between States and of ensuring the repression of international crimes;

And for the purpose of realizing, as contemplated by Article 8* of the Covenant, the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations; the undersigned, duly authorized to that effect, agree as follows:

*Article VIII of the Covenant:

The Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval and air programmes and the conditions of such of their industries as are adaptable to war-like purposes.

ARTICLE 1.

The signatory States undertake to make every effort in their power to secure the introduction into the Covenant of amendments on the lines of the provisions contained in the following Articles.

They agree that, as between themselves, these provisions shall be binding as from the coming into force of the present protocol and that so far as they are concerned the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations shall thenceforth have power to exercise all the rights and perform all the duties conferred upon them by the Protocol.

ARTICLE 2.

The signatory States agree in no case to resort to war either with one another or against a State which, if the occasion arises, accepts all the obligations hereinafter set out, except in case of resistance to acts of aggression or when acting in agreement with the Council or the Assembly of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant and of the present Protocol.

ARTICLE 3.

The signatory States undertake to recognize as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the permanent Court of International Justice

in the cases covered by paragraph 2 of Article 36* of the Statute of the Court, but without prejudice to the right of any State, when acceding to the special protocol provided for in the said Article and opened for signature on December 16th, 1920, to make reservations compatible with the said clause.

Accession to his special protocol* 2 opened for signature on December 16th, 1920, must be given within the month following the coming into force of the present Protocol.

The States which accede to the present Protocol, after its coming into force, must carry out the above obligation within the month following their accession.

* (1) Art. 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in Treaties and Conventions in force.

The Members of the League of Nations and the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant, may, either when signing or ratifying the protocol to which the present Statute is adjoined, or at a later moment, declare that they recognise as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all or any of the classes of legal disputes concerning:

- (a) The interpretation of a Treaty.
- (b) Any question of International Law.
- (c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.

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

The declaration referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain Members of States, or for a certain time.

In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

(2) Special Protocol of 16th Dec. 1920.

Protocol of Signature.

The Members of the League of Nations, through the undersigned, duly authorized, declare their acceptance of the adjoined Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was approved by a unanimous vote of the Assembly of the League on the 13th December, 1920, at Geneva.

Consequently, they hereby declare that they accept the jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with the terms and subject to the conditions of the above-mentioned Statute.

The present Protocol, which has been drawn up in accordance with the decision taken by the Assembly of the League of Nations on the 13th December, 1920, is subject to ratification. Each power shall send its ratification to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations; the latter shall take the necessary steps to notify such ratification to the other signatory Powers. The ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

The said Protocol shall remain open for signature by the Members of the League of Nations and by the States mentioned in the Annex to the Covenant of the League.

The Statute of the Court shall come into force as provided in the above-mentioned decision. Executed at Geneva, in a single copy, the French and English texts of which shall be authentic.

16th December 1920.

ARTICLE 4.

With a view to render more complete the provisions of Paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Article 15*⁽¹⁾ of the Covenant, the signatory States agree to comply with the following procedure:

1. If the dispute submitted to the Council is not settled by it as provided in paragraph 3 of the said Article 15, the Council shall endeavour to persuade the parties to submit the dispute to the judicial settlement or arbitration.

2. (a) If the parties can not agree to do so, there shall, at the request of at least one of the parties, be constituted a Committee of Arbitrators. The Committee shall as far as possible be constituted by agreement between parties.

(b) If, within the period fixed by the Council, the parties have failed to agree, in whole or in part, upon the number, the names and the powers of the arbitrators and upon the procedure, the Council shall settle the points remaining in suspense. It shall with the utmost possible despatch select in consultation with the parties the arbitrators and their President from among persons who, by their nationality, their personal character and their experience, appear to it to furnish the highest guarantees of competence and impartiality.

(c) After the claims of parties have been formulated, the Committee of Arbitrators, on the request of any party, shall through the medium of the Council

quest an advisory opinion upon any points of law in the dispute from the Permanent Court International Justice which in such case shall meet with the utmost possible despatch.

3. If none of the parties asks for the arbitration, the council shall again take the dispute under consideration. If the Council reaches a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the representatives of any of the parties to the dispute, the signatory States agree to comply with the recommendations therein.

4. If the Council fails to reach a report which is concurred in by all its members, other than representatives of any of the parties to the dispute, it shall submit the dispute to the arbitration. It shall itself determine the composition, the powers and the procedure of the Committee of Arbitrators and, in the choice of the arbitrators, shall bear in mind the guarantees of competence and impartiality referred to in paragraph 2 (b) above.

5. In no case may a solution, upon which there has already been the unanimous recommendation of the Council accepted by one of the parties concerned, be again called in question.

6. The signatory States undertake that they will carry out in full good faith any judicial sentence or arbitral award that may be rendered and that they will comply, as provided in paragraph 3 above, with the solutions recommended by the Council. In the

event of a State failing to carry out the above undertakings, the Council shall exert all its influence to secure compliance therewith. If it fails therein, it shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto in accordance with the provision contained at the end of article 13*⁽²⁾ of the Covenant. Should a State in disregard of the above undertakings resort to war, the sanctions provided for by article 16* of the Covenant, interpreted in the manner indicated in the present Protocol, shall immediately become applicable to it.

7. The provisions of the present article do not apply to the settlement of disputes which arise as the result of the measures of war taken by one or more signatory States in agreement with the Council or the Assembly.

* (1) Art. 15 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

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

For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

The Council shall endeavour to effect a settlement of disputes, and if such efforts are

successful, a statement shall be made public giving such acts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

Any Member of the League represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the Members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the

Representatives of those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of the Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

(2) Art. 13 of the Covenant.

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

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

For the consideration of any such dispute the court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the Court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

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

(3) Art. 16 of the Covenant.

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Article 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their

nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effect military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenants of the League.

The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are cooperating to protect the covenants of the League.

Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by vote of the Council concurred in by the Representatives of all other Members of the League represented thereon.

ARTICLE 5.

The Provisions of paragraph 8 of Article 15 of the Covenant shall continue to apply in proceedings before the Council.

If in the course of an arbitration, such as is contemplated by Article 4 above, one of the parties claims that the dispute, or a part thereof, arises out of a matter which

by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the arbitrators shall on this point take the advice of the Permanent Court of International Justice through the medium of the Council. The opinion of the Court shall be binding upon the arbitrators, who, if the opinion is affirmative, shall confine themselves to so declaring in their award.

If the question is held by the Court or by the Council to be a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the State, this decision shall not prevent the consideration of the situation by the Council or by the Assembly under Article 11* of the Covenant.

* Art. 11 of the Covenant.

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

ARTICLE 6.

If in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 15 of the Covenant a dispute is referred to the Assembly, that body shall have for the settlement of the dispute all the

powers conferred upon the Council as to endeavouring to reconcile the parties in the manner laid down in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Article 15 of the Covenant and in paragraph 1 of Article 4 above.

Should the Assembly fail to achieve an amicable settlement:

If one of the parties asks for the arbitration, the Council shall proceed to constitute the Committee of Arbitrators in the manner provided in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 of Article 4 above.

If no party asks for arbitration, the Assembly shall again take the dispute under consideration and shall have in his connection the same powers as the Council. Recommendations embodied in a report of the Assembly, provided that it secures the measure of support stipulated at the end of paragraph 10 of Article 15 of the Covenant, shall have the same value and effect, as regards all matters dealt with in the present Protocol, as recommendations embodied in a report of the Council adopted as provided in paragraph 3 of Article 4 above.

If the necessary majority cannot be obtained, the dispute shall be submitted to the arbitration and the Council shall determine the composition, the powers and the procedure of the Committee of Arbitrators as laid down in paragraph 4 of Article 4.

ARTICLE 7.

In the event of a dispute arising between two or more signatory States, these States agree that they will not, either before the dispute is submitted to the proceedings for the pacific settlement or during such proceedings, make any increase of their armaments or effectives which might modify the position established by the Conference of the Reduction of Armaments provided for by Article 17 of the present Protocol, nor will they take any measure of military, naval, air, industrial or economic mobilization, nor, in general, any action of a nature likely to extend the dispute or render it more acute.

It shall be the duty of the Council in accordance with the provisions of Article 11 of the Covenant to take under consideration any complaint as to infraction of the above undertakings which is made to it by one or more of the States parties to the dispute. Should the Council be of opinion that the complaint requires investigation, it shall, if it deems it expedient, arrange for the enquiries and investigations in one or more of the countries concerned. Such enquiries and investigations shall be carried out with the utmost possible despatch and the signatory States undertake to afford every facility for carrying them out.

The sole object of the measures taken by the council as above provided is to facilitate the pacific settlement of disputes and they shall in no way prejudice the actual settlement.

If the result of such inquiries and investigations is to establish an infraction of the provisions of the first paragraph of the present Article, it shall be the duty of the Council to summon the State or States guilty of the infraction to put an end thereto. Should the State or States in question fail to comply with such summons, the Council shall declare them to be guilty of a violation of the Covenant or of the present Protocol and shall decide upon the measures to be taken with a view to end as soon as possible a situation of a nature to threaten the peace of the world.

For the purpose of the present Article decisions of the Council may be taken by a two-thirds majority.

ARTICLE 8.

The signatory States undertake to abstain from any act which might constitute a threat of aggression against another State.

If one of the signatory States is of opinion that another State is making preparations for war, it shall have the right to bring the matter to the notice of the Council.

The Council, if it ascertains that the facts are as alleged, shall proceed as provided in paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 of Article 7.

ARTICLE 9.

The existence of demilitarized zones being calculated to prevent aggression and to facilitate a definite finding of the nature provided for in Article 10 below, the establishment of such zones between States mutually consenting thereto is recommended as a means of avoiding violations of the present Protocol.

The demilitarized zones already existing under the terms of certain treaties or conventions, or which may be established in future between States mutually consenting thereto may, at the request and at the expense of one or more of the concerned States, be placed under a temporary or permanent system of supervision to be organized by the Council.

ARTICLE 10.

Every State which resorts to war in violation of the undertakings contained in the Covenant or in the present Protocol is an aggressor.

Violation of the rules laid down for a demilitarized zone shall be held equivalent to resort to war.

In the event of hostilities having broken out, any State shall be presumed to be an

aggressor, unless a decision of the Council, which must be taken unanimously, shall otherwise declare:

1. If it has refused to submit the dispute to the procedure of pacific settlement provided by Articles 13 and 15 of the Covenant as amplified by the present Protocol, or to comply with a judicial sentence, or arbitral award or with a unanimous recommendation of the Council, or has disregarded a unanimous report of the Council, a judicial sentence or an arbitral award recognizing that the dispute between it and the other belligerent States out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the latter State; nevertheless, in the last case, the State shall only be presumed to be an aggressor if it has not previously submitted the question to the Council or the Assembly, in accordance with Article 11 of the Covenant.

2. If it has violated provisional measures enjoined by the Council for the period while the proceedings are in progress as contemplated by Article 7 of the present Protocol.

Apart from the cases dealt with in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the present Article, if the Council does not at once succeed in determining the aggressor, it shall be bound to enjoin upon the belligerents an armistice, and shall fix the terms acting if need be by a two-third majority, and shall supervise its execution.

Any belligerent which has refused to accept the armistice or has violated its terms shall be deemed an aggressor.

The Council shall call upon the signatory States to apply forthwith against the aggressor the sanctions provided by Article 11 of the present Protocol and any Signatory State thus called upon shall thereupon be entitled to exercise the rights of a belligerent.

ARTICLE 11.

As soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply the sanction, as provided in the last paragraph of Article 10 of the present Protocol, the obligations of the said State, in regard to the sanctions of all kinds mentioned in paragraph 1 and 2 of Article 16 of the Covenant, will immediately become operative in order that such sanctions may forthwith be employed against the aggressor.

Those obligations shall be interpreted as obliging each of the signatory States to cooperate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in resistance to any act of aggression in the degree which its geographical position and its particular situation as regards armaments allow.

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 16 of the Covenant, the signatory States give a joint and several undertaking to come to the assistance of the State attacked or threatened, and to give each other mutual support by means of facilities and reciprocal

exchanges as regards the provision of raw materials and supplies of every kind, openings of credits, transport and transit, and for this purpose to take all measures in their power to preserve the safety of communications by land and by sea of the attacked or threatened State.

If both parties to the dispute are aggressors within the meaning of Article 10, the economic and financial sanctions shall be applied to both of them.

ARTICLE 12.

In view of the complexity of the conditions in which the Council may be called upon to exercise the functions mentioned in Article 11 of the present Protocol concerning economic and financial sanctions, and in order to determine more exactly the guarantees afforded by the present Protocol to the signatory States, the Council shall forthwith invite the economic and financial organisations of the League of Nations to consider and report as to the nature of the steps to be taken to give effect to the financial and economic sanctions and the measures of cooperation contemplated in Article 16 of the Covenant and in Article 11 of this Protocol.

When in possession of this information, the Council shall draw up through its competent organs:

1. Plans of action for the application of the economic and financial sanctions against an aggressor State;
 2. Plans of economic and financial cooperation between a State attacked and the different States assisting it;
- and shall communicate these plans to the Members of the League and to the other signatory States.

ARTICLE 13.

In view of the contingent military, naval and air sanctions provided for by Article 16 of the Covenant and by Article 11 of the present Protocol, the Council shall be entitled to receive undertakings from the States determining in advance the military, naval and air forces which they would be able to bring into action immediately to ensure the fulfilment of the obligations in regard to sanctions which result from the Covenant and the present Protocol.

Furthermore, as soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply sanctions, as provided in the last paragraph of Article 10 above, the said States may, in accordance with any agreements which they may previously have concluded, bring to the assistance of a particular State, which is the victim of aggression, their military, naval and air forces.

The agreements mentioned in the preceding paragraph shall be registered and published by the Secretariat of League of Nations. They shall remain open to all States, Members of the League, which may desire to accede thereto.

ARTICLE 14.

The Council shall alone be competent to declare that the application of sanctions shall cease and normal conditions be reestablished.

ARTICLE 15.

In conformity with the spirit of the present Protocol the signatory States agree that the whole cost of any military, naval or air operations undertaken for the repression of an aggression under the terms of the Protocol, and the reparation for all losses suffered by individuals, whether civilians or combatants, and for all material damage caused by the operations of both sides, shall be borne by the aggressor State up to the extreme limit of its capacity.

Nevertheless, in view of Article 10* of the Covenant, neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the aggressor State shall in any case be affected as the result of the application of the sanctions mentioned in the present Protocol.

*Art. 10 of the Covenant.

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE 16.

The signatory States agree that in the event of a dispute between one or more of them and one or more States which have not signed the present Protocol and are not Members of the League of Nations, such non-Member States shall be invited on the conditions contemplated in Article 17* of the Covenant, to submit, for the purpose of a pacific settlement, to the obligations accepted by States signatories of the present Protocol.

If the State so invited, having refused to accept the said conditions and obligations, resorts to war against a signatory State, the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant, as defined by the present Protocol, shall be applicable against it.

*Art. 17 of the Covenant.

In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League, or between States not Members of the League, the States or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16 inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

If a State so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort of war against a Member of the League, the provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

If both parties to the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

ARTICLE 17.

The signatory States undertake to participate in an International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments which shall be convened by the Council and shall meet at Geneva on Monday, June 15th 1925. All other States, whether Members of the League or not, shall be invited to this Conference.

In preparation for the convening of the Conference, the Council shall draw up with due regard to the undertakings contained in Articles 11 and 13 of the present Protocol a general programme for the reduction and limitation of armaments, which shall be laid before the Conference and which shall be communicated to the Governments at the earliest possible date, and at the latest three months before the Conference meets.

If by May 1st, 1925, ratification have not been deposited by at least a majority of the permanent Members of the Council and ten other Members of the League, the Secretary-General of the League shall immediately consult the Council as to whether he shall cancel the invitations or merely adjourn the Conference until a sufficient number of ratifications have been deposited.

ARTICLE 18.

Wherever mention is made in Article 10, or in any other provision of the present Protocol of a decision of the Council, this shall be understood in the sense of Article 15 of the Covenant, namely, that the votes of the representatives of the parties to the dispute shall not be counted when reckoning unanimity or the necessary majority.

ARTICLE 19.

Except as expressly provided by its terms the present Protocol shall not affect in any way the rights and obligations of Members of the League as determined by the Covenant.

ARTICLE 20.

Any dispute as to the interpretation of the present Protocol shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

ARTICLE 21.

The present Protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be ratified.

The deposit of ratification shall be made at the Secretariat of the League of Nations as soon as possible.

States of which the seat of the Government is outside Europe will be entitled merely to inform the Secretariat of the League of Nations that their ratification has been given; in that case they must transmit the instrument of ratification as soon as possible.

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

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

If, within such period after adoption of the plan for the reduction of the armaments as shall be fixed by the said Conference, the plan has not been carried out, the Council shall make a declaration to that effect; this declaration shall render the present Protocol null and void.

The grounds on which the Council may declare that the plan drawn up by the International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments has not been carried out, and that in consequence the present Protocol has been rendered null and void, shall be laid down by the Conference itself.

A signatory State which, after the expiration of the period fixed by the Conference, fails to comply with the plan adopted by the Conference, shall not be admitted to benefit by the provisions of the present Protocol.

In faith whereof the undersigned, duly authorized for this purpose, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at Geneva, on the 2nd day, October, 1924, in a single copy, which will be kept in the archives of the Secretariat of the League and registered by it on the date of its coming into force.

公表第十九號 (十月十三日)

日墨修好通商條約改訂

現行日墨修好通商航海條約ハ明治二十一年十一月帝國ニ於テ尙諸外國カ領事裁判權ヲ保有シタル時代大隈外相ニ依リ始メテ彼我對等ノ基礎ノ下ニ成立セル所ノ本邦條約改正史上記念スヘキ條約ナルモ全文僅ニ十一箇條ヨリ成リ又其ノ締結後既ニ三十有五年ヲ經過シ今日ノ進歩發展セル兩國間通商ノ交通關係ヲ規律スルニ不十分ナルモノアリタル處去ル大正五年中墨國政府ヨリ在同國帝國代表者ニ新條約締結方ヲ提議セルコトアリ右ヲ機會トシ爾來帝國政府ヨリノ提出案ヲ基礎トシ右現行條約改正ニ關スル交渉引續キテ兩國政府間ニ行ハレタルカ最近交渉大ニ進捗シ愈々去ル十月八日改正條約ノ調印ヲ見ルニ至レリ

新條約ハ現在日英通商航海條約ニ範ヲ採リタルモノニシテ入國旅行居住ノ自由ヲ始メトシテ產業生業及通商航海ニ關スル諸般ノ事項ニ付適宜國民待遇又ハ最惠國待遇ヲ確保セルモノナルカ別ニ一箇條ヲ設ケ駐在外交使臣カ當該國國民ノ權利擁護ノ爲駐在國政府ニ申出テ得ヘキ場合及内亂ノ

際ニ於ケル損害賠償ニ對スル最惠國待遇ノ確保等ニ付規定スル所アリタリ
 尙新條約ハ批准交換ノ後十五日ヨリ實施シ五年ノ據置期間經過後ハ一年ノ豫告期間ヲ以テ何時
 ニテモ廢棄シ得ヘク關稅ニ關スル條項ハ他ノ條項ニ影響スルコトナク一年ノ豫告期間ヲ以テ何時
 ニテモ廢棄シ得ルモノトセリ

（以下は極く淡く印刷された日本語の文章が続く）

日清通商手続規則

公報第十九號 (十一月二十日)

and good neighbourhood.

At the same time, hundreds of thousands of Japanese subjects are actually resident, and Japanese investments and enterprises on a vast scale are in evidence, in the region of Manchuria and Mongolia. In particular, Japan's own security depends largely upon the maintenance of law and order in that region. With no intention whatever of interfering in the domestic trouble of China, the Japanese Government desire to call the serious attention of both contending forces to these obvious facts and to state that Japan deems it of capital importance that these rights and interests, so essential to her, be fully respected and safely guarded.

公報第二十一號

(十二月二十七日)

日瑞司法的解決條約ノ調印

日本政府ハ大正十年中瑞西國政府カラ日本國ト瑞西國トノ間ニ將來生スヘキ紛争ヲ平和的ニ處理スル爲條約ヲ締結シタキ旨提議ニ接シタ帝國ハ現ニ國際聯盟ニ加ハツテ國際平和ノ確立ニ力ヲ盡シテ居ルト共ニ米國トノ間ニハ仲裁裁判條約ヲ結ンテ其ノ間ノ國交ニ資シテ居ルヤウナ次第テ右瑞西國ノ提議ニ付テモ其ノ趣旨ニ於テ素ヨリ賛成テアルノテ其ノ提議ニ應スルコトトシ兩國間ニ商議ヲ進メタ結果今回議カ整ヒ本月二十六日帝國外務省テ幣原外務大臣ト瑞西國臨時代理公使「ブルンナー」氏トノ間ニ本條約即チ司法的解決條約ニ調印スルコトニナツタノテアル

右條約ハ五箇條カラ成ツテ居テ其ノ内容ハ凡ソ左ノ通テアル

- 一、兩締約國ノ間ニ生スルコトアルヘキ法律の紛争カ外交上ノ手段又ハ其ノ他一切ノ調停ノ方法ニ依ツテ解決スルコトヲ得ナイ場合ニハ之ヲ司法的解決ニ付スルコト

但シ各締約國ハ其ノ見解ニ依ツテ其ノ國ノ緊切ナ利益、獨立若ハ名譽ニ關シ又ハ第三國ノ利

益ニ關係アルモノト認メタ一切ノ紛争ヲ司法的解決ニ付シナイ自由ヲ保有スルコト

二、本條約ノ規定ニ從ツテ司法的解決ニ付セラレル紛争ハ常設國際司法裁判所ニ提出セラレルモノナルコト

兩締約國ハ特定ノ場合毎ニ紛争ヲ常設國際司法裁判所ノ簡易手續部ニ付スルコトヲ協定シ得ルコト

又締約國ハ紛争ヲ合意ニ依リ構成セラレル仲裁裁判所ニ付スルコトヲ協定シ得ルコト此ノ場合ニ付テハ反對ノ協定ノナイ限り其ノ仲裁手續ニ本條約ノ規定ヲ準用スルコト

三、常設國際司法裁判所ニ訴ヘル各場合ニ於テハ兩締約國ハ必ス先ツ常設國際司法裁判所規程及規則ノ規定ニ從ツテ紛争ノ目的裁判所ニ付與セラレル特別權限及其ノ他兩國間ニ取極メラレル一切ノ條件ヲ明瞭ニ確定スル特別契約ヲ締結スルコト

該特別契約ハ締約國政府間ニ文書ヲ交換シテ之ヲ締結スルコト特別契約ハ其ノ一切ノ點ニ付常設國際司法裁判所ニ依ツテ解釋セラレルコト

四、締約國ハ常設國際司法裁判所ノ判決ヲ善意ヲ執行スヘキコト締約國ハ裁判手續進行中常設國際司法裁判所テ宣告セラレル判決ノ執行ニ對シ有害ナル影響ヲ與ヘル一切ノ措置ヲ出來得

ル限リ避止スルコト

五、本條約ハ批准ヲ要シ批准書ハ成ルヘク速ニ東京ヲ交換スヘキコト本條約ハ批准書交換後五
年間効力ヲ有シ右期間滿了ノ六月前ニ廢棄セラレナイトキハ締約國ノ一方カラ他方ニ對シ廢
棄ノ意思ヲ通告シタ後十二箇月ヲ經過スル其ノ効力ヲ持續スルコト

附 錄

一 第四十八議會ニ於ケル松井外務大臣ノ演說

(一月二十二日)

諸君、第四十八議會開會ニ際シマシテ茲ニ我對外關係ニ付聊カ所見ヲ申述フルノ機會ヲ得マシタコトハ私ノ最モ光榮トスル所テアリマス 輓近世界ノ大勢ハ歐洲大戰後既ニ相當年月ヲ經過致シマシタニモ拘ハラヌ今尙安定ノ域ニ達シマセヌコトハ洵ニ憂慮ニ堪ヘキ次第テアリマシテ帝國ノ立場トシテハ洋ノ東西ヲ問ハス苟モ人類ノ平和ト文明ノ發展トニ對シマシテハ出來得ル限り貢獻致ス考ヘテアリマス先ツ歐洲方面ニ付テ申シマスルト過去五年以來ノ懸案テアリマシタ聯合諸國ト土耳其トノ平和條約カ昨年七月二十四日勞山ニ於テ調印セラレマシタ其ノ結果トシマシテ帝國ハ歐洲諸列強ト同様ノ地位ニ於テ土耳其國ト國交ヲ開キ得ルニ至リマシタカ政府ハ近ク右條約ノ御批准ヲ仰キ關係各國政府ト共ニ速ニ本條約實施ノ運ニ至ラシメムコトヲ希望シテ居ル次第テアリマス尙歐洲ニ於キマシテハ大戰善後ニ關スル諸問題中未タ解決ニ至ラヌモノモアリマシテ大使會議其ノ他ノ國際會議ニ於テ間々議論ヲ生スルコトモアリマシタカ政府ハ常ニ前申述ヘマシタ

本和保持ノ精神ト公正ノ態度トヲ以テ之ニ證ミ歐洲復興ノ一日モ速ナラムコトヲ希望シテ居ル次第アリマス次ニ大正十一年二月華盛頓ニ於テ日、英、米、佛、伊五國ノ間ニ調印シテ海軍備制限條約ハ政府ニ於テ速ニ批准ノ手續ヲ了シ昨年八月十八日ヲ以テ各國ノ批准書寄託ヲ完了致シ茲ニ同條約ノ實施ヲ見ルニ至リマシタノテ政府ニ於テハ其ノ規定並精神ヲ尊重致シ直ニ實行シ得ルモノハ既ニ夫々着手致シテ居ル次第アリマス尙同時ニ成立致シマシタ太平洋方面ニ關スル四國條約モ亦實施ヲ見ルニ至リマシタカ是レ亦全局ノ平和殊ニ太平洋方面ニ於ケル列國協同支持ノ上ニ新ナル一保障ヲ加ヘラレタルモノテアリマス又同條約ノ實施ニ依リ日英同盟協約ハ終了シマシタカ永年光輝アル歴史ノ下ニ繼續セラレマシタ兩國ノ親密ナル關係ハ依然トシテ溢ル所ナク永ク兩國國民ノ精神ニ存スルコトト信シマス次ニ米國トノ關係ニ付キマシテハ同國大統領「ハーディング」氏カ昨年八月旅行中突然長逝セラレマシタコトハ帝國朝野ノ舉テ哀悼ノ意ヲ表スル所テアリマス殊ニ同大統領カ在世中世界平和ノ爲ニ盡瘁セラレマシタ功績ヲ追想致シマシテ一層其ノ感ヲ深クスル次第アリマス併シ日米兩國ノ國交ハ依然トシテ傳統的親善關係ニ在リ洵ニ喜ハシキ次第アリマスルカ只一ツ遺憾ナルコトハ太平洋沿岸ニ於ケル在留日本人待遇問題ノ經過テアリマス元來本問題ハ極メテ複雜微妙ナル關係ヲ有シテ居リマスルカ故ニ政府ニ於テモ之

カ處置ニ付キマシテハ常ニ格段ノ注意ヲ拂ヒ必要ノ措置ヲ講シテ居マス、尙本問題ニ關シマシテハ相互ニ十分ナル理解ト尊敬ノ念トヲ以テ之ヲ處理シ何等妥當ナル解決ノ方法ヲ講スルコトニ最善ノ努力ヲ爲ス覺悟テアリマス、次ニ日露關係ニ付キマシテハ兩國カ地理上經濟上極メテ緊密ナル關係ニ在ル計リテナク兩國間ニハ諸種ノ懸案存スルノ事情アルニ願ミマシテ成ルヘク速ニ善隣ノ關係ヲ樹立セシムルコトハ政府ノ希望スル所テアリマシテ是レ迄屢次交渉ヲ重ネマシタカ未タ其ノ解決ヲ見ルニ至ラサルハ遺憾トスル所テアリマス、要之、政府ハ從來正當ニ保有スル權利及地位ヲ確保致シ彼我經濟關係ノ發展ヲ期待スル次第アリマス、終リニ帝國ト最モ利害ノ密接ナル支那ニ付申述ヘタイト思ヒマス、御承知ノ通同國ノ現情ハ依然安定ヲ缺キ外國人ノ生命財產マテモ屢次脅威ヲ受クル有様テアリマス、斯ル狀態ノ持續セララルコトハ支那ノ爲甚タ不幸ナルコトテアルハ申スマテモナク支那ニ關係アル列國殊ニ接壤ノ友邦タル我國ノ苦痛トスル所テアリマスルカラ政府ハ支那官民一致シテ一日モ速ニ内政ノ改善ヲ圖リ鞏固ナル統一政府ヲ樹立シ國運ノ發展ヲ策セムコトヲ望ム次第アリマス、乍去支那國內ノ和平統一ト國情ノ改善トハ主トシテ支那國民自身ノ覺醒ト努力トニ俟ツヘキモノテアリマシテ外間ヨリ妄ニ干與スヘキ筋合ノモノテハアリマセズ、政府ハ此ノ趣旨ヲ以テ支那ニ蒞ムト共ニ常ニ友好的精神ト公正ナル態度ト

ヲ以テ兩國間ニ完全ナル國民的瞭解ヲ圖リ兩國ノ文化及經濟ノ發展ヲ促進スル覺悟ヲアリマス、政府ハ此ノ方針ニ基キ且華府會議ニ於テ協定セラレタル諸條約及決議ノ精神ヲ十分ニ尊重致シ對支政策上必要ノ措置ヲ爲ス考ヘテアリマス、之カ爲ニハ固ヨリ國際協調ヲ主眼トスヘキコト申スマテモアリマセムカ我國ト支那トハ御承知ノ通由來特殊ノ關係カアリマスルカラ政府ハ常ニ此ノ點ヲ念頭ニ置キ將來對支關係ヲ律スル上ニ於テ萬遺算ナキヤウ努力スル考テアリマス、以上申述ヘマシタル通帝國ノ對外政策ハ都テ正義ト公平トノ精神ヲ基礎ト致シ我國家及國民ノ正當ナル權利利益ノ擁護ト主張トニ努力致スト共ニ克ク列國トノ協調ニ留意致シ國際諸盟約ノ趣旨ヲ擴充致シ益々世界平和ノ爲其ノ力ヲ致メ決心テアリマス

FOREIGN MINISTER'S SPEECH AT THE 48TH SESSION
OF THE IMPERIAL DIET.

Gentleman,

January 22, 1924.

On this occasion of the opening of the 48th Session of the Diet, I feel it a great honour to have an opportunity of expressing my views concerning our foreign relations.

It is a matter for deep concern for us that, despite the lapse of a considerable time

since the end of the War, the general situation of the world is still in a state of unrest. In this state of affairs, it is the intention of our country to make whatever contributions that lie within its power to the promotion of peace among nations and to the development of civilization, whether in the Orient or in the Occident.

With regard to European affairs, the Treaty of Peace between the Allies and Turkey, which had been pending for the preceding five years, was signed at Lausanne on the twenty-fourth of July last year, and as a result it has become possible for Japan, to open, on the same footing as the European Powers, diplomatic relations with Turkey. The Government hope to have the Treaty ratified at an early date, and to take necessary steps, together with the other Governments concerned, for putting it promptly into effect. In Europe there are still some problems arisen out of the War, which are left unsettled, and differences of view have sometimes revealed themselves on that account at the Conference of Ambassadors and other international councils. The Japanese Government, facing as they do such a situation always with the spirit of preserving peace and justice, are imbued with the earnest hope that the rehabilitation of Europe may be achieved with the least possible delay.

With reference to the Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armament, which was signed at Washington in February of 1922 among the five Powers, namely, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, the Government took prompt steps for

its ratification; and, the deposit of the ratifications of the Powers concerned having been completed on the eighteenth of August last year, the Treaty has come into force. The Government, determined to respect its spirit as well as its letter, are already taking practical action in all cases where the provisions of the Treaty admit of immediate execution. The Four-Power Treaty concerning the region of the Pacific, which was concluded at the same time as the Naval Treaty, has also come into operation. It is an additional safeguard to the general peace, as well as an instrument promoting concord and cooperation of the interested Powers in the region of the Pacific. With the coming into force of this Treaty the Anglo-Japanese Alliance came to an end. I am confident, however, that the cordial relations between our two countries, which have continued for many years, constituting a glorious history, will remain unaltered and will always be a source of inspiration for the two peoples for ages to come.

In making reference to our relations with the United States, I have to express the profound grief felt by all classes of our people at the sudden death of President Harding while on a journey in August last; our grief is felt all the more keenly when we recollect the strenuous efforts and noble achievements made by him in the cause of world peace. On the other hand it is a matter of great pleasure to note that our relations with the United States continue to follow the path of traditional friendship. There is, however, one thing regrettable, and that is the course which the treatment of Japa-

nese residents on the Pacific coast has taken. This problem is exceedingly complicated and delicate. The Government, dealing with it, are constantly paying special attention, and all necessary steps are being taken. It is our intention to make our best efforts to the end that the problem may be treated with full understanding and in a spirit of mutual respect, with a view to arriving at a proper solution.

Regarding Russo-Japanese affairs, it is the desire of the Government to establish relations of good neighbourhood between Russia and Japan as soon as possible, inasmuch as our two countries not only stand to each other in a close relationship both from geographical and economical points of view, but that there are various problems pending between them. Accordingly, negotiations have been repeatedly entered into, but I regret that no settlement has yet been reached. In brief, the intention of the Government is to ensure the rights and position which Japan has hitherto rightfully held and to develop the economic relations of both countries.

In conclusion, let me speak about China with whom our interests are very closely related. As you know, gentlemen, the present state of affairs in that country is still so uncertain that even the lives and property of foreigners are frequently menaced. That such a situation should continue is, needless to say, very unfortunate for China, and is, moreover a cause of great pains for the Powers interested in that country, especially for Japan, who is a close neighbour of hers. This Government, therefore,

hope that the Government and people of China will cooperate in full harmony for the development of her own destinies by improving her domestic administration, and establishing a strong unified Government with the least possible delay.

The pacification and unification of China and the improvement of her national conditions depend in the main on the awakening and exertions of the Chinese people themselves, and any interference from the outside should studiously be avoided. Prompted by these considerations in regard to China, this Government intend, always in a spirit of friendship and with an attitude of justice, to promote understanding between the peoples of our two countries, and to facilitate the development of their culture and economic affairs. In accordance with this principle and with full respect for the spirit of the various treaties and resolutions adopted at the Washington Conference, the Government will take whatever measures that are necessary in dealing with China. In taking such a step it need hardly be said that we should make it our guiding principle to abide by the spirit of international concord, but it must be remembered at the same time that there exists special relations between Japan and China. Bearing therefore this fact constantly in mind, the Government will put forth their endeavors to cultivate the best relations with China in future.

As I have said, the diplomatic policy of our country is based throughout on the spirit of justice and fairness. While making efforts to safeguard and assert the le-

gitimate interests of our country and people, and keeping up the harmonious cooperation with other Powers with an eye single to the extension and consolidation of the spirit of the various international compacts, the Government are resolved to put forth ever greater efforts for the promotion of peace throughout the world.

二 米國移民法案ニ關シ米國通信員ニ與ヘタル
清浦内閣總理大臣ノ聲明

(四月十六日)

合衆國議會カ日本人ニ對シ斯ク斷乎タル態度ヲ執リタルハ遺憾ノ次第テアル常ニ正道ヲ持シテ溢ラサリシ我過去ノ歴史ニ鑑ミ斯ノ如キ措置ハ不必要ト思考セラレル吾人ノ要求ハ單ニ體面ヲ保持セントスルニ過キナカツタノテアル此ノ事實ハ假令明白ニ言明シナカツタトシテモ少クモ友情及行爲ノ終始一貫セル記録ハ之ヲ示シテ餘リアルノテアル合衆國カ移民ニ關スル立法權ヲ行使スル權利ハ固ヨリ我々ノ爭ハサル所テアル從ツテ吾人ハ單ニ反省ヲ求ムルニ過キナイノテアルカ若シ之ヲ拒否セララルルニ於テハ洵ニ遺憾ニ堪ヘナイ何トナレハ從來屢々米國民カ我々ニ示シタ妥協的態度ト同シク今回モ何等カ考慮ヲ加ヘラレムコトヲ希望シタカラテアル米國ハ屢々我カ歴史上ノ最大ナル危機ニ際シ精神的及財政的ノ援助ヲ與ヘ且又昨秋ノ大災害ニ際シ與ヘラレタ深厚ナル同情ハ吾人ノ忘ルル能ハサル所テアル

PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT TO NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS
CONCERNING AMERICAN IMMIGRATION BILL.

April 16, 1924.

My regret is, of course, deep that the Congress of the United States has been fit to deal with us Japanese so drastically. It seems to us hardly to have been necessary in view of the fact that our whole history has shown us willing to be reasonable. We were willing to accept only a nominal privilege. If we have not made this clear in a language which is foreign to us, we have at any rate shown it by that long record of action of friendship which may now be impaired but cannot be broken. The right of the United States to arrange its own immigration is not disputed by us. We asked only for a concession. If this is denied us, we shall regret it, because we had hoped for a further act of consideration to be added to the several which your nation has shown us on former occasions. You gave us moral and financial support in the greatest crisis in our history and you gave us impressive sympathy in our greatest disaster. These things we shall not forget.

三 第四十九議會ニ於ケル幣原外務大臣ノ演說

(七月一日)

外交問題ハ往々一國運ノ消長ニ影響スルモノテアリマスカラ個々ノ場合ニ對スル具體的政策ヲ決定スルニ付テハ最モ慎重ナル考慮ヲ要スルコトハ申スマテモアリマセヌ然ルニ現内閣ハ成立以來未タ三週間ヲ出テス斯ノ如キ具體的政策ヲ決定スルノニハ餘リ短時日テアリマス從ツテ本日ハ唯大體ノ方針ノ筋道ノミニ付所見ヲ茲ニ申述ヘテ諸君ノ御了解ヲ得タイト考ヘマス

第一ニ帝國ノ外交ハ我正當ナル權利利益ヲ擁護増進スルト共ニ列國ノ正當ナル權利利益ハ之ヲ尊重シテ極東並太平洋方面ノ平和ヲ確保シ延テハ世界全般ノ平和ヲ維持スルコトヲ根本主義トスルノテアリマス是レハ餘リニ抽象的ニ聞エルカモ知レマセヌカ事實ニ於テ帝國ノ外交上ニ於ケル百般ノ政策及行動ハ之ヲ出發點トスルモノテアリマス我々ハ何等他國ヲ犧牲トシテ非理ナル慾望ヲ滿サムトスルモノテハアリマセヌ又所謂侵略主義領土擴張政策ト言フカ如キ事實不可能ナル迷想ニ依ツテ動かサレルモノテハアリマセヌ之ト同時ニ日本ノ正當ナル權利利益ヲ擁護増進スルノハ政府トシテ當然ノ責務テアリマス此ノ責務ノ遂行ニ關シテ列國ノ正當ナル權利利益ト衝突ヲ見

ルヘキ理由ハ毫モナイト信シマス凡ソ國際間ノ不和ハ一國カ他國ノ當然ナル立場ヲモ無視シ偏狹ナル利己的見地ニ執着スルコトニ依ツテ發生スルモノテアル之ニ反シテ我々ノ主張スル所ハ畢竟列國ノ共存共榮ノ主義テアリマス今ヤ世界ノ人心ハ一般ニ此ノ方向ニ向ツテ覺醒セムトスルノ徵候ヲ示シテ居ル國際聯盟ノ制度ノ如キモ此ノ人心ノ覺醒ニ根柢ヲ有スルコト疑ヲ容レマセヌ列國カ共ニ以上ノ根本義ヲ認ムルニ於テハ百般ノ國際問題ハ自ラ解決ノ基礎ヲ發見スルニ難カラサルコトト考ヘマス

第二ニ申述ヘタイ重要ナル點ハ所謂外交政策ノ繼續性ト云フコトテアリマス外交政策ノ繼續トハ其ノ政策ヲ實行スル手段方法カ一定不變テアルト云フ意味テハアリマセヌ一旦定メテ外交方針ハ之ヲ永久ニ變更シナイト云フ意味テモアリマセヌ外交政策ヲ實行スル手段方法ハ勿論外交方針其ノモノモ四圍ノ環境ニ應ジテ隨時變更スルコトハ何レノ國ニ於テモ屢々見ル所テアリマス併シ乍ラ一國ノ政府カ公然外國ニ與ヘテ約束ハ條約ニ依ルト否トヲ問ハス如何ニ政府又ハ内閣ノ更迭カアリマシテモ此等ノ更迭ニ依ツテ變更シ得ヘキモノテハアリマセヌ之カ外交政策繼續主義ノ要諦ヲアツテ之ニ依ツテ始メテ國家ノ威信モ保タレルモノテアリマス其ノ遵守セラレルト否トハ國際平和ノ依ツテ懸ル所テアル我々ハ自ラ此ノ主義ヲ遵守スルト共ニ列國ニ於テモ亦同様ノ精神ヲ以

我我國ヲ迎フルコトヲ期待スルモノナラバ、其ノ爲メニ、
 目下我國ノ對外關係ニ於テ國民ノ注意ヲ惹キツツアルハ米國新移民法ニ關スル問題露顯「ソダ
 エト」政府トシテ交渉案件ニ關スル問題露顯支那ノ一般時局ニ關スル問題アルト思ハレマス仍テ茲
 ニ此ノ三問題ニ付テ大體ノ所感ヲ述ヘヨウト考ヘマス
 御承知ノ如ク合衆國議會ハ過日新移民法案ヲ可決シ同法案ハ大統領ノ裁可ヲ經テ法律トナリマシ
 タ其ノ由來ヲ尋ネマスルト近年米國ニ於テハ外國移民ニ南部及東部歐羅巴ヨリノ移民激増ノ傾向ヲ
 示スニ至リ合衆國カ此等ノ諸外國分子ヲ渾然融合シテ本來ノ米國民ノ社會組織中ニ統一セシムル
 ニハ事實上困難ヲアルト云フ觀察カ一般ニ行ハルルコトトナリマシタ茲ニ於テ外國移民ノ入國ニ
 對シ從來ヨリモ一層嚴重ナル制限ヲ加フルノ必要ヲ感スルニ至ツタノテアリマス日本勞働者ノ米
 國移住ニ付テハ所謂紳士協約ナル一ノ取極カアツテ日本政府ハ現ニ米國ニ居住スル者ノ一定ノ近
 親及再渡航者ヲ除クノ外一切勞働移民ノ米國行出國ニ對シ禁止的ノ取締ヲ行ヒ來レル爲新ナル日
 本移民ノ増加ハ事實ニ於テ殆ト問題トスルニ足ラナイモノナラマシタ從ツテ今同ノ移民法ハ一
 般移民ノ入國ヲ嚴重ニ制限セムコトヲ目的トセルモノナラマシタ特ニ日本移民排斥ノ意味ヲ含ムヘ
 キ理由カナカクツタノテアリマス然ルニ合衆國議會ニ於テ同法案審議中若干排日論者ノ運動遂ニ其

ノ效力奏シ歸化權ナキ外國人ハ原則トシテ入國ヲ拒絕セラルト云フ趣旨ノ一箇條カ新移民法中ニ
 挿入セラレバコトトナシタハ寔ニ遺憾ナラマシ本問題ノ經過ヲ觀察スルニ三箇ノ注意スヘキ
 要點カアルト思フ

第一ハ日本人排斥論者ト雖近來ハ日本人カ劣等人種ヲアルト云フカ如キ議論ヲ注意シテ避ケテ居
 リマス唯彼等ノ云フ所ハ日本人ト米國人トハ恰モ油ト水トノ關係ヲアル油ト水トハ何レカ優等ト
 モ劣等トモ云フコトハ出來マセヌケレトモ何レノ場合ニ於テモ油ハ溶解シテ水ト一體ニナルコト
 カ出來ヌモノナラバ即チ日本人ハ米國ニ同化セサルモノナラバ同化セサルモノヲ米國ノ社會組織
 中ニ入レルコトハ米國ノ將來ニ禍ヲ爲スモノナラバト云フコトカ日本人排斥論ノ最も重要ナル前
 提ト成ツテ居ルモノト認メテレマス日本人種ノ劣等ヲ理由トシテ排斥條項ヲ可決シタ次第テハア
 リマセヌ尤モ我々日本人不同化性ノ前提カ今日マテ何等確定の事實ニ依ツテ證明セラレタル
 ノ一片ヲ獨斷的見解ナルコトヲ信シ其ノ趣旨ハ既ニ五月三十一日日本政府ノ米國政府ニ送リタル
 公文書中ニモ大體露顯シテアル所ナリマス
 第二ハ各國ノ國家固有主權ノ當然ノ作用トシテ自國版圖内ニ來ルヘキ移民ヲ付制限及取締ノ自
 由ヲ有ストハ原則ハ米國ニ於テハ既定ノ國策トシテ常ニ主張シ來ツタ所ナリマシテ過般排日條

項ノ制定ニ當リマシテモ一ノ重要ナル論據ヲ成シテ居リマス米國カ特ニ此ノ點ニ重キヲ置クノハ
 同國特殊ノ國情ニ基クモノテアツテ我々モ此ノ原則ヲ爭フ次第ヲハアリマセエ併シ乍ラ此ノ原則
 ヲ認メテモ之カ爲排日條項ハ日米條約ノ規定ト何等抵觸スル所カナイト云フ結論ヲ生スルモノテ
 ハアリマセエ

第三ニ今回ノ排日條項ハ米國大統領及國務卿ニ於テモ夙ニ反對意見ヲ示シ之カ削除ノ爲百方苦心
 セラレタノテアリマス又米國ノ輿論モ同國新聞紙ノ多數カ反映スル所ニ依レハ一般ニ我立場ヲ能
 ク了解シテ居ルモノト認メラレマス本件立法カ斯ノ如ク多數ノ有力ナル新聞紙ニ依ツテ一樣ニ批
 難ヲ受ケタルコトハ注目スヘキ現象テアリマス
 要之、我々カ排日條項ニ抗議スルノハ同條項ノ規定スル差別待遇カ正義公平ノ觀念ト兩立セヌ又
 國際禮讓ノ通義ニモ副ハサル所アルモノト確信スルカ爲テアリマス從ツテ今回米國ニ於テ本件立
 法カ既定ノ事實トナツタト云ツテモ到底本問題ハ既ニ終了セルモノトハ認ムルコトカ出來マセヌ
 我々ハ我正當ナル主張カ満足ヲ得ラレサル限り我抗議ヲ維持シ本問題ノ圓滿ナル解決ノ爲又日米
 兩國間ノ親交ヲ永遠ニ確保セムカ爲及テ限リ努力スル覺悟テアリマス
 次ニ露西亞問題ニ付テハ元來日本ハ露國ト地理的ニ接壤ノ關係アリ又經濟上ノ關係ニ付テモ

重要ナル點ニ於テ利害ヲ共ニスル次第ヲアリマスカラ結局兩國ハ親善友好ナル隣國トシテ互ニ接
 近スヘキ運命ヲ有スルモノト信シマス殊ニ露國民カ歐洲大戰ノ初期ニ際シテハ聯合與國共同ノ目
 的ノ爲ニ重大ナル犠牲ヲ供シ其ノ後大戰ノ末頃ニ至リ勃發シタル革命ノ内亂ニ依リ名狀スヘカラ
 サル艱難ニ遭遇シタルコトハ我々ノ露國民ニ對スル同情ヲシテ一層深カラシムル所以テアリマス
 我々ハ露國民カ能ク此ノ艱難ノ試練ニ堪ヘ速ニ平和的發展ヲ遂クルニ至ラムコトヲ衷心ヨリ祈ラ
 サルヲ得マセヌ露國ノ内政問題ニ至ツテハ固ヨリ我々ノ批評シ得ヘキ事柄ヲハアリマセエ併シ乍
 ラ兩國間ニハ現ニ解決ヲ要スル幾多重要案件カアツテ豫メ十分明確ニ此等案件ノ解決ヲ遂ケ置ク
 ニアラスンハ國交開始後ニ至リ更ニ不愉快ナル紛議ヲ惹起スノ虞アルコトハ明瞭テアリマス就テ
 ハ數年來或ハ大連ニ於テ或ハ長春ニ於テ又最後ハ東京ニ於テ兩政府當局者間ニ非公式交渉ヲ試ミ
 マシタカ不幸ニシテ商議成立ヲ見ルニ至ラナカッタノテアリマス最近前内閣時代ニ更ニ北京ニ於
 テ正式交渉ヲ開始シマシタケレトモ未タ種々ノ點ニ於テ意見ノ一致ニ到達セサル際我内閣ノ更迭
 ヲ見ルニ至ツタ次第テアリマス我々ハ固ヨリ既ニ開カレタル交渉ヲ繼續シ慎重ニ考慮ヲ盡シテ百
 方満足ナル結果ヲ得ルコトニ努メル覺悟テアリマス尤モ交渉未決ノ今日ニ於テ今後我等ノ執ラム
 トスル措置ノ具體的方針ヲ明言スルコトヲ得ナイ次第ハ諸君ニ於テモ十分諒察セラルルコトト考

ハマス諸國、其關係は、皆マ開言スルハ、コトヲ得テ、本國ハ諸國ニ對シテ、十分合意ヲ得ルニ至ラズ、對支問題ニ至リテハ、是レ亦我々ノ極メテ重要視スル所ヲアリ、由來日支兩國、政治土經濟土及文化土ニ於テハ、最モ密接ナル關係ヲ有スルコトハ、言フヲ俟タズ、所ヲアリ、マシテ兩國間ニ十分ナル了解ヲ保ツノ必要ナルコトモ、自明ノ理ヲアリ、マス列國、殊ニ日本トシテハ、支那ノ政情、一日モ速ニ安定ヲ告ケムコトヲ希望スルノハ、當然ヲアリ、マスカ遺憾ヲ未タ著シキ結果ヲ見ルニ至リ、マセ、近年支那ノ諸地方ニ於ケル外國人ノ被害事件、頻發シタルカ爲、支那ノ不満足ナル政情ハ、一層痛切ニ外國人ノ注意ヲ惹クニ至ツタヤウヲアリ、マス併シ、乍ラ支那カ百般ノ施政ニ互ツテ改善ヲ斷行スルコトハ、定ニ容易ナラサル事業ヲアツテ、其ノ事情ハ、我々ニ於テモ、深ク諒察シナケレハ、ナリ、マセ、我々ハ同情ト耐忍ト希望トヲ以テ、支那國民ノ努力ヲ觀望シ、偏ニ其ノ成功ヲ斷ルノミナラス、支那ノ我レニ求ムルコトアルヘキ友好的協力ハ、我レニ於テ及フ限り之ヲ提供スルヲ併セサル考ヘテ、アリ、マス支那ノ内政上ノ事情ニ付テハ、我々ノ干與スヘキ限テハ、アリ、マセ、又我々ハ、支那ノ合理的ナル立場ヲ無視スルカ如キ何等ノ行動ヲ執ラムトスルモノヲハ、アリ、マセ、之ト同時ニ、支那ニ於テモ、我々合理的ナル立場ヲ無視スルカ如キ何等ノ行動ヲ執ラサルコトヲ信シ、マス、我々ハ、固ヨリ支那ニ於テ機會均等主義ノ下ニ、日支兩國國民ノ經濟的接近ヲ圖ラムトスルモノヲアリ、マ

テ之カ爲ニハ、日本ヲ利スルノミナラス、又支那ヲモ等シク利スル方法ヲ以テ目的ノ遂行ヲ期スルモノヲアリ、マセ、我々ノ公明正大ナル政策ハ、支那國民ニ於テモ、必ス之ヲ認ムルニ至ルコトト信シ、マス、先般ノ華盛頓會議ニ於テ、支那ニ關スル諸條約カ、調印セラレマシタノハ、夙ニ御承知ノ通テ、アリ、マス、同條約ハ、調印國中批准未了ノモノアルカ爲ニ、未タ效力ヲ發生スルニ至リ、マセ、ケレトモ、其ノ規定スル政策ハ、我々ノ執ラムトスル政策ト、全然一致スルモノヲアリ、マス、カラ政府ハ、同條約ノ精神ニ依ツテ、終始セムトスル次第ヲアリ、マス、對米、對露、對支問題ニ對スル大體ノ意見ハ、以上述ヘタル通テ、アリ、マス、カ申スマテ、モナク、政府ハ、單ニ此ノ當面ノ問題ノミニ注意ヲ集中スル譯テハ、アリ、マセ、米、露、支三國ノミナラス、極東及太平洋方面ニ於テ、重要ナル領土上又ハ、經濟上ノ利益ヲ有スル諸國トモ、絶エス、友好的關係ヲ維持増進シ、全局ノ國際平和ニ貢獻セ、ムカ爲、誠心誠意努力スル決心ヲアリ、マス、私ハ、此ノ際、外交ノ衝ニ當ル責任ノ極メテ重大ナルコトヲ自覺シ、幸ニ諸君ノ御了解ヲ得テ、此ノ任務ヲ遂行セムコトヲ期スル次第ヲアリ、マス

FOREIGN MINISTER'S SPEECH AT THE 49TH SESSION
OF THE IMPERIAL DIET.

July 1st 1924.

Gentlemen,

The fortunes of a nation are in many cases affected by its foreign relations, and it will readily be seen that the definition of a precise policy for each particular problem calls for a most careful consideration. Only three weeks have elapsed since the formation of the present ministry, and the time placed at our disposal has been too short to work out such a policy. I shall, therefore, confine myself to-day to the exposition of the general outlines of the course which we propose to pursue.

In the first place, I wish to observe that the guiding principle of our foreign policy is to safeguard and to promote our legitimate rights and interests, with due respect to those of other nations, and to maintain the peace of the Far East and the Pacific, as well as the general security of the world. Academic as this principle may appear, it actually lies at the root of every line of thought and action which we are following in the field of diplomacy. We have no sordid end to serve at the expense of other nations. We are not influenced by any aggressive tendency or territorial greed, or by any similar policy which is impossible of fulfilment. At the same time, it is the manifest duty of

the Government to safeguard and to promote our legitimate rights and interests. There is no cause for apprehension that our discharge of this duty might bring us into conflict with the legitimate rights and interests of others. International discord is engendered when one nation holds to its own narrow vision of selfishness in disregard of the positions to which other nations are duly entitled. On the contrary, it is the principle of "live and let live" for which we stand. The world is now, it appears, gradually awakening to a consciousness of that truth. To this popular tendency, the League of Nations undoubtedly owes its inception. I feel certain that if all nations will simply abide by the same fundamental principle, they ought not to find much difficulty in arriving at a basis for solving any international question with which they may be confronted.

The second point of importance to which I wish to invite your attention is the principle of continuity of foreign policy. This does not mean that methods to be adopted in prosecution of a settled policy should always remain unchanged, nor does it mean that a policy once determined should be allowed to prevail for all time. It often happens in any country that, not only the methods for attaining defined objects but also the objects themselves are liable to modification according to an altered situation. But all official commitments given by one Government to another, whether by treaty or otherwise, should on no account be affected by any change of Government or

Cabinet. Therein lies the significance of the diplomatic axiom to which I have referred. By its faithful observance alone can national honour be maintained. Upon it depends the peace of the world. That principle we shall firmly uphold and we trust that our adhesion to it will be reciprocated by other nations in their dealings with us.

At the present moment, the attention of the nation in regard to our foreign relations is being centered on the questions relating to the new Immigration Act of the United States, to our negotiations with the Soviet Government and to the general situation in China. I shall now proceed to express my general views on these three questions.

As you are aware, a new Immigration Act recently passed the United States Congress, and, having been approved by the President, it has been finally written into the statute-books of the country. As to the genesis of this Act, you will recall that of late years in the United States immigration from foreign countries, especially from Southern and Eastern Europe, has been showing a marked increase. It has come to be generally believed that it will be a matter of practical difficulty to merge these foreign elements in the homogeneous community of original Americans. It has accordingly been felt necessary to impose a more rigorous restriction upon foreign immigration. As for the emigration of Japanese laborers to the United States, an arrangement popularly called the Gentlemen's Agreement, has long been in force.

Under that arrangement the Japanese Government have been exercising a prohibitory control over the departure to the United States of all classes of laborers except certain relatives of those living in the United States and persons who are returning to that country after a temporary visit to Japan. Consequently, the increase of new Japanese immigrants in the United States has not been, in fact, of any appreciable number. It is believed that the new Immigration Act was originally intended to institute a rigorous restriction of immigration in general, and that there was no reason for embodying in the Act a provision designed specifically to exclude Japanese immigrants. It is sincerely to be regretted that, while the Bill was under discussion in Congress, certain leaders of anti-Japanese persuasions should have succeeded in putting through a clause to the effect that aliens ineligible to citizenship should, as a rule, be denied admission into the United States.

In reviewing the development of this question, there are three points which engage our attention.

First, no intimation has lately been made, even by the exclusionists, of any inferiority of the Japanese race. Their contention is in effect that the Japanese are to the Americans what oil is to water. Neither oil nor water can be said to be superior or inferior to the other, but the fact is that in no case can oil dissolve and merge in water. In other words, they say, Japanese are unassimilable to American

life, and the introduction of such alien elements will prove a source of danger to the United States. Such an argument formed one of the essential pleas for the exclusion of Japanese; it was not on the ground of the inferiority of the Japanese race that the exclusion clause was adopted. It should, however, be pointed out that the pleas of Japanese unassimilability is no more than an arbitrary presumption unsupported by any evidence of facts. Our views on this point have been already roughly set forth in the Note of May 31st last addressed by the Japanese Government to the Government of the United States.

Secondly, it has always been consistently maintained by the United States, that the liberty to limit and control immigration is one of the essential attributes of the inherent sovereign right of each nation. The same argument was repeatedly invoked with special emphasis in the discussion of the exclusion clause. We understand that the importance placed on this point by the United States is due to the special conditions of that country. But we have no intention of calling this doctrine in question. The recognition, however, of such principle does not lead to any conclusion that the exclusion clause is in no respect repugnant to the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Japan and the United States.

Thirdly, it should be appreciated that the President and the Secretary of State of the United States have from the outset shown their opposition to the exclusion clause,

and have made all possible efforts to have it eliminated from the Act. Public opinion in the United States, as reflected by a great section of the American press, also appears to be sympathetically disposed to Japan's position in the matter. It is a significant fact that the legislation in question has met with uniform disapproval by many influential newspapers of the United States.

Our protest against the exclusion clause is based upon the conviction that a discriminatory treatment, as laid down in that clause, is contrary to the dictates of justice and fairness, and is imposed upon us in disregard of the ordinary rules of international comity. The legislation is now an accomplished fact in the United States, but we can by no means concede that the question is closed. Until our just contentions shall have been given satisfaction, we shall maintain our protest, and shall use our best possible endeavours to seek an amicable adjustment of the question and to ensure forever the traditional friendship between the two nations.

Turning to the Russian problem, it should be noted that Japan and Russia, being geographically contiguous, and having important economic interests much in common, are destined to come into close relationship with each other as good and friendly neighbours. Our sympathy with Russians is all the more intensified by the vast sacrifice which they offered at the initial stages of the European war for the common cause of the Allies, as well as by the indescribable difficulties which they suffered in the internal

struggle towards the closing days of the war. We earnestly trust that the Russian people will emerge successfully from this trying ordeal and speedily achieve their peaceful development. The domestic questions of Russia are admittedly matters on which we are not at liberty to express any opinion. There are, however, various important questions awaiting settlement between the two countries, and, unless these questions are fully and definitely settled beforehand, unpleasant disputes are likely to follow the re-establishment of diplomatic relations. During the past several years unofficial conversations between the representatives of the two Governments have taken place at Dairen, at Changchun and at Tokio, unfortunately without success. More recently, in the days of the last Cabinet, official negotiations were opened at Peking, but, in the course of the conference when no agreement of views had yet been reached on various points, our Ministry changed. We are determined to continue the negotiations already opened and, upon careful examination of the question, to make every possible effort to arrive at a satisfactory settlement. Considering that the negotiations are still pending, you will understand that we are not yet in a position to make any definite statement on the course that we are hereafter to take on the subject.

Lastly, the question of China is evidently one to which we attach particular importance. Japan is closely linked with China by political, economic and cultural ties, and a little reflection will make it clear that relations of the fullest understanding should

be maintained between the two countries. It is but natural that all the Powers, and this country in particular, should desire to see an early stabilization of political conditions in China, and it is much to be regretted that no appreciable achievement has yet been made in this direction. Recent incidents in which the persons and property of foreigners have been attacked in various parts of China seem to have aroused the attention of the Powers with increasing concern to the unsatisfactory conditions in that country. It should, however, be fully appreciated that it is a tremendous undertaking for China to carry out the work of reform in all branches of administration to suit modern requirements. We shall watch these efforts of the Chinese people with sympathy, tolerance and hope, and we pray that they may be crowned with success. We shall further be willing to render, in so far as lies in our power, any cooperation that China may require of us. We have no intention whatever of interfering in questions of her internal politics. Nor shall we take any action disregarding of the position which she justly enjoys. At the same time, we trust that China on her part will take no action compromising our rightful position.

It is our intention to promote the economic rapprochement between the Chinese and Japanese peoples, subject always to the principle of equal opportunity in China. We shall strive to achieve this end in a manner which will benefit China herself, as well as Japan, and I have no doubt that the Chinese people will come to realize our policy.

of fair and square dealing. You are well aware that various treaties relating to China were signed at the Washington Conference. They have not yet come into force, as they remain unratified by some of the Signatory Powers. But the principles which they stipulate are in complete accord with our own, and we are resolved to abide by the spirit of those treaties.

In now submitting for your consideration some outlines of our views on questions relating to the United States, Russia and China, I need hardly add that we shall not confine our attention to these questions. Our sincere and earnest efforts will be directed to maintain and to strengthen friendly relations not only with those three countries, but with all the nations having important territorial or economic interests in the Far East and the Pacific, and, generally, to do our whole part in securing to the world the blessings of peace and stability. I am fully sensible of my heavy responsibilities in assuming direction of our foreign affairs, and I reply upon your generous support in the discharge of my mission.

四 米國移民法改正ノ結果ニ關スル佐分利通商局長談

(十二月二十六日)

從來銀行又ハ會社カラ米國ニ於ケル支店勤務ノ爲社員ヲ派遣スル場合ハ契約勞働法ノ關係上豫メ勞働省ノ許可ヲ得ル等入米ノ手續ニ付テ非常ノ面倒カアツタカ本年七月一日カラ實施セラレタ新移民法ノ規定ニ依リ今日テハ此等ノ者ノ入米カ容易トナツテ居ルノテアル

米國新移民法ノ條項ハ第三條ノ第六項ニ「現行通商航海條約ノ規定ニ準據シ單ニ商業ヲ營ム目的ヲ以テ合衆國ニ入國シ得ル外國人」ハ非移民トシテ入國シ得ルコトヲ規定シ米國政府ハ條約上ノ商業トハ日米兩國間ノ通商ヲ指スモノテ日本ニ本店カアル商會社ノ米國支店詰員及日本生産品ノ販賣又ハ之カ補充ノ爲ニ渡米スル者等ハ皆移民法上ノ現行通商航海條約ノ規定ニ準據シテ商業ヲ營ム目的ヲ以テ入米スル者テアルト認メ入國ヲ許可スル方針テアルトコトテアカラ個人ノ場合所謂日米間ノ國際貿易ニ從事スル者ナラハ資本ノ大小ハ必スシモ直接ノ論點テナイノテアル又米國航路ヲ有スル日本汽船會社ノ支店員及日本ニ本店ヲ有スル銀行ノ支店員等モ同様商業ヲ營ム者トシテ渡米期間ニ制限ナク入米ヲ許可セラレルコトトナツタ次ニ夫カ國際商業ニ從事スル者ト

シテ入米ヲ許可セラレタ場合其ノ妻子ノ入國ハ如何ニナルカト云フコトハ新移民法上テコトクニ
 カルノ問題トシテハ妻子ハ一時的の用務又ハ觀光トシテ一時入國スルヨリ外ニ方法ハナイヤウテ
 アル而シテ一時入國者ノ滯米期間ハ一箇年以内ノ範圍ニ於テ移民官ノ裁量ニ依リ滯留期間ヲ定メ
 ラレ若シ該期間カ一箇年以上トナルト特ニ移民官ヨリ勞働省ノ決定ヲ求ムル必要カアルノテ相當
 ノ不便カアル次第テアルカ實際上ニ於テハ米國政府當局ハ此等妻子ニ對シテハ特別考慮ヲ加ヘ夫
 カ滯米資格ヲ維持スル期間ハ其ノ妻子モ滯米スルコトノ出來ルヤウ便宜ノ取計ヲスルトメコトヲ
 アル

日本新聞社ノ特派員ハ海外商業ノ範圍ニ屬スルモノト認メ善意ノ者ナラハ國際商業ニ從事スル者
 トシテ入國ヲ許可セラレルコトトナツテ居ル

斯ノ如ク新移民法實施後銀行會社員等ハ從來ノヤウナ面倒ナ問題ヲ惹起セス自由ニ渡航シ得ルコ
 トトナツタノテアツテ世間テハ新移民法上從來ヨリ却テ寛大トナツタ此等ノ取扱手續ノアルコト
 ヲ知ラナイヤウテアルカラ念ノ爲注意スル次第テアル

學生ハ米國當局ノ指定シタ諸學校ノ入學證明書ヲ得タ上米國領事ヨリ移民査證ノ發給ヲ受ケルコ
 トトナツテ居ルカ此ノ學生ノ入國手續ニ付テモ現在ノ取扱ニ甚シイ不便ナ點カアルコトカ明トナ

ラハ米國側テハ渡米學生ノ爲取扱振ヲ變更スルニ吝ナルヤウナコトハナイト信スル理由カアル

7C-63

Handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.

Small handwritten mark or characters at the bottom right of the page.







