

APPENDIX TO REPORT OF THIRD ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, 1922.

MANDATES REPORT, BY CAPTAIN E. O. MOUSLEY.

New Zealand Government Offices,

SIR,—

Strand, London W.C. 2, 1st June, 1923.

I have received for transmission to you and enclose Captain Mousley's report on the Third Assembly of the League of Nations, 1922, with special reference to mandates. I desire to make a few comments.

On page 25 (this report) Captain Mousley refers incidentally to the question of the national status of the inhabitants of mandated territories, and on page 30 he gives four resolutions passed at a recent meeting of the Council of the League, when the point was dealt with. He, however, has not given the Council's resolution which had particular reference to the desire of the Government of South Africa to confer British nationality on the inhabitants of South-west Africa possessing German nationality, with the proviso that any such inhabitant of German nationality may have the right of declining to accept British nationality. That resolution was as follows:—

“The Council of the League of Nations, taking into consideration the special case presented to it, and the fact that only the inhabitants of South-west Africa alluded to in Article 122 of the Treaty of Versailles are concerned, take note of the declaration made by the representative of South Africa, and sees no objection to the proposed action.”

On page 25 Captain Mousley refers to the publication of the report of the Permanent Mandates Commission before such report had been considered by the Council; on page 26, to the necessity of consideration being given to the reply of the mandatory Power to suggested criticism before the final observations of the Permanent Mandates Commission are arrived at; and on page 26, to No. 8 of the Rules of Procedure of the Permanent Mandates Commission, which provides for a public meeting when the final terms of the Permanent Mandates Commission's observations are adopted. These points are referred to in the report of the Third Assembly of the League of Nations which Sir Francis Bell, Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, and I made to you in October last, and will be found on pages 34 and the following; and I take this opportunity of emphatically stating that in my opinion the meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission, at which its final observations are adopted, should not be public, and I said so when I spoke before the Assembly.

On page 26 of his report Captain Mousley observes that the Dominion Mandatories have no representation on the Permanent Mandates Commission. This is true. On the other hand, however, nationals of two other mandatory Powers, Great Britain and Japan, sit on the Commission, not, perhaps, as representatives of their Governments, but, at any rate, as interested members.

On page 27 Captain Mousley refers to an observation of the Permanent Mandates Commission to the effect that the mere distances which separate the countries from which labourers are recruited from the place to which they are taken renders it necessary that labour contracts should be concluded for very long periods; and again on page 27, where he refers to my explanation of the position and uses the phrase “long-period indenture of Chinese labour.” The phrase “long period” is a relative term, but I desire to state that when the report of the Sixth Committee on mandates was before the full Assembly I more than once stated that the labour that goes to Samoa is under contract for three years.

On page 35 Captain Mousley, in quoting Sir Francis Bell's speech to the Assembly, says, “The mandatory Powers are not represented on either the Council or the Permanent Mandates Commission, but they are represented by their delegates in this Assembly.” That is hardly correct, because Great Britain, France, Japan, and Belgium are represented on the Council. Probably Sir Francis Bell meant to say that the Dominion mandatory Powers were not represented on either the Council or the Permanent Mandates Commission.

Pages 39: I agree with Captain Mousley's remarks relative to the rules of procedure of the Permanent Mandates Commission, and think that they should be modified.

On page 40, last paragraph but one, Captain Mousley suggests that there should be closer liaison between the Secretary of the League and the representative of the Dominion in London. Personally I see no necessity for this. The work involved is comparatively light and, so far as my judgment goes, it can be done by the present staff of this office.

I have, &c.,

J. ALLEN.

The Right Hon. the Prime Minister, Wellington, New Zealand.

SIR,—

London, 1st June, 1923.

As directed, I have the honour to submit the following special report on the subject of mandates as dealt with at the last Assembly of the League, which took place at Geneva in September, 1922, and to which I accompanied the Hon. Sir Francis Bell in the capacity of Private Secretary. This subject, as indicated by Sir James Allen in his official report of that Assembly, was only cursorily dealt with in that report, being reserved for more comprehensive treatment later on.

It is a matter which, while always of direct interest to the Dominion of New Zealand as a mandatory State, this year assumed additional interest in that, in accordance with the provisions of the mandates system, the consideration of the reports of the mandatory Powers holding “C” mandates, and of the observations thereon of the Permanent Mandates Commission, came before the Assembly for the first time. These observations, while for the most part complimentary and no