the minimum provisions of existing colonial legislation and on previous international conventions.”

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) said that he had no objection to this change.

The section was adopted, with the amendment proposed by M. Gohr.

Article 2. — Abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade.

A discussion took place on the following paragraph of the draft report:

“A slight change has been made in the drafting of sub-paragraph (b) of this article, the words ‘notably in the case of domestic slavery and similar conditions’ being now omitted. This modification was made because it was believed that such conditions came within the definition of slavery contained in the first article and that no further prohibition of them in express terms was necessary. This applies not only to domestic slavery but to all those conditions mentioned by the Temporary Slavery Commission and to which I referred last year, i.e., ‘debt slavery’, the enslaving of persons disguised as the adoption of children and the acquisition of girls by purchase disguised as payment of dowry, etc.”

M. Gohr, Chairman of the Temporary Slavery Commission, questioned the correctness of the words “it was believed that such conditions came within the definition of slavery contained in the first article”. If these words were retained, he would like to add the following words as a corrective at the end of the paragraph:

“Even if, as is possible, these last practices do not come under the definition of slavery as it is given in Article 1, the Commission is unanimously of the opinion that they must be combated. In a more general way, it interprets Article 2 as tending to bring about the disappearance, from written legislation or from the customs of the country, everything which admits the maintenance by a private individual of rights over another person of the same nature as the rights which an individual can have over things.”

After an exchange of views, the addition proposed by M. Gohr was adopted.

M. Ooms (Liberia), with regard to the reference to “the acquisition of girls by purchase disguised as payment of dowry”, said that there existed between Liberia and the British Government an Agreement, ratified in 1921, whereby, on the boundary between Sierra Leone and Liberia, it had been stipulated that any dowry should not exceed £5 sterling.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) thought that the observations of the Liberian delegate fitted in very closely with the words of the report.

The Chairman said that the Committee would note with satisfaction the statement made by M. Ooms.

This section of the report was adopted, as amended.

Article 3 — Slave Trade by Sea.

This section of the draft report read as follows:

“The British Government again supported a suggestion contained in the report of the Temporary Slavery Commission that the transport of slaves by sea be treated in the Convention as piracy. The Sixth Committee took the same attitude toward the question from a moral point of view, but many members of the Committee thought that serious difficulties arose as regards the application in law of this proposal. No attempt has therefore been made to incorporate a clause to this effect in Article 3.

“The French Government proposes that instead the provisions of the Arms Traffic Convention dealing with maritime rights should be inserted in the Convention, with the necessary adaptations to make them applicable to slaves. Other delegations felt, however, that to make so considerable a change in the Convention would not be in consonance with their instructions. The Committee therefore decided to confine itself to the article in the draft which, though it accepts the principle of the Arms Traffic Convention in this respect, gives greater elasticity as to the ‘final arrangements to be made’.”

Count Bonin-Longare (Italy) congratulated Viscount Cecil on the excellent way in which he had summarised the views expressed in the Sub-Committee, but he noticed one omission. There was no reference to the amendment adopted in the Sub-Committee with regard to special agreements. He would like some words added recognising the importance of such treaties and conveying something to the effect that the Committee desired to leave the door open to special treaties, it being understood, of course, that these would be within the meaning of the Convention.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) agreed that a few words to this effect might be added.

With regard to the compliment which M. Bonin-Longare had paid him, he must disclaim it so far as he himself was concerned. If the draft had any merit, the main credit must be assigned to the Secretariat.
After an exchange of views, the following revised draft was adopted:

"In particular, attention may be drawn to the third paragraph of Article 3, which provides for the conclusion of special agreements between the signatory Powers. These agreements will enable the parties concerned to make arrangements of greater stringency and stipulations better suited to local conditions than are possible in a general international Convention."

Prince Arfa (Persia), with regard to the last paragraph in the report on Article 3, pointed out that, as Persia had not accepted the principle of the Arms Traffic Convention, it would be desirable to omit the reference to that Convention, or, alternatively, to have an addition at the end of the paragraph:

"... In particular as regards the supervision of native ships — an expression which cannot be applied to vessels belonging to the signatory States."

Count Bonin-Longare (Italy) thought that the Persian amendment was going too far. On the previous day, a paragraph had been added to satisfy the objections of the Persian delegation, which showed that all vessels were on the same footing. He hoped the Persian delegate would be content with this; otherwise there would be a contradiction between the text of the Convention and the text of the report.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) said that he understood that his Persian colleague desired that there should be no inequality between the signatory States. He suggested the following words:

"The Committee therefore decided to confine itself to the article in the draft which, though it accepts the principle of the Arms Traffic Convention, provides for the absolute equality of signatory States and gives greater elasticity as to the final arrangements to be made."

Prince Arfa (Persia) said that he found himself in a difficult position, as he had binding instructions from his Government on this point. Persia had always refused to recognise the Arms Traffic Convention. He asked the Committee therefore not to insert words stating that the signatories accepted the principles of that Convention. If he could not be given satisfaction on this point, he requested that the reservation made by him should be expressly mentioned in the report.

Sir William Vincent (India) said that he only accepted the paragraph in the report on the understanding that it was subject to the reservation he made at the previous meeting.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) said that he could see the difficulty his Persian colleague was in and therefore he suggested the following:

"Other delegations felt, however, that to make so considerable a change in the Convention would not be in consonance with their instructions. The Committee therefore decided to confine itself to the article in the draft, which, though it recognises that some of the provisions of the Convention concerning the International Trade in Arms should form the basis of the proposed new agreement, provides for the absolute equality of the signatory States and gives elasticity as to the final arrangements to be made."

Prince Arfa (Persia) asked whether the English amendment used the word "provisions" and not "principles".

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) said that that was what he had suggested.

M. Aubert (France) wished to retain the words as they were and to add at the end of the paragraph the words contained in Article 3 of the Convention:

"It is understood that this general Convention will not place the ships (even of small tonnage) of any High Contracting Parties in a position different from that of the other High Contracting Parties."

The Chairman said he thought it would be dangerous to try and interpret the text in the report. He proposed that the Committee should merely say that it adopted the compromise form of text for Article 3 instead of giving the reasons why they adopted it.

Prince Arfa (Persia) said he was prepared to accept Viscount Cecil’s text with the word “stipulation” inserted in the French text instead of the word “principle”.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) hoped that, if time were given to his French colleague to reflect, he would not have any objection to the text he proposed; it merely stated quite plainly what had been said in the article. As it met the wishes of the Persian delegate, he suggested they should leave it.

After an exchange of views, the following text was adopted:

"The Committee therefore decided to confine itself to the article in the draft which refers to certain provisions of the Arms Traffic Convention, gives greater elasticity as to the final arrangements to be made and provides for the absolute equality of the signatory States."

This section of the report was adopted, as amended.
Article 4 — Mutual Assistance.

The first paragraph of this article of the draft report was as follows:

"No change has been made in this article; but the various suggestions as to its application made on behalf of the Committee last year may be recalled. It was then pointed out that mutual assistance might be given in particular by arrangements for the right of pursuit across inland frontiers, a point treated in the report of the Temporary Slavery Commission. It is to be hoped that such arrangements for the right of pursuit across inland frontiers will be concluded by the States concerned; particularly those situated in Africa, Arabia or Asia, or those having possessions in these parts of the world."

M. Aubert (France) said that he had not before him the text of last year's report and could not agree to the insertion of the words in the last sentence: "it is to be hoped that such arrangements for the right of pursuit across inland frontiers will be concluded by the States concerned." In view of the fact that no decision had been taken on this point, he did not see how the Committee could make such a recommendation.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) said that a similar wording was accepted by the French delegation last year. This was a matter which was raised in the Temporary Slavery Commission's report, and it had been decided that it could not be put in the Convention because it was too elaborate, but they hoped that some such provision would be made by special agreement. The only difference between the two forms was that last year he had said: "I sincerely trust that such arrangements"; and so on, whilst the words now used were: "It is to be hoped that such arrangements". He had no objection to use the first form of words to meet the wish of M. Aubert.

This section of the report was adopted, as amended.

Article 5 — Forced or Compulsory Labour.

This section of the draft report was as follows:

"In drafting this article, the Committee confronted perhaps the most difficult of the problems before it. After much consideration, the present drafting was finally agreed. It represents a definite attempt to deal with the question of forced labour in a general international agreement. This alone marks progress of considerable importance.

"The Committee was very anxious to put into the Convention all the provisions necessary to prevent forced labour giving rise to conditions analogous to slavery. With this object in view, it has agreed that forced labour should only be resorted to for public purposes apart from purely transitory arrangements designed to make the progressive abolition of forced labour for private purposes both just and practicable. In this connection, it will be observed that stringent conditions are imposed on forced labour for private purposes even during the transitory period. Among these conditions is the requirement that adequate remuneration should be paid to those subjected to forced labour. In the case of forced labour for public purposes, this condition is not repeated. This omission has been made because there are cases where forced labour for public purposes is not remunerated in the ordinary sense of that word. For instance, in certain countries labour for public purposes is accepted instead of taxes. It must be remembered that there are also exceptional cases in which it could scarcely be said that compulsory labour for public purposes is, strictly speaking, remunerated. But though the requirement that adequate remuneration should be paid for forced labour for public purposes is not included in the Convention, the Committee is strongly of opinion that such remuneration should as a general rule be paid. It is also of opinion that forced labour oven for public purposes should not, as a general rule, be resorted to unless voluntary labour is unobtainable. It therefore suggests that the Assembly should pass a resolution to this effect, which I shall subsequently propose and which is based on a proposal by the German delegation.

"The Belgian delegation had submitted an amendment to the effect that forced labour might also be exacted in the interests of education and social welfare, provided that it was only imposed upon the natives in those two cases on their own lands and for their own direct profit. In the mind of the authors of the amendment, this provision had no other purpose than to give to the colonial governments the means of protecting the natives against their want of foresight, and to assist them in rising to a more advanced state of civilisation. The Committee, while recognising the disinterested and humanitarian motives for this suggestion, was not able to accept it. It feared that in its application this proposal might lead to grave abuses of exactly the type which the Convention itself was designed to prevent or suppress."
“In principle, the Committee was most decidedly opposed to the use of forced labour for other than public purposes, but at the same time it recognised that, owing to special conditions in certain colonies, it might be necessary to call upon the population for this kind of labour in exceptional cases. The draft Convention, however, subordinates such recourse to certain conditions that are considered essential in order to guard against the abuses to which this form of labour may give rise. In the first place, it can only be authorised in exceptional cases when there is imperious necessity: secondly, it shall always be adequately remunerated; finally, in no case must it involve the removal of the labourers from their usual place of residence. If these conditions are strictly observed, the evils of forced labour for private enterprises will be enormously diminished.

“It was also suggested that a clause be added to this article providing for the infliction of due punishment on anyone who exacted or who sought to exact forced labour from natives illegally. The Committee entirely agreed with the intention of the authors of this proposal, but considered that such an addition to Article 5 was unnecessary, as, in its opinion, such punishment would be provided for as the result of stipulations in Article 6.”

M. Goehr, Chairman of the Temporary Slavery Commission, thought that the paragraph commencing “In principle, the Committee was most decidedly”, down to the words “in exceptional cases”, did not quite show the bearing of Article 5 of the Convention. While the draft Convention in principle excluded the use of forced labour for private purposes in all colonies and in all cases, the draft report seemed to say that in any colony forced labour might be used in exceptional cases.

Viscount Cecil of Cheledwood (British Empire) said he was conscious that there was a little difficulty about this wording, which was a reproduction of last year’s report, but if M. Goehr would look at the previous paragraphs he would find that the transitory aspect of these provisions was very clearly indicated. Subject to what other members of the Committee might think, he would be content to leave out altogether the paragraph referred to by M. Goehr, the comment on this part of the Convention to be confined to the previous paragraphs.

M. Louwers (Belgium) thought that in last year’s report some words were inserted to meet the very objection that M. Goehr had just raised.

M. Goehr, Chairman of the Temporary Slavery Commission, said that, if he remembered rightly, the Assembly modified the report at the last moment last year in order to show that private forced labour was not allowed in principle but would be tolerated in some colonies where it existed, provided that progressive measures were taken to abolish it, and subject to certain strict regulations.

Viscount Cecil of Cheledwood (British Empire) said that that was almost what was stated in the report—rather shortly perhaps, but he did not think it could be stated more clearly. As he did not think there was any necessity for a detailed reference to the provisions of the Convention, he thought they would meet M. Goehr’s objection if they struck out the remarks in the second part, which were perhaps not quite accurate, and left the rather summary but sufficient reference contained in the first part.

Count Bonin-Longare (Italy) said that, after reading the whole passage through, he was prepared to accept Viscount Cecil’s proposal to omit the paragraph beginning “In principle”, which was really a repetition.

M. Louwers (Belgium) said that, even with the omission of the paragraph, what remained aneared to convey the impression that forced labour for private purposes was allowed, although it was considered as a transitory measure, whereas the Convention stated the contrary, with the one exception that, in the territories where it already existed according to legislation and custom, it might continue but was to be progressively abolished. The report ought therefore to bring that point out clearly.

Viscount Cecil of Cheledwood (British Empire) thought it would be impossible to state in plainer language exactly what M. Louwers had put forward. The report said:

“With this object in view, it has agreed that forced labour should only be resorted to for public purposes apart from purely transitory arrangements designed to make the progressive abolition of forced labour for private purposes both just and practicable.”

The words of the Convention were:

“In territories in which compulsory or forced labour for other than public purposes still survives, the High Contracting Parties shall endeavour progressively and as soon as possible to put an end to the practice. So long as such forced or compulsory labour exists, this labour shall invariably be ”, etc. [the conditions being stated].
The report went on:

"In this connection, it will be observed that stringent conditions are imposed on forced labour for private purposes, even during the transitory period."

M. LOUWERS (Belgium) moved an amendment to substitute for the words "apart from purely transitory arrangements", the words "apart from the cases provided for in the second paragraph of Article 5".

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) begged his Belgian colleague not to insist upon his amendment, which he could not possibly accept. It was important to mark in the report itself that it was a transitory provision. That was the effect of a very long discussion in the Committee.

M. LOUWERS (Belgium) said he was anxious that they should emphasise the absolute character of the prohibition in the Convention and should not appear to enlarge its terms.

M. Louwers' amendment was negatived and the suppression proposed by Viscount Cecil accepted.

Count VAN LYNDEN (Netherlands) moved the addition, after the words "unless voluntary labour is unobtainable", of the phrase "although exceptions may also be necessary to this rule." He had already made the suggestion at the previous meeting.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) thought the words "as a general rule" would meet the point. It seemed a mistake to go further and say specifically that forced labour might be resorted to even if voluntary labour were obtainable.

Count VAN LYNDEN (Netherlands) said that cases might occur in which, even if voluntary labour were obtainable, exceptions must be made to the rule of not using forced labour if the development of the territory was not to be hampered. As they had specifically provided for exceptions to the rule of adequate remuneration, it seemed that, for the sake of consistency, they ought to say that exceptions might be allowed as regards the use of forced labour.

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) said he did not attach any importance to the words if the Committee desired to see them inserted. If the words proposed were added, they would have the appearance of weakening the words "as a general rule", which phrase implied that there were exceptions. He would prefer to leave the sentence as it stood.

Count VAN LYNDEN (Netherlands) said he was prepared to withdraw his amendment and he took note of what Viscount Cecil had said to the effect that exceptions would be possible to the rule in question.

The section dealing with Article 5 was adopted, subject to various drafting amendments.

The sections dealing with Articles 6 and 7 were adopted without debate.

**Article 8. — Jurisdiction of the Permanent Court.**

This section of the draft report read as follows:

"This article is substantially identical with articles of the same nature which have been inserted in several international conventions negotiated during recent years under the auspices of the League of Nations."

General FREIRE D'ANDRADE (Portugal) proposed to add at the end:

"It does not impose any fresh obligations on Members of the League of Nations which have signed the Protocol of the International Court of Justice."

Viscount CECIL OF CHELWOOD (British Empire) said he would be willing to accept the amendment in the following form:

"...And it imposes no new obligations on the Members of the League of Nations which have signed the Facultative Protocol of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice."

The chapter on Article 8 was adopted, with this amendment.

**Article 9. — Partial Accessions.**

This section of the draft report reads as follows:

"This article has been inserted primarily for formal reasons in most of the recent international Conventions. The Committee was of the opinion that there would probably be little occasion for the interested States to use it in the case of the present Convention. On the other hand, to avoid possible difficulties, it was considered advisable to follow a practice which has now become usual."

Sir William VINCENT (India) thought that the report should inform the Assembly that particular States had made certain reservations with regard to the Convention, and he suggested that, at the end of the paragraph, the following words should be added:

"... and certain States have made reservations in respect of particular articles and territories."
General Freire d'Andrade (Portugal) withdrew the reservation which he had made on the previous day, the chapter of the report dealing with Article 8 having been amended in accordance with his wishes.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire) understood the object of the Indian delegate's suggestion but thought it would be difficult to put it in the paragraph. He still cherished the hope that some at any rate of the Indian reservations would not be made at the time of signature. It would hardly be proper, as a matter of drafting, to state that opportunity had been taken of this provision which could only be taken at the time of signature. But he suggested that it would be better, perhaps, to say: "This article has been inserted primarily for formal reasons in most of the recent international Conventions", and to leave out the sentence about its not being likely that many people would use it, which, he agreed, made it a little difficult for his Indian colleagues.

Sir William Vincent (India) explained that his idea was that the Assembly should not be misled or that the Committee should not be accused of concealing facts which ought to be brought to the notice of the Assembly. He was not so sure that India would be able to withdraw the reservations she had made, though it was possible that there might be changes in them. In any case, he was prepared to accept Viscount Cecil's suggestion that this was neither the place nor the time to make the amendment.

The Committee agreed to the suppression suggested by Viscount Cecil. This section of the report was adopted, as amended.


The Dedjazmatch Guetatcheou (Abyssinia) desired to make a declaration on behalf of his Government with regard to Article 4. He would like it to be understood that the very interesting indications in the report with regard to the different articles, and particularly with regard to the right of pursuit across frontiers, referred to in Article 4 — and which the Abyssinian Government was unable to accept — were regarded only as suggestions intended to enlighten the Governments but not to commit them in the same manner as the text of the Convention itself.

The Chairman said that the Committee would take note of this declaration of the Abyssinian delegation.


The Chairman said that, as delegate for Belgium, he had full power to sign the Convention and was prepared to append his signature at once. He hoped that a great number of States would similarly be able to sign the Convention without reservations.

Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (British Empire), on behalf of the British Government, said that he hoped to sign the Convention on the morrow without reservation.

Sir George Foster (Canada) said that he also was authorised, on behalf of the Canadian Government, to sign the Convention.

Dr. Nansen (Norway) said that he had received a telegram from the Norwegian Government authorising him to sign the Convention.

Dr. von Schubert (Germany) said that personally he also was prepared to sign the Convention, but first of all he must ascertain that he had full powers.

General Freire d'Andrade (Portugal) was expecting a telegram from the Portuguese Government enabling him to sign the Convention.

25. Mandates: Draft Resolution proposed by the Drafting Committee.

The Chairman read the following resolution proposed by the Drafting Committee:

"The Assembly,

"Having taken cognisance of the report to the Council relating to the mandated territories and of the discussion on the subject which has taken place in the Council;

"And having heard the Vice-Chairman of the Permanent Mandates Commission:

"Thanks the Permanent Mandates Commission for the devotion and the zeal with which it has carried out its delicate task;

"Has confidence in the members of this Commission, as well as in the Members of the Council, to ensure the application of the principles of Article 22 of the Covenant in a cordial spirit of co-operation with the mandatory Powers."

The draft resolution was adopted.
On the proposal of Count Bonin-Longare (Italy), the Committee asked the Chairman to act as Rapporteur.

It was agreed that the resolution should be formally read before the Assembly and that the Rapporteur might add the oral explanations he wished.

The agenda of the Committee being exhausted, Count Bonin-Longare (Italy), on behalf of his colleagues, thanked the Chairman for the able way in which he had directed the meetings of the Committee.

Annex.

DRAFT CONVENTION RELATING TO SLAVERY PROPOSED BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE.

Preamble.

Whereas the signatories of the General Act of the Brussels Conference of 1889-90 declared that they were equally animated by the firm intention of putting an end to the traffic in African slaves;

Whereas the signatories of the Convention of St. Germain-en-Laye of 1919 to revise the General Act of Berlin of 1885 and the General Act and Declaration of Brussels of 1890 affirmed their intention of securing the complete suppression of slavery in all its forms and of the slave trade by land and sea:

Taking into consideration the report of the Temporary Slavery Commission;

Desiring to complete and extend the work accomplished under the Brussels Act and to find a means of giving practical effect throughout the world to such intentions as were expressed in regard to slave trade and slavery by the signatories of the Convention of St. Germain-en-Laye and recognising that it is necessary to conclude to that end more detailed arrangements than are contained in that Convention;

Considering, moreover, that it is desirable to prevent forced labour from creating conditions analogous to slavery;

Have decided to conclude a Convention and have accordingly appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

Who, having communicated their full powers, have agreed as follows:

Article 1.

For the purpose of the present Convention, the following definitions are agreed upon:

1. Slavery is the status or condition of a person over whom any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised.

2. The slave trade includes all acts involved in the capture, acquisition or disposal of a person with intent to reduce him to slavery; all acts involved in the acquisition of a slave with a view to selling or exchanging him; all acts of disposal by sale or exchange of a slave acquired with a view to being sold or exchanged, and, in general, every act of trade or transport in slaves.

Article 2.

The High Contracting Parties undertake, each in respect of the territories placed under its sovereignty, jurisdiction, protection, suzerainty or tutelage, so far as they have not already taken the necessary steps:

(a) To prevent and suppress the slave trade;

(b) To bring about, progressively and as soon as possible, the complete abolition of slavery in all its forms.

Article 3.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to adopt all appropriate measures with a view to preventing and suppressing the embarkation, disembarkation and transport of slaves in their territorial waters and upon all vessels flying their respective flags.

The High Contracting Parties further recognise the value of separate agreements between the Powers concerned conferring on their warships, in certain zones in which they may consider the existence of traffic in slaves to be a possibility, special rights enabling them to prevent and suppress the said traffic on vessels flying the flag of any of the Powers which are parties to such agreements. The High Contracting Parties undertake to communicate to each other agreements which may be concluded for this purpose.

or the following text:

Article 3.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to negotiate as soon as possible a general Convention with regard to the slave trade which will give them rights and impose upon them duties of the same nature as those provided for in the Arms Traffic Convention (Articles 12, 20, 21, 23, 24 and paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Section II of Annex II) with the necessary adaptations.

It is understood that, before or after the coming into force of this general Convention, the High Contracting Parties are entirely free to conclude between themselves, without, however, derogating from the principles laid down in the preceding article, such special agreements as, by reason of their peculiar situation, might appear to be suitable in order to bring about as soon as possible the complete disappearance of the slave trade.

1 The Report and the Convention, as adopted by the Sixth Committee, presented to the Assembly and adopted at the plenary meeting of September 25th, 1926, are published in the annex to the Minutes of the Plenary Meetings of the Assembly. They are also published separately in document A.104.1910. VI.
The High Contracting Parties shall give to one another every assistance with the object of securing the abolition of slavery and the slave trade.

Article 5.

The High Contracting Parties recognise that recourse to compulsory or forced labour may have grave consequences and undertake, each in respect of the territories placed under its sovereignty, jurisdiction, protection, suzerainty or tutelage, to take all necessary measures to prevent conditions analogous to those of slavery from resulting from compulsory or forced labour.

It is agreed that:

(1) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes.

(2) In territories in which compulsory or forced labour for other than public purposes still survives, the High Contracting Parties shall endeavour progressively and as soon as possible to put an end to the practice. So long as such forced or compulsory labour exists, this labour shall invariably be of an exceptional character, shall always receive adequate remuneration, and shall not involve the removal of the labourers from their usual place of residence.

(3) In all cases, the responsibility for any recourse to compulsory or forced labour shall rest with the competent central authorities of the territory concerned.

Article 6.

Those of the High Contracting Parties whose laws do not at present make adequate provision for the punishment of infractions of laws and regulations enacted with a view to giving effect to the purposes of the present Convention undertake to adopt the necessary measures in order that severe penalties may be imposed in respect of such infractions.

Article 7.

The High Contracting Parties undertake to communicate to each other and to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations any laws and regulations which they may enact with a view to the application of the provisions of the present Convention.

Article 8.

The High Contracting Parties agree that disputes arising between them relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, if they cannot be settled by direct negotiation, be referred for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice. In case either or both of the States to such a dispute should not be parties to the Protocol of December 16th, 1920, relating to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the dispute shall be referred, at the choice of the Parties and in accordance with the constitutional procedure of each State, either to the Permanent Court of International Justice or to a court of arbitration constituted in accordance with the Hague Convention of October 18th, 1907, or to some other court of arbitration.

Article 9.

At the time of signature or ratification or of accession a State may declare that its acceptance of the present Convention does not bind some or all of its colonies, possessions, protectorates or overseas territories or any territories under its sovereignty, suzerainty or authority in respect of all or any provisions of the Convention; it may subsequently accede separately on behalf of any one of them or in respect of any provision to which any one of them is not a party.

Article 10.

The present Convention, which will bear this day's date and of which the French and English texts are both authentic, will remain open for signature by States Members of the League of Nations until April 1st, 1927.

The Secretary-General of the League of Nations will subsequently bring the present Convention to the notice of States which have not signed it, including States which are not Members of the League of Nations, and invite them to accede thereto.

A State desiring to accede to the Convention shall notify its intention in writing to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and transmit to him the instrument of accession, which shall be deposited in the archives of the League.

The Secretary-General shall immediately transmit to all other States a certified true copy of the notification and the instrument of accession, informing them of the date on which he received them.

Article 11.

The present Convention will be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited in the Office of the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The Secretary-General will inform all signatory or acceding States of such deposit.

The Convention will come into operation for each State on the date of the deposit of its ratification or of its accession.

In faith whereof, the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Geneva the , 1926, in one copy, which will be deposited in the archives of the League of Nations. A certified copy shall be forwarded to each signatory State.

[Signatures.]
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