

GENEVA, July 6th, 1926.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

ORGANISATION FOR COMMUNICATIONS
AND TRANSIT

PASSPORT CONFERENCE

held at Geneva from May 12th to 18th, 1926

- I. Minutes of the Plenary Meetings of the Conference.
 - II. Annexes.
-

Publications of the League of Nations

VIII. TRANSIT
1926. VIII. 4.

CONTENTS

	Page
THE BUREAU OF THE CONFERENCE AND THE DELEGATIONS	5
FIRST MEETING, held on May 12th, 1926, at 3 p.m.	
1. Election of President	12
2. Programme of Work	12
3. Election of Vice-Presidents	13
4. Adoption of Rules of Procedure	13
5. Participation in the Work of the Conference	13
6. Minutes of the Conference	13
7. General Discussion	13
8. Adoption of the Agenda	15
9. Abolition of the Passport Regime	16
SECOND MEETING, held on May 13th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.	
10. Emigration Questions	20
Emigrants' Identity Book	21
THIRD MEETING, held on May 13th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m.	
11. Abolition of the Passport Regime (<i>continued</i>)	25
12. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained :	
A. Issue of Passports	25
Type of Passport	26
Authorities competent to issue Passports	27
Duration of Validity	28
Extent of Validity	30
Fees	32
13. Constitution of Two Sub-Committees	32
FOURTH MEETING, held on May 14th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.	
14. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained (<i>continued</i>) :	
B. Visas	32
Transit Visas	32
15. Constitution of a Sub-Committee on Emigration Questions	37
FIFTH MEETING, held on May 15th, 1926, at 10 a.m.	
16. Transit Cards for Emigrants (Communication by the Sub-Committee)	38
17. Issue of Identity Documents to Emigrants	38
18. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained (<i>continued</i>)	39
SIXTH MEETING, held on May 15th, 1926, at 5 p.m.	
19. Recommendation concerning the Abolition of the Passport System .	44
20. Discussion of the Report by the Technical Sub-Committee on Possible Improvements in the Standard Passport (International Type)	45
Family Passports	45
Additional Pages prohibited	45
Collective Lists	46
21. Letter from the German Consul-General to the Secretary-General of the League	46
22. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained (<i>continued</i>) :	
C. Control at Frontiers	47
B. Exit Visas	48
23. Scope of the Recommendations adopted by the Conference	49
24. Declarations by the French and German Delegates	49

SEVENTH MEETING, held on May 17th, 1926, at 4 p.m.

25.	Emigration Questions (<i>continued</i>)	49
	Transit Cards for Emigrants	49
	Issue of Special Documents to Emigrant Workmen	50
26.	Travelling Facilities for Persons without Nationality	50
27.	Mutual Police Assistance	50
28.	Proposal by the Hungarian delegation regarding Facilities to be granted in the case of the Maintenance of the Passport Regime	50
	1. Territorial Competence : Personal Applications for Visas	50
	2. Proof of the Necessity of the Journey	51
	3. Preliminary Enquiry and Approval	51
	4. Simplification of Formalities	52
29.	Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation regarding the Objects of a Passport	53

EIGHTH MEETING, held on May 17th, 1926, at 9.15 p.m.

30.	Abolition of the Passport Regime (<i>continued</i>)	54
31.	Control at Frontiers (<i>continued</i>)	56
32.	Passport Visas (<i>continued</i>)	57
33.	Issue of Visas in Urgent Cases	63
34.	Exemption from the Formality of a Visa in Urgent Cases for Holders of "Lettres de Mission" issued by the League of Nations	63
35.	Letter from the President of the International Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations	64
36.	Resolutions of the International Students' Organisations	64
37.	Recommendations by the Czechoslovak Delegation	65
38.	Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation concerning Facilities to be granted in the case of the Maintenance of the Passport Regime (<i>continued</i>)	66

NINTH MEETING, held on May 18th, 1926, at 4.30 p.m.

39.	Adoption of the Final Act	66
	Preamble and Paragraph I : Passport Regime	66
	Paragraph II : Facilities to be granted	66
	A. Issue of Passports	66
	1. Type of Passport	66
	2. Duration of Validity	66
	3. Extent of Validity	66
	4. Fees	66
	B. Visas	67
	C. Facilities for the Obtaining of Passports and Visas	67
	D. Control at Frontiers	67
40.	Closing Speeches	70

ANNEXES	71
-------------------	----

The Bureau of the Conference and the Delegations

President :

His Excellency M. C. R. PUSTA,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Esthonia in France.

Vice-Presidents :

His Excellency Dr. Aristides DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Cuba at Berlin and Vienna.
M. Athanase POLITIS,
Technical Representative of the Greek Government at Paris, Member of the
Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, Chairman
of the Passport Sub-Committee.

Secretariat General :

M. R. HAAS,
Secretary-General of the Conference.
Col. T. A. HIAM.
M. J. M. F. ROMEIN.

ARGENTINE.

Delegate :

M. Alejandro UNSAIN,
Deputy-Consul of the Argentine at Geneva (as an observer).

AUSTRIA.

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Emerich PFLÜGL,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

Assistant Delegate :

Dr. Heinrich REINHARDT,
Former Ministerial Counsellor, Member of the Committee for Communications
and Transit.

BELGIUM.

Delegates :

M. Henri COSTERMANS,
Secretary-General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
M. Louis GONNE,
Administrative Officer, Director-General of Public Safety and Prisons in the
Ministry of Justice.
M. Léon HELBIG,
Chief Secretary to the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice.

BRAZIL.

Delegate :

M. E. F. DE MONTARROYOS,
Technical Assessor to the Permanent Delegation of Brazil accredited to the League
of Nations.

Assistant Delegate :

M. Hildebrando ACCIOLY,
Chief Secretary to the Permanent Delegation of Brazil accredited to the League
of Nations.

BULGARIA.

Delegate :

M. Dimitri MIKOFF,
Chargé d'Affaires at Berne.

CANADA.

Delegates :

- Dr. W. A. RIDDELL,
Dominion of Canada Advisory Officer accredited to the League of Nations.
Mr. J. BRUCE WALKER,
Director of Immigration and Colonisation for Canada.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

Chief Delegate :

- M. Arthur MAIXNER,
Doctor of Law, Chief of the Passports Department at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Delegates :

- M. Ladislaus ČERNOCKÝ,
Doctor of Law, Counsellor at the Ministry of the Interior.
M. Leo ZAVŘEL,
Doctor of Law, Chief of the Emigration Department at the Ministry of Social Welfare.

CHINA.

Delegate :

- His Excellency M. CHAO-HSIN CHU,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Italy.

Assistant Delegates :

- M. H. OUANG,
Representative of the Ministry of Communications, Peking, Member of the Committee for Communications and Transit.
Dr. NIENTSENG HIU,
Secretary of the Permanent Office of the Chinese Delegation accredited to the League of Nations.

CUBA.

Delegate :

- His Excellency Dr. Aristides DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berlin and Vienna.

DENMARK.

Delegates :

- His Excellency M. A. OLDENBURG,
Minister Plenipotentiary, Representative of the Royal Danish Government accredited to the League of Nations.
M. Frantz C. B. BOECK,
Counsellor of Legation, Chief of Department at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

Delegation :

- His Excellency M. François SOKAL,
Minister Plenipotentiary, Delegate accredited to the League of Nations, Delegate of the Polish Republic, acting in the same capacity for the Free City of Danzig.
M. Lebrecht MUNDT,
Oberregierungsrat at the Senate of the Free City of Danzig.

ESTHONIA.

Delegate :

- His Excellency M. C. R. PUSTA,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in France.

FINLAND.

Delegate :

- M. Eino WÄLIKANGAS,
Counsellor of Legation, Chief of the Personnel and Administrative Affairs Department at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

FRANCE.

Delegates :

- M. PASQUET¹,
Senator, former Counsellor of State, former Secretary-General of Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones.
- M. E. DE NAVAILLES,
Deputy Director at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Technical Advisers :

- M. P. F. M. LAUNAY,
Chief Engineer of Roads and Bridges, Assistant to the Director-General of Railways at the Ministry of Public Works.
- M. J. LEBELLE,
Chief of the Foreign Labour Department at the Ministry of Labour.
- M. L. J. MAGNAN,
Administrator of Customs at the Ministry of Finance.
- M. M. PAON,
Chief of the Agricultural Labour Department at the Ministry of Agriculture.
- M. E. G. PERRIER,
Chief of the Personnel of the Public Safety Department at the Ministry of the Interior.
- M. R. REAU,
French Consul-General.

GERMANY.

Delegates :

- His Excellency Dr. Paul ECKARDT,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.
- Dr. Erich KRASKE,
Counsellor of Legation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- M. Johannes KRAUSE,
Regierungsrat at the German Ministry of the Interior.
- M. Karl SOMMER,
Oberregierungsrat at the Bavarian Ministry.
- M. Bernhard WOLFF,
Oberregierungsrat at the Prussian Ministry of the Interior.

Secretary :

- M. Wilhelm ECKARDT.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Delegate :

- Mr. R. A. C. SPERLING, C.B., C.M.G.,
His Majesty's Minister at Berne.

Assisted by :

- Mr. W. Haldane PORTER, C.B.,
Chief Inspector, Aliens' Branch, Home Office.
- Mr. H. S. MARTIN, C.B.E.,
Chief Passport Officer, Foreign Office.
- Major H. E. SPENCER, C.B.E.,
Chief Passport Control Officer, Foreign Office.

GREECE.

Delegates :

- M. D. NIKOLOPOULOS,
Director at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
- M. D. BIKELAS¹,
Secretary of Legation at Berne.

HUNGARY.

Delegate :

- M. Ladislav DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML,
Ministerial Counsellor, Director of the Passport and Travel Section at the Royal Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

¹ Did not attend the Conference.

INDIA.

Delegate :

Mr. J. W. HOSE,
Formerly of the Indian Civil Service.

Secretary :

Mr. C. H. SILVER,
India Office, London.

IRISH FREE STATE.

Delegate :

Mr. Michael MACWHITE,
Representative of the Irish Free State accredited to the League of Nations.

ITALY.

Delegates :

Comm. Silvio CAMBIAGIO ¹,
Minister Plenipotentiary.

Professor Torquato GIANNINI,
Emigration Commissioner.

Commendatore Luigi MIRANDA,
Chief of Division at the Ministry of the Interior.

M. Pietro DE STEFANI,
Chief Secretary of Legation, Chief of the Passport Bureau at the Ministry for
Foreign Affairs.

JAPAN.

Delegate :

M. Saburo KURUSU,
Chief Secretary at the Rome Embassy.

Secretaries :

M. S. TRATO,
Third Secretary of the Japanese Legation at Berne.

M. T. ITO,
Attaché at the Japanese Legation at Berne.

LATVIA.

Delegate :

M. Charles DUZMANS,
Latvian Representative accredited to the League of Nations.

LIBERIA.

Delegates :

His Excellency Baron Rodolphe Auguste LEHMANN ¹,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in France.

Dr. A. SOTTILE,
Liberian Consul.

NETHERLANDS.

Delegate :

M. J. F. BOER,
Director at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

NICARAGUA.

Delegate :

Dr. A. SOTTILE,
Permanent Delegate accredited to the League of Nations.

NORWAY.

Delegate :

Dr. Christian L. LANGE,
Secretary-General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

¹ Did not attend the Conference.

POLAND.

Delegation :

- His Excellency M. François SOKAL,
Minister Plenipotentiary, Delegate of the Polish Republic accredited to the League
of Nations (Delegate).
M. Léon MALHOMME,
Chief of Division in the Consular Department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

PORTUGAL.

Delegate :

- His Excellency Dr. Antonio Maria Bartholomeu FERREIRA,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berne.

ROUMANIA.

Delegate :

- His Excellency M. Nicolas Petresco COMNÈNE,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berne, Permanent
Delegate accredited to the League of Nations.

Technical Delegate :

- M. BUNGETZIANU,
Inspector-General of Police and Public Safety.

KINGDOM OF THE SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES.

Delegate :

- M. Constantine FOTITCH,
Counsellor at the Royal Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

SIAM.

Delegate :

- His Excellency M. Phya SANPAKITCH PREECHA,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Rome.

SPAIN.

Delegate :

- His Excellency M. Emilio DE PALACIOS,
Ambassador of His Majesty the King of Spain.

Substitute Delegate :

- M. Francisco Ramirez MONTESINOS,
Chief of the Diplomatic Section at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Assistant Delegate :

- M. J. DE ARENZANA,
Spanish Consul at Geneva.

Expert :

- M. Luis SANCHEZ,
Administrative Officer at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

SWEDEN.

Delegates :

- His Excellency M. A. J. P. D'ADLERCREUTZ,
Minister at The Hague.
M. T. O. R. DE WIJNBLADH,
Secretary-General at the Royal Ministry of the Interior and Labour.

SWITZERLAND.

Delegates :

- M. H. ROTHMUND,
Director of the Central Aliens' Police Department.
M. M. RATZENBERGER,
Chief Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Department.

TURKEY.

Delegate :

Saadoullah FERID Bey,
Turkish Consul at Geneva.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

Delegate :

Mr. G. A. JENKIN,
Administrative Officer, Office of the High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa.

URUGUAY.

Delegate :

His Excellency M. Enrique E. BUERO,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Switzerland.

Assistant Delegate :

M. Oscar DE DEFFEMINIS,
Uruguayan Consul-General in Switzerland.

SAAR BASIN GOVERNING COMMISSION (in an advisory capacity).

Delegate :

M. Henri HEIMBURGER,
Director of the Department of the Interior.

Assistant Delegate :

M. Xavier FABIANI,
Chief of the Traffic Section.

The following have been admitted on special invitation to take part in the Conference in an advisory capacity :

The Representatives of the ADVISORY AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE FOR
COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT.

M. Athanase POLITIS,
Member of the Committee, Chairman of the Passport Sub-Committee.

M. H. F. DEROOVER,
Rapporteur of the Committee of Experts on Emigration Questions set up by
the Passport Sub-Committee.

The Representative of the COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL EMIGRATION
AND IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE.

M. Tomaso PERASSI,
Professor of International Law, Secretary and Legal Adviser of the Committee.

The Representatives of the INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

M. J. MARCOTTY,
Former President of the Belgian National Federation of Industrial and Commerce
Associations.

Dr. Max FISCHER,
Director of the firm of Carl Zeiss, Jena.

M. A. JUNOD,
Director of the Swiss National Tourist Office, Zurich.

Mr. J. KINGSLEY-ROOKER,
Representative of the Secretary-General of the International Chamber of
Commerce.

The Representative of the INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

M. Louis VARLEZ,
Technical Adviser, Chief of the Emigration Service at the I.L.O.

The Representatives of the INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING CONFERENCE.

- M. Theodor RITTER,
Director of the Hamburg-America Line.
Mr. E. O. DUNNE,
Secretary-General of the Atlantic Conference.

The Representatives of the INTERNATIONAL UNION OF RAILWAYS.

- M. G. LEVERVE¹,
Secretary-General of the I.U.R.
M. CHOQUET,
Chief of the Secretariat of the I.U.R.

The Representatives of the PASSPORT AND POSTAL REFORM COMMITTEE.

- Major the Hon. Neville LYTTON, O.B.E.¹,
Honorary Secretary of the Committee.
Mr. B. H. LUNN¹,
Member of the Committee.
Captain A. G. D. DUNCAN,
Member of the Committee.

¹ Did not attend the Conference.

I. MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE PASSPORT CONFERENCE

FIRST MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Wednesday, May 12th, 1926, at 3 p.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

1. Election of the President.

Sir Eric DRUMMOND, Secretary-General of the League of Nations, read the following resolution, adopted on December 9th, 1925, by the Council of the League of Nations:

"The Council decides, on the proposal of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, to summon a Conference on the Passports Regime, to meet on a date between April 15th and May 15th, 1926, the exact date to be fixed later by the President of the Council after consultation with the Secretary-General of the League and the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee.

"All Governments which were asked to attend the last General Conference on Communications and Transit will be invited to send representatives to this Conference.

"International organisations specially qualified to assist the Conference in its work will also be invited to attend in an advisory capacity; the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee will be asked to give the names of such organisations."

The Conference had met in pursuance of this resolution.

The Secretary-General thought that the delegates would wish in the first place to appoint a President, and invited them to submit proposals.

On the proposal of M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT (Cuba), seconded by M. SOKAL (Poland) and M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary), M. PUSTA (Esthonia) *was elected President by acclamation.*

The PRESIDENT expressed his appreciation of the honour the Conference had done him in electing him President, an honour which, he felt sure, was intended for his country. Esthonia had first taken part in international affairs at the Barcelona Conference on the Freedom of Communications and Transit. Since then she had carefully adhered to the principles which she had accepted at that Conference, together with her neighbours the other Baltic States. He thanked the Conference for the compliment to himself and to his country.

2. Programme of Work.

The PRESIDENT said he did not propose definitely to fix the programme for the present Conference, but he thought it would be desirable to co-ordinate the opinions of the various Governments which had replied to the questionnaire, and to see what further suggestions might usefully be added to the programme as it now stood, as a result of the work of the Paris Conference in 1920, the Emigration Conference held at Rome, and of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit. It would perhaps be advisable to decide at the outset what method of procedure they would adopt in dealing with the agenda. He thought they would do well to follow the usual precedent and begin with a general discussion, which would give the delegates an opportunity of making any statements they considered important. On the other hand, as the agenda consisted of two parts, one relating to general passport regulations and the other to emigration questions, the Conference might decide to appoint two sub-committees, composed of members of any delegation which expressed a desire to be represented. In that case the Conference would need to elect the chairmen of the committees, who would be the two Vice-Presidents of the Conference.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France), though not opposed to the appointment of two Vice-Presidents, did not think it really necessary to set up two committees. To begin with, the questions considered by each sub-committee would have to be discussed again in plenary meeting, and secondly, as the Conference had before it a programme carefully drawn up by the Sub-Committee which had met in Paris and finished its work on October 5th, 1925, they might regard the preparatory work as complete. He thought the most expeditious method would be to examine the Passport Sub-Committee's proposals one by one.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) pointed out that the two groups of questions which they had to consider — passport questions and emigration questions — were absolutely different in scope, the former constituting — from the point of view of the Conference — a much wider problem than the latter. He therefore proposed that they should first discuss passport questions and then any emigration questions which might have a special bearing upon passport questions. He referred, of course, to documents regarding emigrants. If they could reach an agreement on passport questions, the emigration questions would settle themselves.

3. Election of Vice Presidents.

The PRESIDENT considered that the object of the French delegate's proposal was to speed up the work of the Conference. He thought they might proceed forthwith to appoint two Vice-Presidents, one to follow passport questions and the other emigration questions. They would then see, in the light of subsequent discussions, whether it was necessary to proceed immediately to appoint two committees.

On the proposal of M. Emeric PFLÜGL (Austria), the Conference elected the following by acclamation as Vice-Presidents : M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT (Cuba), and, on the proposal of M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT (Cuba), M. Athanase POLITIS (Greece).

4. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Conference should adopt the Rules of Procedure for the Organisation of General Conferences on Communications and Transit adopted by the Barcelona Conference and modified by the Second General Conference.

This proposal was adopted.

5. Participation in the Work of the Conference.

The PRESIDENT informed the Conference that thirty-eight States had replied to the Secretariat's invitation. He was also glad to note that a number of organisations were participating in the work of the Conference in an advisory capacity.

6. Minutes of the Conference.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General) informed the Conference that the Minutes of the meetings would be issued in French and English every day. He earnestly requested delegates to hand in as quickly as possible any amendments they desired to make to the Minutes. All important statements would appear in the Minutes, but, in order to reduce subsequent printing to a minimum, they would be made as short as possible.

These arrangements were approved.

7. General Discussion.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Conference should proceed to a general discussion on the basis of the work of the Advisory and Technical Committee. Each delegation would, of course, be entitled to propose any additions it desired to make.

It had never been suggested either at the Paris Conference or at subsequent meetings, that they should draw up conventions in the strict sense of the word; all that had been done was to make recommendations which, he would add, were already being applied in principle in many countries. An agreement had been signed by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Roumania and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and similar agreements were in course of negotiation between other countries (see Annex 1).

It would appear desirable to continue on these lines, as they could work with the same good-will, but with greater freedom of action than if they were to discuss draft conventions.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said he was glad to see that the documents of the Conference included the Gratz Agreement, to which the President had just referred, and which he himself had helped to frame. This agreement had produced most satisfactory results and he thought it might be taken as a model. He invited the members of the Conference to study it (see Annex 1).

The PRESIDENT welcomed the Hungarian delegate's suggestion.

M. SOKAL (Poland) stated that, in view of the ever-increasing complaints which were being made in regard to the difficulties of communications, and particularly in regard to the system of visas and passports, it would appear essential that the settlement reached on this question should have as broad a basis as possible. The Polish Government thought that special agreements in this matter could only afford an imperfect solution and would never prove satisfactory; it therefore proposed as a general rule that all States Members of the League of Nations should abolish passports.

Any mutual agreements by groups of States to abolish passports for traffic between the countries in the group and to replace them by other identification documents to be issued by their local authorities could only be applied within very narrow limits. If they attempted to extend this method, it would be found most impractical, because the passport-supervision authorities would be greatly overworked. They would have to deal with as many different identification documents as there were countries and, in addition, these documents would be drawn up on different models and in different languages. If the Polish Government's proposals were accepted, he was authorised to say that his Government was prepared to draw up a standard model of a personal identity document which could, if necessary, be used for purposes of identification during a journey; it would thus take the place of a passport, which would then become superfluous.

If the Conference did not accept his proposal, the Polish Government would inform the Conference later as to the policy it would adopt.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) said that the German Government was following with great interest the steps the League was taking with a view to removing, as far as possible, the difficulties in regard to passenger traffic, due to the passport regulations of the different countries.

It was true that, as a result of a number of inter-State agreements and in particular the numerous agreements concluded by Germany, the international barriers erected by the passport and visa system had been broken down, and that the Conference held at Paris in 1921 had also accomplished much in this direction. But much still remained to be done, and for that reason the German Government had gladly accepted the invitation it had received from the League of Nations to participate in the Conference it was summoning with the object of improving the existing situation, which was very unsatisfactory both economically and socially. The German Government had indeed thought it desirable to ask the League's organising committee to add to the programme of the Conference certain proposals (see Annex 2) for the clearer definition of the principles laid down by the Paris Conference, and their more effective application. He hoped that the questions on the programme of the Conference would be satisfactorily solved, and for his part he intended to do his utmost to secure that result.

M. PFLÜGL (Austria) said that, at the very outset of its work, the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit had turned its attention to the passport regime which had rendered important service during and after the war. Unfortunately, like other good things, the passport system had lasted too long, and to-day many countries were suffering from its effects, particularly countries such as Austria, to whom, owing to their geographical situation, transit conditions were of primary importance.

The Austrian Government had given the question its closest attention, and had been among the first to seek to introduce facilities. It had applied the Paris resolutions, to which it had given practical effect, especially in the Gratz Convention. It had recently concluded arrangements with a limited number of countries mutually abolishing the visa which had hitherto been required.

The Austrian Government was very glad to be taking part in the present Conference, which, it was hoped, would lead to further progress. The Austrian Government's policy was based on the considerations laid down in the report of the Sub-Committee on Passports, and it therefore would support every effort to reduce such passport formalities as at present existed.

M. KURUSU (Japan) expressed his satisfaction at the optimistic spirit revealed in the speeches that had just been made. He desired, however, to point out that the Sub-Committee, which had studied the passport and visa system was composed, with the exception of the delegate of Cuba, of representatives of European countries. It was necessary to compare communications within Europe with that of a country like Japan with the rest of the world. He hastened to add that he was not making this statement in any spirit of obstruction, but simply in order to draw the attention of the Conference to that particular point.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) drew attention to the importance of the Polish delegate's proposal. The German and Japanese delegates had already begun to discuss certain aspects of it. He thought the importance of the proposal was such that it should be communicated in writing to the members of the Conference.

He added that he wished to associate himself with the statements made by the German and Austrian delegates, and particularly the latter, since the situation of Hungary was very similar to that of Austria.

Referring to the Japanese delegate's remark that "there was a great difference between travelling in Europe, where there were many small States in close proximity to each other, and travelling from Europe to America or Japan", the speaker proposed that the work of the Conference should be divided into two parts, namely, questions relating to countries of small area, such as the European States, which can be crossed in a few hours, and questions relating to large countries outside Europe.

M. MARCOTY (International Chamber of Commerce) thanked the League of Nations for having asked the International Chamber of Commerce to participate in the work of

the Conference. The Chamber had been occupied with the passport question for some time past, and at the Rome Congress had submitted a resolution which might be summarised as follows: Gradual abolition of the passport system, as far as possible, by means of inter-State agreements; similar agreements in regard to visas; in the meantime, simplification of formalities; reduction of the cost of passports and visas.

M. RITTER (International Shipping Conference) said the International Shipping Conference was of opinion that the state of affairs prevailing before the war should be restored as quickly as possible; *i.e.*, that the passport system should disappear. In the meantime steps should be taken to facilitate freedom of intercourse between the various countries, not only in the interests of travellers themselves, but also in order to promote a better understanding between nations. The International Shipping Conference hoped it would at any rate be possible to abolish transit visas altogether and to take such other steps as would facilitate travel.

Captain DUNCAN (Passport and Postal Reform Committee) said his Committee desired him to lay two points before the Conference for consideration, namely:

- (1) The abolition of the visa, and
- (2) The extension of facilities for travelling without passports.

With regard to the first point, it might be admitted that the passport was still a necessity, but it was difficult to see the need for the visa. Already the visa, which was a matter of annoyance and expense for travellers and tourists, had been abolished between certain countries. With regard to the second point, the question of the issue of group tickets — in other words, the extension of the facilities for travelling without passports at all — he could only speak with authority so far as Great Britain was concerned. It was desirable to extend that facility. Those travelling on what was called a group ticket had to travel under a responsible agency and could easily be traced. In this case there was little danger of undesirables entering a country — a possibility which it was the object of the passport system to prevent. The group-ticket system was a simple method of keeping out undesirables; it was convenient for tourists, who, after all, brought money to the countries they visited.

M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT (Cuba) said he had been very glad to hear the statements of certain delegates in favour of the abolition of visas and passports. Cuba had already abolished passports; no such document was required there even in the case of emigrants. No visa was necessary either for entering the country, passing through it or leaving it. The Cuban delegation did not propose that the Conference should adopt so radical a reform as that, for it realised the peculiar position of certain States, both from a political and a geographical point of view, but it would support any measure likely to lead to the gradual abolition of passports and visas. Cuba, as a matter of fact, had already abolished visas with Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said that the British delegation had listened with great interest to the declarations of the speakers who had preceded him. They did not themselves propose to make any general declaration. They would reserve their observations for the occasions when specific items on the agenda were under discussion. In the meantime, however, their silence must not be taken to imply consent to any of the proposals which had been put forward.

The PRESIDENT noted that there were no more speakers on the list for the general discussion, and he would therefore consider it closed. To sum up, the Conference had before it two sets of statements: the liberal and comprehensive proposal of the Polish delegation, and the declarations of other delegations, which, for the present, were unable to decide as to the total abolition of passports. But all showed the same desire to make every effort to simplify the present system, if that system were to be retained. These two possibilities had already been considered by the Conference held at Paris in 1920, and they had been placed on the agenda of the present Conference.

He therefore proposed that they should begin to discuss the questions on the agenda.

8. Adoption of the Agenda.

The PRESIDENT proposed that members of the Conference should first express their opinion on the agenda (see Annex 3) without discussing individual items.

M. MALHOMME (Poland) considered that they should first vote upon the proposal made by the Polish delegate, M. Sokal, which provided that passports should be abolished, on condition, however, that all the States Members of the League decided to do so.

Until that point was settled, it would be useless to discuss the question of visas, which would no longer be required if passports were abolished.

If the proposal were rejected, the Polish delegation would adopt a different policy, which they would announce in due course.

The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that they had agreed that at the present meeting they would simply exchange views, without entering into any commitments, and that they would not as yet vote on any proposal.

However desirable it might be to adopt the Polish suggestion, they could not possibly do so at the present stage. Moreover, a request had been made that the text read by M. Sokal should be submitted in writing to the members of the Conference.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) tendered the apologies of M. Pasquet, the chief French delegate, who had at the last moment been prevented from coming to Geneva, but would make every effort to take part in the concluding work of the session.

He renewed his suggestion that they should adopt as their agenda the proposals of the Sub-Committee on Passports in the order in which these proposals appeared in the Report of October 5th, 1925 (see Annex 3). He thought this method of procedure would give the delegates every opportunity of expressing their views, both general and particular. As the first of the resolutions in that Report dealt with the abolition of the passport regime, it would afford an opportunity for a discussion as to whether the Conference intended to abolish Passports or retain them.

A discussion of the Sub-Committee's proposals would also enable the Hungarian delegate to make a statement on the provisions laid down in the agreement between Austria, Hungary and various other countries and to show how far they proved useful.

The same observation applied to the German delegation's proposal (see Annex 4).

Finally, he suggested that the Conference should decide whether it desired to adopt the Report of the Sub-Committee dated October 5th, 1925, as its agenda, or whether it preferred to proceed by some other method.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting should accept M. de Navaille's proposal and adopt the agenda submitted by the Sub-Committee. That procedure appeared to him to afford members every opportunity of making their views known in the course of the discussion.

As no objection was raised, the Chairman declared this method of procedure adopted.

9. Abolition of Passport Regime.

The PRESIDENT observed that various statements on this question had already been made and thought that the Conference should first come to a definite agreement regarding abolition. It might perhaps, while not abolishing passports, decide to advocate the granting of certain facilities.

M. GIANNINI (Italy) considered the Polish proposal that passports should be totally abolished too radical a measure, although it would afford a solution for all the other items on the agenda. He stated, on behalf of his delegation, that, although Italy sympathised with all efforts, measures and resolutions likely to reduce the formalities connected with the issue of passports, she could never adhere to a proposal which contemplated their abolition.

Prior to 1914 passports had not been in use; they had fallen into disuse half-a-century earlier; they had only been re-introduced in special circumstances. Until Italy was convinced beyond all doubt that every reason for the compulsory use of passports had disappeared, she could not vote in favour of their abolition, although she fully recognised the fraternal spirit underlying the Polish proposal. Italy, to her great regret, would be obliged to vote against it. She approved, however, any measures which would simplify visa formalities. She had already abolished visas for certain countries, and had concluded with several States (Roumania, Hungary, etc.) the agreement of which the Conference was already aware, thus giving material proof of her intention.

The speaker pointed out that a passport afforded immigrants a kind of social protection which was not required by ordinary travellers. A passport was particularly necessary as an identification document for workers and their families; it provided them with the protection they needed, enabled them to obtain permits of sojourn, to obtain information as to the best locality for securing work and to avoid interference while travelling. For these reasons Italy had long considered that a passport constituted an identification document which every immigrant should have in his possession.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) asked the President what the Conference would do next morning if passports were abolished that evening? Would the meeting consider emigration questions independently of any decision regarding passports? He considered that, as the Italian delegate had just pointed out, emigration questions had a definite bearing upon the decision as to what document an emigrant required for his protection. If the President replied that the meeting would discuss the question independently, he would be glad if it could be dealt with the next morning, as the experts would then be present.

The PRESIDENT thought they would naturally wish first of all to exchange opinions on problems as a whole. The emigration question might perhaps be discussed subject to certain reservations which the delegates had already stated. Without wishing to anticipate their decisions, he thought it was justifiable to assume that the emigrant question would be discussed. For the time being, he would ask the delegates to express their opinions with regard to the abolition of the passport system.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) stated that the French delegation could not at present consider the abolition of the passport regime. The French Government had, however, acted upon the suggestions made by the Sub-Committee and had concluded with Belgium and Luxemburg agreements by which passports between these countries were no longer required: travellers could pass from one country to the other on the mere production of an identity card.

The French Government was prepared to consider whether it could extend this regime to other countries, but it could not accept the principle of the abolition of passports.

M. GONNE (Belgium) stated that the Belgian Government could not consider the abolition of passports. It had concluded an arrangement with France, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, under which a Belgian proceeding to Holland, France or Luxemburg need possess nothing more than an identity document bearing a recent and certified photograph. These documents did not, in actual practice, take the place of passports. Thus, a Belgian trader going to Paris and desiring to proceed from there to London could not leave for England without further formality. He had first to obtain from the Belgian Consulate in Paris a permit allowing him to cross the Channel. Thus it was possible for simplification in one direction to create delay in another.

M. JUNOD (International Chamber of Commerce) readily understood that the Governments could not, at the present juncture, adhere to any proposal to abolish passports. If such a proposal were put to the vote, it would not obtain a majority, which was regrettable from the point of view of manufacturers, traders and tourists. Though political and Governmental requirements might have to be taken into account, they should not forget that, in 1920, the Passport Conference at Paris had adopted a resolution contemplating the total abolition of restrictions and a complete return to the pre-war regime. The Sub-Committee of the Passports Conference had drafted a resolution which entirely endorsed the proposals made by the Conference in 1920, and went even further. The Assembly of the League had not been the only body to draw the attention of all Governments to the special importance of the Passport Conference in 1926. Economic circles and public opinion expected the present Conference to advance another step towards general abolition and reduce the inconvenience and expense of this system, as it interfered with international relations and trade facilities. Could not the Conference adopt a resolution contemplating the abolition of passports at the earliest possible date? Public opinion would regard this as a step in the right direction. Considerable progress had already been made since 1920. A resolution had been adopted by the International Conference of the Chambers of Commerce at Rome. The present meeting ought therefore to arrive at a decision which would constitute a further step towards the abolition of passports.

M. COMNÈNE (Roumania) pointed out that the Paris Conference had expressed a hope that passports would be abolished in the immediate future. The Roumanian Government agreed, but realised that such a step could not be taken at present. He therefore thought, like the great majority of the members of the Conference, that the best plan would be to devote all their efforts to discovering means of improving the present passport system.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) stated that his Government could not accept the proposal for the entire abolition of passports, but was ready to grant facilities with a view to improving the present system.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said that, in view of the difficulties which lay in the way of complete abolition, he supported the Roumanian representative's statement.

The least they could do would be to adopt a resolution having in view the abolition of passports in as short a time as possible. The Austrian Government was prepared to accept all suggestions to that end.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) stated that the Czechoslovak Government was in principle keenly interested in the abolition of the compulsory passport, because such a step would be in keeping with the principles it had followed hitherto. It would be very glad to see the end of the passport system, which was the cause of so much inconvenience — in the railway administration, for instance. It was a hindrance to travelling, as might be seen by studying its effects in the case of certain lines; it was a hindrance to the operation of the service on the frontiers and, finally, it gave rise to difficult situations in the frequent and necessary intercourse between railway administrations and thereby rendered the general reconciliation of peoples still more difficult.

The obligation to obtain a passport constituted a very real bar to trade, particularly in the case of a country like Czechoslovakia, which mainly relied upon its industries and its exports.

The Czechoslovak Government was therefore endeavouring to remove the difficulties which prevented the abolition of compulsory passports. These difficulties were due to the attitude of neighbouring States, which still hesitated to abolish the existing system, either because they were anxious to protect home industries (and in this connection he would point out that, whereas in those countries such protection was ensured by law, in Czechoslovakia it was not) or because the new situation in Central Europe obliged them, in the interests of the safety of the State or of public health, to retain some means of exercising supervision over persons crossing their frontiers.

Similarly, Czechoslovak laws did not provide for permits of sojourn, which often were rigorously exacted by several other States.

M. NIKOLOPOULOS (Greece) thought that another solution could be found which would be practically equivalent, in effect, to the indirect abolition of passports. That solution was to extend the period of validity of passports to ten years, and at the same time to issue passports valid for all foreign countries. In that case travellers would only have to trouble themselves to obtain a passport once in every ten years.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) thought that, in the present state of affairs, it would be impossible entirely to abolish passports. Further, they would observe that the German proposals contained a provision by which passports might, as between countries which had abandoned the system of visas, be replaced by a simpler and less costly document. He asked that they should discuss this special proposal after a decision had been reached on the subject of the proposal for total abolition.

M. KURUSU (Japan) said the Japanese delegation fully appreciated the spirit which inspired the Polish delegation's proposal, but could not agree at the present moment to the suggestions contained therein. Passports were necessary for administrative reasons and were often extremely useful, as had been convincingly explained by Professor Giannini. The Japanese delegation, however, agreed to study the means of expediting the gradual abolition of the passport system. This might be done by means of inter-State agreements and in that connection he wished to point out that no passport was required at present for the journey between China and Japan.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) shared the Roumanian delegate's views. He thought they ought rather to discuss the facilities which could be granted with a view to rendering the present system less onerous. The Latvian Government would view such facilities very favourably.

The best way to approach as nearly as possible the entire abolition of passports was to conclude special agreements between neighbouring and even between distant countries. Latvia had concluded a treaty of this kind with Esthonia, and no passports were required between those two countries. He hoped that this method would be followed by many States. The present situation was not so bad as it seemed, since a number of special agreements of that kind had already been concluded.

The difficulties in the way of the complete abolition of passports were more evident than elsewhere in the case of the States adjacent to Russia. That was why the Latvian Government could not agree to the generous suggestion made by Poland.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said that the discussion had hitherto proceeded on the assumption that the abolition of all passports would be a sign of progress and advance and that a return to pre-war conditions was desirable. He thought, however, that even before the war many countries required passports, so that it was necessary to come to an agreement as to what really was desirable. At any rate, conditions had changed so much since the war that everyone had to take into consideration a good many things they could formerly ignore.

On the general question of passports, however, the British Government did not at all agree with the assumption to which he had just referred. They considered, in fact, that, pending the introduction of another document which could be obtained more easily and more cheaply and yet would be just as universally valid, a passport was one of the most useful possessions that a traveller abroad could possibly have. It enabled him to claim the protection of his diplomatic and consular representatives if he got into any kind of difficulty. It was immediate evidence of identity to foreign administrations if he required to receive money, sign documents, or receive registered letters or letters *poste restante* and for that reason he would have thought it would be exceptionally useful to business-men.

Apart from that, he did not think his Government could accept the total abolition of passports for one particular reason, namely, that the passport enabled a returning traveller to obtain access to his own country immediately and without any other formalities. If any document such as he had mentioned could be obtained more easily than a passport, he had no doubt his Government would be quite ready to accept it; but in that case he did not

see that there would be any particular difference between a passport and a *carte d'identité*; it would be precisely the same thing under a different name.

With regard to the reciprocal arrangement between Belgium and France to which the representatives of those countries had referred, the Belgian representative had observed that it was in some cases a positive disadvantage to a traveller to have a *carte d'identité* instead of a passport; although it might be valid for the first country he visited, it would not necessarily be so for all the others. For that reason he thought the British Government would be quite ready to support his Roumanian colleague's proposal, which he understood to be, in effect, that although the abolition of passports was desirable at some future date, that date had not yet arrived.

Mr. HOSE (India) agreed with his colleague from Great Britain. He emphasised the usefulness of passports and asked the Polish representative what his position would be if he had lost his purse and were without a passport in the bazaar of Benares.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) felt bound to agree with his French, Belgian, British Czechoslovak and Roumanian colleagues. He considered that the proposals to supersede the passport by another identification document and to prolong the validity of the passport should be referred to a sub-committee for consideration.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) pointed out that passports might be abolished in the case of certain States and individuals. The Passport Sub-Committee's proposal referred, in effect, to agreements which might be concluded between certain States.

A resolution suggesting regional agreements would in itself constitute a step forward, for certain States would be ready to abolish passport formalities in their relations with certain other States.

He thought that the identification documents of the kind used in Austria were quite unknown in England. The passport was therefore a matter of far greater importance for England than for Austria. The Austrian traveller carried an identification document which he could use where the English traveller would be obliged to have a passport. He therefore considered that the possibility of total abolition should not be entirely ruled out; it should rather be stated that passports could not at present be abolished but could, in the case of a certain group of States or certain categories of persons, be dispensed with completely without being replaced by other formalities.

M. JUNOD (International Chamber of Commerce) did not consider the Roumanian representative's proposal contrary to his own suggestion. He merely asked that they should discuss the facilities which might be granted should the passport regime be retained. That question would be dealt with later. At present the Conference was only discussing the abolition of the passport, and, as he had already stated, total abolition was not immediately possible. They should, however, attempt to achieve it; this had been his aim in the proposal he had submitted.

He thought that the British representative had misunderstood him; it was not passports, but only compulsory passports that he proposed to abolish in the near future. He understood the usefulness of a passport as an identification document for the English, as it assured them of the protection of the British Government, just as in time past the Roman Government protected those who could claim to be Roman citizens. He therefore thought it necessary to draw a distinction between compulsory and optional passports. Before the war, only a few countries required passports. In his proposal, which was in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations, and had moreover met with the approval of the British representative, he desired a return to pre-war conditions in the matter of compulsory passports. If the Conference arrived at a definite conclusion with regard to this point before discussing matters of detail concerning the facilities to be granted, such a step would doubtless be favourably received by the public, which would perhaps fail to understand why the Conference should confine its efforts to simplifying agreements concerning the form of passports, their tenor, and the discussion of visas, etc.

He considered the *carte d'identité* most convenient in countries where it was in general use, as, for example, in Belgium or in France, but nationals of countries where it did not exist should not be expected to adopt it.

Mr. JENKIN (South Africa) remarked that, apart from the Japanese delegate, nearly all the speakers had discussed the conditions existing in Europe. He would like them to consider the case of people making a world tour, or visiting other continents. Such people met with countless difficulties, chiefly because they were ignorant of the languages of those countries. Although the shipping interests supported the abolition of the passport, he doubted very much whether they had the backing of worldwide travellers. British subjects generally, and certainly British subjects from the Dominion of South Africa, would undoubtedly hesitate before abandoning the passport, seeing how valuable a document it was for them.

Setting aside the question of the formalities required of South Africans abroad, there was yet the question of the entry of subjects of other States into South Africa. The passport was of extreme value to the Immigration Authorities and the police and also for purposes of collecting revenue.

Nevertheless, the Government of the Union was prepared to consider total abolition, but was of opinion that the time was not yet ripe for it.

M. DE STEFANI (Italy), referring to the statement made by various delegates and in particular by the British representative, thought it necessary, on behalf of the Italian delegation, to explain his point of view in regard to the juridical conception of a passport. A passport was an administrative document which enabled other countries to identify the holder and determine his nationality. The issuing of a passport was part of the sovereign power which a country possessed over its subjects. The distinction between a compulsory and an optional passport did not arise in connection with the juridical conception. It was essential therefore that the question of the abolition of passports should be considered from this point of view also. Undoubtedly, as new requirements arose and existing conditions changed, the juridical conception would develop *pari passu*.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said that, in view of this statement, he proposed that they should appoint a sub-committee to establish the exact definition of a passport and its object (identification paper, document entitling the holder to protection, and travelling paper).

The PRESIDENT said that there were no more speakers on his list. He summarised the discussion as follows:

Proposals of a radical nature had been put before them to the effect that the passport system should be completely abolished. The representative of the International Chamber of Commerce had recommended that they should return to the state of affairs prevailing before the war. He thought that that proposal merited special consideration. Other speakers had described the systems adopted up to now by a number of States which had concluded regional agreements, and this method appeared to be quite effective. He himself was fully satisfied with the results obtained in Latvia. He realised, however, that the countries of Northern Europe might advisedly study what had been done by other countries. He also noted that certain delegates had revealed the difficulties which would arise if the passport system were abolished immediately and had also shown that a passport was of very definite use to the holder. For example, it afforded certain protection to commercial travellers. The same fact had been confirmed by a number of delegates. The Conference had also been warned of the danger of laying down regulations which would only meet the views and requirements of European states and would take no account of the requirements of countries outside Europe.

In view of the fact that it was not proposed to adopt a resolution there and then and that only an exchange of views was contemplated, he thought it would be desirable to appoint a drafting committee to consider all the suggestions which had been made, define their general tendency and summarise them in the form of recommendations addressed to the various States.

He therefore proposed that they should pass to the other items on the agenda.

This was agreed to.

SECOND MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Thursday, May 13th, at 10.30 a.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Estonia) and afterwards M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT (Cuba) (Vice-President of the Conference).

10. Emigrant Questions.

The PRESIDENT invited the Members to consider the question of emigrants' passports and identity books, taking as the basis of discussion the report issued by the Sub-Committee on the Regime of Passports dated October 5th, 1925 (see Annex 3).

He requested M. Deroover, who had signed the report by the experts on Emigration, to come to the platform, and invited M. de Agüero y Bethancourt to be good enough to take the Chair at the meeting, which was to discuss the emigrant question.

M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT *took the Chair.*

He said that he was very glad to have beside him an expert who had signed the Sub-Committee's report, and who could give the Conference all necessary explanations and reply to any questions that might be asked.

He briefly summarised the main points of the emigrants' identity book, a specimen of which had been handed to all delegates for their information.

They would first of all discuss whether the specimen book could be accepted or not.

Emigrants' Identity Book.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) said that the French delegation was prepared to accept the specimen proposed by the Sub-Committee, provided that only the particulars ordinarily shown on passports were compulsorily entered in the book, and that the other particulars shown in the model should be entered only if necessary and desirable in the interests of the emigrant.

Secondly, the identity book should not overlap with the passport. The French delegation then suggested that the word "passport" should appear somewhere on the document. The main reason for this would be to spare emigrants difficulties in their dealings with minor officials when crossing frontiers.

Mr. Haldame PORTER (Great Britain) said the British Government was unable to accept the proposed identity book for their emigrants leaving Great Britain, the vast majority of whom proceeded either to other parts of the British Empire or to the United States of America. The Dominions did not require the very varied particulars contained in the identity book, and, so far as those proceeding to the U.S.A. were concerned, by an arrangement between the British Government and the Government of the United States all British emigrants proceeding to the United States were examined before leaving the shores of Great Britain by American officials — an immigration officer and a medical inspector — who either passed them as suitable emigrants for the United States or rejected them. In the circumstances, therefore, the British Government did not consider it necessary to require an emigrant from Great Britain to take out an identity book.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) supported the French delegation's proposal. He reminded the Conference that it had met with a view to abolishing passports and restoring the pre-war situation. It was quite true that in pre-war days ordinary travellers were only in rare and exceptional circumstances asked to provide themselves with passports; nevertheless, even in those days emigrants had to have some sort of document to enable them to travel.

He himself thought that the identity book might be used for emigrants, in place of a passport, and he was therefore in favour of the French delegation's proposal.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary), following up M. Reinhardt's statement, observed that Hungary had only established a passport system for emigrants in the emigrants' own interests; nowadays — as everybody knew — hundreds of thousands of emigrants were leaving Hungary every year.

Professor GIANNINI (Italy) said that, after the statement made by the Austrian delegation, he felt bound to return to the fundamental question as to whether passports were necessary or not.

The Italian delegation approved the reasons advanced in the Sub-Committee's report in favour of passports or other identity documents for emigrants. Any one of the thirteen reasons put forward would be sufficient to justify their maintenance.

They could not compare the position in 1914 with the post-war period. Whereas before the war emigrants were able to enter practically any country without difficulty, strict measures of control were now enforced almost everywhere, particularly in respect to the number allowed to enter the different countries. Emigrants had not only to be provided with a document, but they had to obtain permission to enter a foreign country, and the granting of such permission often depended on the economic conditions of the country in question.

He therefore agreed with the Sub-Committee that a document of some kind was necessary, but he thought the identity book proposed would not lead to the simplification of formalities; he thought the present form of passport would be preferable. One of the principal objections to the document proposed was that it would be open to forgery and fraud by reason of its form. It was absolutely essential that passports, or whatever took their place, should form a single document. Nothing was more conducive to fraud than the possession of a book consisting of several leaves. From the point of view of identification he thought it would be difficult to persuade all countries to include the emigrant's fingerprints on the identity card. The holder's photograph was therefore still the most simple method, but so much fraud had been practised in this connection that he felt bound to recommend the Conference to adopt the system of the direct reproduction, by some simple process, of the emigrant's photograph on the actual paper on which the identity document was made out. Collective passports were of no use to emigrants. The adult members of a family might have to separate, and that would necessitate the multiplication of documents and so increase the risk of loss. From the fiscal point of view there would be no difficulty, because fees could be charged per head instead of per document. On the whole, therefore, it would seem preferable for the Conference to choose a document consisting of a single sheet, which should only contain such particulars as were strictly necessary for the identification of the holder. For instance, there was no real need to mention the holder's state of health, as such information would only hold good for a limited time and, moreover,

the authorities of the country of arrival would certainly insist on examining the emigrant before allowing him to enter their territory. On the other hand, they should definitely decide in which order the surname and christian or personal name of the emigrant should appear, for at present practice varied from country to country and thereby caused considerable inconvenience.

For all these reasons Italy could not accept the proposed model in its present form, but she was prepared to agree to a passport or identity book more in conformity with the principles the speaker had just laid down.

Mr. Bruce WALKER (Canada) said that Canada was an immigration country *par excellence*; before the war she received from Europe and the United States something like half-a-million people per year.

That Canada, with a population of no more than eight millions, had successfully digested that foreign element was, he thought, a tribute both to her power of absorption and to the character of the immigrants themselves. The Canadian Government did not require passports except in the case of immigrants from Europe, and would be inclined to dispense altogether with those passports were they not necessary in the interests of the immigrants themselves. What the Government of Canada valued most was the visas granted by the Canadian emigration officers at Riga, Danzig, Paris and Antwerp, the purpose of these visas being to enable the holder's identity to be established. The real purpose of the visa, however, was to give an assurance that the emigrant's country of origin should undertake to allow him to return, either voluntarily or within five years if he should be deported. Hitherto there had been very few deportations from Canada to Europe, a fact which was evidence of the high class of people who emigrated to Canada. What that country needed was the desirable class of immigrant.

His predecessor in London, in a letter on immigration to the Passport Sub-Committee, expressed his general accord with the principle of the identity book, but he pointed out that there were some details of the book which were needless. Since that time the Canadian Government had written to say that all necessary purposes were served by the emigrants' passports as at present issued, together with the special visa already referred to, and that accordingly the identity book seemed superfluous.

Though the identity book itself might have, in principle, a great deal to commend it, in actual practice it appeared to partake of an inquisitorial character, and, from the Canadian point of view, to probe into matters that were not of immediate concern to the immigration country, such as, for instance, the father's name and the mother's name (these particulars were obtained by the decennial census of Canada), the probable period of emigration (this was assumed to be the whole of the immigrants' natural life); the object of the journey (the Canadian authorities considered that the object of the immigrant's journey should be to improve and better his condition).

Then again, the immigrant was required to produce death certificates of husband, wife, or children. In Canada, these certificates were considered unnecessary, as the deceased would not be present. As regards military service, the Canadian authorities desired immigrants to forget that they ever had any military service. Particulars as to criminal record were entirely unnecessary, because a man was prohibited from immigrating if he had any criminal record at all. In brief, all these matters were of no importance. It would be better to decide whether they could agree or not on the principle of the identity book and, if the principle of the identity book were not agreed to, then the Conference might discuss what other steps might be taken, while simplifying the movement of the migrant on the one hand, to secure him safety as to his identity on the other.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium) agreed with the French delegation that it was inconvenient to give different names to travelling papers.

He thought it would be better, before continuing the discussion on the identification document for emigrants, to ask the Conference to decide whether the passport system should be maintained or abolished. Various arguments had been put forward on that subject on the previous day, but no decision had been taken. They would have first to adopt a definite attitude on the point.

M. DEROOVER (Rapporteur of the Committee of Experts on Emigration Questions appointed by the Passport Sub-Committee) reminded the Conference that the experts had also considered the question whether it was desirable to maintain the passport system or not. They considered that it was hardly possible for emigrants to change their country under conditions which would afford all desirable guarantees unless they possessed a document clearly establishing their identity and family circumstances.

Of the particulars required in the proposed identity book, some were obligatory and others merely optional, the latter being made optional on account of the laws of various countries. It had been said that these particulars partook of an inquisitorial character, but that was on account of the requirements of certain legislative codes. The Committee of Experts thought it desirable that the book should contain all particulars which would be helpful to the emigrant when he settled in the country of immigration.

The experts, like the Italian delegation, had thought it desirable that the particulars contained in the identity book should all be contained in one sheet, but they thought that this would be difficult, if not impossible.

The experts did not think it desirable that family passports should be introduced. They thought that every adult emigrant should have an identity document of his own, but that the book of the head of a family should state that the holder was married and should give the number of his children. When accidents occurred at work, for example, it was often difficult to get the necessary information concerning the emigrant's family, so that it would be very useful to the emigrant if these particulars were mentioned in the book.

Particulars regarding the object of the journey, death of husband, etc., were made optional, and were only introduced because they were strictly required by the laws of certain countries.

The question had been raised whether there should be an identity book at all. The experts were of opinion that, even if passports were abolished altogether, emigrants could not possibly be allowed to cross — in many cases — several continents without some kind of identification. The identity book was proposed in the interest of the emigrant himself.

M. KRASKE (Germany) said that the German Government rather hesitated to accept the identity book as suggested. It went without saying that emigrants or immigrants were a class of travellers subject to certain restrictions, who had to comply with certain formalities which might be dispensed with in the case of ordinary travellers. On the other hand, they should not be unduly handicapped and embarrassed. As long as the passport system was in existence, the German Government did not see any reason why that system should not apply to emigrants or immigrants, thus putting them on the same footing as every other traveller and, as long as the passport system could not be abolished altogether, there would not seem to be any reason to abolish it just in the case of emigrants and immigrants. As the honourable delegates from Italy and from Canada had already pointed out, some of the data required in the identity book seemed rather humiliating to the bearer of the book. They would seem to Germany — which was more of an emigrating country than an immigrating country — superfluous, as the Canadian delegate, speaking for an immigrating country, had pointed out. At a time when there was a widespread movement to better the conditions of emigrants in many ways, as far as travelling facilities and reception in the country of destination were concerned, it would seem a little strange that all sorts of documents and particulars should be required which might be necessary in some countries but were entirely unnecessary in others; and the fact that such particulars were meant to be optional did not quite do away with their humiliating effect. There was one further point. When an emigrant had settled in the country of destination he would, under the present system — i.e. under the passport system — sooner or later be in a position to apply for a passport, because a number of emigrants might occasionally be obliged to travel to countries adjacent to the country of their new domicile, and they would hardly consent to be considered for years and years as immigrants, which would always be the case according to their identity books. If they had to apply for passports, then any advantage which there might be in the identity book would be substantially lessened, and the book would seem the more superfluous because procuring a passport now and using it for the years to come was much simpler than to have an identity book first, and then afterwards to apply for the passport also.

M. KURUSU (Japan) said that, until last year, the Japanese Government used to issue two kinds of passports, one for ordinary travellers and one for emigrants. But in 1925 this system was abolished, and the Japanese Government now issues only one kind of passport to emigrants and non-emigrants. The type used at present is the one adopted by the Paris Conference, and it wished to maintain the *status quo* in that respect.

Japan had approved the resolution adopted at the Emigration Conference in Rome in 1924, expressing the desire that such means as book of identity should be adopted to show the identity and the nationality of emigrants.

The Japanese Government was willing to study the feasibility and practical means of adopting the identity book on three conditions:

(1) That the identity book and passport should be made co-existent and supplementary to each other;

(2) That the majority of immigration countries wants it; and

(3) That the adoption of the system would not inconvenience the holders in any way by making them subject to more expense or trouble or to undesirable treatment. In that connection he wished to point out that the adoption of some special system for emigrants would make it necessary to come to a decision as to what definition should be given to "emigrants". Such a definition would have to be applicable in all countries and be recognised at least by all Members of the League of Nations.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) doubted whether the question now under discussion merited the importance that the Conference appeared to attach to it. What was actually being done with regard to identity documents for emigrants did not appear to have caused insuperable difficulties.

The French delegation was not averse to the introduction of identity books, but doubted if they would offer great advantages. Numerous objections had been raised, and in any case

the French delegation did not think there was anything to be gained by placing emigrants in a special category.

A distinction must be drawn between countries of emigration, countries of immigration and transit countries. In the case of immigration and of transit countries, the document in itself mattered little, provided it bore the visa of the consular authorities. So far as France was concerned, any emigrant holding a document visé by the French consular authority was at liberty to enter her territory.

Mr. DUNNE (International Shipping Conference) said that the emigrant question was of great importance to the International Shipping Conference, the members of which transported large numbers of emigrants every year.

The identity book would only be useful if introduced in complete substitution of all other documents, including passports. As long as the question of abandoning the passport and adopting the identity book had not yet been settled, it might lead to duplication of documents.

Moreover, the identity book in the form in which it had been presented was objectionable, especially when it recorded petty offences, committed years ago. Detachable leaves were, in the opinion of his Conference, undesirable. His Conference was greatly concerned with page 18 of the identity book — the general medical certificate. It was not clear what entries would be made on it; as emigrants were inspected by three or four doctors before they were allowed to come on board, four pages like page 18 would probably be required.

There was also the question of the class of passenger who greatly objected to being labelled as an emigrant, and there were many emigrants who objected to having their finger-prints taken. Generally speaking, the first aim should be simplification and as far as possible the abolition of existing vexatious requirements.

M. MALHOMME (Poland) desired to make a statement, which he was anxious that members should not take into consideration unless the proposal submitted by the Polish delegation on the previous day, contemplating the abolition of the passport, were rejected. The abolition of the passport naturally involved the abolition of the identity book also. He agreed with the German delegate that emigrants should not be treated differently from ordinary travellers.

Although a model identity book intended to replace passports for emigrants offered great advantages, and might certainly be of great use, the Polish Government could not adopt it in the immediate future, as the proposed identity books would involve considerable expenditure. The production of such documents would require an increase of administrative machinery, and at present this was quite impossible.

For these reasons most emigration States had adopted a greatly simplified type of passport, in which the only coupons relating to statistics and inspection were the "Departure Card" and the "Return Card"; these were detached at the frontier at the time of departure, and, eventually, of return. Such cards met the requirements of the shipping companies as regards statistics and inspection.

It seemed very doubtful whether it would be possible to fill up the proposed eight cards which were to contain details of statistics and inspection and were intended for the use of the countries of origin, transit and destination, as well as for shipping companies; it was equally improbable that so complicated a system would work regularly, quite apart from the fact that a considerable increase of staff would be needed to collect the required information.

Moreover, the introduction of emigrants' identity books would only be justified if all the entries and notes given, for example, on Pages 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20, concerning the death of husband or wife or of children, good conduct and character, health, vaccination against smallpox, criminal record and pending proceedings, were drawn up in several languages.

Entries made in any one of the following languages — Polish, Russian, Czech, Bulgarian and Serb — could not be understood by the local authorities in the case of an emigrant arriving in the countries of Western Europe or overseas, and would consequently be valueless.

The Polish Government could not possibly accept and put into execution the proposal to replace transit visas for emigrants by special transit cards, except on a basis of reciprocity.

Professor GIANNINI (Italy) urged the importance of drawing a distinction between emigrants and non-emigrants, and between passports for emigrants and passports for non-emigrants. The emigrant was a worker who might meet with accidents, and would then require a relief allowance and compensation. Such was not the case with the ordinary traveller. Travelling facilities and conditions of residence were not the same for the two categories of persons. The emigrant was almost always obliged to reside in the locality for which a permit had been issued to him, and a passport was therefore indispensable. This condition did not apply to the traveller, who could travel throughout a State with an

ordinary vised passport. The emigrant's passport might be defined by the term "International Labour Identity Book", issued in the interests of the holder as much as in that of the country of emigration or of immigration. It must also be borne in mind that the worker in a foreign country, especially when unemployed, was regarded with a certain amount of distrust, even in the most democratic countries. It was true that up to the present millions of workers had emigrated, holding only the existing papers, but that did not prove that the system was flawless. Indeed, the whole object for which the present conference had been convened was to remedy these drawbacks.

While the Italian delegation was bound, as a matter of form, to reserve its decision as to the identity-book, it was of opinion that the optional particulars as to the circumstances of the worker, etc., might be of great use, and he had no criticism to offer; on the contrary, he thought that those particulars should be included.

He therefore proposed that, in order to take account of the Passport Sub-Committee's proposal, the identity-book should be divided into two parts, the first establishing the identity of the holder and containing all necessary guarantees, and the second giving optional particulars. The preparation of a model identity book on these lines might be entrusted to a sub-committee, which would adopt all the best features of the draft identity-book.

The PRESIDENT, summing up the discussion, pointed out that opinions differed. Certain speakers had even criticised the principles underlying the system of identity books; others had been entirely opposed to their institution. He therefore proposed to take a vote, and, should the meeting decide in favour of the identity book, to appoint a sub-committee composed of representatives from emigration, immigration and transit States to draft a model identity book.

When put to the vote, the proposal to establish an identity book was unanimously rejected.

THIRD MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Thursday, May 13th, 1926, at 3.30 p.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

11. Abolition of Passports (*continued*).

The PRESIDENT stated that he had before him two texts, submitted by the French and German delegations respectively. Their authors proposed to summarise the discussions which had taken place at the first meeting, more especially the discussion on the actual principle of the abolition of passports.

He thought it would be well to hold over these proposals for the moment, as they could be referred, with any others which might be submitted, to the Committee which would no doubt be appointed to draft a single text.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said he had already explained that his Government was of opinion that travellers should possess passports. He had received very definite instructions on this point and it would be quite impossible for the British delegation to accept any resolution contemplating the possibility of abolishing passports in the near future.

The PRESIDENT thought that the text prepared by the Drafting Committee would be elastic enough to satisfy all the delegations, and that, in any case, the actual work of the Drafting Committee would not conflict with the instructions received by the British Delegation.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) stated that his delegation reserved the right to express its opinion on the final text produced by the Drafting Committee. The British delegation preferred not to be represented on that Committee, because it felt that the text the latter produced could not possibly concord with the instructions which the British delegation had received.

On the proposal of the PRESIDENT, *the Conference adjourned to a later meeting the discussion of the text to be drawn up regarding the abolition of passports.*

12. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be Maintained.

A. Issue of Passports.

The PRESIDENT reserved the question and proposed that the meeting should pass to Item 2 of the Agenda: Section A — Issue of Passports. He stated that a number of proposals had been submitted, which would make the passport regime, if retained, as

elastic as possible. He invited the members of the Conference to consider these proposals severally, dealing first with the question of the "type of passport" (see Annex 3).

Type of Passport.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) recalled the fact that the Conference in 1920 had emphasised the necessity for the adoption of a uniform type of passport by all States throughout the world. The model given in the resolution of that Conference had already been adopted by a large number of countries. Others, however, decided not to do so, because they feared that that type of identity book might not offer sufficient safeguards against fraud. The single-sheet type of passport offered no better security. It actually happened that, in consequence of the number of visas to be affixed, the original sheet had to be supplemented by joining supplementary sheets to it. In such a case the possibilities of fraud were even greater than with the book system.

He wished to draw the attention of the Conference to the type of passport which had been in use in Austria before the 1920 Conference and had only been slightly modified in consequence of the resolutions adopted by that Conference. In preparing the passport, special precautions had been taken to prevent any kind of fraud. The paper used was of a special kind, similar to that usually employed in the manufacture of paper money, which made it impossible to erase or delete any inscription in such a way that the erasure could not be detected. Every passport was provided with a serial number on the front page and the back of the cover. Moreover, all these passports were perforated with a stamp having the initials of the Austrian Republic. This stamp was affixed in almost, but not quite, the same place on each passport, so that, if a leaf taken from one passport were substituted for a leaf in another, it would be impossible, on holding the whole document up to the light, to read the perforated initials, as the perforations on the interpolated sheet would not coincide with those on the other sheets. Passports could thus be inspected with great facility and without any loss of time.

He invited those of his colleagues who were interested in the matter to examine a specimen of an Austrian passport, a number of which he had handed to the Bureau of the Conference. He sincerely hoped that the various countries would agree upon a standard type. He had ventured to submit the type employed in Austria, in the hope that the safeguards it offered against fraud would lead other States which had not already done so to decide on the adoption of this form of book.

The PRESIDENT stated that he had received a written proposal from the Austrian delegation the text of which had also been distributed to the delegates present (see Annex 5). He proposed that the Conference should not examine this document until they had terminated the discussion of the first Article. He thought it would be necessary to set up a technical sub-committee to examine this proposal and any others of a similar nature.

Mr. MARTIN (Great Britain) said that the British Government was quite satisfied with the type of passport recommended by the Paris Conference in 1920. The advantage of the old single-sheet form of passport was the impossibility of extracting any part of it and substituting another. On the other hand the book form was more convenient. The British Government had adopted a combined form; a book-passport made in one single sheet folded together, so that it was impossible to substitute pages.

Moreover, a form of paper and fugitive ink had been adopted which rendered it impossible for any alteration or erasure to be made by the use of chemicals or otherwise. As in Austria, a serial number was printed both on the outside cover and on the first sheet of the passport, a system which had proved to be a very effective precaution against fraud.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) pointed out that Hungary had adopted the specimen passport of 1920, which had given full satisfaction. His Government hoped that it would be maintained and that it would come into general use.

He would like, however, to read to the Conference the following recommendations adopted by the Graz Conference in 1922.

"The Graz Conference is of opinion that the adoption of the following measures would be highly desirable:

"1. Model passport.

"(a) Additional space should be left for the description of the holder, especially under the headings of *name* and *profession*:

"(b) Particulars as to height (*e.g.* tall, medium height, short) should be included in the description of the holder;

"(c) Particulars as to rights of citizenship (*indigénat*) should be included;

"(d) It should be permissible to insert the words 'On behalf of (head of the State);

"(e) Emigrants' passports should be prepared in such a way as to be clearly distinguishable from ordinary passports;

"(f) For reasons of economy, a passport issued for a single journey should consist of only 12 pages instead of 32."

These recommendations were made by the representatives of seven States.

He proceeded to explain the various resolutions as follows :

Recommendation No. 1. The passport proposed by the Paris Conference provided for the holder's name a space of about 5 centimetres, which was inadequate because some names were very long. This would ensure safety and proper inspection.

Recommendation No. 2. The passports of the 1920 model made no provision for indicating the height of the holder (which was a point of some importance).

Recommendation No. 3. In the Paris type, a space of only 3 or 4 centimetres was allowed for "occupation"; this was not sufficient. For the convenience of police officials, they should have space enough to insert some such mention as "Director of Messrs. X..."; a statement of too general a nature would be useless.

Recommendation No. 4. In certain countries the status known as "indigénat" (right of citizenship or settlement) was unknown, in France and the Anglo-Saxon countries, for instance. Other countries were familiar with the conception, and attached great importance to it, *e.g.* Czechoslovakia, Roumania and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The idea was expressed in Italian by the term "pertinenza" and in French by "droit de cité". It was proposed that in States in which this conception of "indigénat" existed, a space should be left for mentioning the fact on the passport itself. "Indigénat" was not the same as domicile; the relation between the individual and the commune from which he came was of great importance to the individual, and that was why it was by no means superfluous to mention the fact.

Recommendation No. 5. Certain States desired the name of the Head of the State to appear on the passport issued.

Recommendation No. 6. This point might be considered at the same time as emigration questions.

Recommendation No. 7. At the time of the Graz Conference, there was not that broad-minded outlook which prevailed at present. Passports were then valid for a single journey, in conformity with the decisions of the Paris Conference of 1920. In such circumstances a book of thirty-two pages seemed unnecessary. Apart from questions of adequate police supervision, there were others which warranted the issue of passports for only one voyage.

The Hungarian delegation would submit to the President in writing a proposal that the number of pages should be reduced from 32 to 12.

The PRESIDENT said he thought it would be necessary to set up a small Sub-Committee to examine the British and Hungarian proposals. For the present, therefore, he would ask the delegates to do no more than submit suggestions to be referred to this sub-committee.

Professor GIANNINI (Italy) said that he would refer to the sub-committee proposals regarding certain technical changes which he would like to explain to the delegates.

M. NIKOLOPOULOS (Greece) suggested that with a view to avoiding possible fraud in connection with passports, the name of the holder should be inserted whenever a consular visa of any sort was given.

In order to be certain that a page had not been substituted, the authorities would only need to ascertain whether the name on the visa was identical with the name of the holder of the passport as shown at the beginning.

The PRESIDENT invited M. Nikolopoulos to submit his suggestion to the Sub-Committee.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) welcomed the appointment of a Sub-Committee, and added that he would submit his observations to it. He would be glad if the German delegation could be represented on it.

The PRESIDENT willingly accepted the German delegation's proposal, particularly as it had already submitted highly important documents on the subject.

Authorities competent to issue Passports.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) held that the question was an urgent one, in view of the difficulties which applicants occasionally experienced in obtaining their passports from the issuing offices. These offices should, as far as possible, be decentralised. In Austria, for example, several Government institutions were authorised to issue passports. In Vienna, every District Police Commissioner, as well as the Directorate of Police, could issue passports, and the applicant was not therefore compelled to apply to distant authorities. Outside Vienna, the Sub-Prefectures were authorised to issue passports.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) stated that Hungary recognised the importance of Recommendation No. 2. In his country, the local authorities were responsible for the issue of passports, but, as certain States restricted the number of immigrants (the United States, for example, admitted only 476 Hungarian immigrants annually), it was impossible to dispense with central offices capable of exercising general control. In Hungary, the Ministry of the Interior decided whether a passport should be issued or not to a country where immigration was subject to restriction.

The PRESIDENT pointed out to M. de Gömöry-Laiml that his remarks applied more particularly to Recommendation 4.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) agreed.

Mr. MARTIN (Great Britain) said that the only authority in Great Britain responsible for the issue of passports was the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who had one office in London and one in Liverpool, the latter to cover applications from the northern part of the country. In the case of people living at a distance, passports could be obtained on application by post, a practice which had not been found to cause inconvenience. It was not, in the British Government's view, within the province of the police to issue passports for foreign travel.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) said that in his country passports were issued from a single office in Ottawa. Although Canada was a vast country, the system had worked very satisfactorily.

Application forms were available in post offices, etc. The applicant had merely to fill up the form, secure two references from clergymen, Members of Parliament or Justices of the Peace, and forward it by post together with two signed photographs. The passport was despatched to the applicant in the same manner, if his application was found in order. In cases of great urgency, but in such cases alone, the emigration authorities had the right to issue a letter of identity which served until a passport was available.

The system had worked so well that the Canadian Government saw no reason to change it. It had accordingly instructed its representatives to state that Canada favoured a central office rather than the policy of distributing the offices of issue.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium) was of opinion that the matter could hardly be settled by means of international regulations, as the question at issue was the administrative organisation in each country, and conditions varied so much that a uniform solution was out of the question.

In Belgium, the Minister for Foreign Affairs issued passports, but he could delegate his powers to governors of provinces and district commissioners. To go further would be not only difficult but dangerous. Mistakes would occur if, for instance, post office officials were authorised to issue passports, for they did not possess the necessary information as to either the criminal record of the parties concerned or their position as regards military service.

He therefore thought that all they could do would be to make a recommendation in favour of decentralisation wherever it might be found useful.

M. MARCOTTY (Delegate of the International Chamber of Commerce) stated that the International Chamber of Commerce considered it highly desirable that passports should be quickly obtainable. The Conference would do well to formulate a recommendation to that effect. Passports must, of course, be issued by experienced persons, in order to avoid mistakes and the serious inconveniences that might result therefrom.

It would perhaps be useful to investigate more closely the methods of procedure employed by various countries in issuing passports. Each Government might find interesting suggestions in the results of such an enquiry.

M. MUNDT (Free City of Danzig) stated that it was often a matter of some difficulty to establish the nationality of applicants for passports, and at Danzig it was considered preferable to entrust the issue of passports solely to officials of the Free City who were accustomed to the work.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that no definite proposal had been made, but the exchange of opinions as to the advantages of one system or another would be of use to the Technical Committee and would enable it to draft a recommendation to be submitted to Governments.

Duration of Validity.

The PRESIDENT read a passage from the draft Agenda drawn up by the Sub-Committee concerning the duration of the validity of passports (see Annex 3).

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said that in 1920 the Austrian Government had made the period of validity two years, but was now prepared to extend it to five years.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that the German Government was also ready to agree to a period of five years.

M. KURUSU (Japan) wished to call the attention of the Conference to Japan's present system. As their answer to the questionnaire sent out by the Advisory and Technical Committee showed, the validity of the Japanese passport was not fixed by a certain length of time but by a particular journey. Reading the Minutes of the Sub-Committee which

had prepared the agenda, it would appear that they had not entertained the idea of one passport for one journey. It might be supposed that, if a passport were issued for one journey, it would mean a very limited duration of validity of the passport, but this was not so. Japan being situated far from the rest of the world, the Japanese Government always understood, in issuing passports, that the journey to be undertaken would last a considerable length of time. Article 14 of the Japanese Passport Regulations stated that a passport would be valid even for ten years if the holder remained in the foreign country to which he travelled and, after the period of ten years had elapsed, it could be even further renewed on application to the consuls or other responsible authorities.

The Japanese Government explicitly stated in its instructions to its delegates that it desired to maintain the present system, besides the system of fixing validity by a certain period of time. But, in principle, it had no objection to the proposal which was made that the duration of the validity of the passports should be extended to five years if possible.

The PRESIDENT replied that the Japanese delegate's statement would be noted, but added that the Conference could only adopt recommendations.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIHL (Hungary) said that Hungary, in consequence of the resolutions of the Graz Conference, had adopted a two-years duration of validity. If the Conference unanimously decided that passports should be valid for five years, Hungary would ask for a period of transition to be allowed, in order to enable the system to be introduced gradually.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) wondered whether it would not be preferable to allow Governments a certain latitude in regard to the steps to be taken. In Sweden passports were delivered for the duration desired by the traveller, with a maximum validity of two years. Were it to be a question of increasing this validity to five years, for example, Sweden would certainly hesitate to take such a step. He did not think, therefore, that he could accept the recommendation that the validity of passports should be increased to five years.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the text submitted by the Sub-Committee was an outcome of the Paris Conference and had been rendered as elastic as possible. It was simply a recommendation to the Governments to prolong the duration of the validity of passports from two to five years if possible, in accordance with the example set by other countries. He did not think there could be any objection to this recommendation, since, after all, the Governments were not bound to adopt it.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) pointed out that, in the recommendation, a hope was expressed that States would adopt a period of validity of at least two years.

The PRESIDENT replied that the Paris Conference had already made a recommendation to that effect. It was no more than a recommendation, and States were not required to enter into any commitment.

Professor GIANNINI (Italy) said that there seemed to be two aspects of the passport question, one political and the other technical. The Conference ought to devote its attention more especially to the technical side; countries might certainly profit by its suggestions. In his opinion documents of identity and all other documents of the same kind should be issued for a limited period in order that record might be kept of any changes in the legal or personal status of the holder.

As regards emigrants, he felt bound to make a reservation: In any case Italy could not admit the unconditional validity of passports, either as regards duration or destination. It was necessary to state the country of destination in order to protect the holder.

M. OUANG (China) said that passports issued by the Chinese Government were valid for one year. When, however, the holder intended to stay abroad for a longer period, the validity of his passport might be prolonged by the consular authorities. The Chinese Government had no objection to the duration of validity being extended from two to five years.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation felt that they should aim at the greatest liberty consistent with security. He did not know whether one could go beyond the period of five years, because after that period the photograph might no longer be recognisable as that of the holder. He held that the Conference was assembled primarily to consider the interests of the great mass of people. He thought it was more in keeping with the holder's dignity to give him a passport for five rather than two years. In so doing the Government showed that it could trust him for five years to be worthy of a passport. He thought that was a fact which should be kept in mind when discussing the question of the duration of validity.

M. JUNOD (International Chamber of Commerce) stated that the International Chamber of Commerce, in agreement with the International Shipping Conference, strongly supported the Sub-Committee's resolution and hoped that, in the interests of travellers in

general and traders in particular, the duration of the validity of passports would be extended to five years.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) said that, at the suggestion of the President, he had referred to the recommendation adopted by the Paris Conference, and had found that it contained the following provision. "The passport shall be issued either for a single journey, or for two years." Then, turning to the replies sent in by Governments to point 3 of the questionnaire, which related to periods of validity, he observed that there the periods of validity differed in different countries. In Esthonia, for instance, the period was six months or a year; in France, one year; in Great Britain five years; in Sweden, one or two years. As, therefore, it would seem that the recommendation of the Paris Conference had remained practically a dead letter, he did not see the use of making another recommendation which would probably meet with the same fate.

The PRESIDENT, replying, as Esthonian delegate, to M. d'Adlercreutz, stated that a new law on passports was under consideration in Esthonia and would shortly be submitted to Parliament. At present, passports issued in Esthonia were only valid for a period of from six months to one year. Esthonia, however, was not opposed in principle to the Sub-Committee's recommendation and her delegate would certainly vote in favour of it.

He did not think it should be impossible for any of the delegations present, even those which had made reservations or had not taken part in the discussion, to accept the text submitted by the Sub-Committee. He therefore proposed that they should proceed to take a vote on it.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey) thought it would be better to make passports valid for one year only. He thought that after one year the document would become so covered with visas that it would be very difficult to examine. Hitherto the Turkish Government had only issued passports valid for one year. He could not vote unless he received further instructions from his Government. He added that an explanation of the duration of validity would not be of much use to the holder, as visas had, as a rule, to be renewed every six months or every year.

The PRESIDENT observed that this was simply a recommendation and did not commit the Governments in any way. He put to the vote the motion, which read as follows:

"The Conference, noting that a large number of countries have adopted the duration of validity of two years for passports, as proposed by the 1920 Conference, and that a certain number of countries have not yet adopted that period, recommends that all countries should in any event adopt a minimum validity of two years and, if possible, validity approaching five years, which has already been adopted by certain countries."

(A vote was taken by a show of hands. The motion was adopted by 25 votes to 5.)

Extent of Validity.

The PRESIDENT then read paragraph 4 of the Passport Sub-Committee's recommendations: Extent of validity:

"The Sub-Committee recommends that, except in certain special or exceptional cases, Governments should issue passports valid for all foreign countries."

M. KURUSU (Japan) desired to make in this connection a reservation similar to that made by the Italian delegate.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) stated that, as certain States restricted the number of immigrants who might enter the country, the Hungarian Government would have to reserve the right to enter in passports the names of the countries to which the holder of the passport could travel.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the proposal before the Conference would not in any way affect the decisions which might be reached in connection with visas. It was simply a question of restricting the validity of the passport to certain specified countries.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) confirmed the President's statement, and added that the immigrant question was also being dealt with separately. These observations applied not only to Recommendation No. 4, but also to No. 3, and the reservations which had been made were quite consistent with those texts.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) explained that the present practice of the British Government was in accordance with the direct recommendations of the 1920 Conference. Passports were not valid for every country, and the groups of countries for which they were valid was specified on the document itself. It would be difficult to modify the present system, for the following reasons, among others:—The Scandinavian Governments required that the photograph and signature should be specially countersigned by the

issuing officer ; moreover, His Majesty's Government had given undertakings in the House of Commons regarding the movements of theatrical artistes in view of the danger of the white slave traffic ; further, his Government were anxious that British subjects should not emigrate to countries where climatic conditions were known to be unsuitable ; lastly, special conditions were attached to the visas granted for Iraq and Palestine.

The British Government was therefore anxious to maintain the principle of specifying the countries for which a passport was valid, but was quite ready wherever possible to increase the number of such countries.

The PRESIDENT asked Mr. Sperling whether the reservation contained in the proposal itself, namely, "except in certain special or exceptional cases", would not meet his requirements.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) replied that his Government objected to issuing what might be called negative passports, *i.e.*, passports which could be described as valid for the whole world except for certain specified countries.

The PRESIDENT repeated that the proposal submitted in no way bound the Governments, which would be free in exceptional cases to refuse to issue passports for certain countries.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) thought that the Sub-Committee's recommendation was in no way binding upon Governments, and that the words "except in certain special or exceptional cases" could be interpreted to apply to immigrants as well as all other special cases.

The PRESIDENT thought there had been a slight misunderstanding on the part of the Austrian delegation. A vote had been taken that morning on the emigrants' identity book, which the Conference had unanimously rejected. That in no way prejudged the status of emigrants, because the question would be dealt with by a Conference on the following day. The reservations made by the Italian and Austrian delegates would be duly taken into consideration.

M. KURUSU (Japan) observed that, as he had already explained, no distinction was made in Japan between the passports of emigrants and those of ordinary passengers. He pointed out the fact that in the case of Japan, the number of cases covered by the expression "special or exceptional cases" in the proposal would be much more numerous than "general" cases. Accordingly, he maintained the reservation he had made that morning.

M. MALHOMME (Poland) agreed with the Secretary-General of the Conference that it would be desirable not to discuss the passports question simultaneously with the emigrants question. Nevertheless, he thought it would be difficult to treat the questions severally. He proposed that they should add, after the words "the Conference recommends that Governments should issue passports valid for all foreign countries" the words "as regards emigrants, the Conference is of opinion that it would be desirable to specify the countries in which the passport will be valid ; this would constitute a measure of protection and would tend to discourage emigration to countries in which the labour market is well supplied or in which labour conditions are unfavourable."

Mr. HOSE (India) said that he had definite instructions to oppose the adoption of universal validity as a general rule. The establishment of such a rule would involve the enumeration on the passport of groups of States for which the document was not valid. Such an enumeration would be invidious for these States. The Indian Government was therefore formally opposed to the adoption of a passport with universal validity. On the contrary, he strongly supported the system proposed by Great Britain that the groups of countries which the traveller would probably visit should be indicated.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) suggested an amendment as follows : "The Conference recommends that, except in certain special or exceptional cases, Governments should issue passports valid for as many foreign countries as possible." He hoped this would meet the requirements of most of the delegates.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) proposed that the decision on this point should be adjourned until the results of the discussions on the emigrant question were known.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) thought that the British delegate's proposal would satisfy such of the delegates as were hesitating to adopt passports delivered for all countries. In France, passports were valid for all countries and their validity was only restricted in very exceptional cases. The French Government saw no reason for prohibiting any French citizen from going to any country he chose.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) said that the German delegation supported the French delegation's views. It would be preferable to submit the other proposal in writing in order that it might be discussed.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) thought it would now be extremely easy to draft a text which would meet with general approval. He would like to anticipate any possible misunderstandings. The text proposed by the Sub-Committee had been interpreted as advocating that, in exceptional cases, a list should be given of States on whose territory the passport was not valid. This was not the case. It seemed clear from the discussion, however, that questions which particularly concerned emigrants were being held over and that a proposal such as that made by the Polish delegation might be discussed when the emigration question was dealt with. There might be certain restrictions — which could not yet be foreseen — which would apply to emigrants, but would not affect the general passport arrangements.

He thought it would be comparatively easy to make an amendment similar to that proposed by the British delegate, taking into account the opinion of certain countries which had explained the system they employed. He doubted whether, in its present form, it would accurately represent the opinion of the Conference. Apparently a large number of countries had adopted, or were prepared to recommend, a system of passports valid for all foreign countries. On the other hand, other countries issued passports valid only for groups of countries. Would it not be possible to take both points of view into account and, without entirely sacrificing — as the British text did — Recommendation No. 4, which met the French and German delegations' wishes, adopt the recommendation (in the form that has been given to it in Recommendation No 4), with the following addition: "The Sub-Committee recommends that except in certain special or exceptional cases the Governments should issue passports valid for all foreign countries or for groups of as many countries as possible" ?

The PRESIDENT asked the British delegate whether he accepted this proposal.

MR. SPERLING (Great Britain) declared himself in favour of the text submitted by the Secretary-General of the Conference.

The text proposed by the Secretary-General of the Conference was adopted unanimously (27 delegations).

Fees.

The PRESIDENT put the following text to the vote :

"The Conference recommends that the fees charged for the issue of passports should be fixed in such a manner as to bring in revenue to the States not exceeding the expenditure involved in the preparation of the passports and their issue to the persons concerned."

That text was adopted.

13. Constitution of Two Sub-Committees.

On the proposal of the PRESIDENT, the Conference appointed a Sub-Committee composed of MM. POLITIS (Vice-President of the Conference), DE NAVAILLES (France), and ECKARDT (Germany) to draft the two proposals submitted with regard to the abolition of passports.

The Conference, on the PRESIDENT'S proposal, also appointed a Sub-Committee to investigate technical questions (type of passport, etc.) composed of the representatives of Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Italy.

FOURTH MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Friday, May 14th, 1926, at 10.30 a.m.

President: M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT (Cuba) (Vice-President of the Conference).

14. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained (continued).

B. Visas.

Transit Visas.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that, in the sixth paragraph relating to this subject in the Committee of Experts' report (see Annex 3 — Appendix), it was stated that "to spare emigrants the difficulties which they encounter at present it would be most desirable that the countries through which they pass should agree to recognise as sufficient the transit card of the country of embarkation".

M. DEROOVER (Rapporteur of the Committee of Experts) explained why the experts had made this proposal. The reasons were given in the report.

He desired to draw the Conference's attention to the agreement signed at Paris on January 27th, 1926, between Belgium and France concerning reciprocity in regard to transit cards for emigrants embarking at Belgian and French ports; the text of this agreement had been distributed to the members of the Conference.

It would be necessary to adopt a uniform type of transit card in order to simplify the examination of these cards.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) explained the system used by his Government for over 20 years. The shipping companies who carried the emigrants had entered into bonds with the Home Secretary, under which the shipping companies were responsible for the removal from Great Britain of the emigrants in transit and for their maintenance and control so long as they were in Great Britain. They were responsible too for removal back to the country of origin of all emigrants who were rejected as unsuitable for the country of destination. Great Britain had never required transit visas for emigrants in transit, but some five years previously a system of transit cards had been invented. The emigrant in transit gave up half the card on arrival and the other half on departure from Great Britain. When the authorities were in possession both of the *in* and *out* card, they knew that the shipping company concerned had discharged its obligations to the State.

The British Government strongly advocated that transit visas should be abolished and their place taken by a single transit card which might either be stamped or marked in an entirely different manner on the frontiers of the country of transit. He had noted with great interest the agreement between France and Belgium (see Annex 6). The second article appeared to present some difficulties because it made the State in which the port of embarkation was situated responsible for certain actions by the emigration agents and the authorised shipping companies. The legal effects of this provision were not clear, and he did not know if his Government could be bound to action of that sort, but, in any case, it had the greatest sympathy with the suggestions contained both in the Sub-Committee's report and in the particulars set forth in the agreement between France and Belgium.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) stated that the Czechoslovak Government granted transit visas to emigrants free of charge, or on payment of a fee amounting to not more than a tenth of the normal fee.

A transit visa was generally granted without further information being required, nor were the central authorities consulted; moreover, the applicant was not obliged to appear in person at the Czechoslovak Passport Office, provided he possessed the entrance visa issued by the State to which he desired to immigrate, or the transit visa of a State adjacent to Czechoslovakia.

The Czechoslovak Government wished to know what was to be understood by the term "emigration agent" and proposed that the issue of transit cards should be entrusted solely to agencies holding concessions for the transport of emigrants, provided that these companies offered adequate guarantees and that the issue of transit cards was not abused.

According to the Czechoslovak Emigration Law, the transport of emigrants could only be undertaken by a person duly authorised to do so by the Ministry of Social Welfare. That authorisation was only granted if the strict obligations imposed upon all companies under State control were fulfilled. Supervision was exercised not only over the actions of those companies in Czechoslovak territory, but also abroad.

The companies were obliged to deposit security of at least 300,000 Czechoslovak crowns and a further 100,000 crowns for each of their responsible officials. These securities guaranteed the fulfilment of all the obligations incumbent upon the companies, their representatives and other employees, and also ensured the proper working of the undertaking in its relations both with the State and with the emigrants.

As regards health, the Czechoslovak Government furnished every guarantee that emigrants carried by the Czechoslovak Transport Companies should fully comply with the health regulations laid down by the States to which they were immigrating and by the States crossed in transit.

The Czechoslovak Government was anxious that this supervision and these precautions should also be exercised by foreign States, especially in the case of emigrants conveyed across Czechoslovak territory by transport companies holding concessions from other States.

If this supervision and these precautions were assured, the Czechoslovak Government would accept in its entirety the proposal of the Emigration Experts concerning the issue of transit cards by transport companies in foreign States, and also agreed to the terms of the guarantees required from these companies to ensure that emigrants would be conveyed across the territory of foreign States in a wholly satisfactory manner.

The Czechoslovak Government proposed that transport companies should only issue transit cards to emigrants going overseas, and, further, that, in the case of other emigrants, the transit visa should be affixed to the emigration passport, by the Consular Agent, upon payment of a fee of 10 gold centimes and with as few formalities as possible.

M. DEROOVER (Rapporteur of the Committee of Experts) explained that, by "emigration agents", the experts meant persons or shipping companies who had obtained authorisation from the Governments of the various countries to book and transport emigrants.

He thanked M. Maixner for the interesting facts he had given concerning the Czechoslovak laws, and pointed out that the laws of all European countries on this subject were practically identical. In Belgium, for instance, a licence of the kind in question was only granted to a shipping company after careful investigation of its integrity and upon the deposit of security fixed at 100,000 francs; as a rule, granted for one year only.

He therefore thought that the Czechoslovak Government might be reassured, from the point of view of its national laws, as regards the guarantees provided by the companies licensed by European countries to issue emigration cards.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) pointed out that in Latvia the transit of emigrants was an important consideration. It seemed to be carried out in such the same way as in Czechoslovakia. The Latvian Government could not, however, accept the experts' proposal that transit cards should be issued by shipping companies without consulting the consular agents of the countries concerned. The Latvian Government could not accept the fourth paragraph of the section of the experts' report headed "Transit Visas", because experience had shown that the companies abused their rights in this matter. In some cases indeed, companies were compelled by circumstances to do so. Accordingly, Latvia could not, at any rate for the present, accept the system proposed by the Passport Sub-Committee.

She already granted the other facilities proposed by the experts.

M. DEROOVER (Rapporteur of the Committee of Experts) pointed out to M. Duzmans that the experts had provided for the responsibility of shipping companies.

He thought that the Latvian Government would have no further cause for apprehension if guarantees were furnished ensuring that any company which made wrongful use of emigration cards would infallibly forfeit its licence to book or transport emigrants. All laws on the subject contained a clause to that effect.

In order to secure the suppression of abuses, the experts had proposed that the emigration services of the countries concerned should be authorised to communicate with each other directly.

M. RITTER (International Shipping Conference) said that the organisation he represented would welcome the substitution of transit cards if transit visas could not be totally abolished, as this system would tend to make travelling easier for emigrants.

There would be no improvement, however, if the transit cards had to bear the stamps of the consuls of the countries through which the emigrants had to pass. Transit cards should be issued by the steamship companies and should be exempt from the consular visa; it was not so much the money which had to be paid for a transit visa which caused the trouble as the difficulty of obtaining the visa. In the report of the experts to the Passport Sub-Committee, it was recommended that the responsibility for whatever happened to the emigrants while in transit should be borne by the steamship lines. He drew the attention of the Conference to the fact that both the very stringent regulations of the countries of origin and the still more rigorous immigration laws of the countries of destination burdened the shipping companies so much already that it was impossible to impose further responsibilities on the steamship lines. They were taxed so heavily that they could not undertake to accept additional responsibilities. As transit cards were substituted for the transit visas, he could see no reason why transit cards should bring more responsibilities to the shipping companies than the transit visas did so far.

The shipping companies should, of course, be held responsible for seeing that transit cards were only issued when proper steamship tickets for the country of destination had been supplied, and they had to see that transmigrants possessed sufficient means to feed themselves on their journey through the various countries they traversed. In conclusion, he asked that the recommendation made by the experts should not be accepted in its present wording.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) was anxious that agreement should be reached upon a single model. In Sweden, certain categories of emigrants were exempted from the transit visa, if the shipping companies or their agents undertook certain responsibilities. One detail should be borne in mind: when transit was effected without a visa, emigrants were obliged to travel in groups and to be accompanied from the time of their entry into Swedish territory to the time of their exit by a foreman appointed by the Swedish administrative authorities. The companies, for their part, were bound to pay the cost of any special supervision which the police might consider necessary. He thought that the application of one or other of the two conditions might allay the fears expressed by the Latvian delegate.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) stated that Latvia could not consent to the general application of the proposed measure. She would do her best to apply it as far as possible, but in

present circumstances she could not please herself definitely in this direction. The exposed geographical situation of Latvia must not be forgotten and the Latvian Government could not, therefore, grant the same facilities to travellers as were accorded in France, Great Britain, Belgium and other countries. Any alteration of her present methods might lead to the introduction within her borders of a second Trojan horse; when danger was in her midst, it would be too late to consider the responsibility of the shipping companies, for in Latvia their guarantee was not sufficient.

He agreed with the Swedish delegate that the guarantees he proposed were, in theory, acceptable; but Latvia could not possibly accept them at present.

M. KRASKE (Germany) remarked that special circumstances might also be urged on behalf of Germany, which was one of the principal transit countries. It was natural, therefore, that certain precautions were necessary to regulate and control a heavy stream of travellers. At one time official investigations had shown that 85 per cent. of the persons who entered Germany on transit visas stayed in Germany. Some kind of control was necessary in order to make certain that people passing in transit really left Germany. They had heard from the representative of the International Shipping Conference that the shipping companies could not assume any more responsibility than they already bore. But, in that case, somebody else would have to supervise the transit of emigrants: neither the police nor any other German authorities could assume responsibility when they were not in a position to exercise control. If transit cards were used without any sort of consular visa, they would entitle emigrants to travel just as they pleased, and the German authorities would have control neither over emigrants to overseas countries nor over travellers returning from abroad. If the transit visa were abolished altogether, the measure would also apply to travellers passing through Germany from one European country into another, without transit cards, and the difficulty of control would be further accentuated. The German Government was quite willing to do away with formalities as far as possible, and had already instituted collective visas, which enabled groups of travellers to pass through the country without obtaining individual visas.

In those circumstances, the German Government felt it would not be in a position to abandon the transit visa until the abolition of visas became general.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia), replying to the representative of the International Shipping Conference, desired to point out that the Czechoslovak Government accepted the transit card for overseas emigrants in principle, but could not accept it for emigrants travelling to other European countries. In the case of these latter, it had been thought desirable to retain the consular visa. The agents of the companies did not deal with emigration to other countries in Europe, and in any case the Czechoslovak regulations in the matter of consular fees did not allow them to do so. He took the opportunity of asking the experts for an exact definition of the words "emigration agent".

M. DEROOVER (Belgium) replied that in Belgian and French law the term "emigration agent" denoted any firm or company authorised to transport emigrants. No one could act as an emigration agent without a licence from the Government.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) shared the apprehensions of the Latvian and German delegates. The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was primarily a transit country. She required guarantees that emigrants passing through her territory really left it, and her Government could not accept the transit card. This applied only to overseas emigrants, unless the card had been vised or stamped by the Serb-Croat-Slovene Consular Authorities. Refusal would not occasion great inconvenience, since the shipping companies or their agents had offices in large towns where consular authorities were also established. Emigrants were not required to appear in person at the consulate. The company need only apply to the consulate for a collective visa.

M. GONNE (Belgium) stated that the Belgian Government could not relieve the shipping companies of all responsibility. The emigrant might be rejected or abandoned, or he might lose his way. In such a case it should obviously be the shipping company, and not the Belgian Government, which should repatriate him.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) supported the Belgian delegate's statements. It appeared to him that the responsibility of the emigration agents was the only guarantee afforded to the administrative authorities that emigrants fulfilled the necessary conditions for acceptance in the countries of destination. He recognised that the position of a country like Germany was entirely different from that of France. In the case of Germany, the emigrant would have to be provided with a book similar to the one he now held, but containing detachable leaves which would enable German authorities to exercise control. This book would need to contain as many counterfoils and detachable leaves as there were countries to cross. The question of transit visas as a whole would have to be discussed later; for the time being the emigrant question alone was under discussion.

Mr Bruce WALKER (Canada) said that he would like to congratulate the Emigration Experts on their report ; they had made a very courageous attempt to deal with an extremely difficult and complex problem. He felt that the members of the Conference had perhaps not given the report all the attention it deserved.

Canada favoured such regulations and requirements as made the movement of the emigrant from his old home to his new home in Canada as easy, as comfortable, as safe and as economic as possible.

Under the heading of "Transit Visas" the report contained the following paragraph :

"To spare emigrants the difficulties which they encounter at present, it would be most desirable that the countries through which they pass should agree to recognise as sufficient the transit card of the country of embarkation. Such reciprocal recognition would not seem likely to raise any difficulty in practice. In fact, the card given to the emigrant by the shipping company when the ticket for the passage is taken should make the company responsible not only to the country of the port of embarkation but also to all countries through which the emigrant passes."

That indicated that the policy adopted between France and Belgium for the simplification of visa and transit formalities was a feasible and reasonable one.

For some time past, the Canadian Government had been in direct correspondence and negotiation with various continental countries for the purpose of obtaining for migrants bound for Canada the highest possible consideration, and he was glad to be able to announce that so far their advances had been met in the most cordial spirit.

With regard to the responsibility for the issue of the cards and the continuance of his journey by the migrant, he felt that, while the serious responsibilities of one kind and another which the shipping companies already had to undertake must be recognised, it would not be a good policy to permit them to absolve themselves from responsibility towards the migrant whom they started from his native village to some distant destination. The migrant had probably been induced to think of a new home far away through the influence of an agent of a shipping company. They were not only responsible national bodies, but were great corporations with wide ramifications. Although in the main their agents were as reputable as the agents of any corporation could possibly be, he felt bound to point out that there had been some unfortunate cases caused by the excessive zeal of agents in their search for business. The steamship companies received a very considerable remuneration from the emigrant, and he thought that, once the emigrant had purchased his ticket and placed himself under the direction and care of the steamship company, that company should be held responsible by every country through which the emigrant passed for his safe transit to the port of embarkation, and thence to his destination on the other side of the ocean.

If, by negotiation, the various countries of Europe could be got to agree on a uniform transit ticket, that would be the easiest solution of the difficulty. He was not strongly in favour of migrants, when passing through a country, consulting either their own consular agent or the consular agent of the country to which they were going. Consular officers were, after all, important officials who could hardly be expected to welcome with open arms the humble peasants who made up the great mass of emigrants.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) thought the time had come when a decision might be taken. In four countries — Great Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands — the transit card had been accepted, and in those four countries the transportation companies were entirely responsible for emigrants in transit ; the suggestion now was that the transit card should be extended to other European countries. If the transportation companies were unwilling to take responsibility for emigrants passing through countries other than the four he had named, then the proposal fell to the ground ; if, however, the question were put to the vote, on the assumption that the transportation companies would be willing to assume such responsibility, he would suggest the appointment of a sub-committee to consider the details of the card and to work out the necessary administrative machinery.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) expressed a hope that they might be able to reconcile the views expressed by the Canadian and French delegates. If, when the general formalities were being carried out, they issued the same number of identity coupons as the number of countries which the emigrant would cross, there would be no great complication. He therefore invited the German, Czechoslovak and Serb-Croat-Slovene delegates to consider the possibility of issuing the necessary number of coupons at the time of the emigrant's departure.

M. RITTER (International Shipping Conference) said he had listened with great interest to the statement of the delegate of France that the responsibility for the return of emigrants if they were not allowed to enter the country of destination, should rest with the steamship lines. The steamship lines were bound to do so because their concessions contained a stipulation to the effect that, whenever an emigrant was rejected in the country of destination, they were responsible for bringing him back to his country of origin free of charge.

In reply to the honourable delegate for Canada, he would like to point out that no steamship line was anxious to evade its legitimate responsibilities, but what they objected to was being responsible for an emigrant who purposely went astray in transit, to quote only one instance. Nor could they be responsible if, to quote the terms of the draft, "the emigrant did not comply with the requirements as to health, good character, etc."

The PRESIDENT proposed that a sub-committee should be appointed to study the question of establishing a transit card.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) supported this proposal.

He also accepted the German delegate's proposal that collective visas should be issued to emigrants.

He asked all the delegations to exchange by correspondence, through the President of the Conference or the Secretary-General of the League, detailed information concerning the legislative and administrative provisions of their countries with regard to emigration agents. In particular he would be glad to know :

- (1) On what terms concessions were granted to emigration agents ;
- (2) What rules were laid down regarding responsibility and security ;
- (3) How these agents were supervised.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) asked whether they proposed introducing a transit card only for emigrants crossing the ocean or also for emigrants proceeding from one country to another in the same continent.

15. Constitution of a Sub-Committee on Emigration Questions.

The PRESIDENT replied that this point would be discussed by a sub-committee.

Professor GIANNINI (Italy) said he was glad that the question of establishing a transit card had been referred to a sub-committee. The sub-committee would doubtless succeed in reconciling the various views, which were not, after all, very divergent.

On the previous day, the Conference had abandoned the idea of introducing an identity book. They would therefore have to decide what document should now be issued to emigrants. Would it be a passport as heretofore ? The Conference, however, was discussing the modification of passports.

The vote which had been taken the day before with regard to the identity book might be explained in a variety of ways. It might be held that the Conference had been mainly concerned with the scope ascribed to the proposal. He thought that the rapporteurs had drawn up this book with a view to providing protection for emigrants on the lines laid down by the 1920 Conference, which was concerned with accommodation in railway stations, useful information for emigrants, etc.

The identity book had been drawn up at the Rome Conference. It formed part of the general body of proposals made for the purpose of protecting emigrants. Its creation would be a measure of social reform. The Assembly had rejected the idea the day before, but that was because it did not feel competent to deal with the matter, since it had been convened to consider the question of passports and not the protection of emigrants. Accordingly he submitted the following draft resolution :

"The Conference declares that the recommendations it has adopted concerning, in particular, the regulations covering passports for passengers and travellers, in order to facilitate international communications and commerce, the special questions regarding identification, the movement of foreign emigrants and workers and the international documentation on this subject, should be reserved either for agreements between the various countries or for special meetings of delegates from all the countries concerned."

The PRESIDENT observed that this was a proposal for the full Conference, and he would hand the draft over to its President.

He proposed that they should appoint a sub-committee composed of representatives of countries of emigration, immigration and transit, to consider the question of the transit card. He proposed that this Sub-Committee should consist of M. POLITIS, and the Italian, German, British, Latvian, Serb-Croat-Slovene, French, Czechoslovak and Netherlands delegates and also, in an advisory capacity, M. DEROOVER and a representative of the International Shipping Conference.

This proposal was adopted.

FIFTH MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Saturday, May 15th, 1926, at 10 a.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

16. Transit Cards for Emigrants : Communication by the Sub-Committee.

M. POLITIS (Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Passports) informed the Conference that the Sub-Committee on Transit Cards for Emigrants had been unable to meet until late on the previous day and owing to the limited time at its disposal it had not yet reached a final conclusion. It would therefore resume its discussions on Monday, May 17th, and would submit its suggestions to the Conference on the same day.

17. Issue of Documents of Identity to Emigrants.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Conference should adopt the following recommendation submitted by the Experts on Emigration Questions in regard to the issue of documents of identity :

“We are of opinion that, particularly in respect of identity books, efforts should be made to give effect to the provision in the resolutions of the Rome Conference that the offices competent to issue identity documents to emigrants should be organised in such a way as not to cause emigrants long and expensive journeys, and that the issue of identity documents should as far as possible be entrusted to local authorities, care being taken to prevent the concentration of the services entrusted with the application of the passport regime in large towns, which are frequently at a considerable distance from the places at which emigrants live.”

In order that the Conference might be under no misapprehension as to the purport of this recommendation, the President requested the Secretary-General of the Conference to read the resolution of the Rome Conference.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) read the resolution, which was worded as follows :

“That the offices competent to issue identity documents to emigrants should be organised in such a way as not to cause emigrants long and expensive journeys, and that the issue of identity documents should as far as possible be entrusted to local authorities, care being taken to prevent the concentration of the services entrusted with the application of the passport regime in large towns, which are frequently at a considerable distance from the places at which emigrants live.”

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said he saw no reason why they should not accept this proposal, which after all, was very similar to the recommendation which had been made regarding the issue of passports in general.

The PRESIDENT agreed, and observed that the Conference need only adopt this recommendation in principle for the present, leaving the final drafting of the text until later.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary), reverting to a previous statement of his concerning the United States immigrant quota system, said he wished to make a reservation in this connection. He thought that, if their object was to ensure the most equitable allocation of passports for the United States, they should not allow the matter to be dealt with by a number of officials scattered throughout the country ; the service should be centralised and placed in the hands of the higher authorities, who could issue the passports with full knowledge of the facts, after examining each individual case.

He asked the representative of the Czechoslovak Government to give an opinion, in view of his wide experience.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) stated that the Czechoslovak Government had adopted certain measures which were necessitated by the United States restrictions on immigration. For instance, the passports prepared by the prefects or police authorities were not issued direct to the applicants but were first sent to the Ministry of Social Welfare, which examined each case before handing the passport over. Up to the present Czechoslovakia had only obtained permission for a quota of 3,360 emigrants per annum for the United States. On the other hand, since 1924, 30,000 passports for the United States had been withheld by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Social Welfare.

The PRESIDENT stated that M. de Gömöry-Laiml's remarks would be duly noted.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said that, in accordance with the principles of justice and equity which should govern this matter, he would like to know the opinion of immigration countries on this point.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) reminded the Conference that when paragraph 2 ("Authorities competent to issue Passports"), point A, of the Sub-Committee's proposals was being discussed, some delegates had observed that the modifications proposed, far from being a simplification, would merely lead to delays and further difficulties in the system in force in their countries.

The same observation arose in connection with the issue of identity documents to emigrants. He considered that these two questions could not be dealt with separately, and suggested that the Conference, in order to reconcile the very divergent views which had been expressed, might adopt a text applicable both to general provisions and to special provisions regarding emigrants. The text he proposed was as follows :

"The Conference recommends that the issue of passports and identity documents be so organised as to obviate the necessity of long and costly journeys for travellers and emigrants."

This text was unanimously adopted, 25 delegates voting.

18. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained. B. Visas (continued).

M. REINHARDT (Austria) thought that, as the Conference had been obliged for the present to give up the idea of abolishing passports, it was all the more necessary to try to make a considerable improvement in the visa formalities. There were undoubtedly immense difficulties to be overcome before the consequences of the passport system could be made less troublesome, because that system was closely connected with certain economic conditions which had not existed prior to the war, and which unfortunately, so far from being transitory, seemed to be becoming more serious. Austria, however, in spite of the prevalence of unemployment, had succeeded in disposing of this serious question of the passport system on the basis of her national legislation. The law on the protection of national labour enabled her to deal with the passport question on broader lines. It might also be possible to lessen the inconvenience caused by police requirements. He reminded the Conference that in September 1923 the International Police Congress at Vienna had set up an International Criminal Investigation Board, with the object of consolidating relations between the various national police departments and encouraging the exchange of necessary information between different countries. As this international organisation developed, it might render considerable service in the matter of passports. The financial aspect was equally important: there was no need to dwell on Austria's unfortunate position in that respect, but the Austrian Government had not hesitated to adopt the principle laid down by the 1920 Conference that the fees charged should not be fixed with a view to producing revenue. The Austrian passport fees were at the rate fixed in 1920; they were very small in comparison with the appallingly high fees in many other countries. The Austrian Government did not regret having adopted this policy; it was, indeed, willing to make further sacrifices on the lines indicated in the Passport Sub-Committee's report, because it recognised the good effect of such efforts on trade, tourist traffic, and economic activities in general. In order to shorten the stages which would lead — fairly soon it was to be hoped — to the abolition of the passport system, it was essential that all countries should make a concerted effort. He appealed to the good will of all the delegations to arrive at a decision which would satisfy public expectations.

With regard to the special question of transit visas, he was instructed to state that his Government was prepared to abolish them where it was clear that nothing more than transit through the country was intended.

The PRESIDENT said he thought it would be best to vote on each point of the visa question separately, as it had already been discussed by the Sub-Committee in Paris on October 5th, 1925.

The Sub-Committee's recommendation on the transit visa was worded as follows :—

"The Sub-Committee recommends that transit visas be abolished; the control authorities in the transit countries should merely ascertain that the travellers are really in transit".

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) wished, on behalf of the British delegation, to submit a slightly different text from that of the resolution proposed by Austria, whose spirit in the matter they admired greatly. It was also the object of the British Government to facilitate travel as far as possible, but they recognised that in the matter of transit visas the circumstances of various countries must widely differ. With a view to meeting the difficulties experienced in countries which required a long time to cross, he submitted the following amended wording: "The Conference recommends that those countries which are traversed by lines of rapid and easy communication should make mutual arrangements for the abolition of transit visas". The British Government would always be ready to negotiate such agreements with other countries in order to facilitate travel and promote the interests of business men in all countries.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) stated that the French Government was not prepared to abolish the transit visa altogether. France had already abolished the entrance and transit visa by agreement in the case of 27 countries. This was an obvious step towards total abolition, but if transit visas were entirely abolished, undesirable aliens might enter French territory and the police authorities would experience great difficulty in keeping a watch on their movements. If they were lost sight of for a week or ten days, for instance, they would have time to execute any evil designs which they may have had on entering the country. France was prepared to keep to the practice of inter-State agreements, not only with regard to transit visas, but also with regard to entrance visas.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that Germany was not in a position to abolish transit visas completely, but agreed with the British and French views regarding inter-State agreements for the abolition of visas.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) approved in principle the abolition of the transit visa, and stated that his Government was prepared to conclude agreements with other Governments for the purpose. A convention of that kind had already been concluded with the Netherlands. In order to facilitate the transit of foreign nationals through Czechoslovak territory, his country had authorised frontier control stations on the international railway route to grant transit visas to nationals of all foreign countries without any stipulation as to reciprocity. He would like to know the opinion of the Conference on the following questions :

(1) If transit visas were abolished, what measures could be taken for the expulsion of undesirable aliens ?

(2) Could a transit visa also allow of a short stay in the country — lasting perhaps three or four days ?

M. GONNE (Belgium) pointed out that a traveller holding a transit visa for a distant country might not leave the country of transit. That would be a fraudulent practice which it was highly important to prevent. Belgium therefore considered it necessary to retain the transit visa.

M. MIRANDA (Italy) agreed with the British and French delegates.

He could not have adhered to a proposal which would have limited the action of the authorities to verifying the fact that travellers were really in transit. The Italian Government was contemplating special agreements on the widest possible basis.

M. OLDENBURG (Denmark) said he could not accept the text proposed by the Passport Sub-Committee. Denmark had already concluded a series of agreements concerning the abolition of visas and could go no further for the present. Without transit visas, travellers would meet with greater difficulties on the frontier than under the visa system; they would have to comply with supervision formalities instead of having merely to produce their transit visa.

The Danish delegation was prepared to give closer consideration to the British delegate's suggestion.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey) stated that he could not agree to the abolition of the visa, but his Government was anxious to do what it could to improve the passport regulations. He would communicate the Conference's decision to his Government.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) pointed out that it was possible to cross certain countries without changing train or ship, but this was not possible in others. It was much easier to abolish the visa in the former case.

Partial agreements had been successfully concluded in Europe with the countries contiguous to Hungary. For instance, an agreement had been concluded between Hungary and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes enabling travellers crossing both States without stopping to obtain visas in the train.

In the case of a long journey — when, for instance, a French subject had obtained a visa to return to the Argentine and his vessel stopped for a day or two at Pernambuco — the question arose as to whether he was entitled, if he held no transit visa, to land while the vessel was in port. He thought he was right in stating that the Greek authorities allowed a halt of one or two days at Patras without a transit visa. The Conference would do well to consider this question in connection with the following :

The ordinary transit visa in cases where it was impossible to cross the country without stopping.

The transit visa when the country could be crossed without stopping.

The transit visa for the period during which vessels were in port.

Hungary and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had abolished the transit visa for vessels on the Danube.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France), replying to the Czechoslovak delegate, said that French consuls issued two kinds of transit visas: one without permit to break the journey, the other with a permit to remain in the country for four, five or six days, according to circumstances.

It was important to remember that, once an undesirable alien had succeeded in entering a country, it was very difficult to expel him. For instance, an undesirable alien expelled from France, being unable to enter any neighbouring country, would remain in France.

The PRESIDENT said he understood that the Hungarian delegate wished to raise the question of passengers who unexpectedly found themselves in transit, for example, when a vessel put into port, and they had no intention of breaking their journey at that port. That was a special case which perhaps required consideration.

He reminded the meeting that he proposed the appointment of a drafting committee to which these questions of detail could be referred.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) considered it necessary to make a recommendation in regard to travellers who broke their journey in course of transit through another country. Would it not be possible to allow for a voluntary break *en route*? The Austrian Government would be prepared to support a proposal of this nature.

Mr. HOSE (India) said that in Indian ports travellers required a visa for landing, but there was a special local system of permits in operation by which seamen were allowed on shore for the period of the ship's stay on giving certain undertakings, the responsibility resting on the master of the vessel. The Government of India, for reasons which were in some degree peculiar to itself, could not agree to the abolition of visas in general. In India transit meant, not a short railway journey, but a journey of at least three or four days, and even 15 to 20 days. Within the last two years, the Indian Government had had to take action against persons who had misused transit visas in order to remain in the country. The Indian delegation would agree to the recommendation suggested by the British delegate.

M. KURUSU (Japan) shared the opinion of the British, French and German delegates as to the desirability of concluding individual agreements for the abolition of the transit visa.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) said that he too, as the representative of an essentially transit country, was in favour of this solution. He hoped it would be possible to go further at a later date.

Difficulties seemed already to have been reduced to a minimum in Latvia. Fees were low, and the Latvian transit visa authorised travellers to cross the country without breaking their journey or gave them the right to do so for a few days if they wished. It would perhaps be possible to abolish the visa system without difficulty at a later date, but this could not be done at present.

The Latvian delegate shared the views of the British delegate and of others who had spoken to the same effect.

M. Lebrecht MUNDT (Free City of Danzig) said that at Danzig no entrance, transit or exit visa was required. Unfortunately, however, in spite of the efforts it had been making for years, Danzig did not yet enjoy reciprocity, and the inhabitants of the Free City, when they travelled, had to obtain the necessary visas, a procedure which involved expense and caused loss of time. Judging, however, from the various liberal opinions which had been expressed by the members of the Conference, he had every hope that they would succeed in obtaining reciprocity.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) supported the Austrian delegate's proposal. He suggested that a sub-committee should be appointed to examine the questions relating to undesirable aliens to whom M. Navailles had referred, and also the question of introducing a direct international transit visa. This sub-committee might also examine the proposals which had been submitted to the Conference in writing with regard to the recommendations relating to journalists and students.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) said he was quite willing that the wishes of delegates who asked for committees and sub-committees to be appointed should be acceded to, but was afraid that such procedure might considerably lengthen the work of the Conference.

He thought there was no need to refer to a sub-committee a proposal such as that which the Czechoslovak delegate had just put forward since, the question of transit visas being intimately bound up with that of the entrance visa, those countries which refused to abolish the transit visa would *ipso facto* refuse to abolish the entrance visa also. He himself

favoured the extension of the system of inter-State agreements with a view to the eventual abolition of the transit visa, and he therefore desired to propose the following resolution:

“The Conference recommends that the abolition of entry and transit visas should as far as possible be made general by agreements between States and that opportunities should be given to passengers to break their journey in the countries they travel in, even if their passport is not furnished with a transit visa”.

Mr. KINGSLEY-ROOKER (International Chamber of Commerce) said the International Chamber of Commerce had hoped the Conference would see its way to abolishing the transit visa. The guarantees offered by the transit visa appeared to him very slight against the prevention of undesirables entering any country except in so far as it gave the Government of the country the power to refuse the visa. In the good old days when optional passports existed and visas were unknown, undesirables were met with and yet were controlled more or less successfully. It was, however, evident that the tendency at the Conference was towards reciprocal exemption, and the International Chamber of Commerce would like to support the proposal of the British delegation in the hope that such reciprocal arrangements would be generalised as far as possible.

There was, however, another proposal he would like to submit, and to make his point more clear he would take the case of a business-man who lived in Paris but had interests in Constantinople and travelled between the two cities several times a year, occasionally at very short notice. Before departure from Paris, he was obliged to spend some times a whole day or so in going round to different bureaux in Paris in order to obtain four or five transit visas for his journey. That entailed considerable discomfiture and, although he might perhaps be able to afford the fees involved, he could ill afford the time.

In order, therefore, to facilitate the free movement of traders, which meant the free movement of trade — and that, after all, was an important factor in the well-being of nations — his proposal was that, where transit visas were maintained, they should be granted as far as possible for a definite length of time, a year, say, or the period of the validity of the passport, enabling the holder to make as many journeys as he desired during the period of validity.

Mr. RITTER (International Shipping Conference) said he had already stated that the International Shipping Conference would like to see all transit visas abolished. Referring to certain observations by the honourable delegate of Hungary, he stated that the steamship companies were strongly of opinion that passengers continuing their journey by the same boat should be allowed to go on shore at all the ports of call of their vessel, and should also be allowed to go into the country. The point was of special interest to passengers on pleasure cruises. He knew of instances where passengers who had taken a Mediterranean cruise had had to spend more than 100 gold francs in visas to go ashore at the various ports. That was, in the opinion of the International Shipping Conference, a thing which really should be abolished and which could be abolished, because there was a guarantee that the passengers concerned would not remain in the country but would leave by the same boat. He hoped, therefore, the Conference would recommend that, whatever might be decided on with regard to transit visas, passengers in transit proceeding by the same boat should be allowed to go on shore and visit the country.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) stated that in France no difficulties were put in the way of passengers landing while their vessels were calling at French ports. He had worded the latter part of his proposal in its present form for the very purpose of extending this facility to voyages in other countries.

M. NIKOLOPOULOS (Greece) thought that tourists might be afforded all facilities for landing at a port of call without a consular visa, but he thought it was only fair that they should pay the consular fee, as persons who travelled for pleasure were usually people of means. This, for example, was the system applied in Greece.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) thought that M. Nikolopoulos's suggestion was a very reasonable one, and he withdrew his proposal to appoint a committee to examine the question as a whole.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) proposed the following amendment to his resolution:

“ . . . that opportunities should be given to passengers to break their journey in the countries they travel to, even if their passport is not furnished with a transit visa”.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to take a decision on the first paragraph of the proposal regarding entrance visas, which read as follows :

“The Conference recommends that, except in special or exceptional cases, entrance visas should be abolished by all countries, either generally or under condition of reciprocity, each country retaining its full freedom of action in respect of the enforcement of its legislation with regard to police measures for foreigners, the regulation of the labour supply, etc. . . .”

M. REINHARDT (Austria) thought there was no need to include the words “or under condition of reciprocity”. He thought that a country should not be prevented from entering into an engagement without reciprocity if it wished to do so, and he would therefore prefer to substitute for the words in question the words “or by agreement”.

The PRESIDENT observed that, in point of fact, the text proposed by M. de Navailles provided for the possibility of concluding such agreements. He thought that this text would meet M. Reinhardt's wishes.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said that he could not say, as he had not M. de Navailles' text before him. In any case, he adhered to the view he had just expressed.

He again asked whether the observations he had previously made with regard to passengers breaking their journey would be taken into account in drawing up the final text to be submitted to the Conference.

The PRESIDENT assured him that this would be done.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) asked whether M. de Navailles' text was intended to replace paragraphs 1 and 3 of Section B of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee (see Annex 3). He referred to the paragraphs dealing with transit and entrance visas. If M. de Navailles' text was accepted, that settled the question of principle. If the principle was settled, the questions of detail which followed in the sub-paragraphs of paragraph 3 could be referred to a sub-committee.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) pointed out that, for purposes of procedure, the various questions should be classed in two categories — one dealing with the abolition of the transit or entrance visa, to which M. de Navailles' text referred, and on which it had been proposed that they should take a decision without referring the question to a sub-committee; and a second category of questions relating both to transit and to entrance visas — should it be decided to retain them — and the various questions connected therewith, such as the length of sojourn allowed by the transit visa ; it had been decided that this second category might be referred to a sub-committee.

The PRESIDENT also agreed that the first two sub-paragraphs of paragraph 3 should be taken into consideration in connection with M. de Navailles' proposal. Nevertheless, in order to save the Conference's time, he thought it preferable to refer to the Sub-Committee all the sub-paragraphs of paragraph 3.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) desired to draw the Conference's attention to the importance of paragraph 2, which related to the duration of validity of visas. He desired to emphasise the importance of adopting — as indeed had been the intention of the Conference of 1920 — a type of visa which would be valid for a number of journeys. Such a visa, if the Conference succeeded in introducing it, would certainly be welcomed by the whole world.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Technical Sub-Committee should meet at 3 o'clock. The Japanese delegate would sit on this sub-committee, and he invited the representatives of the International Chamber of Commerce, the International Shipping Conference and the International Railway Union to sit on it. In that case the plenary meeting of the Conference could begin at 5 o'clock, and M. de Navailles' proposal could be distributed then.

At the request of Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) the PRESIDENT explained that the sub-committee which was to meet was the Sub-Committee on Types of Passports which had previously met on Friday, May 14th; the delegates whom he had just named would now join that Committee as well as a representative of the Swiss delegation who had asked to be appointed to it.

SIXTH MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Saturday, May 15th, 1926, at 5 p.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

19. Recommendation concerning the Abolition of the Passport System.

The PRESIDENT read the following draft recommendation :

"Whereas the complete abolition of the passport system generally in force at the present time is impracticable, the Conference recommends — in order to satisfy the expectations of public opinion, particularly in economic circles, as required by the resolution of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations — that abolition be brought about by gradual stages with a view to the suppression to the widest extent possible of the passport system.

"As the most speedy means of achieving this object, the Conference recommends the conclusion of reciprocal arrangements between certain countries, this method having already yielded excellent results."

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said that His Majesty's Government went into the Conference of 1920 with the full intention of carrying out as many of its resolutions as they could, and in fact they had already gone considerably beyond its resolutions in a good many cases, and they had come into the present Conference in the same spirit. Therefore they were particularly anxious only to accept resolutions which would in application be a form of progress. He had already explained the reasons why they did not think the abolition of the passport desirable — in fact, that it might even be regarded as to some extent a relapse into a more difficult situation — and for that reason they were unable to accept or to vote for a resolution in which the view was expressed that the abolition of passports was something desirable in itself.

As regards the statement that public opinion was in favour of the abolition of passports, naturally the British delegation could only speak for its own public, but it felt that this alleged demand was not very widespread in British circles and that it was made by the sort of people who, as champions of the cause of individual liberty, would insist upon the right to do the reverse of what is done by normal people, and who would be the very first to complain if they got into difficulties abroad through the absence of a passport. He would therefore be unable to support the draft resolution now before the meeting.

M. MIRANDA (Italy), Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey), M. COMNÈNE (Roumania), M. ROTHMUND (Switzerland) also stated that their respective Governments could not accept the proposed text.

The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Conference to the resolution adopted by the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations, which read as follows :

"The Assembly draws the attention of all the Governments to the special importance of the Conference on Passports to be held in 1926, which public opinion, particularly in economic circles, undoubtedly expects to take at least a step towards the abolition, to the widest extent possible, of the passport system, and to mitigate considerably the disadvantages and expense which that system entails for the relations between peoples and for international trade facilities."

The draft recommendation submitted to the Conference only differed from the resolution adopted by the Assembly in so far as it indicated the means of achieving the total abolition of the passport system, etc., namely by reciprocal agreements between certain States.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) stated that he was in favour of adopting the draft recommendation because public opinion in Austria desired that something should be done towards the abolition of the passport system.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) thought that certain members of the Conference were labouring under a slight misapprehension.

The authors of the text had not contemplated asking that States should no longer issue passports, which were not without their use. They had desired that States should no longer require the compulsory production of a passport upon entry into their country. They desired to indicate means by which the present system might gradually be replaced by a more liberal régime.

The text might be amended in such a manner that it no longer gave rise to misunderstandings.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) thought that the resolution should indicate certain directions in which the present situation could be improved by means of individual agreements. As this recommendation did not meet with general approval, it would perhaps be best not to vote now but to draft another text.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium) said he would readily support any recommendation calculated to bring about the abolition of passports at an early date, but if the recommendation was to indicate, as the French delegate seemed to understand it did, that the passport should be replaced by another identification document, he failed to see what advantage there could be in the change. The difficulties experienced in obtaining the new document would probably be even greater than those met with in obtaining passports.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said that, in order to shorten the discussion, it would be well for him to state quite definitely that the only resolution to which his delegation would be able to agree would be one to the effect that the world should be restored to such a state of affairs that passports would be no longer necessary. Such a resolution, however, would have little practical value.

Under present conditions, his Government thought the abolition of passports or any other recognised form of identity card would retard rather than expedite such a happy state of affairs, since it would create minor causes of international friction.

On the proposal of the PRESIDENT, the Conference decided to defer discussing and taking a vote on a recommendation concerning an improvement of the passport system until a subsequent meeting.

20. Discussion of the Report by the Technical Sub-Committee on Possible Improvements in the Standard Passport (International Type).

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium), Rapporteur, read the report by the Technical Sub-Committee on Possible Improvements in the Standard Passport (international type). (See Annex 7.)

The Conference decided to discuss the report point by point.

Precautions against Fraud.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) desired that, under this heading, reference should be made to the possibility of using special ink.

This section of the report was adopted.

The Conference adopted without discussion the following sections:

Number of Pages, Visas and Stamps.

Various Entries.

Renewals.

Question of Place of Origin (Indigénat).

Family Passports.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) asked that the minutes should record the fact that Czechoslovakia had already signed agreements contrary to the conclusions reached by the Passport Sub-Committee in this matter, as in Czechoslovakia a wife might use a family passport when going to Austria and Roumania.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) made a statement to the same effect with regard to Hungary, and asked that it might also be recorded in the Minutes.

This section was finally adopted.

Additional Pages prohibited.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey) did not think it possible to prohibit the use of additional pages or slips, more especially as it had been decided to extend the validity of passports. In many cases the number of pages provided would not be sufficient and, if the passport were to be renewed, it would involve the holder in additional expense. Moreover, if expired passports contained visas which were still valid, these would have to be renewed, at further cost to the holder. He hoped some other method would be devised.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium), Rapporteur, thought this difficulty would be removed if the Governments adopted the necessary measures for the renewal of passports.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey) pointed out that he raised no objection to the proposal regarding the prohibition of additional pages or slips, but, thinking that the

prescribed number of pages would not be adequate, he asked by what means the passport could be enlarged.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium), Rapporteur, thought the competent authorities could easily issue a certificate in the case of passports which were still valid when the new measure was introduced. Holders of these passports might be asked to call at a given office, where a stamp would be affixed, providing the necessary guarantee that they need anticipate no future difficulties through holding passports with additional pages or slips.

M. KURUSU (Japan) said that, since January 1st, 1926, the Japanese Government had adopted the type of passport which was decided upon by the Paris Conference. Even in his limited experience, he found that there were many Japanese subjects in several countries in Europe and America who held the old type of passport, which was still valid, the passport consisting of a single sheet of paper with many additional slips attached bearing the stamps of various officials and so forth. If the holders of such passports required to renew them, the chances were that they would be living far from any embassy or consulate where visas could be obtained, and if, for instance, they were to apply to the German authorities and were not granted a visa, it would put them to a great deal of trouble in vain. He would therefore like to make the reservation that, if the holder of a passport was not otherwise objectionable and provided his identity could be fully established by examination of the main passport sheet, certain allowances should be made and the visa granted.

Mr. MARTIN (Great Britain) stated that the British Passport Offices in London and Liverpool issued on the average about 250,000 passports per year, and it had been found, since the agreements arrived at between the British Government and certain other countries with regard to the abolition of visas, that the number of cases in which a passport became full before the date of its expiry was extremely small. It would not occur in more than one case in 10,000. In the few cases in which there were valid visas on a passport which had become full, the practice in Great Britain was to issue to the holder without fee a new passport to run for the unexpired period of the old one, and to attach the new passport to the old one in a secure manner, with a reference to the effect that unexpired valid visas would be found on the old passport attached.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) asked the Rapporteur whether he held that it was in fact an admissible practice to add additional slips or pages in accordance with the official regulations. If so, he proposed that the end of the paragraph should be worded as follows :

“and consequently the use of additional pages or slips not officially perforated and numbered”.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium), Rapporteur, replied that it had been the Committee's intention absolutely to prohibit the use of additional pages and slips. In making his suggestion, he had desired to meet a point raised by the Turkish delegate with regard to passports having additional slips or pages, which a number of people might be holding when this new measure came into force.

The section of the Report entitled “Prohibition of Additional Pages” was put to the vote and was adopted by 22 votes to 3.

Collective Lists.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) having, in consequence of a statement made by M. COSTERMANS (Belgium), withdrawn a proposal he had made suggesting that the Conference should clearly define the system of collective lists, *this section was adopted.*

General Recommendation.

The Conference adopted this recommendation (which was the last section of the Technical Committee's report).

21. Letter from the German Consul-General to the Secretary-General of the League (see Annex 2).

The PRESIDENT stated that part of the proposals made in the letter from the German Consulate referred to questions which had been settled by the adoption of the Technical Committee's report on possible improvements in the standard passport (international type). The question of the issue of uniform internationally recognised passports to persons without nationality had yet to be discussed and would be considered by a special sub-committee.

M. ECKARDT (Germany), in reply to a question put to him by the President, said that his delegation would not press its request concerning the introduction of simple and inexpensive identification documents in relations between countries which had abolished the compulsory visa.

22. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained (*continued*).

C. *Control at Frontiers.*

The PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting should discuss the question of control at frontiers. He read the Passport Sub-Committee's proposal, which was worded as follows :

"The Conference might with advantage consider how, in certain cases, better organisation of the examination of passports and visas at frontiers might diminish the inconvenience caused to travellers, and the delays which international communications may suffer from this fact. While considering this point, it might re-examine the recommendations adopted by the Conference of 1920 or any other suggestions.

"It would also be desirable to draw attention to the fact that it would be useful to make the stamps on passports at frontiers as clear and as visible as possible and that they should be affixed with the utmost care."

He pointed out that the Passport Sub-Committee's proposal had been made in pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Passport Conference held at Paris in 1920, to the effect that :

"States should enter as far as possible into mutual agreements with a view :

"Firstly to establishing joint control of passports at points of exit and entry of adjacent countries, pending the complete abolition of control at the point of exit ;

"Secondly to providing that the authorities giving a visa for the country of destination should also undertake the necessary formalities for obtaining other visas, such as those for transit ;

"And, thirdly to combining passport formalities as far as possible with Customs formalities with a view to reducing to a minimum the time lost on the journey."

M. REINHARDT (Austria) proposed that the Conference should recommend that, whenever and wherever possible, passports should be examined on the train during the actual run.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that he supported M. Reinhardt's proposal.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) described the steps his Government had already taken to carry out the resolutions adopted by the Conference in 1920 (see Annex 8).

He proposed that the medical examination, if considered necessary, should be carried out at the station where the Customs and passport examination took place.

He also recommended that the entry and exit stamps should be affixed, whenever possible, near the visas to which they referred, and in chronological order.

M. PERRIER (France) pointed out that France also had done a great deal to minimise the time required for the examination of passports. He pointed out that this question was connected with that of Customs formalities and the composition of trains, as the examination could only be carried out during the run if there were communication between the carriages.

M. CHOQUET (International Railway Union) stated that the International Railway Union, at its general meeting in October 1923, had recommended that, whenever possible, the examination of visas should take place on the train, and that, where this was not possible during the run, it should take place at the same time as the examination of the luggage, at the frontier station, either upon entry or exit.

He felt bound to draw the attention of the Conference to this recommendation, the adoption of which would be of very real help to international railway traffic.

The PRESIDENT, observing that his proposal had met with general approval, asked M. Reinhardt to embody it in a text which could be submitted to the Conference at its next meeting, together with the Sub-Committee's proposal. They would therefore not take a vote on this question until a later meeting.

M. MALHOMME (Poland) submitted to the Conference the following text, which, he thought, was similar in effect :

"As regards inspection on frontiers, it seems clear that certain facilities should be accorded with a view to simplifying handling operations and reducing to a minimum the time during which trains are obliged to stop at frontier stations.

"In order to attain this result, passports and luggage should be examined in the train between the two frontier stations simultaneously by officials of both countries.

"This question should form the subject of an international convention drawn up in detail by experts, in order that general technical principles may be laid down and certain legal difficulties avoided."

The PRESIDENT said he thought this proposal went a little farther than that of M. Reinhardt; he suggested that M. Malhomme should arrange with the Austrian delegate to combine the two proposals in one text.

M. MALHOMME (Poland) agreed to the President's proposal.

The PRESIDENT also asked M. Choquet, representing the International Railway Union, to be good enough to assist in drawing up the text.

B. Visas. Exit Visas.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) asked the President whether he could not open the discussion on the question of exit visas, a matter which, in the speaker's opinion, should not cause any difficulty. He also wished to make a statement regarding the representatives of the Government of the Saar Territory.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said he would willingly co-operate with M. Malhomme and M. Choquet in drawing up a final text. He would point out, however, that, in conformity with the suggestions made by the Sub-Committee on Passports, the discussion was confined to passports alone, no mention having been made of Customs questions. He would like to know whether the text which was to be submitted to the Conference should also refer to this latter point. Personally, he thought that it would be easier to obtain the approval of the Conference if the text referred solely to passport inspection.

The PRESIDENT said that the Conference obviously had to express its opinion only on passport formalities and the inspection of passengers as holders of passports.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) pointed out that the 1920 Conference had considered the passport and Customs questions simultaneously. If the Conference merely considered the passport question as such, he was afraid its work would not bear any considerable fruit. There could be no doubt that the delays of which passengers complained were mainly due to Customs inspection, and not so much to the inspection of visas, which after all was a very subsidiary formality. If the question were strictly limited to passports as such, it would hardly be worth while discussing.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) said he would like to know whether the question of a special passport for emigrants had been referred to the Sub-Committee. His Government was keenly interested in this type of passport and he therefore desired to have full information on that point.

The PRESIDENT, referring to M. de Navailles' observations on the question of Customs formalities, said he thought that the Conference might, when the text was submitted to it, consider whether an addition should be made on the subject of Customs formalities, or whether it should be adopted as it stood. In any case M. de Navailles' observations would be taken into consideration.

Coming to the question of the exit visa, the President submitted to the Conference the Passport Sub-Committee's proposal, which read as follows:—

"The recommendations of the 1920 Conference on this subject having been accepted by a large number of States, the Sub-Committee is of opinion that the total abolition of exit visas both for nationals and for foreigners might be taken into consideration at the present time". (See Annex 3.)

The President informed M. Maixner that they were now dealing with ordinary passengers and not emigrants — the latter question being reserved for further consideration.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said he would like to know whether exit visas still existed in the various countries represented at the Conference. He hoped that such was not the case, for the exit visa was a considerable hindrance to traffic. He proposed that the Conference should unanimously adopt the recommendation which the President had just read.

The PRESIDENT asked the Hungarian delegate whether he could not perhaps forgo making certain statements which had already appeared in the Hungarian Government's reply to the questionnaire (see Annex 8). If and when the recommendation was adopted, every Government would form its own conclusions and take whatever measures it thought necessary.

M. MALHOMME (Poland) said that his Government was fully prepared to abolish exit visas for all foreigners. That was a measure which could be adopted universally. At present there was no *raison d'être* at all for exit visas. Polish nationals had never had to obtain such a visa, since the Polish passport itself enabled the holder to cross the frontier. The measure to which he referred only applied to foreigners.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) drew the attention of the Conference to the question of the length of a foreigners' stay in the country. Latvia had already abolished the exit visa in principle. He proposed that, in the recommendation to be adopted, they should draw a distinction between travellers as such and foreigners living in the country, carrying on business there, etc. Agreements would have to be concluded to enable Latvia to collect the taxes due to her; otherwise the exit visa would have to be maintained as a measure of control. In any case foreigners who had been living in Latvia for less than six months were not required to obtain exit visas.

The PRESIDENT said that, in view of the different opinions expressed, he thought the question ought to be put to the vote.

The text put to the vote was as follows :

"The recommendations of the 1920 Conference on this subject having been accepted by a large number of States, the Conference is of opinion that the total abolition of exit visas both for nationals and for foreigners might be taken into consideration at the present time".

The recommendation was adopted by 23 votes to 1.

23. Scope of the Recommendations adopted by the Conference.

The Conference decided to adjourn until a later meeting the resolution submitted by the Italian delegation, namely :

"The Conference declares that it has adopted its recommendations with particular reference to the passport system as applied to passengers and travellers, and with a view to facilitating communications and international trade, and that consequently special questions connected with identification, the movement of emigrants and foreign labourers and the international exchange of information on this subject should be settled either by agreements between the various countries or at special meetings of the delegates of all the countries concerned".

The PRESIDENT said that the Conference might meet in full session on Monday at 4 p.m.

24. Declarations by the French and German Delegates.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) made the following declaration :

"The Government of the Territory of the Saar Basin has sent two delegates to follow the work of the Conference. As it appears probable that the Conference will finally draft a protocol to be submitted to the delegates present for signature, the question arises whether the protocol should be signed by the Saar delegates. I feel bound to point out to the Conference that the questions under consideration are of a practical character, that it would be desirable for the resolutions we adopt to be applied by all countries, and that consequently it would be desirable for the protocol to be signed by the delegates of the Saar Government. It should be fully understood, however, that their signature in no way affects the interpretation which may be given to the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles regarding the Saar Territory".

M. ECKARDT (Germany) said that he desired to make a similar declaration for Germany.

The PRESIDENT observed that the matter was thus settled.

SEVENTH MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Monday, May 17th, 1926, at 4 p.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

25. Questions relating to Emigrants (*continued*).

M. DEROOVER (Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee), read his report (see Annex 9). He recommended the adoption of the following two texts :

Transit Card for Emigrants.

"The Conference recommends that all possible facilities should be granted for the passage in transit of emigrants leaving Europe for overseas countries. For this purpose, the League of Nations will be requested to prepare, with the assistance of experts of the States most immediately concerned, a draft arrangement based upon the system of transit cards to take the place of the consular visa, this draft to be submitted to the States concerned for examination and, if approved of, signature".

Issue of Special Documents to Emigrant Workmen.

"The Conference states that it has not dealt with the questions relating to the expediency of introducing special identification documents for foreign emigrants and workmen, and that all decisions or recommendations on this matter have been left either for subsequent agreement between countries or to be dealt with by special meetings of delegates from all the countries concerned."

These two proposals were put to the vote and unanimously adopted.

26. Travelling Facilities to be granted to Persons without Nationality.

The PRESIDENT read the text adopted by the Technical Sub-Committee relating to the proposal made by the German delegation :

"The Conference considers it desirable that certain facilities for travelling should be granted to persons without nationality, and requests the League of Nations to prepare, with the assistance of experts of those States most immediately concerned, a draft arrangement based upon the principle of the introduction of an internationally recognised identity document."

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) stated that he had proposed to mention not only "experts of the States most immediately concerned", but also Dr. Nansen's organisation.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) explained that the Technical Sub-Committee had already discussed the question as to how far this subject was connected with the problem of Armenian and Russian refugees. Various opinions had been expressed. It appeared that, in point of fact, the question of method was to be left to the Committee of Experts, leaving out of account, however, the question of the connection between this matter and Dr. Nansen's work.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said he was satisfied.

The recommendation quoted above was unanimously adopted.

27. Mutual Police Assistance.

The PRESIDENT stated that a proposal concerning mutual police assistance (see Annex 10), submitted by the Hungarian delegation, was before the meeting. He reminded the Hungarian delegate that the Conference of 1920 had already adopted a similar resolution. He asked whether it was really necessary to refer the question to the present meeting (see Annex 11).

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) asked whether the Conference intended to mention all proposals which it considered worthy of recommendation. If so, he thought it would be necessary to reproduce the text of the 1920 resolution.

M. ECKARDT (Germany), seconded by M. COSTERMANS (Belgium), opposed the adoption of the Hungarian delegation's proposal.

The proposal was put to the vote and rejected.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said he assumed that, although the proposal of the Hungarian delegate was rejected, the 1920 resolution remained in force.

The PRESIDENT thought it desirable to keep to the programme of the present Conference. Each country could draw its own conclusions from the vote which had just been taken, and there was no need to record an explanation in the Minutes.

28. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained. Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation.

The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Conference to the Hungarian delegate's proposal concerning facilities (see Annex 12).

1. Territorial Competence : Personal Applications for Visas.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said that he wished to explain one of the Technical Committee's recommendations. When, for example, a traveller from a South American State went to Great Britain with a British visa and then desired to go on to the Continent, it should not be possible to raise objections to his doing so on the ground that he ought to have procured a visa at the place where he was domiciled.

M. KURUSU (Japan) said that the second paragraph of the Hungarian proposal was diametrically opposed to the regulations in force in Japan in connection with visas. He therefore wished to make a reservation on this point, and could not agree to the proposal.

M. DE NAVAILLES said he accepted the first paragraph, but pointed out that, by adopting the second, the Conference would be establishing a general rule which might prove very inconvenient. He would be prepared to accept the paragraph if it applied to exceptional cases, but he would vote against it if it was to be considered general.

The first sub-section of paragraph 1 was put to the vote and adopted.

The second paragraph having also been adopted by 11 votes to 8, —

M. ECKARDT (Germany) proposed that this paragraph should be divided, in order to enable the delegates to vote separately on the two sentences of which it was composed : the German delegation could not accept the second sentence.

The first sentence was adopted by 19 votes to 3 ;

The second was adopted by 12 votes to 9.

2. Proof of the Necessity of the Journey.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) proposed to add the following words at the end of this paragraph :

"or where the country of destination has provisions regulating the admission of all foreigners."

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) seconded this proposal.

The paragraph, so amended, was adopted by 11 votes to 5.

3. Preliminary Enquiry and Approval.

The PRESIDENT read this paragraph.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that, when the Conference began to discuss the Hungarian proposals, their subject-matter was not definitely known. Discussion had shown that they dealt with difficult and complex questions which required exhaustive consideration. He regretted that the Hungarian delegate had not been able to inform the Conference of his proposals earlier, and he thought it would not be right to discuss them under such conditions, seeing that other questions had been investigated by sub-committees. M. Eckardt saw no advantage in continuing the discussion in plenary session, and proposed either to refrain from discussing these proposals or to refer them to a special committee.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) agreed with the German delegate, and asked that the proposals of the Hungarian delegation should be referred to a sub-committee for careful consideration.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) stated that, if he were in the position of the German and Czechoslovak delegates, he would act as they had acted. He also thought that his proposals should be referred to the Technical Committee.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) stated that he could give no definite opinion on Article 3, neither was he able to do so on the following paragraph, because he had not had time to consider it sufficiently. The British delegation, however, had considerable sympathy with the spirit in which these two paragraphs had been drafted.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey), returning to the question of Article 3 — "*Preliminary enquiry and approval*" — pointed out that, according to the text proposed by the Hungarian delegation, the delivery of a visa should not "*as a general rule*" be made conditional on the production of an entrance permit, etc. His Government did not require its consular agents to obtain an authorisation for the issue of visas, but in exceptional cases the consular authorities might receive formal instructions from the Turkish Government to refuse the visa to a given person for certain specific reasons. The Turkish Government could not, therefore, accept this paragraph.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes), Dr. RIDDELL (Canada), Mr. HOSE (India) and M. DUZMANS (Latvia), stated that in their opinion it was impossible to discuss Article 3 of the Hungarian proposal without further preparation.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) considered that the Passport Conference need not vote on the questions of detail dealt with in the Hungarian proposal. He thought it would be better to adopt a more general wording, such as "*simplification of formalities*", and take their decision on that.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) proposed the following amendment to the resolution previously adopted by the Conference :

"The Conference recommends that the issue of passports and identity cards be so organised as to simplify formalities and to obviate the necessity of long and costly journeys for travellers and emigrants."

Mr. JENKIN (South Africa) said he would like, before any decision was taken, to make it quite clear that South Africa could take no part in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Hungarian proposal. With regard to the words in paragraph 3 — “they shall not be applied to whole categories of persons on account of their nationality, race, or any other quality” — South Africa would never agree to such a principle.

Nor could he agree to paragraph 4 which contained the words “an entrance visa shall give the right to reside within the country for a period of at least. . .”. So far as South Africa was concerned, the words “good for South Africa” were added over words to the effect that the entry of all persons was subject to the Immigration Act.

The PRESIDENT asked the meeting to decide whether the Hungarian proposal should be referred to a sub-committee for preliminary discussion or not. He pointed out that the rejection of this clause would mean the rejection of the whole text for the time being, as members of the Conference had expressed their intention of postponing the discussion until a preliminary investigation had been made.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

It was decided by a majority not to refer Article 3 of the Hungarian proposal to a sub-committee.

4. *Simplification of Formalities.*

The PRESIDENT, passing to Article 4 of the Hungarian proposal, asked the author of the text to be good enough to explain to the Conference what were the “fees charged on the occasion of the inspection of passports” (*taxes de manipulation*) referred to in the first sub-section of the paragraph.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) explained that, in the early years after the war, certain countries had charged a fee, which was generally payable in their national currency, for the inspection of passports at the frontier. That practice was a source of great inconvenience. The Hungarian delegation had proposed its abolition should it still be in force in any country. He added that, in spite of her precarious financial situation, Hungary had ceased to charge these fees.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) said that personally he thought that either the Conference should have been prolonged for a period sufficient to enable it to give careful consideration to the Hungarian delegation's proposals which, he would add, were highly interesting, or else a statement should have been made to the effect that it was unfortunately impossible to undertake this investigation during the present session. This remark applied not only to Articles 3 and 4, but to all the Hungarian delegation's proposals.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that, as the first two paragraphs of the Hungarian proposal had been adopted, and Article 3 had just been rejected, it would be better to vote forthwith on Article 4.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) agreed with M. de Navailles. He greatly regretted that the proposals of the Hungarian delegation, which clearly deserved consideration, should have been brought before the Conference at so late a date. He considered that a mere superficial discussion would be valueless, and that the questions could only be dealt with satisfactorily by a sub-committee.

The PRESIDENT asked M. Eckardt if he proposed that they should be referred to a sub-committee.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that he desired to refer to a sub-committee not only Article 4 of the proposal, which related to “facilities”, but all the other texts of a similar character which had just been distributed.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium) pointed out that the delegates present had been convened to discuss a definite programme. The proposals made by the Hungarian delegation, important though they were in themselves, constituted a fresh programme which the Belgian delegation was not in a position to discuss, because it had not received from its Government the necessary instructions enabling it to give an opinion of any value.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) thought it would be doing an injustice to the Hungarian delegation to refuse to deal with the proposals it had made merely on account of the delay in submitting them. He therefore asked the President to be good enough to refer them to a sub-committee.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) supported M. Maixner's proposal. He drew particular attention to the question of the duration of the permit of residence referred to in the second paragraph of Article 4 submitted by the Hungarian delegation, which he considered to be of special importance. On account of this particular point, and in derogation of his previous statement, he requested that the proposal might be referred to a sub-committee.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) stated that the Governments had been invited to make any proposals they considered desirable in regard to the questionnaire which had

been circulated a year previously. The Hungarian delegation had not submitted the summaries earlier because it had preferred to wait until States of greater importance than Hungary had expressed their views, so that it might bear them in mind when making its own proposals.

M. COMNÈNE (Roumania) stated that he was prepared to accept the first paragraph of Article 4, particularly as his Government had not introduced the fee referred to. The second paragraph seemed to him almost to convert the visa into a temporary permit of residence, and might have far-reaching consequences; he could not, therefore, commit his Government in this matter, as he had received no instructions.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey) pointed out that, although the consular visa already existed in Turkey, the Government charged no extra fee. Any person holding a proper visa could enter Turkish territory without further payment. Referring to the second paragraph of Article 4, he stated that a definite period of validity was fixed in the case of a transit visa, and that a traveller holding an entrance visa could remain in the country as long as he pleased, unless the police authorities raised objections.

The PRESIDENT asked the Conference whether it would not prefer to defer consideration of this question until it had received the report of the Technical Sub-Committee.

M. POLITIS (Vice-President), referring to Article 4, observed that two questions arose. The Technical Sub-Committee had fixed the fees to be collected for visas. He would merely add that, apart from these fees, no others of any sort should be collected. The first question, therefore, had been settled. The Sub-Committee had considered the question of the period of residence, and had decided that the entrance visa should make no stipulation as to that period, as in view of the laws of the various countries it was impossible to fix a time-limit.

The PRESIDENT said he understood M. Politis's proposal to have been made in support of his own. It was agreed, therefore, that Article 4 of the Hungarian proposal would be held over until the Technical Sub-Committee's report had been heard.

29. Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation regarding the Objects of a Passport.

The PRESIDENT observed that he had before him another document from the Hungarian delegation concerning documents of identity, travel, protection, nationality, emigration, diplomatic passports, etc. (see Annex 13). He thought these proposals had been brought forward somewhat late in the proceedings — though in saying that he in no way implied a criticism of the Hungarian delegation's action. The Conference had not fixed any time-limit within which delegations should submit additional proposals to those already on the agenda. The Conference might, however, decide whether it wished these proposals to be considered by a Sub-Committee.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said he was quite favourable to the Hungarian delegation's proposal, but could not adopt a definite attitude, because he had had no time to give it full consideration. It would be unfortunate, however, if such important proposals were laid aside for reasons of procedure or through lack of time. If the Conference did so, it might produce a very unfavourable impression on public opinion. The alternatives before the Conference were therefore either to appoint a sub-committee or to give up the attempt to discuss the proposals that day. They should certainly not reject offhand suggestions which at first sight appeared to be excellent.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) observed that these proposals had not come as a surprise. On the previous Wednesday he had proposed that a kind of code of passport regulations should be prepared. He thought that for this purpose they might utilise the present Conference, which included so many experts on passport questions. He would be satisfied if his proposal were examined by the League of Nations. In any case, he thought it would be desirable for a passport conference to take a decision on questions of this kind, which involved principles of a juridical nature.

The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to decide whether the Hungarian proposal should be referred to a Sub-Committee.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) said he understood that the first part of the Hungarian delegation's proposals would also be referred to a special committee.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the only question which had been reserved was Article 4. No question had been reserved for examination by the Sub-Committee.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) said that they should first decide whether the Hungarian proposal should be discussed by the Conference or rejected forthwith. If they were to discuss it, they should decide by vote whether it was to be dealt with in plenary session or in sub-committee.

The PRESIDENT said he thought that the vote on the reference of this question to the committee would be tantamount to the Conference's agreeing or refusing to discuss the question.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) observed that the Hungarian delegation did not wish its proposal to be examined by a sub-committee. It desired the Conference to address a recommendation to the League to the effect that the proposal that it contained should be examined by a committee of experts.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) said he thought that, if the Conference voted in favour of referring this question to a sub-committee, it would not be making its intentions clear, because delegations might be voting for or against such action for different reasons. Some might vote against it because they did not consider it practical, and others because they were not in favour of discussing the question.

They should first of all ascertain whether the Conference wished to deal with the Hungarian proposals themselves or whether it preferred the Hungarian suggestion that they should be examined by a sub-committee, a suggestion which he thought quite acceptable.

M. KURUSU (Japan) supported the German delegate's proposal. They could not do justice to the Hungarian proposal if they discussed it immediately. They would still require to consider the question even if they only made a recommendation.

The PRESIDENT informed the Conference that the Hungarian delegate had agreed to the proposal to recommend the League of Nations to refer the points mentioned by his delegation to a committee of experts. He submitted this proposal to the Conference subject to final drafting.

The proposal was unanimously adopted.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) said he took this decision to mean that the competent organisations of the League were given a free hand to study the question in the most appropriate manner. He wished to make this clear in order that it might not be thought that the League was morally obliged to convene a conference.

EIGHTH MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Monday, May 17th, 1926, at 9.15 p.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

30. Abolition of Passports (*continued*).

The PRESIDENT opened the discussion on the report submitted by M. de Navailles, delegate of France, on behalf of the Sub-Committee appointed to consider questions relating to passport visas (see Annex 14). He proposed that they should first discuss resolution 1, which had been held over. The Conference had before it two texts. One, worded as follows, from the French delegation:

"With reference to the resolution of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations, recognising the value of passports as establishing identity and the right to travel, and taking into account the different opinions which have been expressed regarding the necessity or utility of demanding the production of passports when crossing frontiers, the Conference recommends that the passage of frontiers should be facilitated by means of bilateral agreements or agreements between more than two countries, and that the general control of travellers at frontiers should be gradually discontinued".

The other, submitted by the British delegation:

"The Conference, while having due regard to the resolution of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations, finds itself unable to make any recommendations which will be universally acceptable for the abolition of passports or other documents of identity, but submits the following suggestions for the improvement of the present system in the interests of international travel".

The President suggested a slight amendment to the resolution submitted by the French delegation. He thought the word "Conference" might be omitted in the second part of the resolution and introduced in the first part, which would then read as follows:—

"With reference to the resolution of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations, the Conference, recognising . . ."

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) agreed to this change.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) remarked that his delegation had not had time to examine the French proposal very closely, but he could see at once that it would be impossible for them to accept the last sentence of it, which read "... and that the general control of travellers at frontiers should be gradually discontinued".

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) observed that the object of the last part of the last sentence of the French delegation's proposal was to restore the pre-war position. In pre-war days persons could travel — at any rate in the principal European countries — freely and without having to show any document at frontiers, although, of course, a special watch was kept by the police on persons reported as suspects.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) emphasised the point that a special watch was kept — a very discreet watch, but nevertheless a watch.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) said he did not deny the fact ; what he meant was that there was no general inspection of travellers.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that the German delegation was prepared to agree to the French proposal as submitted. He thought, however, that in view of the British reservation, and as the French delegation did not wish to omit the phrase in question, they might take a vote on the text as a whole, and then, if a majority were not obtained, vote on the proposal down to the words "the passage of frontiers should be facilitated", thus leaving out the sentence which was of a controversial nature.

The PRESIDENT took the view that the proposal could no longer be regarded as coming from the French delegation alone ; it was the Conference's own text, and he asked the delegates to take a decision on the text as it stood before them. If the proposal was not accepted by the majority, they might then consider whether it would be desirable to take a second vote on the text with the amendment thereto proposed by M. Eckardt.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) asked whether the word "voyageurs" (travellers) in the resolution included immigrants or not.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) reminded him that, as a result of the resolution voted upon early in the afternoon, emigrant questions had been excluded.

The PRESIDENT put to the vote the proposal of the French delegation as a whole.

A vote was taken by a show of hands, and the French proposal was adopted by 12 votes to 9.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) made a formal reservation on behalf of his Government to the effect that they did not accept the last words of the resolution from "and that the general control" to the end. He asked that that reservation be printed as a footnote to the resolutions of the Conference and not merely recorded in the Minutes, which had not such a wide circulation.

Mr. JENKIN (South Africa), M. GIANNINI (Italy), Mr. HOSE (India), M. NIKOLOPOULOS (Greece) and M. de GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said that they associated themselves with the reservation of the British delegation, and asked that their countries' names should also appear in the footnote.

The PRESIDENT pointed out to Mr. Sperling that his request, though supported by a number of representatives of other countries, would constitute an entirely new departure in the proceedings hitherto followed. He thought, however, that there would be no particular objection and that the request could be complied with.

M. OLDENBURG (Denmark) said he could not see how, when the Conference had taken an ordinary vote, certain specifically mentioned States could be allowed to formulate their reservations in an official act of the Conference. He proposed that in this instance they should take a vote by roll-call, so that it could be clearly seen who had voted for and who against.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said he thought that if such a vote were taken it would not be necessary to insert any reservation.

The PRESIDENT then proposed that they should take a new vote by roll-call on the French delegation's text as a whole.

M. GIANNINI (Italy) said that, if they voted by roll-call on the text as a whole, several delegates might be placed in a somewhat embarrassing position.

Those who had made a reservation concerning the last part of the resolution could not conscientiously vote against it, since they approved it as a whole, but they could not vote for it because they could not accept the last sentence.

He suggested therefore that they should take one vote on the text, omitting the words "... and that the general control of travellers at the frontier should be gradually discontinued", and another vote on the whole text as submitted. That would enable them to ascertain who was in favour of the shorter resolution and who was in favour of the resolution as a whole.

The PRESIDENT said he thought that, since the reservations only concerned the last sentence, it would only be necessary to put the last sentence to the vote, as all were agreed upon the remainder of the text. He was therefore prepared to put the words "... and that the general control of travellers at the frontier should be gradually discontinued" to the vote by roll-call.

M. MARCOTTY (International Chamber of Commerce) said he thought it would be better to take a separate vote on the two portions of the French proposal. Some delegates who had voted against the proposal when the first vote was taken on the text as a whole might now vote in favour of the first part, if the words "and that the general control of travellers," etc. were omitted.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that the Conference had already decided in favour of the first part of the resolution.

M. MARCOTTY (International Chamber of Commerce) said he thought the procedure he proposed would enable a greater number of votes to be given in favour of that part of the text.

The PRESIDENT said that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, he proposed that they should vote again by show of hands on the first part of the French proposal and should only vote by roll-call on the last sentence, concerning which several delegates had made reservations.

A vote was taken by a show of hands on the following text :

"With reference to the resolution of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations, the Conference, recognising the value of passports as establishing identity and the right to travel, and taking into account the different opinions which have been expressed regarding the necessity or utility of demanding the production of passports when crossing frontiers, recommends that the passage of frontiers should be facilitated by means of bilateral agreements or agreements between more than two countries."

This text was adopted without opposition (16 votes).

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) reminded the meeting that, as he had already stated, his country could not agree to the abolition of passports. The final sentence of the French proposal, if considered separately and not in conjunction with the preceding context, amounted to a proposal for the abolition of passports. He had voted for the French proposal as a whole, but a separate vote on that point would alter the nature of that whole. He would accordingly abstain from voting on the final sentence.

The last sentence of the French proposal was rejected on a vote by roll-call by 13 votes to 10

Austria, Brazil, China, Czechoslovakia, Esthonia, France, the Free City of Danzig, Germany, Switzerland and Uruguay voted in favour of the sentence ;

Belgium, Great Britain, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Roumania, South Africa, Spain and Sweden voted against it.

The text, omitting the last sentence, was therefore adopted.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) stated that, as the last sentence of the proposal was rejected, the British delegation no longer wished their reservation to be mentioned in the resolution.

31. Control at Frontiers (*continued*).

The PRESIDENT read the text drawn up by the Drafting Committee set up at the Sixth Meeting.

"The Conference ;

"Actuated by the desires expressed at different Conferences on international communications in regard to the simplification of passport control formalities at the frontiers ;

"Being of opinion that the progress already made in this matter might be carried further by, so far as possible, generally adopting the system of control already applied on certain international lines of communication of particular importance,

"Recommends that passport control, both on entering and leaving countries, should be carried out :

"(a) While the trains are *in motion*, whenever possible ;

"(b) When that is impossible, during the *stop* of trains at one of the two frontier stations (station of exit or entry) and in such a way that police inspection by the two countries concerned is effected if possible *simultaneously* or at least *one immediately after the other*.

"In order to enable the authorities of either country to exercise their duties in foreign territory, the Conference suggests that agreements should be concluded between States as soon as possible with a view to organising passport control formalities at frontier stations on the lines indicated above.

"Finally, the Conference draws the attention of States to the fact that these improvements would be of no effect unless at the same time agreements were also concluded for the accomplishment of customs formalities under the same conditions of time and place."

This proposal was adopted.

32. Passport Visas (*continued*).

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) the Rapporteur, read the draft resolution submitted by the Sub-Committee on Passport Visas (see Annex 14) :

"The Conference makes the following recommendations :

"(1) That the abolition of entrance and transit visas should be made as general as possible by means of inter-State agreements, a reservation being made in the case of countries unable, for special reasons, to make such agreements ;

"(2) That facilities should be granted to travellers enabling them to break their journey in the countries through which they pass, even though their passport should bear no transit visa, more especially in ports of call ;

"(3) That both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a minimum period of two years and for the whole period of validity of the passport if that should exceed two years. These visas shall, during their period of validity, respectively entitle the person concerned to make an indefinite number of journeys into or through the country. The above provisions do not prevent an entrance or transit visa from being granted for a limited number of journeys or for a single journey, especially when this is requested by the persons concerned, the said persons being at liberty to undertake the journeys or a single journey at any time during the period of validity of the visa. Needless to say, the holder of a passport *visé* in the above-mentioned manner will in no case be entitled to claim the right to reside for the whole period of validity of the visa in the country for which it was granted or to make a prolonged stay therein, basing his claim upon the period of validity of the said visa, since conditions for residence are fixed in each country by laws and regulations and are independent of the period of validity of visas."

Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) asked for information with regard to paragraph 3. Would a State be prevented from giving a visa valid for less than two years if the passport were no longer valid for two years ?

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) explained that the members of the Sub-Committee had differed on that point, and had not been able to come to any agreement. The Conference itself would have to decide.

Mr. J. KINGSLEY-ROOKER (International Chamber of Commerce) said that paragraph 3 raised the highly important question of transferring non-expired visas on expired passports to new passports. In the name of the International Chamber of Commerce and of the general public, he would ask the Conference to consider very seriously the possibility of granting the proposed concession. The Conference had met in order to facilitate travel for the public, and also, in particular, for business-men. A certain amount of progress had been made, and it was very undesirable that at the last moment that progress should be hindered. If the Conference was going to prevent visas of two years in duration being transferred on to another passport merely because that passport had terminated, the whole travelling public would be put to great inconvenience. Travellers, after they had obtained a series of visas available for two years, would be forced to go to the expense and also to the trouble of obtaining all those visas over again. Surely that seemed rather an unnecessary and vexatious obligation. In the Committee which he had attended, difficulties were suggested which seemed likely to prove an obstacle to the granting of facilities which the Chamber desired, but those difficulties had been met by two perfectly practical suggestions. One was made on the part of the Secretariat that, in the case of a visa not having come to an end and the passport having come to an end, it would be perfectly easy for the different

consular offices of the countries which had given those visas to issue some small certificate which would enable the holder to have those visas transferred on to the new passport. Another suggestion had been made by the British delegation when they explained that their own practice was merely to attach the new passport to the expired passport or one in which the pages were complete with visas. For instance, in a case where a given passport held visas valid for two years, the British Government attached the new passport to the old, noting that the present holder had previously travelled on passport number so-and-so "which is attached hereto". He himself possessed two passports which were bound in the way he had just described, and another member of the Conference possessed three passports bound together under that system. It was a perfectly reasonable and, as far as he could see, a perfectly feasible solution of the problem, and the advantages to the travelling public were enormous. It was useless for him to explain all the formalities which a business-man who was travelling over Europe and had a good many visas on his passport would have to go through if he had to repeat all those visas every time his passport came to an end, especially in those countries which delivered passports for very short periods.

He would therefore ask the Conference to consider seriously before it decided to deny that facility to the holder of passports in general.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) said that the British delegation was in favour of some system being introduced by which the visa could be transferred by means of attaching the old passport to the new. But, in considering Recommendation No. 3, he desired to draw attention to a point which seemed really to be of rather more importance to the British delegation. Page 2 of that report said: "The period of validity for visas has been carefully examined. Certain delegates urged that it should be extended to five years, irrespective of the period to elapse before the expiration of the validity of the passport. Other delegates were of opinion that the period of validity of the visa should never exceed that of the passport. Eventually the Sub-Committee agreed unanimously to a period of two years to run from the date of the affixing of the visa, whether a transit visa or an entrance visa, but opinions were equally divided as to whether the period of the validity of the visa could run beyond that of the passport".

Therefore it would appear upon this statement in the report that the Sub-Committee agreed unanimously that a period of two years should be the period for the validity of a visa. On the other hand, what Recommendation No. 3 said was that "both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a minimum period of two years and for the whole period of validity of the passport if that should exceed two years. The above provisions shall not preclude the issue of entrance or transit visas valid for a limited number of journeys, or for a single journey, in particular where specifically applied for, such visas entitling the holder to undertake the journeys or single journey at any time during their period of validity."

It seemed to him that the statement in the first part of the report and the statement in the opening sentence of Recommendation No. 3 were entirely in disagreement, because, if the opening sentence of Recommendation No. 3 meant anything, it meant that a visa might be granted for a period of more than two years, and yet it was stated in the first part of the report that the Sub-Committee unanimously agreed that the validity of the visa should be for two years. If the first sentence in Recommendation No. 3 was accepted, it would mean that a visa given on a British passport which was valid for five years would be valid for five years, a position which the British delegation could not accept. He was perfectly prepared to agree that a visa should be granted for a period of two years, as the Sub-Committee had decided.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) explained that Recommendation No. 3 was the outcome of the decisions adopted by the Sub-Committee. He could only say that the report was not complete on page 2; but, in the resolution he had drafted, he had fully expressed the opinion of the majority of the Committee. The Sub-Committee had unanimously agreed that the validity of the visa should be for two years. It had been unanimous on that point, and there had been a majority who considered that the validity of the passport, at the time when a visa was affixed, should still exceed two years. It was desirable that the visa should have the same period of validity as the passport. The report dealt with a question that had been taken up that afternoon; that of the transfer of the visa: on the question of giving a visa of a longer duration than the passport: opinion in the Sub-Committee was divided. To sum up: (1) they were unanimous in recommending that the validity of the visa should be for two years; (2) a majority had voted that if, when the visa was affixed to a passport, the validity of the passport exceeded two years, the visa itself should be valid for more than two years; (3) when the validity of a passport submitted for a visa was less than two years, they had yet to decide whether the visa should nevertheless be made valid for two years, or whether it should be reduced to the shorter period for which the passport was valid.

Saadoullah FERID Bey (Turkey) said he did not quite understand what was meant by the validity of a visa, and asked for an explanation on the following point: If a visa were valid, did that mean that one could travel several times with that visa, or was the visa only valid for one journey? He pointed out that Turkey did not issue visas of the first kind. She issued visas for a single journey and for a period of two months. If the first solution were contemplated, the speaker would be obliged to obtain instructions from his Government.

M. KURUSU (Japan) said he supported the point raised by the British delegate with regard to the second and third lines of Recommendation No. 3. He hoped the Conference would remember his explanation about the relation of validity to Japanese passports. If a Japanese got a passport which was good for a journey to Great Britain and France and he stayed in London for five years, his passport was still good. If he obtained a visa from a French consul in London and did not use the visa for another four years to come the passport was still good. According to the Japanese regulations, it might even be renewed. It would be disloyal, however, for other countries to accept such a thing unconditionally, and therefore he suggested that a certain limitation should be put to it.

The PRESIDENT thought it would be well to take a vote first upon the principle of the validity of a visa issued for two years and for several journeys. Once that was settled, they could vote on the question whether the validity of the visa should exceed that of the passport. Thirdly, they would have to consider the question, raised by the British delegate, whether the visa was not to be valid for more than two years even on a passport valid for more than two years.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) suggested that the first point on which they should vote should be the question of the validity of the visa. In order to focus the discussion, he would suggest that they should vote on the question whether the word "maximum" should be substituted for the word "minimum" in the first sentence of Recommendation No. 3.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) regretted that the Swedish delegation could not accept the text submitted to the Conference. The proposed regulations were based upon an idea which was definitely enunciated in the text, namely, that the entrance visa gave the traveller no right to reside in any particular country. In Sweden an entirely opposite rule was in force. When a visa valid for three months was issued, the foreigner could enter the territory once and remain there for three months, or enter, leave and re-enter, upon conditions that he left the country at the end of the three months. The adoption of the proposed regulations would have an entirely different effect from that resulting in countries where the system of permits of residence was in force. Moreover, it was stated in the text that the entrance visa gave travellers no right to break their journey, and therefore Sweden could not accept the proposal.

The PRESIDENT pointed out to the Swedish delegate that Recommendation No. 3 ended as follows :—

"Needless to say, the holder of a passport *visé* in the above-mentioned manner will in no case be entitled to claim the right to reside for the whole period of validity of the visa in the country for which it was granted or to make a prolonged stay therein, basing his claim upon the period of validity of the said visa, since conditions for residence are fixed in each country by laws and regulations and are independent of the period of validity of visas."

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) observed that, in Sweden, the supervision of foreigners was exercised by means of the visa system. A visa issued for entry into the territory always gave the right to reside there.

M. ECKARDT (Germany), referring to the British delegate's proposal, stated that he did not agree to replacing the word "minimum" by "maximum". He preferred the word "generally". He suggested that a vote should be taken on this proposal.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) proposed the following text: "...that both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a minimum period at least two years and *if possible* for the whole period...". At the end of the sentence, after the words "if that should exceed two years", they should add "it being understood that, if the validity of the passport should expire under two years, the visa should remain valid only as long as the passport". He had in mind the case of a passport valid for five years which had been issued four years previously, that is to say, was valid for only one more year. If a visa were affixed, the general two-year rule would not be compulsory; the entrance visa would be valid for one year only, in order that it might expire at the same time as the passport.

The PRESIDENT recalled his suggestion that a vote should be taken on the principle of the validity of a visa to be issued for two years, that they should then vote on the question whether the validity of the visa should exceed that of the passport, and finally on the British delegate's proposal.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) stated that he would reply to the Swedish delegate when the vote had been taken. He pointed out that the question whether the validity of a visa could exceed that of a passport was referred to in Draft Resolution No. 8 (see Annex 14).

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said the British delegation entirely agreed with the proceeding proposed by the President, that the first point upon which a vote should be taken was simply the duration of the visa without any regard to the method by which it could be transferred to another passport. Before the vote was taken, he would like to say that the British delegation was prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the German delegation, namely that the word "generally" (*en général*) should be substituted for "minimum".

M. MIRANDA (Italy) stated that, as the Italian delegation had accepted the recommendation that the passport should be valid for two years, it was prepared to agree that the visa also should be valid for two years. It could not accept a longer validity for the visa than for the passport.

The PRESIDENT put the following point to the vote :

"The Conference recommends that both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a period of two years in general".

The text was adopted by 18 votes to 13.

He then put to the vote the question as to whether the visa could remain valid after the passport had expired.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) considered that voting on this point would be equivalent to voting on a legal controversy ; indeed, the controversy had arisen in the Sub-Committee itself. He did not see his way to vote under those circumstances, inasmuch as theoretical controversies could not be settled by voting. With reference to the actual point at issue, it was impossible to give the accessory a longer validity than the principal. He would therefore abstain from voting.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) emphasised the fact that there was no inconsistency from the legal point of view in this case. That would only be so if a passport were issued which was not valid. If the passport were valid, it could be issued with a visa for a longer period than the passport itself.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) said he wished to speak on a point of order. Seeing that the first sentence of paragraph 3 had been unanimously adopted, he asked whether the remaining words fell to the ground.

The PRESIDENT stated that he proposed to take the vote on visas having a validity of two years, even if the validity of the passport were less.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General to the Conference) said that the question before the meeting was the transfer of the validity of the visa from an old passport to a new one.

This point having been settled, the PRESIDENT put the question to the vote.

The meeting decided against the adoption of this provision by 14 votes to 10.

The Conference then decided against rendering the duration of the validity of the visa equal to that of the passport if the latter period exceeded two years.

In brief, the Conference accepted the principle that, in general the visa should be valid for two years, but that if the passport were not valid for two years the validity of the visa should not last longer than that of the passport.

The end of paragraph 3 was also adopted.

M. KURUSU (Japan) stated that the regulations at present in force in Japan provided that the transit visas should be valid for a single journey and for that reason he wished to make a reservation on this point.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) asked whether the sentence "as long as the duration of the validity of the passport if the latter exceeds two years" had been retained.

The PRESIDENT replied that it had not.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said that, when a passport was valid for one year, the visa ought also to be valid for one year.

The PRESIDENT begged M. Reinhardt not to press the point, since it was merely a question of drafting ; the final text would be corrected and re-read on the following day.

In reply to M. MALHOMME (Poland), the PRESIDENT affirmed that the second part of Article 3 had been adopted as a whole.

Paragraph 4, worded as follows, was then adopted without discussion :

"Unless there are exceptional reasons justified by health conditions or in the interests of national security the visas granted should always be valid for all frontiers."

Paragraph 5 was read :

"The fee for the visa should not exceed 10 gold francs for entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to several journeys, 5 gold francs for entrance visas valid for a single journey, and 1 gold franc for transit visas, whether for a long period, for several journeys, or for a single return journey, the recommendation being made to Governments to reduce this scale still further by means of mutual agreements."

M. ECKARDT (Germany) stated that the German delegation held that transit visas having a long period of validity should be treated as entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to several journeys.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference), in reply, read the text adopted by the 1920 Conference regarding the transit visa (see Annex 11), according to which the fee recommended was 1 gold franc as a maximum even for several journeys.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) agreed that the scale adopted by the Paris Conference was the same as that proposed by the Committee, but pointed out that the German Government had stated at the time that it could not agree to the recommendation, and had reserved the right to fix higher scales. The German delegation would now be obliged once more to make a reservation if the Conference insisted on the maintenance of the scales fixed by the Paris Conference.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said that the British delegation, before voting, would like to say that they were perfectly well aware at the time of the Paris Conference of the reservation made by the German delegation. The British delegation regretted that it was obliged to reserve its view with regard to the price of the visa; it had telegraphed to its Government for instructions, but, as there had not been time to enable these to arrive, it regretted that it was unable to agree to the proposal submitted.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) proposed that, instead of the term "entrance visa of long duration or for several journeys", they should substitute "entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to an unlimited number of journeys" ("permanent visa").

M. OLDENBURG (Denmark) hoped it was clearly understood that the agreement would only bind countries adhering to the present arrangements, which had been concluded on a basis of reciprocity.

The PRESIDENT reminded the Danish delegate that the sixth paragraph expressly stated the following: "each State retains the right either to charge fees on a higher scale than that given . . ." or "to charge lower fees as a result of mutual agreements".

The Conference adopted the following maximum fees:

For entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to several journeys 10 gold francs, and

For entrance visas for a single journey 5 gold francs (*adopted by 18 votes*):

For transit visas (1 gold franc) (*adopted by 16 votes to 1*).

Paragraph 5 as a whole was also adopted.

The Conference then approved without discussion paragraphs 6 and 7, worded as follows:

Paragraph 6. — "That the fees charged for visas should not vary according either to the nationality of the passport holder or to the itinerary followed by him, or to the flag of the ship upon which he embarks, each State retaining the right either to charge fees on a higher scale than that given in paragraph 5 in the case of nationals of countries charging higher fees, or to charge lower fees as the result of mutual agreement."

Paragraph 7. — "That provision for exemption from fees or for reduced fees should be made in public official regulations defining the category of persons entitled thereto, as also the conditions to be followed to obtain this privilege, such exemption to be granted in accordance with the principle of equality laid down in paragraph 6."

As paragraph 8 of M. de Navailles' report was omitted, in consequence of the vote taken on its provisions, the former paragraph 9 (becoming paragraph 8) was adopted without discussion in the following form:

" . . . that in exceptional cases, where for genuine and legitimate reasons the visa expires before it has been used, a fresh visa should be granted or the ordinary visa extended free of charge."

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) (Rapporteur), referring to the additional recommendation, worded as follows:

"The Conference recommends that the issue of passports, documents of identity and visas should be organised in such a manner as to spare travellers and emigrants long and costly journeys" —

pointed out that the Conference had already adopted the following recommendation:

"The Conference recommends that the issue of passports and documents of identity should be organised in such a manner as to spare travellers, and emigrants long and costly journeys."

The Sub-Committee had thought it would be better to include visas in this recommendation. Moreover, at the meeting that morning the question of simplification of formalities had arisen. If the Conference were willing, the following passage could be added in the last sentence:

". . . should be organised in such a manner as to simplify formalities and to spare. . ."

The recommendation as amended was adopted.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) (Rapporteur) suggested that they should add, if necessary and if the Conference so desired:

"It also recommends that visas should be issued immediately upon receipt of the application, or in any case on the same day on which the application is made."

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said he would accept the proposal with the addition of the words "when possible."

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) said experience had shown that it was often practically impossible to issue a visa at a day's notice.

M. DUZMANS (Latvia) regarded the recommendation as useless, and would vote against it. It had been found in consular practice that persons requiring visas frequently handed in their passports a week or even a fortnight in advance, and had no desire to receive the visa on the same day.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said he was not in favour of inserting a recommendation which could hardly ever be put into effect; he proposed that they should add the words "within the shortest possible time."

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said he was glad to see that M. de Navailles had again brought forward his own proposal, which had been rejected at a previous meeting.

M. DE NAVAILLES read the text he proposed:

"It recommends that visas should be issued as far as possible at the time of application or at least on the day of application."

He thought the Conference should take a vote on the addition of these words to the resolution. He further observed that the recommendation contained nothing unusual since, in point of fact, visas were as a rule almost always issued at the time when application was made for them.

The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Conference to the words "as far as possible", which made the resolution elastic enough to meet all cases.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden) expressed his astonishment that this question should be dealt with now, seeing that it had been considered impossible to do so at the preceding meeting. He considered that they had been right in retaining the visa system for the purpose of exercising a control which everyone recognised as necessary. If the visa was still to serve as a means of control, they could not expect visas to be issued on the day on which application was made for them, as the visa would thereby be reduced to a mere formality, and the Swedish delegation could not support such a recommendation.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) submitted a text amended as follows: "It also recommends that visas should be issued, as far as possible, either at the time of application or on the day of application". A slight alteration had been made in the original text with a view to avoiding all misunderstandings.

Mr. HOSE (India) asked whether the vote would apply only to one part of the proposal.

The PRESIDENT replied in the affirmative.

A vote was taken on a show of hands.

The text submitted by M. de Navailles was adopted by 15 votes to 8.

M. D'ADLERCREUTZ (Sweden), M. COMNÈNE (Roumania), M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) asked that the fact that they voted against the proposal should be recorded in the minutes.

M. GIANNINI (Italy) drew attention to the fact that the Italian delegation had abstained from voting. It would readily have supported a motion requiring that visas should be issued within the shortest possible time, or within a reasonable time, but could not accept a time limit of one day.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium) thought that this vote should be re-discussed. The text adopted would reduce the visa to a mere formality. He thought that a resolution requiring that the visa should be affixed within the shortest possible time would satisfy everyone.

M. COMNÈNE (Roumania) and M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) supported M. Costermans' proposal.

The PRESIDENT said he saw no reason for revising the Conference's decision. He was, however, prepared to submit a new proposal which would be likely to obtain unanimity, or at least a strong majority, and he asked delegates who had raised objections to submit a text on which the vote could be taken.

M. COMNÈNE (Roumania) asked that the period indicated in M. de Navailles' text should simply be replaced by the words "within as short a time as possible".

M. DE NAVAILLES (France), Rapporteur, stated that for his part he was willing to adopt the text in the amended form proposed, but he would like to be sure, when making this concession, that it would be of use and would enable them to obtain unanimity with regard to the French text.

The PRESIDENT assured him that the amended text would be accepted.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) read the recommendation in its final form, as follows :

"The Conference recommends that the issue of passports, documents of identity and visas should be organised in such a manner as to simplify formalities, and that travellers and emigrants should be spared long and costly journeys. It also recommends that visas be delivered within the shortest possible time".

The PRESIDENT put this recommendation to the vote. The vote was taken on a show of hands.

M. de Navailles' resolution was adopted by 24 votes, no one voting against.

The PRESIDENT stated that M. de Navailles' report had been adopted, and thanked him for the admirable way in which he had accomplished a heavy task.

33. Issue of Visas in Urgent Cases.

The Conference approved the observations of Saadoullah Ferid Bey (Turkey) and M. Deffeminis (Uruguay) emphasizing the necessity of drawing the attention of consuls to the importance of expediting the issue of visas in urgent cases.

34. Exemption from the Formality of a Visa in Urgent Cases for Holders of "Lettres de Mission" issued by the League of Nations.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) referred a note submitted to the Conference by the Secretary-General of the League, regarding persons sent on missions by the League of Nations (see Annex 15), and in particular commissions appointed either by the Council or by the technical organisations of the League. Extremely urgent cases might occur, especially where there was danger of a breach of the peace. Delays of any kind might be somewhat serious. In urgent cases of this kind, persons carrying "lettres de mission" signed by the Secretary-General and containing the name and photograph of the holder might be provisionally exempted from the formality of a visa provided they also carried their ordinary passports. He referred specially to cases where a mission had to leave on a Saturday afternoon or Sunday.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) said that, as far as Great Britain was concerned, the British Consul at Geneva was authorised to give diplomatic visas. That arrangement had been made for the special convenience of League officials and representatives. He would be very glad if all applications for diplomatic visas for such persons could be made to the British Consul at Geneva rather than to the British Legation at Berne.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) thought that this subject lay outside the programme of the Conference if it referred to diplomatic passports and visas, and that therefore the Conference could not discuss it.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) pointed out that it was only a question of making provisional arrangements to dispense with visas until the position was regularised, which would be done as soon as possible. These facilities would very probably be granted even without formal regulations.

He would consult the Governments before taking any action, but he desired to obtain the approval of the present Conference, which was competent in this matter.

M. DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML (Hungary) said that Hungary had always allowed persons travelling on urgent business to enter the country without a visa and even without a passport, particularly persons carrying credentials of an international character.

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) said that in practice it would be advisable to obtain a letter from the Consul at Geneva, so that the person sent on the mission would have in his possession a document drafted in the language of the country.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) agreed that, in the absence of a visa, a letter of that kind would be useful.

M. COMNÈNE (Roumania) said he was sure they were all ready to grant the widest possible facilities to envoys of the League. He thought that Governments might specially instruct their Consuls at Geneva to grant diplomatic visas in these cases, even though the practice were not usual.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) pointed out that this question did not so much concern members of the Secretariat as members of Commissions appointed by the Council when proceeding, for example, to places where there was a danger of a breach of the peace, or where they had to discuss military questions *in situ*.

M. GIANNINI (Italy) thought it was obvious that some recommendation should be made. There was no question of taking a decision there and then. The Secretariat could doubtless come to an arrangement with the various Governments, which could issue instructions either to their frontier authorities or to their consuls. The bureau simply asked the Conference's opinion on this point before any action was taken. He thought there could be no doubt that the Conference's opinion would be favourable.

The PRESIDENT said he supposed that the members of the Conference would see no difficulty in bringing this question to the notice of their Governments.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) said he felt sure the French Government would grant all facilities to enable persons on missions to be admitted to the country on presenting their "lettres de mission", or would instruct its consuls that a special visa should be stamped thereon.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) said that his Government would grant all possible facilities. It would in practice be necessary for the holder of a "lettre de mission" to leave at once, and all stations would have to be notified by telegram to allow him to pass without a visa. The holder would, however, have to obtain visas en route.

The PRESIDENT said that the Conference was unanimously in favour of the request made by the Secretary-General of the League. The Secretary-General of the Conference would take due note of the suggestions which had been made.

35. Letter from the President of the International Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) drew the attention of the Conference to a letter the Secretary-General of the League received from the International Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations (see Annex 16). It raised certain questions which had already been dealt with. The journalists were particularly anxious to be able to travel speedily when any occurrence took place which called for their presence in any particular place. The recommendations to consuls in cases of urgency which the representatives of Turkey and Uruguay had just made, and which had received the general approval of the Conference, would also meet the requirements of journalists as far as this was possible.

The PRESIDENT said he understood that the Conference shared this view.

36. Resolutions of the International Students' Organisations.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) informed the Conference that the resolutions of the representatives of International Students' Associations referred chiefly to railway questions (see Annex 17). In the part relating to passports, students asked for reduced fees. This question had already been dealt with in the resolution proposed by M. de Navailles. In particular, facilities were asked for in connection with journeys to Geneva. The Swiss representative had given an assurance that the authorities of his country would gladly consider the requirements of students coming to Geneva to study the League's work.

As regards the question of an identity card entitling the holder to reduced fees, the Conference had already decided that it did not wish to consider any identity documents other than passports.

The question with which students were chiefly concerned was that of fees, and that had already been dealt with.

The PRESIDENT said he was sure the Conference would recommend the Governments to consider the resolutions of the International Students' Associations.

37. Recommendations by the Czechoslovak Delegation.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) observed that certain proposals which he had submitted had not been discussed.

The PRESIDENT said that M. Maixner referred to a series of recommendations made by the Czechoslovak Republic (see Annex 18), and read the first paragraph :

"The Czechoslovak Government submits the following recommendations :

"1. In view of the practice of certain States, the Czechoslovak Government would desire that the authorities of foreign States should not require the payment of any fee, particularly the stamp duty, when travellers' passports are submitted for the purposes of the declaration to the police and registration."

M. REINHARDT (Austria) asked whether this recommendation referred to passports or to the police.

M. DE NAVAILLES (France) asked for certain information. He did not quite understand the point they were discussing, but possibly they were referring to formalities which did not exist in France. When a foreigner applied for an identity card, he showed his passport as evidence of his nationality and status, and no special fee was required. A charge was made for the identity card itself, but no fee was payable for the actual presentation of the passport.

M. MIRANDA (Italy) said he desired, on behalf of his Government, to support this statement.

The PRESIDENT invited M. Maixner, delegate of Czechoslovakia, to furnish the explanation asked for.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that certain States charged a fee for the issue of passports, an adhesive stamp being affixed to the document. The measure in question might be either a fiscal or a police measure. That was the object of the Czechoslovak Government's recommendation.

M. ROTHMUND (Switzerland) said that in Switzerland any foreigner intending to stay longer than a week had to report his arrival to the local police not later than the eighth day after crossing the frontier. If, however, he came to Switzerland with any other object than to take up his residence there or engage in a remunerative occupation, and if he stayed in an hotel or similar establishment, he was not required to report his arrival during the first three months after crossing the frontier. When he reported, if the local authorities desired to charge a small visa fee for stamping the passport, there was no way of stopping them, because the Cantons were sovereign in that respect.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) said that, when a foreigner had to register with the police in the United Kingdom, he naturally produced his passport to prove his nationality and identity; he had to pay the sum of 1/- for the police registration certificate. That, however, was not in the nature of a fee; it was merely a charge to cover the cost of registration.

The PRESIDENT asked the Conference if it wished to include this recommendation in the Protocol.

On a vote being taken, the proposal was rejected by 8 votes to 6.

The Conference then proceeded to discuss the following point :

"It further desires that no special fee should be charged to foreigners as such for permission to reside within the country."

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) said he thought that this question did not come within the scope of the Conference. He withdrew points 2 and 4, which were no longer necessary, since the question of passports for emigrants had not been discussed.

The PRESIDENT then opened the discussion on point 3.

M. ROTHMUND (Switzerland) pointed out that the supervision of foreigners in Switzerland was based entirely on entries made on identity papers. It was therefore impossible to dispense with such information in those documents.

M. MUNDT (Free City of Danzig) said he agreed with the Swiss delegate. He thought it absolutely essential that some control should be maintained over foreigners. The best method was that of making entries on passports, which were the best form of identity document.

M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) held that it was contrary to the Paris resolution of 1920 to enter these details on a passport. That was why the Czechoslovak Government had thought it desirable to bring the matter to the notice of the Conference and obtain its opinion on the subject.

M. MIRANDA (Italy) said that, under Italian law, foreigners had to make their declaration of residence to the police on a separate form.

The PRESIDENT took the opinion of the Conference on point 3 of the Czechoslovak delegation's proposals.

The proposal was rejected by 12 votes to 5.

38. Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation concerning Facilities to be granted in the case of the Maintenance of the Passport Regime (continued).

M. BUNGETZIANU (Roumania) reminded the Conference that, at the meeting held that afternoon, they had begun to discuss the Hungarian delegation's proposal (see Annex 12). It had voted on points 1 and 2, point 3 had been rejected, and point 4 had been reserved for the end of the meeting. He asked whether it would still be necessary to discuss it.

The PRESIDENT said he thought it would not be necessary to do so, since the Conference had adopted a recommendation submitted by M. de Navailles concerning the simplification of formalities.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) reminded the Conference that they had decided to refer certain points for examination to the League of Nations. He was anxious that they should not lose sight of this decision.

NINTH AND LAST MEETING (PLENARY)

Held on Tuesday, May 18th, 1926, at 4.30 p.m.

President: M. PUSTA (Esthonia).

39. Adoption of the Final Act.

The PRESIDENT requested the Secretary-General of the Conference to read the draft Final Act of the Passport Conference. He asked the British delegation whether it desired that the English text should also be read.

The British delegation replied in the negative.

Preamble and Paragraph I. — Passport Regime.

The Conference consecutively adopted the preamble and Recommendation I — Passport Regime, of the First Section: General Questions.

Paragraph II. Facilities to be granted.

A. Issue of passports.

(1) *Type of passport.* — No observations. *This recommendation was adopted.*

(2) *Duration of validity.* — M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) observed that the resolution of the Paris Conference of 1920, to which reference was made in this paragraph, provided for the possibility of introducing passports available for a single journey.

The PRESIDENT pointed out to M. Maixner that the observations made during this meeting should be confined to the text itself and the question whether the text was in conformity with the decisions adopted by the Conference or not.

Paragraph 2 was adopted.

(3) *Extent of Validity.* — M. KURUSU (Japan) said he wished to make a reservation on behalf of the Japanese delegation, whose Government intended to adhere to the system at present in force in Japan, besides passports available for a single journey, in addition to the system advocated by the Conference.

The PRESIDENT informed M. Kurusu that this reservation had already been recorded. He felt bound to point out once more that observations made during this meeting should bear only upon questions of wording, and not upon subject-matter.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) stated that any mistakes which might exist in the draft would be rectified in the final edition.

Paragraph 3 was adopted without amendment.

(4) *Fees.* — *Paragraph 4 was adopted without amendment.*

B. *Visas.*

The Conference adopted in turn the first four paragraphs under this heading.

Mr. Haldane PORTER (Great Britain) pointed out that the English text of the Final Act contained several sentences in paragraph 5 of Section B (Visas) which were not to be found in the French text.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) stated that there was an omission in the French text. He explained that the text of the missing paragraph had been taken from the resolutions proposed after M. de Navailles' report had been discussed.

Paragraph 5, the complete text of which would be communicated to the members of the Conference during the meeting, was held over.

Paragraph 6. — M. DE NAVAILLES (France) pointed out a typist's error and asked that the words "ou par les intérêts" should be replaced by "ou dans l'intérêt".

The PRESIDENT noted the correction to be made in the text.

Paragraph 6 was adopted with the correction proposed by M. de Navailles.

Paragraph 7. — *Adopted without amendment.*

Paragraph 8. — M. ECKARDT (Germany) pointed out that it would be preferable to say "aux ressortissants des pays qui percevraient" instead of "de pays qui percevraient".

As no other objection was raised with regard to this paragraph, the PRESIDENT declared it adopted.

Paragraphs 9 and 10 were adopted without comment.

C. *Facilities for the Obtaining of Passports and Visas.*

D. *Control at Frontiers.*

Section 2: Questions relating to emigrants.

Section 3: Persons without nationality.

These texts were adopted in turn without comment.

Section 4: Miscellaneous questions.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain) pointed out that the above-mentioned resolution went further than the decision on this point adopted by the Conference at a previous meeting.

The Conference, he thought, agreed that there could be no objection to the League of Nations getting into touch with various Governments for the purpose of obtaining from them the recognition of "lettres de mission" issued to persons sent on missions by the League; he did not think that the Conference had actually advocated the use of such letters.

The British delegation had no instructions on this point and did not feel it could take part in the vote on a recommendation such as this.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) and M. MAIXNER (Czechoslovakia) agreed with Mr. Sperling's statement.

The PRESIDENT asked those delegates who had made this criticism to be good enough to suggest another wording which could be substituted for the text as read, and on which members of the Conference could unanimously agree.

M. REINHARDT (Austria) drew attention to a point which had been raised at a previous meeting and which was not included in the proposed text, namely, that cases in which no visa was obtainable should be definitely mentioned. He thought the following words should be inserted: "in cases of urgency when a visa is not obtainable."

The PRESIDENT said he saw no objection to the insertion of these words. He thought, however, that the remarks which had been made bore especially upon the words "the Conference. . . recommends". He suggested that the word "recommends" should be replaced by "considers that" or "has no objection to".

M. MIRANDA (Italy) proposed the words "expresses the hope".

M. OLDENBURG (Denmark) asked if they could not recommend that Governments should consider the possibility of accepting. . .

M. DE NAVAILLES (France), with a view to arriving at an agreement, proposed that the last two lines of the paragraph should be amended as follows: ". . ., in addition to a regular passport, should be permitted by the countries of transit and of destination, to carry out their mission immediately."

M. DE PALACIOS (Spain) thought that, in such cases of urgency, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations would do well, when issuing the "lettre de mission", to advise the Governments concerned by telegram. It was quite clear that, in the present

circumstances, the Conference was not in a position to discuss the question, but he thought the proposal might usefully be recorded in the Minutes, in order that it might be taken into account in future should occasion arise.

M. ECKARDT (Germany) thought it would be necessary to mention in this paragraph the obtaining of a visa, in order officially to cope with the difficulties which might arise.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference), replying to M. Eckardt, thought that a satisfactory solution might be found by combining M. Reinhardt's suggestion with that of M. de Navailles, and saying: ". . . in cases of urgency where it has not been possible to obtain a visa", and ending with M. de Navaille's text.

The Secretary-General to the Conference, at the President's request, read the paragraph, amended as follows: —

"2. With a view to facilitating the rapid departure of missions of the League of Nations, the Conference recommends that, in cases of urgency when it is impossible to obtain the regular visa, persons holding *lettres de mission* delivered by the Secretary-General (in addition to a regular passport) shall be permitted by the countries of destination and transport immediately to execute their mission."

M. FOTITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) asked that the following addition might be made to the text:

"In these cases, the Secretary-General would be requested to communicate by telegram with the authorities in the countries of destination and transit."

He proposed to add this sentence with a view to assisting the holders of such letters.

The PRESIDENT thought that the Secretariat would, as a matter of course, take all the necessary steps, but he saw no objection to the addition of such a sentence to the text.

M. PFLÜGL (Austria) said that he agreed with the proposals of the delegates of Spain and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

The PRESIDENT stated that a request had been made that in such cases the Secretary-General should immediately advise the Governments concerned.

M. COSTERMANS (Belgium) thought that a text couched in the following terms would satisfy everybody:

"The Conference decides that the delegates should bring to the attention of their Governments a request from the League of Nations to the effect that in cases of urgency, etc."

This would virtually mean deciding that all the delegates should request their Governments to consider the proposal. It would then remain for the Governments to act upon it.

The PRESIDENT said he preferred to leave the text as a recommendation. He thought that the delegates who had made suggestions would be satisfied with the text that had just been drawn up, with the addition of the suggestions made by the representatives of Austria, Spain and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

Mr. MACWHITE (Irish Free State) suggested that the Conference should adjourn for a few minutes in order to enable the Secretary to draft a definite text, as a certain amount of confusion had arisen.

The PRESIDENT requested the Secretary-General to the Conference to read the text again. If there was still any point which was not quite clear, the recommendation would have to be considered last.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) read the completed text:

"2. With a view to facilitating the rapid departure of missions of the League of Nations, the Conference recommends that, in cases of urgency where it is not possible to obtain the regular visa, persons holding *lettres de mission* delivered by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations (in addition to a regular passport) shall be permitted by the countries of destination or of transit immediately to execute their mission. In such cases the Secretary-General shall immediately advise the Governments concerned."

Mr. MACWHITE (Irish Free State) was of opinion that in this the Conference was adopting somewhat reactionary measures. Instead of facilitating the work of the League of Nations they were proposing to recommend certain measures which would continually hamper its work in certain circumstances. He did not see why it should be necessary to communicate with Governments by telegram when "*lettres de mission*" signed by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations were issued to persons already in possession of a national passport.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) begged Mr. MacWhite not to press the point. Cases in which the visa could not be obtained would always be exceptional, and in such cases, even from the practical point of view, the best course would obviously

be to advise the Governments concerned, for the very purpose of sparing persons on missions all difficulties with the frontier authorities. He therefore thought that, even for the purpose which the Irish delegate had in mind, which was to help the League of Nations in the execution of its work, the text in the form now submitted took the various considerations into account and should therefore enable them to arrive at a general agreement.

Moreover, if a Government saw no necessity for special notification from the Secretariat in such a case, and was in a position to give the requisite instructions to the frontier stations in good time, the recommendation on the point need not, of course, be acted upon.

The PRESIDENT asked Mr. MacWhite whether he still maintained his objection after hearing these explanations.

Mr. MACWHITE (Irish Free State) thought it useless to put in a recommendation what every Government should understand — that the Secretary-General would communicate with them. Cases might arise, however, when the authorities at the frontier might not be notified by their Government and might in consequence hold up the bearer of *lettres de mission* for that reason. He did not see any other objection to the text proposed, but was of opinion that the fewer formalities the Conference laid down in their recommendations the better would be the results they obtained.

The PRESIDENT announced that the text of paragraph 2 of Section 4 (*Miscellaneous Questions*) in its amended form was adopted.

Paragraph 3. — Paragraph 3 was adopted without comment.

The PRESIDENT thought there would be no need to read the Annex to the Final Act, which had been distributed to all the delegates. He proposed that the Conference should adjourn for a few moments in order that the complete and corrected text of the Final Act might be put before them.

He informed those of the delegates who would be unable to be present at the end of the meeting that it was now open to them to affix their signatures to the instrument embodying the resolutions of the Conference. (Several delegates acted upon his suggestion.)

On the resumption of the meeting, the PRESIDENT invited the Secretary-General of the Conference to read the final text relating to visas.

M. HAAS (Secretary-General of the Conference) read the following text :

"5. That both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a period of two years in general so long as the period of the validity of the visa does not exceed that of the passport. Those visas should, during their period of validity, respectively entitle the person concerned to make an unlimited number of journeys into, or through, the country. The above provisions do not prevent an entrance or transit visa being granted for a limited number of journeys or for a single journey, especially when this is requested by the persons concerned, the said persons being at liberty to undertake the journeys or single journey at any time during the period of validity of the visa, subject to any legal regulations in the country concerned affecting the entry of aliens. Needless to say, the holder of a passport visa in the above-mentioned manner will in no case be entitled to claim the right to reside for the whole period of validity of the visa in the country for which it was granted or to make a prolonged stay therein, basing his claim upon the period of validity of the said visa, since conditions for residence are fixed in each country by laws and regulations and are independent of the period of validity of visas."

The PRESIDENT said that, as no objections had been raised, he declared this text adopted. He asked the Secretary-General of the Conference to read the final text relating to "*lettres de mission*".

"In order to facilitate the rapid movement of missions under the authority of the League of Nations, the Conference recommends that, in urgent cases when it would not be possible to obtain the regular visas, persons in possession of the necessary papers issued by the Secretary-General of the League and also provided with regular passports should be enabled by the countries of destination or transit to fulfil their duties without delay. In such cases the Secretary-General will immediately notify the Governments concerned."

The PRESIDENT said that, as no delegate had raised any objection to this text, *he would declare it adopted.*

The Final Act as a whole was adopted (See Annex 19).

40. Closing Speeches.

The PRESIDENT went on to say that the Passport Conference had now terminated its labours. He would, however, invite the delegates to consider for a moment what they had actually accomplished.

Had the mandate which the Sixth Assembly had entrusted to the Conference (and which certain States which were not yet members had also agreed to accept) been carried out? The tenor of the instructions issued by the Sixth Assembly and the Council had been, he thought, "the abolition of passports and a return to pre-war conditions". The Passport Conference, at which 38 States and important international organisations were represented, was called upon to say whether and under what conditions these instructions could be carried out. The Geneva Conference, however, braving unpopularity, but conscious of the responsibilities of the Governments represented, had decided that the time was not yet ripe for the total abolition of passports throughout the world. The representative of a very great Power, which had always been famed for its liberal institutions and its great respect for the rights of all mankind, had told the Conference with laudable frankness that it was impossible to revert to pre-war conditions, and that it would be better to try to regulate existing conditions. This conviction was shared by other Powers equally proud of their liberal traditions and respect for individual rights. Smaller and younger democracies also, whose existence was founded on the principles of international collaboration and freedom of communications, had stood solidly by the larger States in their endeavour to secure economic equilibrium and security and peace at home and abroad. To endeavour to modify existing international relations by the mere abolition of passports had seemed to the Conference to be putting the cart before the horse. The Hungarian delegate, M. de Gömöry-Laiml, whose clarity of thought and single-mindedness the Conference had so greatly admired, had felt obliged, towards the end of the Conference, to ask, "What is a passport; what are its uses?" And in a perfectly logical sequence of ideas he had finally raised certain serious problems connected with "discrimination" between nationalities, races and occupations. He was sure that M. de Gömöry-Laiml had himself observed the interest shown by the Conference in the questions he had raised, but he must also have noted, with regret, that the Conference was not in a position to settle these questions.

To M. Deroover he expressed his regret at the fate which had befallen the emigrants' book, though the book would not have sufficed in itself to solve the difficult problem of emigration and immigration. Similarly the travellers' passport would continue — at any rate for the present — to be the conventional inter-State permit. Definite progress had, however, been achieved. The type of passport had been improved; that would probably enable a greater number of countries to adopt it and simplify frontier formalities as far as foreigners were concerned. The Conference had shown a desire to simplify formalities connected with the issue of passports and visas. Valuable information on this point had been furnished by various countries — information which would doubtless be of great use to all. The normal period of validity of passports had been fixed at two years, and it would be still further extended in several countries. The normal validity of the visa had also been brought up to two years. A reasonable scale of fees had been fixed for the issue of passports and visas, and it was laid down that these fees should not be regarded as a source of revenue to the issuing country. The Conference had considered what facilities were required for the transit of emigrants. The steps it had taken justified the expectation that very soon, by inter-State agreements, the very excellent practice of issuing transit cards free of charge would become general, and that in this way emigrants would be spared needless formalities. The Conference had also, at the proposal of the German delegation, studied the question of identity documents for persons without nationality. In view of the procedure they had instituted, there was reason to hope that in the future these persons — and at times there were many such — would be enabled to travel with greater ease. The idea of bilateral or plurilateral inter-State agreements was not new, but considerable progress had been made along these lines at the present Conference. Agreements for the total abolition of passports, or at any rate for the abolition of entrance and transit visas, had been communicated to the Conference by several States. Other agreements, such as those which were shortly to be concluded between the Baltic States, had also been announced. The Conference might well say that it had followed League methods, since the League had endeavoured to complete the Covenant by the Geneva Protocol, but had ultimately reverted to the idea of regional agreements. Moreover, the Passport Conference had not abandoned the idea of abolishing passports in the future; it had laid down the lines on which this aim could be fulfilled. He therefore thought that delegates could face their Governments, public opinion and the Assembly of the League with the consciousness that they had done their duty.

The PRESIDENT concluded with an expression of thanks.

Mr. SPERLING (Great Britain), addressing M. Pusta, thanked the President on behalf of the members of the Conference for the valuable services he had rendered to the Conference as President. The success of their work and the harmony of their meetings had been very largely due to the unfailing tact and patience with which he had helped them to unravel the delicate situations in which the Conference had sometimes found itself. He felt that he was voicing the undoubted thoughts of his colleagues when he said that he hoped that if they ever met again for another Conference on this or any other subject they might have the advantage of M. Pusta's presence as President.

II. — ANNEXES

LIST OF ANNEXES

	Page
1. Agreement concluded between Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Roumania, and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes regarding Passports and Visas	72
2. Letter dated April 26th, 1926, addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations by the German Consul-General	75
3. Report adopted by the Sub-Committee on the Passport Regime in Paris on October 5th, 1925 (including the Draft Agenda of the Conference) . . .	77
4. Proposal submitted by the German Delegation regarding the Suppression of the Passport Regime	102
5. Proposal submitted by the Austrian Delegation regarding Precautions to be taken against Fraud	102
6. Arrangement signed at Paris on January 27th, 1926, between Belgium and France regarding Reciprocity in the Matter of Transit Cards for Emigrants embarking in Belgian and French Ports	102
7. Report by the Technical Sub-Committee on Possible Improvements in the Standard Passport (International Type)	103
8. Replies of the Governments to the Questionnaire regarding Passport Regulations	104
9. Report by the Sub-Committee appointed to study Emigration Questions . .	152
10. Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation concerning Mutual Police Assistance .	152
11. Resolution adopted by the Conference on Passports, Customs Formalities and Through Tickets in Paris on October 21st, 1920	153
12. Proposal submitted by the Hungarian Delegation regarding Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained	158
13. Proposal by the Hungarian Delegation concerning the Objects of a Passport	158
14. Report by the Sub-Committee appointed to consider Questions relating to Passport Visas	159
15. Note by the Secretary-General of the Conference with regard to "Lettres de mission"	161
16. Letter dated May 12th, 1926, addressed by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to the President of the Passport Conference	162
17. Letter dated May 10th, 1926, from the Director of the Section of International Bureaux and Intellectual Co-operation to the President of the Passport Conference with regard to Resolutions adopted by the Representatives of the International Students' Organisations	163
18. Declaration of the Czechoslovak Delegation (Recommendations)	163
19. Final Act adopted by the Passport Conference on May 18th, 1926	164

ANNEX 1.

AGREEMENT CONCLUDED BETWEEN AUSTRIA, CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
HUNGARY, ITALY, POLAND, ROUMANIA, AND THE KINGDOM OF THE SERBS,
CROATS AND SLOVENES REGARDING PASSPORTS AND VISAS.

Whereas the Conference convened by the League of Nations at Paris, in October 1920, adopted resolutions intended to provide increased facilities for the issue of passports and visas and to unify and reduce the fees relating thereto, though these resolutions have not yet been generally put into force;

And whereas the Conference of Porto Rosa referred the question of passports and visas to a further Conference of the Succession States to be convened at Graz for the purpose of investigating the most satisfactory methods of giving effect to these resolutions :

The *Contracting Parties* nominated the following as their representatives :

For the Federal President of the Austrian Republic :

M. Robert LUKES, Consul-General of the First Class ;
M. Egon HEIN, Consul-General of the Second Class.

For His Serene Highness the Regent of Hungary :

M. Ladislav DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML DE DEDINA, Councillor of State.

For His Majesty the King of Italy :

M. Carlo DE CONSTANTIN DE CHATEAUNEUF, His Majesty's Consul ;
Comm. Av. Michele ADINOLFI, Councillor at the Prefecture ;
Cav. Dr. Fausto PIZZICHELLI, Head of Department.

For the President of the Polish Republic :

M. Stanislas MILLAK, Assistant Head of Department ;
M. Zbigniew August MISKE, Acting Vice-Consul at the Consulate at Trieste.

For His Majesty the King of Roumania :

M. Georges GRIGORCEA, Counsellor to the Royal Legation at Vienna.

For His Majesty the King of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes :

M. Vladimir BUDISAVLJEVIC DE PRIJEDOR, Consular Representative at Graz.

For the President of the Czechoslovak Republic :

Dr. Richard STRETTI, Councillor of State.

Who, having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions :

A. *Issue of Passports.*

(1) *Uniform type of ordinary passports.* A uniform type of ordinary (non-diplomatic) passport — "international pattern" (for types, see Annexes 1 and 2 of the Paris Resolution) — shall be established subject to the recommendations made by the Graz Conference.

(2) *Duration of validity of passport.* The passport shall be valid for a period not exceeding two years and not less than one year, save in exceptional cases where the passport is valid for a shorter period, but only in the case of a passport issued for a single journey.

(3) *Fee to be charged.* The fee charged shall not be in the nature of a tax and shall be levied without making any distinction between the countries for which the passport is issued; nationals and non-nationals shall be treated on a basis of absolute equality in the event of passports being issued by a Succession State to persons other than its nationals.

B. *Preliminary Visas.*

(4) *Preliminary visas (i.e. visas granted by the authorities issuing the passport, or by their representatives)* will only be required in case the validity of the passport is subject to doubt; such visas will always be given free of charge.

C. *Exit Visas.*

(5) *Exit Visas* shall be abolished in the case of nationals of the Contracting Powers.

D. *Entrance Visas.*

(6) *Passports not covering all destinations.* Subject to the legitimate exercise of the right of asylum, a visa will not be granted for entrance into the territory of a country which is not named in the passport as a country of destination.

(7) *Duration of the validity of a visa.* For passports issued for a single journey, the duration of the validity of the visa shall be the same as that of the passport. For passports issued for a period of not less than one year, the visa shall be valid for one year or for a single journey, in accordance with the application of the holder of the passport.

A visa for one year (twelve months) shall be valid for any number of journeys (crossing the frontiers).

Except for special reasons, justified by considerations of health or of national security visas given will always be valid for all frontiers.

(8) *Fee charged.* It is understood that the fee for the visa shall be determined according to the nationality of the applicant and regardless of the country in which he happens to be.

The charge for an entrance visa valid for one year shall be fixed at 10 gold francs, and for a single journey at 5 gold francs, subject to any special agreements according more favourable rates which have been, or may be, concluded between the various Succession States.

Entrance visas shall be issued free of charge to persons who are able to show that their income does not, having regard to the economic conditions obtaining in their place of residence, exceed the sum required for the maintenance of themselves and their families. Evidence to this effect will not, as a general rule, be necessary in the case of permanent and temporary employees in public administrations, including members of the land and sea forces, temporary employees, artisans, workmen, servants, ships' crews and day labourers, and, in addition, all such persons as proceed abroad to engage in manual labour. This provision shall apply also to families of the above-mentioned persons (wives, children), even if they travel independently, and to widows and orphans of the above-mentioned permanent employees. Proof may be called for should the competent authority entertain reasonable doubt regarding the grounds assigned for complete exemption from the charges.

Persons actually taking part in scientific and artistic conferences shall likewise be exempt from charges for visas.

E. *Transit Visas.*

(9) *Issue of visa.* Transit visas shall, unless there are exceptional reasons to the contrary, be issued at once to the nationals of the Contracting Powers upon production of the entrance visa for the country of destination and, where necessary, of transit visas for the intermediate countries.

(10) *Duration of validity of visa.* The duration of validity of a transit visa shall be the same as that of the visa of the country of destination.

(11) *Fee charged.* The fee for a transit visa shall be fixed at one gold franc unless more favourable arrangements are provided for in special agreements which have been, or may be, concluded between the various Succession States.

The provisions mentioned in paragraph 8 regarding complete exemption from fees shall also apply to the transit visa.

A transit visa endorsed upon a passport which is issued for a single journey shall be valid for the return journey and the charge shall be one gold franc.

F. *Collective Passport.*

(12) *Family passports.* The previous provisions shall be applicable to family passports including husband, wife, and children under fifteen years of age: a family passport being considered, especially as regards the charges levied, as an individual passport.

G. *Facilities.*

(13) *Simplification of the formalities at the frontiers.* The Succession States undertake to abolish, within three months after the coming into force of this Agreement, any charge levied in connection with the examination of passports at the frontiers.

(14) *Personal attendance of the applicant for a visa.* As regards the entrance visa, applications shall, as a rule, be made in person. In the case of persons entitled to special consideration, the authorities issuing the visas will dispense with the right of insisting upon the personal attendance of the applicant.

As regards transit visas, personal attendance will not be required except in cases where the authorities issuing the visa are not fully satisfied.

(15) *Territorial competence.* In order to obtain a visa the applicant must apply to the competent diplomatic or consular authority for the area in which he is resident.

Nevertheless, in the case of persons entitled to special consideration, the diplomatic or consular authority may issue visas to persons who are not resident in his area.

(16) *Necessity and reason for the journey.* The applicant for the visa shall not be required to prove the necessity for the journey save in special cases where the presence of certain persons might constitute a danger to national security or the public health, or when internal economic difficulties render such proof necessary.

The applicant is bound to impart the reason for the journey so that the charge for the visa may be fixed accordingly.

(17) *Preliminary enquiry and approval.* Visas shall be issued at once without preliminary enquiry or approval.

Enquiries may be made when there is reason to suspect danger to national security or the public health, and, as regards the entrance visa, on account of international economic difficulties (for example, in order to regulate the labour market).

At the request of the applicant, the competent authority shall carry out the enquiries by telegram; in such cases the period allowed for a definite reply (affirmative or negative) shall not exceed fifteen days. The charges arising from the exchange of telegrams between the diplomatic or consular authority and the authority which is asked to make investigations shall be borne by the applicant.

The present Agreement shall be ratified.

Ratifications shall be deposited at Vienna within two months after the signature of this Agreement.

Minutes of the deposit of ratification shall be drawn up as soon as the Agreement has been ratified by Austria, Hungary, Italy and Czechoslovakia.

The Agreement shall come into force between the Contracting Parties which have thus ratified it from the date on which these Minutes are drawn up.

The Agreement shall come into force as regards Poland, Roumania and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on the date of their adhesion and of the deposit of their ratifications.

The Austrian Government shall transmit to all the signatory Powers a certified copy of the Minutes of the deposit of ratifications.

This Agreement may be denounced by any one of the Contracting Parties after the expiration of one year from the date of the first Minutes of the deposit of ratifications; it will then cease to be operative after a period of three months from the date on which the denunciation has been notified to the other Contracting Party.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Agreement.

DONE at Graz the twenty-seventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Austrian Republic and of which certified true copies shall be transmitted to each of the signatory Powers.

(Signed)

LUKES.

Egon HEIN.

Ladislav DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML DE DEDINA.

C. DE CONSTANTIN.

M. ADINOLFI.

Fausto PIZZICHELLI.

Dr. Richard STRETTI.

Subject to the future adhesion of the Polish Republic to points 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and the second paragraph of point 16.

(Signed)

Stanislas MILLAK.

Zbigniew A. MISKE.

Noted ad referendum :

Georges GRIGORCEA.

Noted ad referendum :

Vladimir BUDISAVLJEVIC DE PRIJEDOR.

ANNEX 2.

LETTER DATED APRIL 26th, 1926, ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS BY THE GERMAN CONSUL-GENERAL

With reference to your note, C.L.6.1926 (Transit), dated January 18th 1926, addressed to the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, I am instructed to inform you that the German Government will be glad to be represented at the Passport Conference which begins on May 12th, and the names of its delegates will be announced in due course.

As Germany is particularly affected by international passenger traffic owing to her geographical position, the German Government has examined the agenda of the Conference with the greatest care and with particular interest. In the light of the experience it has acquired, it has become convinced of the desirability of dealing with certain points which do not yet appear on the agenda, although they may be held to arise out of some of the questions already down for discussion. The six questions which the German Government thinks it would be desirable to discuss are stated in the appendix, together with the reasons which make their inclusion in the agenda desirable. The German Government would be grateful if the necessary steps for adding these questions to the agenda could be taken without delay.

(Signed) ASCHMANN.

Appendix.

I. ISSUE OF UNIFORM INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNISED PASSPORTS TO PERSONS WITHOUT NATIONALITY

As a consequence of the far-reaching political changes of the last ten years, many people have lost touch with the countries to which they formerly belonged, and in many cases have lost their previous nationality, within being in a position either to recover it or to acquire a new nationality within a reasonable space of time. These persons without nationality are not as a rule in possession of the papers of identity required by the regulations of the States in which they reside, and their freedom of movement is therefore, in many cases, much restricted.

In the case of one group of such persons, namely, Russian refugees, a uniform internationally recognised passport — the so-called Nansen passport — has been issued on the initiative of the League of Nations and has been adopted and recognised by a large number of States.

For persons who do not belong to this group, however, there is no corresponding document of identity. We believe that most States have taken to providing such persons with provisional passports. These, however, are not always recognised by certain States to which their holders wish to travel and, according to the experience acquired in Germany, this circumstance is often a cause of great hardship to individuals. In order to remedy this situation the German Government ventures to propose as a subject for discussion the general introduction of a uniform identity certificate (*e.g.* of the type of the Austrian passport for aliens), for all persons who are not able to obtain national passports.

II. UTILISATION OF FAMILY PASSPORTS WHEN ONE OF THE HOLDERS IS TRAVELLING SEPARATELY

According to German law, adults possessing family passports have not hitherto been allowed to travel separately with such passports. This rule has been adopted, among other reasons because the policy of other countries in this question is not uniform, so that German nationals travelling separately with family passports might be subjected to inconvenience abroad.

In order to satisfy numerous requests addressed to us by persons who travel abroad, we suggest the adoption, by international agreement, of the principle that adults whose photographs and signatures appear in family passports should be allowed to use these passports also when travelling separately.

III. ADDITION OF SUPPLEMENTARY PAGES TO PASSPORTS DRAWN UP ON THE INTERNATIONAL MODEL

The Paris Passport Conference of 1920 adopted the principle that all passports the pages of which have been used up must be replaced by fresh passports. This principle is also adopted in the German regulations.

The German authorities have observed that foreign passports the pages of which have been used up are frequently provided with additional pages. The refusal to affix the German visa to such additional pages has often caused regrettable annoyance to travellers and has even led to representations from foreign States.

The German Government therefore thinks it desirable that the Conference should consider whether this principle should or should not be maintained.

IV. TREATMENT OF PASSPORTS WHICH FAIL TO CONFORM TO THE INTERNATIONAL MODEL, BY OMITTING CERTAIN PARTICULARS (*e.g.*, THE DESCRIPTION OR SIGNATURE OF THE HOLDER)

According to German law, foreign passports which do not correspond with the international model proposed by the League of Nations are only recognised subject to the following conditions :

(a) The passport must show the holder's nationality.

(b) The passport must be provided with a personal description and a recent photograph of the holder, together with his autograph signature under the photograph; and it is desirable that they should be furnished with an official stamp certifying that the holder is in fact the person represented in the photograph, and that the signature is his own.

The German authorities are frequently shown foreign passports which do not conform to the international type and which in addition are lacking in some of the important particulars mentioned above as being required by the law, such as the personal description or the signature of the holder.

The refusal of the German authorities to recognise these passports has frequently led to unpleasantness. In order to minimise friction in international traffic, the German Government would be glad if the Passport Conference would take a decision regarding the conditions under which passports not conforming to the international model should be recognised.

V. INTRODUCTION OF CHEAP AND SIMPLE IDENTITY CARDS INSTEAD OF PASSPORTS FOR TRAVEL BETWEEN COUNTRIES WHICH DO NOT REQUIRE VISAS

The international model passport contains thirty-two pages, twenty-eight of which are intended to receive endorsements. For travel between countries which have reciprocally dispensed with visas, this form of passport is no longer necessary. It might therefore be well to consider whether in such cases the present passports could not be simplified, *i.e.*, be replaced by an identity card of four pages issued at a trifling cost.

On the suggestion of the Prussian Minister of the Interior, I should like to add the following question to the list of our proposals :

VI. INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF COLLECTIVE LISTS IN THE PLACE OF PASSPORTS

According to German passport law, collective lists are a valid substitute for passports. This measure has been considered useful and necessary to facilitate collective journeys undertaken by societies, associations and other groups. The purpose aimed at in introducing the system of collective lists can only be achieved, however, if such lists are also recognised as a substitute for passports by other States, and are accordingly furnished with collective visas. Recent experience goes to show, however, that this is not always the case. The collective lists are sometimes only recognised after the foreign officials to whom the lists are submitted for stamping have referred the matter back to their central authorities, a procedure which often involves delays that are, to say the least, regrettable.

ANNEX 3.

REPORT ADOPTED BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE PASSPORT REGIME IN PARIS ON OCTOBER 5th, 1925.

As a result of the Conference held in Paris under the auspices of the League of Nations in October 1920, the Advisory and Technical Committee has since that time continuously followed the changes in the passport regime, and, on investigation, has several times taken note of the progress made in carrying out the resolutions of the Conference of 1920.

The Genoa Economic Conference, and later the Emigration Conference held at Rome in May 1924, once more drew the attention of public opinion and of Governments to these problems, which were also considered by the International Chamber of Commerce at its Congress at Rome in 1923 and by the International Union of Railways.

The Advisory and Technical Committee was of opinion that the time had come to propose a fresh joint examination of passport questions by the representatives of the Governments. The object would be, by a procedure similar to that followed in the case of the 1920 Conference, to make fresh progress to meet the present general situation, and if possible to go considerably further than was originally suggested by the 1920 Conference, as on most points the progress it had recommended had already been made or even exceeded. The Advisory and Technical Committee therefore instructed a special Sub-Committee, which has prepared the present report, to study the question as a whole and to prepare the agenda of the new Conference which it would ask the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee to request the Council to convene.

The Sub-Committee has now completed the preparatory work for the Conference. It is of opinion that it would be desirable to convene this Conference for the end of April or the beginning of May 1926.

In its desire to increase the freedom of communications and transit, the Sub-Committee submits a draft agenda and indicates the general lines on which the Conference might work, but the Conference is, of course, free to arrange its own debates. It also forwards a copy of the chief documents which might assist the work of the Conference, and more particularly the replies from the various Governments to the questionnaire sent them — replies which chiefly deal with present conditions (see Annex 8).

It draws attention to the fact that the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations has made suggestions for the programme of the Conference by adopting the following resolution :

“ The Assembly . . . draws the attention of all the Governments to the special importance of the Conference on Passports to be held in 1926, which public opinion, particularly in economic circles, undoubtedly expects to take at least a step towards the abolition, to the widest extent possible, of the passport system and to mitigate considerably the disadvantages and expense which that system entails for the relations between peoples and for international trade facilities ”.

DRAFT AGENDA.

FIRST SECTION. — GENERAL QUESTIONS.

I. Abolition of the Passport Regime.

The Conference might usefully examine the means of bringing about or of hastening the gradual abolition of the passport regime, for instance, by reciprocal agreements between certain States — a method which has already produced some results.

II. Facilities to be granted should the Passport Regime be maintained.

A. Issue of Passports.

1. *Type of passport.* — The Sub-Committee is of opinion that it is not desirable in any way to reconsider the 1920 Conference type of international passport, which has been adopted by a very large number of countries ; it thinks that it would, nevertheless, be desirable for the Conference to consider how, when preparing this passport, certain precautions against fraud could be taken to meet the objections which have prevented certain countries from adopting this type of passport.

2. *Authorities competent to issue passports.* — The Sub-Committee recommends that the offices competent to issue passports should be organised in such a way as not to cause travellers long and expensive journeys, and that the issue of passports should, as far as possible, be entrusted to the local authorities, thus obviating over-centralisation of these services, particularly in large towns.

3. *Duration of validity.* — The Sub-Committee, noting that a large number of countries have adopted the duration of validity of two years for passports, as proposed by the 1920 Conference, and that a certain number of countries have not yet adopted that period, recommends that all countries should in any event adopt a minimum validity of two years, and if possible validity approaching five years, which has already been adopted by certain countries.

4. *Extent of validity.* — The Sub-Committee recommends that, except in certain special or exceptional cases, Governments should issue passports valid for all foreign countries.

5. *Fees.* — The Sub-Committee recommends that the fees charged for the issue of passports should be fixed in such a manner as to bring in revenue to the States not exceeding the expenditure involved in the preparation of the passports and their issue to the persons concerned.

B. Visas.

1. *Transit visas.* — The Sub-Committee recommends that transit visas be abolished; the control authorities in the transit countries should merely ascertain that the travellers are really in transit.

2. *Exit visas.* — The recommendations of the 1920 Conference on this subject having been accepted by a large number of States, the Sub-Committee is of opinion that the total abolition of exit visas both for nationals and for foreigners might be taken into consideration at the present time.

3. *Entrance visas.* — The Sub-Committee recommends that, except in special or exceptional cases, entrance visas should be abolished by all countries, either generally or under condition of reciprocity, each country retaining its full freedom of action in respect of the enforcement of its legislation with regard to police measures for foreigners, the regulation of the labour supply, etc.

Should the abolition of the entrance visa not be accepted, a certain number of improvements might nevertheless be made. The duration of validity of entrance visas should be as long as possible and, if practicable, as long as the duration of validity of the passport. Unless there are exceptional reasons justified by health conditions or the interests of national security, the visas granted should always be valid for all frontiers.

So far as fees are concerned, the fee charged should not exceed five gold francs, it being understood that the charges in question should be fixed according to the principles laid down above in respect of the fees charged for issue of passports.

This fee would be levied without any distinction, based either on the nationality of the holder of a passport or on the point on the frontier at which he entered or left the territory of the State granting the visa. Nevertheless, the nationals of a State which charged nationals of other States a fee less than the general fee might by reciprocity be charged the same fee by the latter States. This fee should in that case also be granted to nationals of all other States offering to allow them to benefit by an identical charge. Individual reductions in fees would be abolished. The only exemptions from charges should be those granted to certain categories of persons under regulations permanently fixed and published. Such exemptions should be subject to the conditions of equality and reciprocity laid down in the preceding paragraph.

Should the duration of validity of a passport expire before that of a visa, a new visa to be stamped on the new passport should be granted free.

Should the duration of validity of a visa expire before it has been used, a new visa should also be granted free.

So far as concerns the granting of visas, the Sub-Committee is of opinion that the Conference might with advantage examine the best methods of furthering the granting of such visas and of obtaining the advantages of decentralisation, for instance by granting visas by post or by any other method.

C. Control at Frontiers.

The Conference might with advantage consider how, in certain cases, better organisation of the examination of passports and visas at frontiers might diminish the inconvenience caused to travellers, and the delays which international communications may suffer from this fact. While considering this point, it might re-examine the recommendations adopted by the Conference of 1920 or any other suggestions.

It would also be desirable to draw attention to the fact that it would be useful to make the stamps on passports at frontiers as clear and as visible as possible and that they should be affixed with the utmost care.

SECOND SECTION. — QUESTIONS CONCERNING EMIGRANTS.

The resolution of the Rome Conference concerning emigration has shown in a general way that improvements are desirable in the transport of emigrants.

The Sub-Committee has instructed a Committee of Experts to consider this question and to submit proposals to assist the work of the Conference.

The report of this Committee, which deals more particularly with the identity papers of emigrants and with means to assist the passage and transit of emigrants overseas, has been adopted by the Sub-Committee and is attached to this present report (see Annex).

Annex.

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE BY THE EXPERTS ON EMIGRATION.

The undersigned experts have the honour to communicate to the Sub-Committee a few suggestions which they think it their duty to submit with a view to removing a number of difficulties arising out of the issue to emigrants of papers of identity and the granting to them of transit and entrance visas.

Passports and identity books.

Without going into political considerations which may in certain cases make the maintenance or abolition of passports necessary, and taking account both of the present legislation and of the recommendations made by the Rome International Conference on Emigration and Immigration in 1924, we are of opinion that the solution of the problem before us should be sought on the following lines :

While it is desirable that, generally speaking, passports should be simplified, and even as soon as possible abolished, we are of opinion that, in view of the conditions under which migration at present takes place, it is difficult to allow emigrants leaving their country and settling in another country to have all legal safeguards on departure, during their journey and on their arrival, unless they possess certain documents which clearly prove their nationality, their identity and particulars of their family.

First, these documents are indispensable to the emigrant in his own interests, particularly with a view to :

- (a) Easy and certain proof of his identity ;
- (b) Assistance from consuls ;
- (c) Facilities for establishing a domicile in the country of immigration ;
- (d) Drawing-up of official documents for the emigrant and his family (birth certificate, marriage certificate, death certificate) ;
- (e) Entering into labour and other contracts ;
- (f) Participation in social insurance and workmen's compensation for accidents ;
- (g) Travelling facilities, etc.

They are also necessary from the point of view of public law for :

- (a) Control over the departure, transit and entry of emigrants in general ;
- (b) The settlement and registration of emigrants and the taking of a census of emigrants ;
- (c) Organisation of the labour market ;
- (d) National and international protection of emigrants ;
- (e) The improvement and comparability of migration statistics ;
- (f) Proof of certain offences (desertion of family or of children, bigamy, etc.).

Your rapporteurs are, however, of opinion that, so far as emigrants are concerned, the above requirements would be even more satisfactorily met by the introduction and general use of identity books than by the maintenance of the passports regime.

This indeed appears to have been the view of forty-six Governments¹ when they recommended the introduction of identity books at the Emigration and Immigration Conference at Rome, which adopted the following recommendations :

“ The Conference,

“ Considering that it is desirable to diminish the expenses of the emigrant and to simplify the formalities to which he has to submit, which are sometimes useless and often troublesome and even humiliating, and in order to facilitate his movements and his establishment in the immigration country :

“ Expresses the wish :

“ That all States should come to agreements on the following points :

“ 1. The establishment in all emigration countries of an *identity book* of a uniform type to be subsequently agreed upon ;

“ 2. The issue of this document free of charge or at a minimum price.”

The introduction of these books, which confer practically the same advantages as passports, might facilitate the abolition of passports in all cases where reasons of a national character do not absolutely require that they should be maintained.

But whether the passport or the identity book is adopted, we are of opinion that under the same form and in the same order the document should contain the following necessary

¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Argentine, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Ecuador, Egypt, Esthonia, France, Germany, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, San Marino, Siam, Spain, Switzerland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

information : name, christian names, sex, age, nationality, profession, last place of residence, particulars of family, country in which the emigrant proposes to settle, photograph¹.

It would also be desirable for passports or identity books to contain any information useful to the emigrant to facilitate his admission to a foreign country, his settlement there and his possible return later to his own country.

For this purpose, it would be well to consider the advisability of including in identity papers the information required by certain countries : degree of education, mother-tongue, finger-prints, previous convictions, etc., whether liable for military service or not, health certificate, certificate of good morals, vaccination certificate, etc.

Primarily with a view to avoiding loss of time at the frontiers or in registration offices and ensuring accurate statistics and ready classification, we think that these identity documents should have detachable leaves containing certain essential information. These leaves might be removed by the authorities concerned in the emigration and in the immigration country, either on the journey out or on the return journey.

For information and to make our views quite clear, we attach to our report a model of the book in question, in which we have endeavoured to take account of the above considerations (Appendix 1).

Transit visas.

So long as the regime of passports and visas continues, emigrants who have to pass through a foreign country when proceeding to their port of embarkation will be obliged to submit to the formality of the transit visa.

In order to obtain this visa, which is given by the consular agents, they are at present obliged to pay a fee which is more or less high and comply with certain conditions ; in particular, they must produce a national passport provided with the entrance visa of the consul of the country of destination. They must also prove that they have sufficient funds for the transit journey and the period during which they may have to stay at the port of embarkation, and, if they are not to be turned back on arrival, they must show that they satisfy the moral, physical and educational requirements of the country of destination.

In order to obtain this visa, the intending emigrants must appear personally at the consulate, and, when they are obliged to cross several countries, this formality necessitates long, expensive and very inconvenient journeys.

Inspired by humanitarian ideas and desirous of simplifying the formalities of the transit visa, certain countries (notably France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Belgium) have issued a special card which takes the place of the consular transit visa and is given free of charge. The issue of cards has been entrusted to those shipping companies which have obtained permission from the countries concerned to accept and transport emigrants.

When the emigrant takes a ticket for his passage, the company arranging for his emigration gives him a transit card for the country in which the port of embarkation is situated. When there are several countries to be crossed, the emigrant is obliged to obtain as many visas as cards as there are countries.

To spare emigrants the difficulties which they encounter at present, it would be most desirable that the countries through which they pass should agree to recognise as sufficient the transit card of the country of embarkation.

Such reciprocal recognition would not seem likely to raise any difficulty in practice.

In fact, the card given to the emigrant by the shipping company when the ticket for the passage is taken should make the company responsible not only to the country of the port of embarkation but also to all countries through which the emigrant passes.

The State in which the port of embarkation is situated would undertake to make its shipping companies bear the expenditure occasioned by emigrants being abandoned or going astray in the transit countries or being turned back from the country of destination.

The company which had delivered the transit card would therefore be responsible :

- (1) If the emigrant had not a ticket for his passage ;
- (2) If he was not in a position to support himself during the journey by land and became a public charge in a transit country ;
- (3) If he did not comply with the required conditions of health, character, etc.

It would be necessary to adopt a uniform type of transit card.

Once the principle of reciprocal recognition of transit cards was admitted, the proper services in the various countries would have to agree as to the assistance they should give each other for the purpose of seeing that the undertakings entered into by the companies issuing transit cards were respected.

¹ The International Labour Conference of 1922, in which thirty-three Governments took part (South Africa, Albania, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Roumania, Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela), after having taken note of the fact that international statistics for emigration should include the following information : sex of the emigrant and immigrant, age, profession, nationality, country in which last resident and country in which he proposes to settle, unanimously recommended that :

"... each Member of the International Labour Organisation should, if possible, make agreements with other Members providing for :

"(d) The determination of uniform particulars to be entered on the identity papers issued to emigrants and immigrants by the competent authorities of Members who are parties to such agreements."

The emigration services of the countries concerned should be authorised to communicate with each other directly in cases of this kind.

We have also attached to this report the transit card which is at present in use in Belgium (Appendix 2).

Issue of identity documents.

We are of opinion that, particularly in respect of identity books, efforts should be made to give effect to the provision in the resolutions of the Rome Conference that the offices competent to issue identity documents to emigrants should be organised in such a way as not to cause emigrants long and expensive journeys, and that the issue of identity documents should as far as possible be entrusted to local authorities, care being taken to prevent the concentration of the services entrusted with the application of the passport regime in large towns, which are frequently at a considerable distance from the places at which emigrants live.

Conclusions.

We are of opinion that the above measures might be adopted without in any way infringing the sovereign rights of States over their emigration, immigration and transit legislation, and that these proposals will entirely safeguard the right of each Government to fix the conditions either for emigration in the case of its nationals or for immigration in the case of foreign nationals, to decide what identity papers are necessary in each case, to indicate what authorities are competent to issue them, to lay down the kind of documents which will be required as evidence, and to fix the duration of validity and the cost of each document.

Geneva, August 29th, 1925.

(Signed) F. DEROOVER.

(Signed) TOMASO PERASSI.

LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE PASSPORT REGIME BY THE DIRECTOR OF EMIGRATION FOR CANADA IN LONDON ¹.

London, September 28th, 1925.

Passport facilities for emigrants.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant enclosing a copy of the report submitted to the Sub-Committee by Messrs. F. Deroover and T. Perassi. In connection therewith, I beg to submit the following observations:

(1) I agree in principle with the suggestions regarding the emigrant's identity book. In practice, however, I am of the opinion that there might be some changes, *e.g.*, finger-prints. Though this is no doubt an excellent system for establishing identification, and especially of those whose particular identification is so essential in connection with the administration of law and order, yet, on the other hand, it might have some tendency to affect the free movement between countries of the really good immigrant class.

(2) If the information regarding health certificates necessitates a medical inspection, then I would suggest that a minimum charge should be made, especially regarding families. You are no doubt aware that in so far as immigrants are concerned there is usually a medical examination by the transportation company in the country of origin and at the port of embarkation, and also another medical examination at the port of entry. There is no charge for medical examination either at the port of embarkation or at the port of entry. I quite agree that there should be a health certificate provided the information can be obtained free.

In addition, I might point out that infectious or contagious diseases might be contracted *en route*, or months after the medical inspection at the point of origin. It should be, therefore, clearly understood that the medical examination or medical certificate upon which final decision will be rendered will be the medical examination at the port of entry to the country of destination.

I would also like to point out that there is probably no profession in which there is a possibility of wider divergence of opinion than the medical profession, and consequently there is liable to be conflict as between the result of the various medical examinations. Upon this ground I would like to have further discussed the advisability of health notation in the emigrant's identity book.

(3) I am also of the opinion that no fee of any kind should be charged for the identity book.

¹ The Director of Emigration for Canada in London was one of the three experts named to submit a report to the Sub-Committee concerning passport facilities for emigrants, but owing to the absence in Canada of the Director at the time of the experts' meeting, he was unable to take part in the deliberations.

(4) I do not know what standard of education is contemplated, but I assume the intention is that each immigrant shall be able to read and write.

(5) With reference to military service, I am doubtful whether a uniform system can be adopted on this subject. I am not quite clear as to the necessity for any endorsement on the identity book regarding military service.

(6) I agree with the transit visa suggestions provided the machinery is simple and without cost to the immigrant.

(7) I also agree with the suggestion that such arrangements be made that immigrants be spared long and expensive journeys in connection with the issue of identity papers.

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT SUBMITTED ON AUGUST 29TH, 1925, TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE BY THE EXPERTS ON EMIGRATION.

Having noted with great interest a letter from the Canadian Director of Emigration dated September 28th, 1925, the undersigned experts beg to point out that, generally speaking, the proposed identity book for emigrants which is annexed to their report, purely for purposes of information, necessitates the giving of particulars of two kinds, some being *compulsory* and others merely *useful* for the emigrant, and therefore *optional*.

Whether a passport or identity book is adopted, we are of opinion that it should contain invariably in the same form and order, the following *necessary information*: name, christian names, sex, age, nationality, trade or profession, last place of residence, particulars of family, country in which the emigrant proposes to settle, photograph.

Moreover, we are of opinion that the passport or book should give information which would be of use to the emigrant for the purpose of facilitating his admission to and settlement in a foreign country and his possible return later to his own country. We therefore thought that it would be desirable to consider whether we could not include in identity documents information at present required by some countries, such as: degree of education, mother-tongue, fingerprints, previous convictions, whether liable for military service or not, health certificate, certificate of good character, vaccination certificate, etc.

The comments of the Canadian Director of Emigration only deal with certain of these optional particulars.

So far as *medical examination* is concerned, it is of course understood that the *optional* medical certificate in the identity book does not affect the right of the State of destination to make an emigrant undergo a fresh medical examination which alone would decide finally whether he was to be admitted to the country of immigration.

As for the expense of issuing the identity book, we agree with the Canadian Director of Emigration in hoping that this document may be delivered free of charge or at a minimum price in accordance with the recommendations of the Rome Conference on Emigration and Immigration.

Paris, October 3rd, 1925.

(Signed) F. DEROOVER.

(Signed) TOMASO PERASSI.

— 2 —

Country :

Emigrant's Identity Book

Description	
of Husband	of Wife
Height	
Weight	
Hair	
Moustache	
Beard	
Eyes	
Complexion	
Special characteristics	

Husband's photograph

Wife's photograph

Issued by { Name of the Authority
issuing the book.

Signatures of Bearers, certified by the Authorities,

Serial No.

Particulars relating to the Head of the Family.

1. Name
2. Christian names..... Sex

3. Nationality (country)
4. Occupation at time of emigration
5. Agriculture, industry, trade, the liberal professions, domestic service or other occupation ¹.

6. Unmarried, married, widower, divorced ¹.
7. Travelling alone, with wife, with children ¹.
8. Able to read and write. Unable to read or write ¹.
9. Native language

10. Commune and country of residence
11. Commune and country of birth
12. Date of birth.....
13. Father's name
14. Mother's name.....

15. Destination
16. Probable period of emigration
17. Object of journey

18. Papers submitted in support of application
19. Authority issuing this document
20. Date

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Finger-prints of Right Hand.

Finger-prints of Wife's Right Hand.

Particulars relating to Wife.

1. Name
2. Christian names
3. Nationality (country)
4. Occupation at time of emigration
5. Agriculture, industry, trade, the liberal professions, domestic service or other occupation ¹.
6. Able to read and write. Unable to read or write ¹.
7. Place of residence
8. Place of birth
9. Date of birth
10. Father's name
11. Mother's name
12. Native language
13. Place and date of marriage
14. Papers submitted in support of application :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Children and other Minors expatriated with the Foregoing.

No.	Names and Christian names of Children	Place and Country of Birth	Date of Birth			Occupation
			Day	Month	Year	
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
	Other persons :					
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						

Sheet No. 1 to be detached by Transport Company.

Detached on at by
Embarking at the port of

— 7 —

Sheet
No. 1

Country issuing the document

Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

Accompanying Persons

Nº	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

[Reverse side blank]

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Detached on at by

Stamp
of Authority

detaching
this sheet

Country issuing the document

Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹.

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹.

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

[Reverse side blank]

Accompanying Persons

No	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Detached on at by

— 9 —

Sheet
No. 3

Country issuing the document

Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

[Reverse side blank]

Accompanying Persons

No	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Detached on at by

Stamp
of Authority

detaching
this sheet

Country issuing the document

Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹.

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹.

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

[Reverse side blank]

Accompanying Persons

Nº	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Sheet No. 5 to be detached by the Transport Company on the return journey.

Detached on at by

Embarking at the port of

— 11 —

Sheet
No. 5

Country issuing the document

Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹.

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹.

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

Accompanying Persons

No	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

[Reverse side blank]

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Detached on at by

Stamp
of Authority

detaching
this sheet

Country issuing the document
Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family
Christian names
Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹.
Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹.

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

[Reverse side blank]

Accompanying Persons

N ^o	Name	Description (wife, child, etc).	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Sheet No. 7 to be detached on entering the country of origin at the time of repatriation.

Detached on at by

Stamp
Authority

Specimen
of sheet

— 13 —

Sheet
No. 7

Country issuing the document.....

Date, place of origin and No. of book.....

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹.....

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹.....

Nationality

Place and date of birth.....

Country of destination

Object of emigration

[Reverse side blank]

Accompanying Persons

No	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

Sheet No. 8 to be detached at place of settlement on return to native country.

Detached on at by

Stamp
of Authority

detaching
this sheet

— 14 —

Reference
No. 8

Country issuing the document

Date, place of origin and No. of book

Name of head of family

Christian names

Unmarried, married, divorced, widower ¹

Name and Christian names of wife

Travelling alone or accompanied ¹

Nationality

Place and date of birth

Country of destination

Object of emigration

[Reverse side blank]

Accompanying Persons

Nº	Name	Description (wife, child, etc.)	Sex	Place and date of birth
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				

Place and date of detachment :

¹ Strike out what does not apply.

I

ADDITIONAL PARTICULARS WHICH MAY BE
DEMANDED BY GOVERNMENTS

Special authorisation for the emigration of minors and
young girls.

Death certificates of husband, wife or children.

Certificate of good conduct und character.

General medical certificate.

Vaccination certificate.

Criminal record.

Any pending proceedings

Position as regards military service.

Certificate of registration with the Consulate.

II

OTHER REMARKS AND CERTIFICATES

VISAS AND STAMPS

Appendix 2*.

Reproduction of a card (format 29 1/2 cm. x 15 cm.) printed both sides and perforated in the center.

**ENTRÉE
EN BELGIQUE**

(Entry into Belgium)
**INKOMST
IN BELGIE**

MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES — (Ministry for Foreign Affairs)
MINISTERIE VAN BUITENLANDSCHE ZAKEN
COMMISSARIAT DU GOUVERNEMENT POUR L'ÉMIGRATION, A ANVERS
(Government Emigration Commission, Antwerp)
REGEERINGSKOMMISSARIAAT VOOR DE LANDVERHUIZING, TE ANTWERPEN
ÉMIGRANTS TRAVERSANT LA BELGIQUE EN TRANSIT
(Emigrants passing through Belgium to other countries)
LANDVERHUIZERS WELKE BELGIË DOORREIZEN

N^o

Nom de Famille (en majuscules)
(Surname [in block letters])
Familienaam (in hoof dletters)
Prénom Age
(Christian name) (age)
Voornaam *ouderdom*
Sexe Nationalité Célibataire Marié Veuf
(Sex) (Nationality) (Unmarried) (Married) (Widower)
Geslacht *Nationaliteit* *Ongehuwd* *Gehuwd* *Weduwnaar*
Point d'entrée en Belgique
(Entered Belgium at)
Inkomstpunt in België
Point de sortie de Belgique
(Left Belgium via)
Uitgangspunt uit België
Provenance
(Coming from)
Herkomst
Destination
(Proceeding to)
Bestemming
Billet N^o à le
(Ticket No.) (to) (date) 192
Biljet Nr. *te* *den*

SIGNATURE DE L'AGENT D'ÉMIGRATION.

(Signature of Emigration Agent)

Handteekening van den Landverhuizingsagent.

(Cette partie doit être remise à l'entrée de l'émigrant en Belgique au Contrôle des passeports de la gare frontière ou du port de débarquement. Elle doit être renvoyée par le Contrôle des Passeports au Commissariat du Gouvernement pour l'Émigration, Grande Montagne au Corail, 10, à Anvers.)

(This part to be given up on entering Belgium at the Passport Control Office at the frontier station or port of disembarkation. It must be returned by the Passport Control Officer to the Government Emigration Commission, Antwerp.)

Dit deel moet aan het ingangspunt in België door den landverhuizer aan den Paspoortkontrooldienst afgegeven worden. Het moet door den Paspoortkontrooldienst aan het Regeeringskommissariaat voor de Landverhuizing, Grootte Koraalberg 10, te Antwerpen, teruggezonden worden.

* The Belgian transit card is in French and Flemish ; the English text, in brackets, is a translation.

**SORTIE
DE BELGIQUE**

(Departure from
Belgium)
**UITGANG
UIT BELGIE**

MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES — (Ministry for Foreign Affairs)
MINISTERIE VAN BUITENLANDSCHE ZAKEN
COMMISSARIAT DU GOUVERNEMENT POUR L'ÉMIGRATION, A ANVERS
(Government Emigration Commission, Antwerp)
REGEERINGSKOMMISSARIAAT VOOR DE LANDVERHUIZING, TE ANTWERPEN
ÉMIGRANTS TRAVERSANT LA BELGIQUE EN TRANSIT
(Emigrants passing through Belgium to other countries)
LANDVERHUIZERS WELKE BELGIË DOORREIZEN

N^o

Nom de Famille (en majuscules)
(Surname [in block letters])
Familienaam (in hoof dletters)
Prénom Age
(Christian name) (age)
Voornaam *ouderdom*
Sexe Nationalité Célibataire Marié Veuf
(Sex) (Nationality) (Unmarried) (Married) (Widower)
Geslacht *Nationaliteit* *Ongehuwd* *Gehuwd* *Weduwnaar*
Point d'entrée en Belgique
(Entered Belgium at)
Inkomstpunt in België
Point de sortie de Belgique
(Left Belgium via)
Uitgangspunt uit België
Provenance
(Coming from)
Herkomst
Destination
(Proceeding to)
Bestemming
Billet N^o à le
(Ticket No.) (to) (date) 192
Biljet Nr. *te* *den*

SIGNATURE DE L'AGENT D'ÉMIGRATION.

(Signature of Emigration Agent)

Handteekening van den Landverhuizingsagent.

(Cette partie doit être remise à la sortie de l'émigrant de Belgique au Contrôle des passeports de la gare frontière ou du port d'embarquement. Elle doit être renvoyée par le Contrôle des Passeports au Commissariat du Gouvernement pour l'Émigration, Grande Montagne au Corail, 10, Anvers.)

(This part to be given up on leaving Belgium at the Passport Control Office at the frontier station or port of embarkation. It must be returned by the Passport Control Officer to the Government Emigration Commission, Antwerp.)

Dit deel moet aan het uitgangspunt uit België door den landverhuizer aan den Paspoortkontrooldienst afgegeven worden. Het moet door den Paspoortkontrooldienst aan het Regeeringskommissariaat voor de Landverhuizing, Grootte Koraalberg 10, te Antwerpen, teruggezonden worden.

[Reverse side.]

A timbrer à l'entrée en Belgique par le Contrôle des passeports de la gare frontière ou du port de débarquement. — Indiquer la date.

Cette partie de la carte doit être remise par l'émigrant au Contrôle des passeports à l'entrée en Belgique.

(To be stamped on entry into Belgium by the Passport Control Office at the frontier station or the port of embarkation. — Indicate date.)

(This part of the card must be given up by the emigrant to the Passport Control Office on entering Belgium.)

Te stempelen bij aankomst in België door den Controoldienst der paspoorten in de grensstatie of haven van ontschepping. — Datum aanduiden.

Dit gedeelte der kaart moet door den landverhuizer aan den Controol der paspoorten bij de aankomst in België afgegeven worden.

Abzustempeln beim Eintreffen in Belgien von der Reisepass-Kontrollstelle an der Grenz-Bahnstation oder im Landungshafen. — Datum anführen.

Dieser Teil der Karte muss vom Auswanderer beim Eintreffen in Belgien an die Reisepasskontrollstelle abgegeben werden.

Budiž opatřeno razítkem při příchodu do Belgie od kontrolního úřadu cestovních listů na hraniční stanici aneb v přístavě vylodění. — Uvedte datum.

Tento díl lístku musí vystěhovalce odevzdati při příchodu do Belgie kontrolnímu úřadu cestovních listů.

PO RUSKU

Petschat pogranišchenai straczi kontrolia passportow pri wesde w Belgii ili porta wisadki. — Mesiate i tšchislo.

PO RUSKU

Eta tšchast kartoczki dolsna būt wrutsdhena tšchinowiku kontrolnoi stanci pri wezde w Belgii.

Do pieczetowania przy przyjeździe do Belgii przez kontrolę paszportowa na stacyi pogranicznej lub w porcie ladowania. — Naznaczyc date.

To czesc karty musi wręczyc Emigrant kontroli paszportowej przy przyjeździe do Belgii.

Lebejegezendö megérkeresnél Belgiumbau a Határ ellenerezo utlevél hotaság által Vagy a kikötőbau. — Kelt.

Ezen jegynek a szelvényi a Rivándérlő által az ültölevél ellenerező Belgiumbau átadondó.

A fi timbrat la intrare in Belgia prin Controlul pasaportilor den gara de granitza sau din portul de debarcare. — A se memtiona data.

Accasta parte din carta trebuie se fi remis din parte emigrantului la Controlul pasaportilor la intrare in Belgia.

A timbrer à la sortie de Belgique par le Contrôle des passeports de la gare frontière ou du port d'embarquement. — Indiquer la date.

Cette partie de la carte doit être remise par l'émigrant au Contrôle des passeports à la sortie de Belgique.

(To be stamped on departure from Belgium by the Passport Control Office at the frontier station or the port of embarkation. — Indicate the date.)

(This part to be given up by the emigrant to the Passport Control Office on leaving Belgium.)

Te stempelen bij het vertrek uit België door den Controol der paspoorten in de grensstatie of haven van inschepping. — Datum aanduiden.

Dit gedeelte der kaart moet door den landverhuizer aan den Controol der paspoorten bij het vertrek uit België afgegeven worden.

Abzustempeln beim Abgehen aus Belgien von der Reisepass-Kontrollstelle der Grenzahnstation oder im Landungshafen. — Datum anführen.

Dieser Teil der Karte muss vom Auswanderer beim Abgehen aus Belgien an die Reisepasskontrollstelle abgegeben werden.

Budiž opatřeno razítkem při opuštění Belgie od kontrolního úřadu cestovních listů na hraniční stanici aneb v přístavě vylodění. — Uvedte datum.

Tento díl lístku musí vystěhovalce odevzdati při opuštění Belgie kontrolnímu uradu cestovních listů.

PO RUSKU

Petschat pogranišchnoi straczi kontrolia passportow pri wiesde is Belgii ili porta. — Mesiač i tšchislo.

PO RUSKU

Eta tšchast kartocki dolsna būt wrutschena tšchinowniku kontrolnoi stanci pri wiesde is Belgii.

Do pieczetowania przy wyjeździe z Belgii przez kontrolę paszportowa na stacyi pogranicznej lub w porcie ladowania. — Naznaczyc date.

Te czesc karty musi wręczyc Emigrant kontroli paszportowej przy wyjeździe z Belgii.

Lebeljegezendö Belgium elhagyasnál a Határ ellenerező útlevél hotaság által Vagy a kikötőnél. — Kelt.

Ezen jegynek a szelvényi a Rivándérlő által az ütlelevél ellenerező Belgium elhagyasó átadondó.

A fit timbrat laesire din Belgia prin Controlul pasaportilor din gara de granitza sau din portul de imbarcare. — A se mentiona data.

Accasta parte din carta trebuie se fi remis din parte emigrantului la Controlul pasaportilor la esire din Belgia.

ANNEX 4.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE GERMAN DELEGATION REGARDING THE SUPPRESSION OF THE PASSPORT REGIME.

The Conference, while recognising that the general and complete suppression of the passport system is not practicable at the present time, nevertheless deems it necessary to contemplate such suppression at as early a date as possible.

Meantime, the States represented at the Conference will do all in their power to bring about or hasten by means of special agreements the progressive suppression of the present system, and they undertake to mitigate the drawbacks of the said system in so far as it still exists by facilitating the issue of passports in an effective and liberal manner by means of uniform regulations.

ANNEX 5.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE AUSTRIAN DELEGATION REGARDING PRECAUTIONS TO BE TAKEN AGAINST FRAUD.

Ad. II. A. (1) TYPE OF PASSPORT.

1. Use of paper employed for bank-notes, paper money, documents, etc., making it impossible to erase and efface writing by chemical means.

2. Placing of identity numbers on the cover and on the first page of the passport.

3. To prevent the exchange of sheets, they should be stamped with a dry perforated composing-stick in such a way that the initials of the name of the State should be punched out, according to the model which the Bureau holds at the disposal of the Conference.

ANNEX 6.

ARRANGEMENT SIGNED AT PARIS ON JANUARY 27TH, 1926, BETWEEN BELGIUM AND FRANCE REGARDING RECIPROCITY IN THE MATTER OF TRANSIT CARDS FOR EMIGRANTS EMBARKING IN BELGIAN AND FRENCH PORTS.

For reasons of humanity, and in order to simplify the transit formalities for emigrants travelling through their respective territories, the French Government and the Belgian Government have agreed to the following provisions.

Article 1. — The two Governments shall recognise as valid for the purpose of travel in transit through their respective territories the special transit cards delivered to emigrants either by the authorities of each country or by the emigration agents or companies authorised by the authorities of the country of embarkation to engage and transport emigrants and deliver the aforesaid cards. These cards must be delivered free of charge to the emigrants and shall exempt the latter from obtaining the consular visa.

Article 2. — The State in which the port of embarkation is situated undertakes that the emigration agents and the authorised shipping companies in its territory shall pay all expenses which may be incurred by the other State owing to emigrants becoming abandoned or lost during transit, or being rejected by the country of destination.

The agents and companies shall be held responsible especially in the following cases :

If the emigrant has no ticket ;

If he does not possess sufficient means to provide for himself during transit on land and should thus become a charge upon public charity ;

If he does not fulfil the conditions regarding health, moral character, etc., required by the laws of the country of destination and of the countries of transit.

Article 3. — The Emigration Departments of the two countries are authorised to come to an agreement as to the help they shall afford each other in order to enforce the observance of the obligations entered into by the agents and the companies who have delivered emigration cards. These departments are authorised to communicate directly with each other for this purpose.

Article 4. — The two Governments shall despatch to each other at the beginning of each year a list of emigration agents and companies authorised within their respective territories to engage and transport emigrants, and shall keep each other acquainted with all changes made in this list. They shall communicate to each other emigration cards of the type in use within their territory in sufficient numbers for the needs of their respective services.

Article 5. — The present arrangement shall enter into force as from the date of the exchange of ratifications. It shall last one year and shall be renewable by tacit consent until its denunciation, which must be notified six months before the expiration of each period.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Plenipotentiaries duly authorised for this purpose have signed the present arrangement and have thereto affixed their seals.

DONE at Paris in duplicate, January 27th, 1926.

(Signed) E. DE GAIFFIER.
Aristide BRIAND.

ANNEX 7.

TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE ON POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE STANDARD PASSPORT (INTERNATIONAL TYPE).

REPORT BY M. H. COSTERMANS.

Precautions against Fraud.

The Committee has considered various questions connected with the type of passport to be adopted and the precautions to be taken against fraud.

It has agreed that booklets of the type in use in England, Germany, Austria and France, a copy of which is exhibited at the Conference, are to be recommended.

The first-mentioned is perfection itself, but is so expensive that many countries might be unable to adopt it. The other passports mentioned above, though cheaper, afford all necessary safeguards, and might be taken as models. The paper employed is such as to obviate all risks of erasures or falsifications of the writing by the use of chemicals.

The Committee is strongly of opinion, however, that the *cover* should bear the name of the country issuing the passport, the name of the holder and the series number of the passport. It is also essential that the number of pages should be stated, as in the 1920 model. Further, every page should be perforated in one or more places; the system of perforation in use in Austria can be thoroughly recommended. For reasons of economy, the binding required by the resolution of the Paris Conference of 1920 should be optional.

At the suggestion of the Greek delegate, the Committee proposes that every visa should mention the passport-holder's name. This, combined with the numbering of the pages, would prevent cases of fraudulent substitution such as have been found to occur.

Number of Pages, Visas, and Stamps.

In order to leave room for all the visas which may be required having regard to the period of the passport's validity (minimum two years), the Committee proposes: (1) that there should be at least 16 pages; (2) that the officials concerned should be instructed to place visas in order of issue, and not to use more than half-a-page for each. The Committee thinks it desirable that stamps placed on passports by frontier officials should be perfectly clear, and should occupy as little room as possible.

Various Entries.

The question of the entries to be made on the passport form has given rise to the following observations:

- (1) Sufficient space should be provided for the full name of the holder;
- (2) Christian names and surnames should be written either in block capitals or in what is known as English roundhand;
- (3) The surname should be underlined.

It is agreed that christian names need not be translated.

The Committee has adopted the Hungarian delegate's proposal that the holder's occupation should be accurately defined, and that space should be left for this description.

It is also essential that his exact height should be shown (this being an important point in the personal description), instead of general indications such as "tall", "average", or "short".

Renewals.

A full page should be left for renewals, whereas the 1920 model leaves only three or four lines. Considerable trouble has been caused by the scattering of successive renewals throughout the book. The renewal page should immediately follow the page on which the period of validity is shown.

Question of Place of Origin ("indigénat").

The States represented at the Conference of Graz strongly recommended that the place of origin ("indigénat") of the holder should be stated on the passport; the Committee observes that there is no reason why this rule should not be followed by the countries concerned, and further points out that the Passport Conference of 1920 agreed that Governments might add on the passport any useful information as to the passport system.

The Committee agrees to complete the above remark as follows: "and any other indications which the Governments may deem necessary".

Family Passports.

In connection with the German delegate's suggestion regarding family passports, it is agreed that the head of the family may travel alone with such a passport, but that it cannot be used by his wife and children travelling without him. It is understood that widows should be regarded as heads of families.

Additional Pages prohibited.

The Paris Conference of 1920 decided that, when all the pages of a passport had been used, it should be withdrawn and a new passport issued. The Committee hopes that this decision will be confirmed, the use of additional pages or slips being prohibited.

Collective Lists.

The Committee sees no objection to the use of collective lists in lieu of passports for collective journeys by members of clubs or societies. It is understood that permission must in the first place be applied for from the Governments concerned, which will grant it subject to certain conditions enabling a check to be kept.

General Recommendation.

The Committee thinks it desirable to suggest that the Conference recommend that States which still use a passport of other than the "international type" should, as soon as possible, adopt the model recommended by the present Conference.

ANNEX 8.

REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE¹ REGARDING PASSPORT REGULATIONS.

A. PASSPORTS.

QUESTION 1:

Has your Government suppressed passports:

(a) *Entirely?*

(b) *For the nationals of certain countries?*

In the case of (b), please name the countries and say whether such action is subject to reciprocity.

In cases where passports have been suppressed, what documents, if any, take their place? (For instance, identity cards, etc.)

REPLIES:

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

(a) No.

(b) No.

¹ See Appendix.

ALBANIA.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

- (a) No.
- (b) The documents required of aliens entering the United States may be listed as follows :

Immigrants.

They must present immigration visas, quota or non-quota, in accordance with the requirements of the Immigration Act of 1924, except :

- (1) Children born subsequent to the issuance of the immigration visa of the accompanying parent. (Section 13 (a) (1), Immigration Act of 1924.) Such children are not required to present documents of any kind.
- (2) Aliens who have previously been admitted legally into the United States, have departed therefrom, and have returned within six months. Of this class :

(a) Those who have not proceeded to countries other than Canada, Newfoundland, St. Pierre, Miquelon, Bermuda, Mexico and islands included in the Bahama and Greater Antilles groups are not required to present documents of any kind ;

(b) Those who have proceeded to countries other than those named in (a) may present, in lieu of immigration visas, permits to re-enter, issued under the provision of Section 10 of the Act of 1924.

Non-Immigrants.

With the exception hereinafter specified, they must present passports or official documents in the nature of passports issued by the Governments of the countries to which they owe allegiance, duly visaed by consular officers of the United States.

Exceptions :

- (1) Persons in transit through the United States to a foreign destination. They may present transit certificates according to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.
- (2) Aliens who are passengers on vessels bound for foreign ports and touching at ports of the United States. They may land temporarily under regulations prescribed by the Department of Labour, without documents of any kind.
- (3) Wives and children under sixteen years of age accompanying their husbands or parents. They are not required to present separate passports if they are mentioned in the passports of their husbands or parents and their photographs are attached thereto.
- (4) Citizens of St. Pierre and Miquelon and French citizens domiciled therein ; citizens of Canada, Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas and British possessions in the Greater Antilles, and British subjects domiciled therein ; citizens of Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, San Domingo. Such persons may enter the United States temporarily from any of the countries named in this paragraph, or pass in transit through the United States from any such country to any other such country, without documents of any kind.
- (5) Seamen, masters of vessels of all nationalities sailing for a port of the United States must submit for visa a list of all the alien members of the vessel's crew to the American consular officer at the port from which the vessel commences its voyage. If there is no American consular officer stationed at that port, the crew list should be submitted at the first port of call (if the vessel touches at any other port) where an American consular officer is located. This does not refer to consular agents, who are not authorised to visa crew lists.
- (6) Aliens making round-trip cruises from American ports without transshipment from the original vessel to another one while *en route*, provided the original contract for passage calls for transportation from an American port to the ports included in the cruise and return to either the original or another American port, require no visas for re-entry into the United States.
- (7) Aliens of no nationality, and those who, when they apply for visas, are outside of the territories of the countries to which they owe allegiance and who, for any reason, are unable to obtain passports or documents in the nature of passports issued by the Governments of such countries, and aliens bearing passports issued by Governments not recognised by the United States. They may enter the United States with documents showing their origin and identity visaed by consuls, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

ARGENTINE.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

AUSTRALIA.

- (a) No.
- (b) No, with the exceptions that : (1) under a reciprocal arrangement with the Dominion of New Zealand, British subjects travelling between Australia and New Zealand do not require to hold passports or any equivalent document ; (2) British migrants from the United Kingdom who are granted assisted passages by the Australian Government are allowed to travel on certificates of identity issued gratis, in lieu of passports.

AUSTRIA.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

BELGIUM.

- (a) No.
- (b) The nationals of France, Luxemburg and the Netherlands do not require a passport for entering Belgium. They must be provided with an identity card, on which appears a recent photograph of the holder. Passports are required in the case of all other nationals. ¹

BULGARIA.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

CANADA.

- (a) No.
- (b) The Canadian Government does not require the holding of a passport for the purpose of leaving the Dominion but, to meet the requirements of foreign authorities, continues the issue of passports to its nationals and British subjects resident in Canada for the purpose of travel abroad.

It also requires as a condition of the entry of any immigrant (that is, a person entering with the object of taking up permanent residence in the Dominion) the possession of a valid passport issued in the country of which such person is a subject or citizen by the Government of such country within a year of the date on which it is presented.

This requirement is not enforced, however, as regards British subjects landing in Canada directly or indirectly from Great Britain or Ireland, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia, the Union of South Africa or the United States of America, nor as regards citizens of the United States or farmers, farm labourers or female domestic servants landing in Canada from the United States — the term British subject in this connection including only persons born or naturalised in Great Britain or Ireland, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia or the Union of South Africa.

For the purpose of entering Canada, passports are not required by any person belonging to the non-immigrant classes as defined in the Immigration Act, Section 2 (g), i-vii, which will be found on pages 9-10 of the Office Consolidation of the Immigration Laws.

CHINA.

- (a) No.
- (b) Passports are suppressed for nationals of certain countries, subject to reciprocity, with the exception of persons travelling in the interior of the country. Chinese Government officials may require such persons to produce identity cards in lieu of passports.

CUBA.

- (a) Yes. (Subject to certain general conditions and a number of special conditions applying to the nationals of certain countries under the provisions of Decree 384 of March 2nd, 1925.)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

¹ In practice it has been proved that this regime can only offer certain advantages when the Governments of the countries to which it is granted — as a measure of reciprocity — impose on their nationals the necessity of being provided with an official identity card. It is obvious that, in the absence of this latter, the obtaining of an official identity document would necessitate as many formalities and take as much time as for a passport. The latter offers, moreover, the advantage of allowing the holder to travel in all other foreign countries. Passports are required in the case of all other nationals.

DENMARK.

(a) No.

(b) Passports are suppressed for former Danish citizens naturalised in North, Central and South America. Nationals of the United States of America and of Canada, born in Sweden or Norway, may travel through Denmark without a passport.

In both cases, the individuals in question must produce, instead of a passport, a certificate and an identity document, with a photograph attached, and a declaration from a public authority attesting the authenticity of the photograph.

ESTHONIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

FRANCE.

(a) No.

(b) Passports are suppressed (subject to reciprocity) for nationals of Belgium and Luxemburg. The passport is replaced by an identity card, on which appears a photograph of the holder and which is stamped by the local authorities of the place of residence of the holder.

GERMANY.

Passports are required by all persons crossing the frontier and all non-Germans residing in the territory of the Reich. School-children under 15 need only have an identity card with details as to the holder. Simple permits, for use in frontier districts (easily obtainable), may be substituted for passports in the case of residents on the frontier, excursionists and officials.

GREAT BRITAIN.

(a) No.

(b) No.

GREECE.

(a) No.

(b) No.

GUATEMALA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

HUNGARY.

(a) No.

(b) In conformity with the regulations laid down by the Passport Conference held in Paris in October 1920, passports are suppressed, subject to reciprocity, for inhabitants of frontier districts. Under the terms of existing agreements with neighbouring States, these persons need only produce identity cards granted by the local authorities when crossing the frontier.

Officials of communications and transport services (railways, navigation), nationals or foreigners, travelling in the performance of their duties are, subject to reciprocity, exempted from passport formalities if they possess a service order granted by the competent authority.

The Hungarian Government has entered into negotiations with other neighbouring States to obtain the same facilities. No definite arrangements have yet been made.

For Russian refugees, the Hungarian Government adheres to the proposals of the High Commissioner of the League of Nations and recognises the identity card provided for by the Geneva Agreement of July 3rd-5th, 1922, as taking the place of a passport.

INDIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

IRISH FREE STATE.

(a) No.

(b) No.

ITALY.

(a) No.

(b) Yes. An exception is made in respect of foreign tourists making a short stay in Liguria, coming from France, or in the district of the Lakes (Lombardy), coming from Switzerland, and provided with the special tourist's card recently issued.

These foreigners, however, may not remain in Italy for more than five days (except in the case of Swiss nationals who are provided with a special tourist's card valid for one month).

Foreigners must also produce documents satisfactorily proving their identity when called upon to do so by the police authorities.

JAPAN.

(a) No.

(b) Chinese nationals require no passport or other similar document. Similar facilities are granted to Japanese nationals proceeding to China. Identity cards replacing passports are, however, required in the case of Japanese nationals making journeys into the interior of China. These certificates are issued by the Japanese consuls in China.

LATVIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

LITHUANIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

LUXEMBURG.

(a) No.

(b) In virtue of special arrangements, the nationals of Belgium, France and the Netherlands are not obliged to carry passports, but must be provided with an identity card. This favour has been accorded under conditions of reciprocity.

NETHERLANDS.

(a) No.

(b) Passports have been suppressed for the nationals of Belgium and Luxemburg, who may enter the Netherlands on the production of an identity card bearing a photograph of the holder.

CURAÇAO.

(a) No.

(b) No.

SURINAM.

(a) Yes (subject, however, to the prohibitions of entry provided for by the decrees concerning immigration and the admission, etc., of foreigners). Immigration is only allowed under Government supervision under the regime laid down in the above-mentioned decrees.

NEW ZEALAND.

(a) No.

(b) By arrangement with the Commonwealth authorities, passports are not required for British subjects travelling between New Zealand and Australia.

NORWAY.

(a) No.

(b) No.

PALESTINE.

(a) No.

(b) No.

PANAMA.

(a) No.

(b) Nationals of China, Syria and Turkey and negroes are subject to special regulations.

PERSIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

POLAND.

(a) No.

(b) No.

ROUMANIA.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

SIAM.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

SWEDEN.

- (a) No.
- (b) In virtue of an agreement between Norway and Sweden, persons living in certain localities near the frontiers of the two countries may cross the frontier and stay there for three days without a passport; a certificate of nationality is, however, necessary. Nationals of the United States of America and of Canada, who are of Swedish origin, may enter the country and live there for three months without producing a passport. Only a duly legalised certificate of nationality is required. Such nationals must, however, land at Gothenburg.

There are also further facilities of this nature which are granted in special cases.

SWITZERLAND.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

URUGUAY.

- (a) Yes. (Subject, however, to entry prohibitions, established under existing immigration laws.) Emigrants must produce certificates stating that they fulfil the conditions laid down by the Uruguayan immigration laws. These certificates may be replaced by passports visaed by Uruguayan consular agents.

VENEZUELA.

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes, for *bona-fide* immigrants.

QUESTION 2.

*Has your Government adopted the type of passport known as the International ?
(Recommended by the Paris Passport Conference, 1920.)*

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

Yes.

ALBANIA.

The Albanian Government has not yet adopted the international type of passport recommended by the Passport Conference held at Paris in 1920.

The Albanian passport consists of 24 pages and is in two languages — Albanian and French.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

No.

ARGENTINE.

No.

AUSTRALIA.

Yes.

AUSTRIA.

Yes, since January 1st, 1922.

BELGIUM.

The Belgian passport conforms to that recommended by the Paris Conference. It is drawn up in two languages (French and Flemish), and even in three languages (French, Flemish and German) as regards the travelling permits issued to the inhabitants of the territories united with Belgium in virtue of the Treaty of Peace.

The Belgian Government has not, however, adopted the system of the stitched or bound book, which lends itself to fraud, but continues to use the passport established on a single sheet, which has, in addition to the part reserved for the text properly so called, 15 spaces for visas.

BULGARIA.

No.

CANADA.

Yes.

CHINA.

Yes, since April 1924.

CUBA.

The Cuban Government has adopted the international type for diplomatic and "special" passports ; ordinary passports have hitherto been in the form of a single sheet. The international type will shortly be adopted for ordinary passports and the charges recommended will be made.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

Yes.

DENMARK.

Yes.

ESTHONIA.

Yes.

FRANCE.

No.

GERMANY.

Yes, with the following modification : Pages 2 and 3 are interchanged : the columns for renewals have been transferred to page 5 ; the text of the passport is in German only.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Yes.

GREECE.

Yes, the international type has been adopted by the Greek Government.

GUATEMALA.

(No reply given to this question.)

HUNGARY.

Yes.

INDIA.

Yes.

IRISH FREE STATE.

Yes, with a very slight modification as regards the front cover, *i.e.* the word "passport" is at the top, not the bottom, of the cover, and the words "Irish Free State" under the harp design in the centre.

ITALY.

The Italian Government has not yet adopted the international type of passport. No complaints have hitherto been received of insufficient clearness in the present type of passport.

JAPAN.

The Japanese Government has decided to modify the passport model to conform as far as possible to that adopted by the Passport Conference held in Paris in 1920. This new model is at present in course of preparation and will be put into circulation from January 1926.

LATVIA.

Yes.

LITHUANIA.

Yes.

LUXEMBURG.

No.

NETHERLANDS.

No.

CURAÇAO.

No.

SURINAM.

No.

NEW ZEALAND.

Yes.

NORWAY.

Yes.

PALESTINE.

Two local forms of *laissez-passer* are in use now, but passports, in English, French, Arabic and Hebrew, which will follow the type of the British passport, are in preparation.

PANAMA.

No. The Government has not adopted the "International" type. As new passports will have to be printed shortly, it will obtain and examine this type of passport and decide whether it is advisable to introduce it.

PERSIA.

Yes.

POLAND.

Yes, with unimportant modifications, *e.g.* Polish consular officials may, if they deem it necessary, draw up the passport in English and the non-Polish local language, in addition to Polish and French (obligatory languages).

ROUMANIA.

No.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

Yes.

SIAM.

Yes, since July 1921.

SWEDEN.

The passport used by the local Swedish authorities is practically the same as the "International". As, however, it was considered desirable to print the Swedish passport in four languages, the "International" model could not be adopted *in toto*.

SWITZERLAND.

No ; but the Swiss passport, which is made out in three languages (German, French and Italian), corresponds, generally speaking, to the international passport ; nationality is not, however, specially indicated, since Swiss passports are issued exclusively to Swiss nationals.

URUGUAY.

No. It should be noted, however, that on an Uruguayan passport there appears : No. of passport, date of issue, period of validity, countries for which valid, number of pages, signature of holder, photographs (full face and profile), with certificate from competent authority giving date of photographs and colour of left eye. The passport is made out in four languages — Spanish, French, Italian and English. Shortly, however, the passport will only be prepared in Spanish and French. There also appears a print of the applicant's right thumb, taken by a competent authority.

VENEZUELA.

Yes.

QUESTION 3.

What is the duration of validity of the passport ?

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

Five years.

ALBANIA.

One year.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

American passports, beginning shortly after May 1st, 1925, will be valid for two years from date of issue, unless expressly limited to a shorter period. When limited, they may be renewed one or more times, provided the period of validity of the passport shall not exceed two years from the date of issue.

ARGENTINE.

Two years.

AUSTRALIA.

Duration of validity of passport is five years for passports issued by the Commonwealth since January 1st, 1925 ; prior to this date the period was two years.

AUSTRIA.

Generally two years. This period can be extended four times, for a period of two years each time, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Paris Conference, 1920.

BELGIUM.

Two years.

BULGARIA.

One year.

CANADA.

Five years, with provision for a single renewal of five years.

CHINA.

One year. May be renewed.

CUBA.

Passports issued by the diplomatic and consular officials of Cuba are valid for one year. Passports issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have no time-limit.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

Two years.

DENMARK.

Two years. Two renewals of two years each may be made. Validity of diplomatic passports is fixed in each individual case.

ESTHONIA.

Six months or one year. For persons travelling to States bordering on Esthonia (Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia) special passports are issued with a validity of from two to four weeks.

FRANCE.

One year.

GERMANY.

Duration of validity of passports is generally two years. Can be extended for periods of one year, but their total duration may not exceed five years.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Five years. It is then renewable for one, two, three, four or five years at the option of the holder up to a maximum of ten years from the original date of issue.

GREECE.

The duration of validity of passports is as follows :

- Category A. For a single journey.
- » B. For several journeys in the same year.
- » C. For several journeys in two years.

The latter passports are issued to traders.

GUATEMALA.

One year. Passports issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or by the competent authorities cease to be valid 30 days after the date of issue if the holder has not left the country during that time.

A passport also ceases to be valid if the holder has used it and has returned to the country before its expiration.

Passports which have ceased to be valid may be renewed for a further period of 30 days, if application is made within thirty days from the date of issue.

HUNGARY.

Generally one year. In special cases two, and even three years.

INDIA.

Five years ; it is renewable for a further period of from one to five years ; validity of passport must not be extended beyond ten years from date of issue.

IRISH FREE STATE.

Two years, renewable for four further consecutive periods of two years. A change is, however, in contemplation, following the lines of a recent alteration in the British passport regulations extending the initial period of validity to five years and making the passport renewable for further consecutive periods of from one to five years.

ITALY.

Passports are valid for one year. On the expiration of this period they are renewable for a further period of one year.

JAPAN.

The duration of validity of the passport is not fixed. It is valid from the date of the holder's departure until the date of his return to Japan whatever be the length of his stay abroad. Passports may not, however, be used for more than one journey and must be handed back to the authorities on the holder's return to Japan. As an exception to this rule, however, there exists a special passport for the benefit of those travelling frequently to the maritime province of Siberia or to Hong-Kong for commercial or other similar purposes. This passport may be used for several journeys and is valid for three years.

LATVIA.

One year, with right to renewal for a period not exceeding five years.

LITHUANIA.

One year.

LUXEMBURG.

One year.

NETHERLANDS.

One year. In certain special cases the passport may be granted for a shorter period. The passport may be renewed as often as may be required.

CURAÇAO.

One year.

The passport may be renewed twice for one year.

SURINAM.

One year.

NEW ZEALAND.

Five years. The passport is renewable for periods of one, two, three, four or five years at the option of the holder up to a maximum of ten years from date of issue.

NORWAY.

Generally two years, or for a single journey.

PALESTINE.

Maximum period of validity of a *laissez-passer* is two years; it is proposed, however, that passports when issued shall be valid for five years and renewable for one or more periods up to a total of five years.

PANAMA.

Two years.

PERSIA.

One year. The validity of passports granted to the inhabitants of towns and villages situated close to frontiers is one month.

POLAND.

Validity of passports issued by the home authorities must not exceed six months; that of passports issued by consular officials, one year.

ROUMANIA.

Three months, six months, or a maximum of one year.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

From three months to two years.

SIAM.

Passports are normally valid for two years, but in exceptional cases their validity is restricted to a single journey.

SWEDEN.

Passports issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, legations and consulates are valid for two years ; those issued by the local authorities are valid for one year, except for conterminous countries, when the duration of validity is two years.

SWITZERLAND.

One or two years. The duration of validity may be extended to five years.

URUGUAY.

One year, with renewals for successive periods of one year.

VENEZUELA.

One year.

QUESTION 4.

What fee is charged for the issue of the passport ? And for a renewal ? In the case of family passports, what fee is charged ?

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

The fee for issue of a passport is £1.

The fee for renewal : one shilling for each year for which renewal is required.

The fee for a family passport is £1. Husband, wife and children (under 16 years) may be included.

ALBANIA.

The fees charged for the issue of a passport are :

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| (a) In Albania | 10 gold francs |
| For renewal | 10 " " |
| (b) In the case of passports issued by diplomatic and consular authorities abroad : | |
| (a) Passports valid for one year | 20.— gold francs |
| (b) Passports valid for six months | 15.— " " |
| (c) For necessitous persons | 7.50 " " |

Renewal of validity of passports :

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| (a) For six months | 15.— " " |
| (b) For necessitous persons | 7.50 " " |

No special fee is charged for family passports.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 10 dollars.

There is no fee for a renewal. A passport may include a husband, wife and minor children, and in some instances brothers, sisters, grandchildren, nieces and nephews — though this is not a general arrangement.

ARGENTINE.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 7 pesos.

No family passports are issued.

AUSTRALIA.

The fee for issuing a passport is 10 shillings.

For renewals, one shilling for each year of renewal.

For family passports (including husband, wife and children under 16 years of age) 10 shillings.

AUSTRIA.

The fees charged for the issue of passports are as follows :

10,000 crowns for persons in easy circumstances.

5,000 crowns for persons just able to live on their incomes.

2,500 crowns for poor persons (to cover cost of passport).

and a further sum of 15,000 or 2,500 crowns respectively as stamp duty.

The fee for renewal of passports is 15,000 crowns for persons in easy circumstances and 2,500 crowns for poor persons (stamp duty).

The fees charged by Austrian diplomatic or consular authorities abroad for the issue or renewal of a passport are as follows :

4.50 gold crowns for persons in easy circumstances, and

0.50 gold crown for poor persons,

plus a further charge of 100% on these amounts in European and 500% in extra-European States.

The fees for family passports are the same as those indicated above.

BELGIUM.

(a) Fee for passport in Belgium 8 paper francs.

(b) Abroad (through diplomatic agents or consulates) 3 gold francs.

Or at the current rate of exchange of the gold franc. . . . 12 paper francs.

The Belgian passport is not renewable.

A family passport can be made out without extra charge for the husband, wife and children under 15 years if travelling with their parents.

BULGARIA.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 100 levas ; the same fee is charged for renewal.

CANADA.

Fee for issue of a passport, 5 dollars ; 2 dollars for renewal. No additional fee is charged for a family passport.

CHINA.

Fee for issue of a passport, 4 Chinese dollars ; 4 Chinese dollars for renewal.

A fee of 4 Chinese dollars is charged for a family passport. Children over 15 years of age must have individual passports.

CUBA.

The fee charged for passports issued by the consular and diplomatic offices of Cuba is 3 pesos in the case of individual passports and 4 pesos in the case of family passports.

For persons proceeding to Cuba the fees amount respectively to 1 peso and 1.50 pesos. No charge is made for passports issued by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

The fees for the issue or renewal of passports (whether individual or family) are as follows :

1. Passports issued by the competent home authorities :

(a) For servants, apprentices, workmen, day labourers, or other persons living on their earnings (where such earnings do not exceed those of an ordinary day labourer). 0.50 Cz. Cr.

(b) For other persons 3.00 Cz. Cr.

An additional fee is charged (4 Cz. Cr.) for the book and stamp.

2. Czechoslovak diplomatic and consular agents abroad charge the following fees for the issue, extension or renewal of passports (either individual or family) :

For persons in easy circumstances 18.00 Cz. Cr. to 36 gold crowns.

For persons not so well off 2.00 Cz. Cr. to 4 gold crowns.

The same fee is charged for the *passavant*.

For alterations to passports, corrections, etc., persons in easy circumstances pay 9 Cz. Cr. up to 18 gold crowns.

Less wealthy persons are exempt from fees. ¹

¹ A bill regarding consular fees has recently been drawn up and is to be placed before the Czechoslovak legislature. This bill provides for a considerable reduction in passport and visa charges.

DENMARK.

For passports issued by the Danish police authorities in Copenhagen, a fee of 4 crowns is charged ; outside Copenhagen, 3 crowns.

For passports issued by Danish diplomatic or consular agents abroad, a fee of 5 crowns is charged.

Diplomatic passports and passports issued by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs for official journeys are free.

Family passports are not issued : children under 15 years of age travelling with either parent do not require a separate passport, but may be included on one of their parents' passports, in which case no charge is made.

ESTHONIA.

The following fees are charged for the issue of passports :

For 2 weeks	250 Esthonian marks
» 4	500 » »
» 6 months	2,000 » »
» 1 year	4,000 » »
» 1 » (for students)	500 » »
» 1 » (for sailors)	2,000 » »
» 1 » (for persons living abroad)	500 or 1,000 Esthonian marks
For collective pleasure trips, for each person .	250 Esthonian marks.

The same fee is charged for renewals.

The fee for family passports is the same as for individual passports.

FRANCE.

Fee for the issue of a passport, 7 francs.

No family passports are issued in France.

GERMANY.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 5 marks ; for each renewal, 3 marks.

The same fees are charged for family passports, irrespective of the number of names entered thereon.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Fee for issue of a British passport, 7s. 6d.

Fee for renewal, one shilling per year.

Wife and children (under the age of sixteen) can be included on the passport without extra fee.

GREECE.

The fees charged for the issue of passports or their renewal are as follows :

Passports issued by the Greek Prefectures :

Category A.	81 paper drachmæ.
» B.	162 » »
» C.	243 » »

Passports issued by the Greek Consular authorities :

Category A.	21.60 gold drachmæ.
» B.	30.— » »
» C.	48.— » »

Family passports may be issued by the Greek Prefectures and Consular authorities for the same charge as ordinary passports of categories A and B.

GUATEMALA.

The fee for passports issued to Guatemalans and Central Americans (subject in the latter case to reciprocity) is 2 dollars national currency. This fee may be increased or reduced by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the basis of reciprocity, *i.e.*, if Guatemalans in other countries are charged higher or lower fees than the above.

No fee is charged for diplomatic passports.

For a family passport, *i.e.* head of family, his wife and persons under his legal authority, the same fee as for one passport is charged.

HUNGARY.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 8 gold crowns. This is reduced to one gold crown for persons whose income does not exceed that of a daily labourer, as also for public officials and members of their families.

The same fees are charged for renewals.

There is no increase of fee for family passports.

INDIA.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 3 rupees.

For renewal, one rupee — for each year or part of a year for which renewed.

In the case of a family passport, *i.e.* husband, wife and children under 15 years, the fee for a single passport is charged.

IRISH FREE STATE.

Fee for passport, 7s. 6d.

Fee for renewal, one shilling per year.

For family passport (husband, wife and children under 16), no extra charge.

ITALY.

Passports issued in Italy. — The fee charged for the issue of a passport is 30 lire plus 2.40 lire stamp duty. The fee for the renewal of a passport is also 30 lire.

Passports issued abroad. — The fee charged for the issue of a passport is 25 lire or the equivalent in the currency of the country where the fee is charged.

No family passports are issued by Italy. Children under 14 years of age may, however, be entered on the passports of their parents, relatives in the ascending line, guardians, etc., with whom they are travelling. In these cases no additional fee is charged.

JAPAN.

The fee for the issue of a passport (ordinary or family) is 5 yen.

Passports are not renewable.

LATVIA.

The fee for the issue of passports, as also for renewal, is fixed at 12 lats per year.

The fee for family passports is the same as the above ; these passports may include the husband, wife and children under 14 years of age.

LITHUANIA.

The fee for an ordinary passport or a family passport is 50 litas. The charge for renewal for one year is 50 litas, except in the case of passports for Governments officials, members of their families and students. These passports are renewed for six months, the charge being 10 litas.

LUXEMBURG.

Fee for the issue of a passport, 10 francs (Luxemburg).

Family passports are not issued.

NETHERLANDS.

Fee for passport. Fls. 5.50

The same is charged for renewal.

Fee for issue of family passports Fls. 8.00

Fee for renewal of family passports Fls. 5.50

CURAÇAO.

The fee for issuing a passport is Florins 2.50.

Florins 5 are charged for family passports, including servants. No charge is made for renewal.

SURINAM.

The fee for issuing a passport is Fl. 4.—.

The fee for renewal is Fl. 2.—.

The same fees are charged for family passports.

NEW ZEALAND.

The fee for the issue of the passport is 10 shillings, and for each year of renewal, one shilling. No extra charge is made for family passports (*i.e.* where wife and children under 16 years of age are included).

NORWAY.

For passports issued by the police authorities in Norway the fee is 2 crowns. For passports issued by legations or consulates abroad, the fee is 5 crowns in Europe, and 10 crowns outside Europe, the last-mentioned fees being provisionally increased by 40 per cent.

The fees for the renewal of a passport and for the issue of a family passport are as above.

PALESTINE.

The fee charged for a *laissez-passer* of the form issued to persons entitled to Palestinian citizenship is P.T. 40; a second form (issued only as an identity card to aliens unable to obtain passports) costs P.T. 25. These *laissez-passer* are not renewable. No difference in charges is made when more than one member of a family are included on one *laissez-passer*. It is proposed to charge P.T. 50 for the passport when introduced, and P.T. 5 for each year of renewal.

PANAMA.

No fee is charged, either for the issue or for the renewal of passports. No charge is made for family passports.

PERSIA.

Persian passports may be divided into three classes: ¹

Those for merchants, for the wealthy, and for pilgrims to Mecca	57	kran.
Those for servants and small traders	34	kran.
Those for workmen	23	kran.

POLAND.

The fee charged by the home authorities depends on the object for which the applicant goes abroad. Persons leaving the country to earn their living abroad and emigrants are granted free passports; those travelling on business pay 25 gold francs. Persons travelling for scientific purposes or social study or for reasons of health are charged 20 francs. A tourist's passport costs 100 gold francs.

Under the new consular rates which will shortly come into force, the fee for the issue of passports by the consular authorities will be 30 gold francs, reduced in the case of workmen and students to 15 gold francs.

A family passport costs twice as much as the ordinary passport. The fee varies according to the object of the journey.

ROUMANIA.

The fee for the issue of passports in Roumania is 25 lei 25b. The same fee is charged for a family passport. The fee for passports issued abroad is 20 gold lei.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

The fees charged for the issue of passports are as follows:

Passports with a validity not exceeding 6 months	10	dinars.
Passports with a validity of from 6 to 12 months	20	dinars.
Passports with a validity of over one year:		
Fee for each year after the first	20	dinars.

The same rates are charged for the renewal of an expired passport (whether previously renewed or not), account being taken of the period of time elapsing between its expiry and re-issue or renewal.

The fees for family passports are the same as for individual passports.

SIAM.

The fee charged for the issue of each passport is 6 ticals or 10 gold francs. The same fee is charged for renewal. No additional fee is charged for a family passport if the children are under 14 years of age. Children over 14 years of age must have a passport of their own.

SWEDEN

The fee for the issue of a passport is 6 crowns for those issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and local authorities, and 5 crowns for those issued by legations and consulates.

For renewals a fee of 4 crowns is charged.

The same fees are charged for family passports.

SWITZERLAND.

On issue:		European countries	Other countries
Passport valid for three months	3	francs	10 francs
" " " one year	8	"	12 "
" " " two years	16	"	24 "
On renewal:			
For three months or under	3	francs	6 francs
For one year	5	"	8 "

These are the fees charged by legations and consulates.

In Switzerland, passports are issued and renewed by the cantonal authorities. The fees vary from canton to canton.

¹ Minors travelling with the head of the family and Moslem women travelling with their husbands or a parent are entered on the passports of those accompanying them and do not pay any fee. Non-Moslem women must obtain separate passports and pay the necessary fees.

URUGUAY.

The fee for the issue of a passport is 1.50 Uruguayan gold dollars ; the same fee is charged for each renewal when granted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and 3 Uruguayan gold dollars when granted by consular agents.

No family passports are issued.

Children under 10 years of age can, however, be included on their parents' passports or on those of the persons in whose care they are, without extra fee.

VENEZUELA.

No fee is charged for the issue of a passport to a Venezuelan national in Venezuela.

The diplomatic and consular authorities charge 5 bolivars (5 gold francs) for the issue of a passport to a Venezuelan national and 10 bolivars (10 gold francs) for the issue of a passport to a foreigner.

B. PASSPORT VISAS.

QUESTION 1.

Has your Government suppressed the visa :

(a) *Entirely ?*

(b) *For the nationals of certain countries ?*

In the case of (b), please name the countries and say whether such action is subject to reciprocity.

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

(a) No.

(b) It has been abolished for the nationals of the following countries : Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. This is a reciprocal arrangement.

ALBANIA.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, subject to reciprocity.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

(a) No.

(b) (See answer to Query 1 under Passports.)¹

ARGENTINE.

(a) No.

(b) No.

AUSTRALIA.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, for nationals of the following countries, subject to reciprocity : Denmark, France, Italy, Liechtenstein, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. Visas for German and Austrian nationals have been suppressed on the basis of reciprocity.

¹ Attention may be called to a recently enacted statute which authorises the President " to the extent consistent with the public interest, to reduce such (passport visa) fees or to abolish them altogether, in the case of any class of aliens desiring to visit the United States who are not 'immigrants' as defined in the Immigration Act of 1924, and who are citizens or subjects of countries which grant similar privileges to citizens of the United States of a similar class visiting such countries." Negotiations pursuant to this Act are being undertaken.

AUSTRIA.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, in the case of Italian and Czechoslovak holders of diplomatic passports, subject to reciprocity, and also in the case of Cuban nationals in regard to entrance and transit visas and of Dutch subjects in regard to transit visas.

BELGIUM.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, for the nationals of the following countries: British Empire, China, Cuba, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Norway, Panama, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America, Uruguay¹.

BULGARIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

CANADA.

(a) No.

(b) Visas are only required by alien immigrants. Persons sailing directly or indirectly from Europe must obtain the visa of the Canadian immigration officers in Europe. No charge is made for this. Other alien immigrants must obtain a visa from a British diplomatic or consular officer, the fee being fixed by the Foreign Office.

CHINA.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, for nationals of Belgium and Japan, subject to reciprocity.

CUBA.

The Cuban Government requires neither visa nor passport from foreigners.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

(a) It has not been possible for the Czechoslovak Government to completely suppress the visa.

(b) Visas have been entirely suppressed for the nationals of Czechoslovakia and France respectively (including Algeria and Morocco), as also the transit visa for the nationals of Czechoslovakia and the Netherlands respectively. Negotiations for the suppression of the visa have been begun with other countries, *e.g.* Italy.

Persons holding diplomatic passports, and belonging to the following countries — Esthonia, France, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and Spain — are exempt from obtaining diplomatic visas. Negotiations relative to the complete suppression of the diplomatic visa are in process between Czechoslovakia and practically all other countries.

Exemption from visas is only granted under reserve of reciprocity.

In exceptional cases, *e.g.* for fairs, international congresses, etc., complete freedom of transit, with total exemption from a regular passport or visa, is granted by the Czechoslovak Government, without regard to reciprocity.

DENMARK.

(a) No.

(b) Subject to reciprocity, visas are suppressed for the following countries: Belgium, France (not including colonies and protectorates), Great Britain (including the Dominions, Colonies and British Protectorates, with the exception of Gibraltar, India and Malta), Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Netherlands (not including colonies and protectorates), Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland (except in the case of persons entering the country to take up employment or to obtain work, who are obliged to obtain a visa).

ESTHONIA.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, for Italian nationals, subject to reciprocity. Transit visas have been suppressed between Esthonia and the Netherlands.

¹ The Belgian authorities think that similar treatment should be given to Belgian nationals travelling in the above-mentioned countries; up to the present, the United States has not agreed to take any such action.

In addition, every foreigner wishing to live in Belgium for more than three consecutive months is obliged to obtain a visa for a limited or unlimited stay; this applies to nationals of every foreign country, whether the Government concerned imposes similar obligations on Belgian nationals or not.

The question of a *visa de séjour* seems to be outside the scope of the present enquiry, which apparently only concerns the regime applicable to travellers.

FRANCE.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, for the nationals of the following countries — Australia, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Great Britain, Honduras, Italy, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Netherlands, Newfoundland, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Salvador, Siam, Spain, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay.

Passports having been suppressed for the nationals of Belgium and Luxemburg, subject to reciprocity, there is no visa obligation in these cases.

GERMANY.

(a) Generally speaking, visas are not abolished except for German nationals.

(b) It is intended to modify or abolish the visa system in the case of nationals of countries willing to accord reciprocal treatment. German and Austrian Governments have suppressed visas for German and Austrian nationals on the basis of reciprocity.

GREAT BRITAIN.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, reciprocally, for the nationals of the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.

GREECE.

(a) No.

(b) Authorisation to enter Greece may be granted to foreigners subject to reciprocity.

GUATEMALA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

HUNGARY.

(a) No.

(b) No.

The obligation to obtain visas has not been abolished for the nationals of any country, since all foreign countries require the visa for Hungarian nationals¹.

INDIA.

(a) No.

(b) No.

IRISH FREE STATE.

(a) No.

(b) Yes, reciprocally, for nationals of the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. Aliens coming for the purpose of taking up employment must in all cases obtain a special permit to enter the Irish Free State from the Irish Free State Department of Industry and Commerce.

ITALY.²

(a) No.

(b) Yes, subject to reciprocity, for nationals of the following countries:³

1. Albania,
2. Belgium,

3. Cuba,
4. Denmark,

¹ It should be noted that in special cases, such as journeys of urgent necessity, the Hungarian frontier authorities allow entry into Hungary without visa, on condition that the holder of the passport procures the visa subsequently at the passport office of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Budapest.

² By letter dated May 5th, 1926, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy has forwarded the following supplementary information:

With reference to my note of September 12th, 1925, in which I mentioned the countries with which the Royal Government has concluded agreements for the reciprocal abolition of passport visas, I have the honour to inform you of the entry into force on May 1st, 1926, of an agreement between Italy and Switzerland, which provides new and increased facilities in connection with the system of passport visas now in force between the two countries.

Under this agreement consular visas need not be obtained for passports by:

1. Nationals of either State entering the territory of the other for pleasure, for reasons of health, or with intent to settle, provided that they do not engage in any remunerative occupation;
2. Nationals of either State entering the territory of the other with the object of creating a remunerative, but independent, business.

A similar agreement has been concluded with the Principality of Liechtenstein.

Further, the agreement between Italy and Great Britain for the abolition of passport visas, of which the Secretariat has already been informed, has now been made applicable to entrance into the Irish Free State and the Dominion of New Zealand.

³ Negotiations with a view to the abolition of the visa are in progress with the following States:

1. Austria,
2. Colombia,
3. Panama.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 5. Esthonia, | 10. Mexico, |
| 6. France, | 11. Monaco (Principality of), |
| 7. Great Britain, including : | 12. Netherlands, |
| (a) Dominion of Australia, | 13. Norway, |
| (b) Dominion of Canada, | 14. Salvador. |
| (c) Dominion of Newfoundland, | 15. Spain, |
| (d) Dominion of South Africa, | 16. Switzerland, |
| 8. Japan, | 17. Uruguay. |
| 9. Luxemburg, | |

Italy has also concluded agreements with the States enumerated below with a view to the reciprocal abolition of consular visas on diplomatic passports (issued in conformity with Resolution III of the International Conference on Passports, etc., held at Paris in October 1920) :

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1. Austria, | 5. Portugal, |
| 2. Czechoslovakia, | 6. Roumania, |
| 3. Hungary, | 7. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Kingdom of the. |
| 4. Panama, | 8. Switzerland. |

JAPAN.

- (a) No.
(b) Yes, subject to reciprocity, for the nationals of the following countries: Belgium, France (excluding Colonies), Hong-Kong, Italy (excluding Colonies), Liechtenstein, Netherlands (excluding Colonies), Switzerland.

LATVIA.

- (a) No.
(b) No.

LITHUANIA.

- (a) No.
(b) No.

LUXEMBURG.

- (a) No.
(b) Yes, reciprocally, for nationals of Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay¹.

NETHERLANDS.

Generally speaking, the Netherlands Government still requires a visa for foreigners wishing to enter its country. In virtue, however, of certain arrangements with Governments, on a reciprocal basis, nationals of the following countries are exempt from the Dutch visa: Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

OTRÁCAO.

No visa exists.

SURINAM.

No visa exists.

NEW ZEALAND.

- (a) No.
(b) Yes, reciprocally, in the case of Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxemburg, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

NORWAY.

- (a) No.
(b) Yes, for nationals of the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain (Colonies, etc.), Iceland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

¹ The visa is necessary for Austrians, but is issued free of charge.

PALESTINE.

- (a) No.
- (b) No.

PANAMA.

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes, for nationals of China, Syria, Turkey and for negroes, who are subject to special regulations.

PERSIA.

All foreigners on entering Persia must be in possession of a passport provided with the visa of the Persian consul residing in the country where the traveller resides.

POLAND.

The obligation to produce a visa is maintained only in principle for foreigners ; it is only required of Polish citizens in certain cases.

ROUMANIA.

Visas for foreigners have not been suppressed.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

Visas are necessary for all foreigners.

SIAM.

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes.

France and Algeria, subject to reciprocity.

United States of America : suppressed for non-immigrant nationals of the United States, subject to two weeks' notice of change.

Reciprocity is not complete, as non-immigrant Siamese nationals wishing to visit the United States must produce a passport furnished with a visa. The United States make no charge for the visa, however.

SWEDEN.

Visas have been suppressed, subject to reciprocity, for the nationals of the following countries : Belgium, British Empire, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND.

- (a) No.

(b) Yes ; entirely, in the case of nationals of the following States : all countries on the American continent, Andorra, Belgium, China, Denmark, British Empire, Spain, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Monaco, Norway, the Netherlands, and Sweden ; and partly—if the foreigners in question are not in search of employment—in the case of nationals of Germany, Austria, France and Italy. Such action is not subject to reciprocity in the case of overseas countries.

URUGUAY.

Although no passport or other document is required when entering Uruguay (except in the case of immigrants), the competent authorities of Uruguay will grant a visa to holders of passports who wish to have one.

The Uruguayan passport (granted only to nationals — either by birth or by naturalisation — and to foreign women married to Uruguayans who by reason of their marriage have lost their original nationality without having obtained Uruguayan nationality) is valid, without a visa being necessary, in the following countries : Belgium, France, Italy, Luxemburg and Switzerland.

VENEZUELA.

No reply.

QUESTION 2.

Where are visas obtained ?

In the event of the applicant being resident at a place where no consular agent exists, can the applicant secure a visa by mail or must the applicant apply in person ? Is a preliminary visa required ? (That is, a visa granted by the authorities issuing the passport or by their representatives.)

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

The Union of South Africa does not maintain consular representatives abroad but visas for the Union may be obtained from any British consular or passport control officer abroad, and also at any British Passport Office in the British Empire. As a rule, visas can be obtained by mail. With regard to preliminary visas, if a passport has been made valid by the issuing authority for the portion of the British Empire to which the holder desires to travel, a visa is granted without the requirement of a further endorsement or authentication by the issuing authority.

ALBANIA.

Persons living in a district in which there is no consular authority may obtain a visa by sending their passports through the post to the legations or consulates in another district.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

Diplomatic visas may be obtained at diplomatic missions; passport and immigration visas at consulates-general, consulates, vice-consulates, and certain designated diplomatic missions where there are no consular offices. An applicant must apply in person for a visa.

No preliminary visa is required.

ARGENTINE.

Visas may be obtained from the Argentine consulate in the district in which the applicant resides permanently or temporarily.

Applicants must present themselves personally at the consulate, which will not grant a visa if the bearer of the passport does not comply with the conditions for entering the country laid down by the Public Administration Order of Law 817 of December 31st, 1923.

AUSTRALIA.

Visas for Australia are obtained from His Britannic Majesty's consular or passport officers, or from the passport officers in British Dominions outside Australia, in accordance with the regulations governing the granting of visas by such authorities.

AUSTRIA.

Visas may be obtained on the territory of the Republic from the competent passport offices, and abroad from Austrian diplomatic and consular authorities.

Austrian legations in certain countries have further been authorised to confer on demand, and under certain conditions, the right to grant visas to Chambers of Commerce and other commercial associations, to important tourist and sports associations, as well as to automobile associations in the countries to the Government of which these legations are accredited. (See also under "Recommendations.")

It is not necessary to apply for a visa in person, when the applicant resides in a locality other than that of the authority granting the visa. Save in exceptional cases, visas may be obtained in such circumstances by post. In no case is a preliminary visa demanded.

BELGIUM.

Visas can be obtained abroad from diplomatic and consular agents (Belgian) and, in Belgium itself, from the offices of the provincial governors and district commissioners. In principle applicants should present themselves in person, but in urgent cases, or if serious difficulties are entailed therefrom, officials are authorised to waive this condition and grant requests received by correspondence or by proxy. A preliminary visa granted by the authorities of the country to which the applicant belongs is only required when the authenticity of the passport is uncertain.

BULGARIA.

Visas may be obtained from the Section of Public Safety in the locality in which the applicant resides and at Bulgarian legations and consulates; the applicant is not required to attend in person. A preliminary visa of the country to which the applicant is travelling is needed.

CANADA.

On the Continent of Europe visas may be obtained from Canadian immigration officers who are stationed at Paris, Antwerp, The Hague, Hamburg, Danzig and Riga ; otherwise, at British embassies, legations or consulates.

CHINA.

The Special Commissioners for Foreign Affairs in different provinces are in charge of the granting of visas. Where no consular agent exists, the applicant must apply in person to the competent authorities.

CUBA.

Persons wishing to have their passports visaed must apply in person to the consular offices of Cuba or to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

By the terms of Article 14 of the Agreement of Graz, concluded January 27th, 1922, and ratified by Hungary, Italy and Czechoslovakia regarding entrance visas, the personal attendance of the applicant is necessary. In certain special cases, the competent authorities may waive this requirement. As regards transit visas personal attendance is not required, except in doubtful cases. Foreigners living permanently in Czechoslovakia can obtain from the political administration of the district in which they reside an entrance visa allowing them to return to Czechoslovakia. Preliminary visas are only required in doubtful cases and are affixed free of charge.

DENMARK.

Visas may be obtained from a Danish legation in a foreign country or from a consular officer authorised to grant such visas.

Should there be no Danish authority for the granting of visas in the locality in which a person desiring a visa resides, the visa can, in general, be obtained through the post.

ESTHONIA.

Visas may be obtained from the nearest Esthonian representative (legations, consulates, consulates-general and consular agencies).

Personal application is not necessary, as the visa can be obtained by correspondence. For foreigners going to Esthonia an entrance visa is absolutely necessary.

FRANCE.

Visas are obtained from the consulate in the consular district in which the applicant lives.

Visas can be obtained through the post.

GERMANY.

Visas are issued by the competent authorities, namely, within the Reich, by administrative officials of intermediate rank, and abroad by diplomatic and consular representatives.

The applicant for a visa must, as a rule, appear in person before the competent authorities, but the latter may, where they see no objection, dispense with this formality. German representatives abroad are instructed to make extensive use of this permission.

A preliminary visa is not required, in principle, by the German authorities ; it is only given at the request of foreign authorities.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Visas are granted by all salaried consular officials and by passport control officers. Applications may be put forward by post and the personal attendance of the applicant is not required unless the consular or passport control officer considers it necessary. No preliminary visa is required.

GREECE.

Visas may be obtained from the consular authorities. Should the applicant reside in a locality where there is no consular agent, he may obtain a visa by sending his passport by mail. The consular agent may, however, require the applicant to appear in person.

GUATEMALA.

In foreign countries consuls or, where there is no consul, vice-consuls and consular agents are empowered to visa the passports of foreigners and to collect the proper fees ; they may also issue passports to Guatemalans at places where there is no Guatemalan legation.

Ministers and consuls may not visa passports for persons of Chinese or Mongol race, unless such passports have been obtained from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (which alone can issue them) and bear an endorsement showing that the holders have been given leave to return to their national territory.

HUNGARY.

Visas may be obtained from :

- (a) Royal Hungarian diplomatic agencies ;
- (b) Authorised Royal Hungarian consular agencies ;
- (c) All "honorary" Hungarian consular agencies, when these are expressly authorised by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to visa passports ;
- (d) In the case of foreigners residing or staying in Hungary, visas may be obtained from the Passport Bureau of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Budapest ;
- (e) Transit visas may be obtained during the journey from the inspectors on express trains crossing Hungary, subject to reciprocity.

The above-mentioned authorities may in special cases exempt applicants for visas from attending in person. This exemption is widely granted.

INDIA.

Visas for India can be obtained from the proper British diplomatic, consular or military authority in a foreign country. As a rule, an applicant for a passport visa must apply in person. A preliminary visa is required.

IRISH FREE STATE.

No arrangements for giving Irish Free State visas in countries abroad as yet exist except in the United States of America, where visas are obtained at the Irish Passport Control Office, 1, Broadway, New York.

In the case of aliens of other countries who wish to visit the Irish Free State and for whom a visa is necessary, application is made through the nearest British consulate. If the applicant is resident at a place in which no consulate exists, he can apply through the post. The passport held by the applicant should bear the endorsement of the authorities by whom it was issued making it valid for travelling to the Irish Free State. An exit visa to leave the Irish Free State is not required either by nationals or non-nationals.

ITALY.

Visas must be applied for from the Department competent for the district in which the applicant resides. When the latter is not known to the competent authorities, he must generally make his application in person. No preliminary visa is required.

JAPAN.

Visas are granted by embassies or legations or by Japanese consulates abroad. Honorary consuls are not authorised to grant visas.

Persons residing in a locality where there is no Japanese consul must procure the visa at the nearest Japanese consulate. Applicants must attend personally, save in special cases.

As a general rule preliminary visas are not required, but may be demanded in special cases.

LATVIA.

Visas may be obtained from the Latvian consular or diplomatic representative having consular jurisdiction in the district where the applicant for a visa resides.

When a person demanding a visa resides in a locality which has no consular or diplomatic agent, the visa may be obtained by post without the applicant having to attend in person, provided that he is able to produce the necessary reference documents from the local authorities.

LITHUANIA.

In Lithuania : at passport offices.

Abroad : at legations and consulates.

The visa may be obtained by mail.

No preliminary visa is required.

LUXEMBURG.

Visas are issued by the Department of Foreign Affairs, by Luxembourg consuls abroad and, failing them, by Belgian consuls, in execution of Article 26 of the Convention of July 25th, 1921, establishing an economic union between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and Belgium. The personal attendance of the applicant is not required. A preliminary visa is not required.

NETHERLANDS.

Visas must be obtained from Netherlands consuls abroad.

It is not strictly necessary for the applicant to appear in person, but it is recommended if possible, in order that the consul may be able to obtain all necessary information. Preliminary visa not required.

NEW ZEALAND.

Visas are obtained at the Office of the Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington. They may be obtained by post, personal attendance not being required. No preliminary visa is required.

NORWAY.

Visas are granted by legations, consuls who are members of the regular consular service and certain "honorary consuls" of Norway abroad. Visas may be obtained by sending the passports through the post. Preliminary visas are not required.

PALESTINE.

Visas for Palestine are granted by British consular officers under the same conditions as other British visas. In the case of certain categories of immigrants a consular officer should not grant a visa without the prior authority of the Government of Palestine.

British visas are issued in Palestine only by the Permits Section at Jerusalem, but persons residing in other parts of the country may have their applications transmitted by a local officer of the District Administration. Personal application, either at the Permits Section or the local office of a District Officer, is as a rule necessary.

PANAMA.

Visas are granted by diplomatic and consular officers of Panama; where these do not exist, visas may be granted by similar officials of friendly countries.

PERSIA.

Passports for foreigners are visaed by the Chancellors of Persian Legations, by the Persian consul residing in the locality in which the traveller lives, or by the Persian consul residing in the town nearest to the residence of the applicant.

In cases where applicants for a visa reside in a locality where there is no consular agent for Persia, the visa can be obtained by post. If the applicant is sufficiently well-known to the consul the visa will be granted without further formalities; if not, the applicant must furnish evidence of this identity.

POLAND.

Entrance visas are obligatory only for the nationals of foreign countries. The entrance visas which have hitherto been required for a certain category of Polish subjects, will shortly be completely suppressed. Entrance visas are granted by the consular authorities. The regulations demand that the applicant attend in person at the consular office in order to obtain a visa; the consul may, however, waive this rule and visa passports sent by post, but only in cases where the identity of the applicant is beyond doubt. Preliminary visas are not necessary.

ROUMANIA.

Visas are granted by diplomatic and consular representatives.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

Visas may be obtained from diplomatic and consular representatives of the Kingdom on personal application or by post.

SIAM.

From all Siamese Legations and Consulates.
Persons desiring a visa must apply in person.
No preliminary visa is required.

SWEDEN.

Visas, as a rule, are only granted by legations and consuls who are members of the regular consular service.

If the applicant for a visa resides in a locality where there is no qualified authority to grant it, it may be obtained through the post.

No preliminary visa is required.

SWITZERLAND.

Legations and consulates supply the visas ; in certain *exceptional and urgent cases the entrance visa may be obtained at the frontier. As regard the transit visa, this may be obtained at a legation or consulate, or at the frontier.* The holder of the passport need not appear in person ; applications may be made in writing. There is no preliminary visa. Foreigners in possession of a permit to reside in Switzerland may *before leaving the country* obtain return visas from the cantonal police authorities. In that case they must return within the time-limits indicated in the visa.

URUGUAY.

Visas may be obtained from the Uruguayan consulates.

In addition, the competent section of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs visas, on demand, the passports previously visaed by a consular agent of the Republic.

In order to secure a visa, the applicant must attend in person. Consuls only are authorised to visa passports granted or visaed by the local authorities in the district of the consulate in question.

VENEZUELA.

In Venezuela : the President of the States and the Prefects of the Departments of Libertador and Vargas in the Federal District.

Abroad : the diplomatic and consular representatives of Venezuela.

QUESTION 3.

Is an exit visa required for other than nationals ?
Is an exit visa required for nationals ?

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

An exit visa is required for nationals of countries which require British subjects to obtain an exit visa.

An exit visa is not required for nationals.

ALBANIA.

Yes.

Yes.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

No exit visa is required.

ARGENTINE.

No exit visa is required.

AUSTRALIA.

Exit visas are required for others than nationals, except in the case of nationals of the following countries going to Australia, *viz.* Denmark, France, Italy, Liechtenstein, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

Exit visas are not required for nationals who are in possession of " Empire-wide " passports. In other cases — which are comparatively rare — such visas are required.

AUSTRIA.

No exit visa is required.

BELGIUM.

No exit visa is required.

BULGARIA.

Exit visas are required for nationals and foreigners.

CANADA.

No exit visa is required.

CHINA.

Exit visas are required for nationals only.

CUBA.

No exit visa is required in Cuba.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

No exit visa is required.

DENMARK.

No exit visa is required.

ESTHONIA.

Exit visas are required¹.

FRANCE.

An exit visa is required for foreigners².

GERMANY.

Exit visas are only required for foreigners. Foreigners who duly establish that they are domiciled or habitually resident in Germany do not, however, require an exit visa.

GREAT BRITAIN.

No exit visa is required.

GREECE.

An exit visa is required :

for foreigners. In cases in which reciprocity is given it is possible that exit visas may not be required from foreigners.
for nationals.

GUATEMALA.

An exit visa is required for foreigners³.

HUNGARY.

No exit visa is required⁴.

INDIA.

No exit visa is required.

IRISH FREE STATE.

No exit visa is required.

¹ For nationals the exit visa is valid one month, for foreigners 5 days only.

² French citizens, however, can only leave the country on production of a French passport.

³ Those who do not possess passports are given embarkation permits, which carry the same rights as visas.

⁴ Hungarian travellers complain that certain States — such as Poland and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes — continue to demand exit visas, for which they charge, unilaterally, heavy fees.

ITALY.

No.

No.

JAPAN.

No exit visa is required.

LATVIA.

Exit visas are only required in cases where a prolongation of the period mentioned below has been granted¹.

LITHUANIA.

All passports, without exception, must have the exit visa.

LUXEMBURG.

No exit visa is required.

NETHERLANDS.

No exit visa is required.

NEW ZEALAND.

Visas are required, except for the subjects of Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxemburg, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. If application is made for a visa by the subjects of these countries, such visa is granted free of charge.

No exit visa is required for nationals.

NORWAY.

No exit visa is required.

PALESTINE.

No exit visa is required.

PANAMA.

(No reply to this question.)

PERSIA.

An exit visa is required for foreigners, but not for nationals.

POLAND.

Foreigners are given the exit visa at the same time as the entrance visa, so that a second exit visa is only required in cases where the period of validity of the first has expired. Exit visas are issued by the administrative authorities.

As a rule, an exit visa is not required of nationals, as the passport issued by the Polish authorities — whether for a single journey or for several journeys — gives the bearer the right to cross the frontier once or several times in each direction.

Exit visas are obligatory if the consular passport has been granted only for re-entry into Poland.

It is also necessary to obtain an exit visa on renewing a passport granted for a single journey (even if the validity of the passport has not expired) if the passport has been used for crossing the frontier each way. In such cases the visa should rather be considered as an extension of the validity of the passport.

ROUMANIA.

An exit visa is required. It can only be obtained at the frontier.

¹ The entrance visa carries with it the right to stay for two weeks — according to the new proposal, 30 days.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

Exit visas are required for foreigners where the period of validity of the entrance visa has expired. Exit visas are required for all nationals of the Kingdom without exception.

SIAM.

No.
No.

SWEDEN.

No exit visa is required.

SWITZERLAND.

No.
No.

URUGUAY.

As no passport need now be produced on leaving the country, the question of an exit visa does not arise.

VENEZUELA.

No reply.

QUESTION 4.

What is the period of validity for the entrance visas ?

Is the entrance visa valid at all entrance points on all frontiers ?

Is the entrance visa required for nationals ?

What is the fee charged for the entrance visa ?

Is such charge universal ? If reduction in price is granted to nationals of certain States, is such reduction subject to reciprocity ?

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

Unless the period of validity of an entrance visa is specified it is valid so long as the passport itself is valid.

The entrance visa is valid for entry at all recognised points of entrance.

As British passports are, as a rule, made valid at the time of issue for travel throughout the British Empire, nationals do not require an entrance visa for the Union.

The Union Government has adopted the principle of reciprocity in regard to fees for visas, and the fee in each case is based on the amount of fee levied in the case of a British subject for a similar visa granted by the country of which the applicant is national.

ALBANIA.

The period of validity of the entrance visa is three months.

It is valid at all entrance points (harbours, ports of call, etc.) where there are authorities charged with the supervision of passports. This visa is required both for nationals and foreigners.

The fee charged for the entrance visa is five gold francs. It is imposed in the case of the first journey only. During the period of validity of the visa (three months) no further charge is made.

Diplomatists, members of the consular services and students are exempted from this charge. Wage-earners proceeding to or returning from neighbouring countries pay only two gold francs. Reductions in visa charges to nationals of certain countries are invariably granted subject to reciprocity.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

(a) A passport visa is valid for a period of one year unless the passport upon which it is granted is valid for a shorter period of time, in which case the passport visa expires with the passport.

- (b) The entrance visa is valid at all points at which immigration authorities are stationed.
- (c) The entrance visa is not required for nationals.
- (d) The fee for a visa is 10.00 dollars.
- (e) At the present time such charge is universal.

ARGENTINE.

One year.

The entrance visa is valid for all the frontiers of Argentina.

National holders of documents certifying to their Argentine nationality have no need of entrance visas.

3 pesos for each passport visa are charged at the Argentine consulates ; no exception is made for any nationality.

AUSTRALIA.

Entrance visas for Australia granted by the British authorities outside the country are valid for 12 months unless a shorter period is specified.

Such visas are valid for entrance at any port in Australia.

Entrance visas are not required for nationals.

The fees for entrance visas for Australia are in accordance with the British Passport Regulations, or the regulations operating in the various British self-governing Dominions where the visas are granted.

The fee for visas granted by the Australian Government is two shillings.

AUSTRIA.

The period of validity of the entrance visa affixed to a passport of a validity of one year or more, is of one year. That of an entrance visa granted on a passport valid for one single journey is the duration of the journey. In all other cases the period of validity of the visa is, generally speaking, the same as that of the passport.

The entrance visa is, as a rule, valid at all points of entry open to general circulation, on all frontiers.

Entrance visas are not required for nationals.

The fee charged for entrance visas is at present 5 francs (gold) for a single journey in Austria lasting for a period of 12 months, and 10 francs (gold) for an unlimited number of journeys during a period of 12 months. This fee is, however, less than that actually charged, on the basis of reciprocity, for nationals of the United States of America, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, Germany, Roumania and Poland, but, according to the new regulations in force since July 20th, 1924, the above-mentioned fees of 10 and 5 gold francs and of 1 gold franc for the entrance visa may be charged, even to the nationals of these States or of any other State which asks a higher fee from Austrian nationals, without reciprocal facilities for Austrian nationals being demanded.

Nationals of Luxemburg and of Panama are exempted from payment of the fee for entrance visas.

BELGIUM.

The period of validity for entrance visas varies from 24 hours to 3 months according to the time the applicant can prove that he requires. This regulation is not very strictly enforced, however, and latitude is given to Agents authorised to issue visas.

In principle, the visa holds good for entrance into the country by all routes and frontiers. Belgian nationals are exempt from all visas when entering the Kingdom.

The Fees charged for Foreign Passport Visas are as Follows :

Nationals.		Gold francs per visa
1. British	A. No visa required.	
Chinese		
Cuban	B. Passport visa for permanent residence in Belgium.	10.—
Danish		
Spanish		
French		
Dutch	C. Passport visa for a destination in the Belgian Congo	10.—
Icelandic		
Italian		
Japanese		
Norwegian		
Panaman		
Swedish		
Uruguayan		
2. United States...	A. No visa required.	
	B. Visa for permanent residence in Belgium	50.—
	C. Passport visa for a destination in the Belgian Congo	50.—

Nationals	Gold francs per visa
3. Luxemburg	Free of charge
4. Swiss, and Liechtenstein .	20.—
5. German	75.—
6. Bulgarian	5.—
7. Latvian	10.—

- A. No visa required.
- B. Passport visa for permanent residence in Belgium.
- C. Passport visa for a destination in the Belgian Congo
- A. No visa required.
- B. Visa of an individual passport for permanent residence in Belgium
- C. Visa of a collective passport for permanent residence in Belgium :
 - 1. For each adult person
 - 2. For each child less than 15 years of age
- D. Passport visa for a destination in the Belgian Congo
- 1. Transit visa for a single journey without a stay in Belgian territory.
- 2. Return transit visa without a stay in Belgian territory
- 3. Transit visa for a single journey allowing a stay of two days in Belgian territory
- 4. Visa for a single journey and a stay limited to 7 days in Belgian territory
- 5. Visa for a single journey and a stay limited to one month in Belgian territory.
- 6. Visa for a single journey and a stay limited to three months in Belgian territory.
- 7. Visa for a single journey and an unlimited stay in Belgian territory.
- 8. Visa for an unlimited number of journeys in Belgian territory during a period of one month
- 9. Visa for an unlimited number of journeys in Belgian territory during a period of three months
- 10. Visa for an unlimited number of journeys in Belgian territory during a period of six months
- 11. Visa for an unlimited number of journeys in Belgian territory during a period of one year
- 12. Visa of a collective passport : 10 % of the fee which would be charged if the visa were delivered separately to each person making the collective journey, with a minimum of
- 13. Visa granted to seamen on their way to join a ship at a Belgian port.
- 14. Only one fee will be charged for the visa of a family passport including husband, wife and children less than 15 years old.
This privilege is however not applicable in the case of a visa for an unlimited stay for which the fee is payable by each person above the age of 15 years.
- 15. In the case of the extension of visas the fee provided for in the above tariff will be applicable, due consideration being paid to the length of the extension contemplated.
- A. Transit visa without a stay in Belgian territory (Not including return)
- B. Transit visa through Belgium with authorisation to stay two days at the port of embarkation (Not including return)
- C. Return visa available for a period not exceeding 3 months, or a visa for permanent residence in Belgium.
- D. Passport visa for a destination in the Belgian Congo
- A. Transit visa without a stay in Belgium (Not including return).
- B. Transit visa through Belgium with authorisation to stay two days at the port of embarkation (Not including return)
- C. Visa for return journey available for a period not exceeding 15 days
- D. Visa for permanent residence or an unlimited stay in Belgium
- E. Visa available for a period of not more than three months and for several return journeys
- F. Passport visa to a destination in the Belgian Congo

12.50
50 % of the
ordinary fee.

Nationals		Gold francs per visa
8. Polish	A. Transit visa without a stay in Belgium (not including return)	1.—
	B. Transit visa through Belgian territory with authorisation to stay two days at the port of embarkation (not including return)	5.—
	C. Return visa available for a period not exceeding one month and for a single journey.	10.—
	D. Transit visa available for a period not exceeding three months and for several journeys	20.—
	E. Visa for an unlimited stay in Belgium	10.—
	F. Passport visa to a destination in the Belgian Congo	10.—
9. Roumanian	A. Transit visa without a stay in Belgium, not including return; the fee remains fixed at.	1.—
	B. Transit visa through Belgium with authorisation to stay two days at the port of embarkation (not including return) the fee remains fixed at	5.—
	C. All other journey visas, as well as the visa for permanent residence in Belgium	13.—
10. All nationals, other than those mentioned above .	A. Transit visa without a stay in Belgium (not including return).	1.—
	B. Transit visa through Belgium with authorisation to stay two days at the port of embarkation (not including return)	5.—
	C. All other journey visas, as well as the visa for permanent residence in Belgium	10.—
	D. Passport visa to a destination in the Belgian Congo	10.—

Complete exemption from charges is obtained by the following :

1. Persons whose poverty is officially verified ;
2. As an act of international courtesy and subject to reciprocity : Official Agents of Foreign Powers and members of their suite.

Charges are established under reserve of reciprocity, with a legal minimum charge of 10 francs (gold) for visas other than transit visas.

As regards nationals of Poland and Germany, a special scale of charges has been fixed by agreement under reserve of reciprocity.

BULGARIA.

The validity of the visa is 45 days.

The entrance visa is valid on all points of entry into the Kingdom.

The price of a visa is 80 levas in Bulgaria. Abroad the price varies, and is fixed on the basis of reciprocity.

CANADA.

The period of validity of a visa is determined by the requirement that the passport on which it is inscribed must be presented within a year of its issue.

CHINA.

No definite period is fixed. The visa is only valid in seaports.

No entrance visa is required for nationals.

CUBA.

No visa is required for entering Cuba.

The charge for a passport visa is 2 pesos for foreigners and 1 peso for Cuban nationals. No charge is made for visas issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

The principle of reciprocity is strictly observed with regard to the period of validity of the entrance visa. A visa issued with a passport valid for a single journey usually has the same length of validity as the passport. The maximum period of an entrance visa is one year.

Except for special reasons, justified by the sanitary situation or in the interests of national safety, visas issued are valid at all points on all frontiers.

No entrance visa is required for nationals.

The fee charged for an entrance visa was fixed by the permanent Commission of the National Assembly of the Czechoslovak Republic on September 27th, 1920 (No. 564 *Treaty and Ordinance Series of the Czechoslovak Republic, Year 1920*) :

1. Fee for visa for return journey:

- (a) for important merchants, bankers, large land-owners, manufacturers and persons of property, Cz. cr. 20 to 40 gold cr. ;
- (b) other persons in easy circumstances from Cz. cr. 10 to 20 gold cr. ;
- (c) persons belonging to the middle classes from Cz. cr. 5 to 10 gold cr.

2. For a permanent visa (several journeys) :

- (a) important merchants, bankers, large land-owners, manufacturers and persons of property pay from Cz. cr. 100 to 200 gold cr. ;
- (b) other persons in easy circumstances pay from Cz. cr. 50 to 100 gold cr. ;
- (c) persons belonging to the middle classes pay from Cz. cr. 20 to 40 gold cr.

These fees are, however, only levied in quite exceptional cases when the fees charged by the consular authorities of the State of which the applicant is a national to Czech nationals are not known ; in all other cases the fees charged are subject to reciprocity.

DENMARK.

The period of validity of a visa differs according to circumstances.

During the period of validity of a visa, it is good for an unlimited number of entries or exits at all points of entry or exit on all frontiers.

The entrance visa is not demanded for nationals, neither is it necessary for these latter to be in possession of a passport when they can give proof of their Danish nationality.

The tax demanded for a visa is fixed on the principle of reciprocity.

The fee charged is universal, but all requests for reduction are always favourably received.

ESTHONIA.

The entrance visa is valid for three months, but for citizens of the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics it is valid for 6 months. Entrance visas are valid at all the frontier points in Esthonia.

Visa fees are not uniform. They are established on a basis of reciprocity.

Diplomatic passports, passports held by representatives of the International Red Cross, passports held by journalists, by refugees and members of relief commissions abroad are exempted from payment of the visa fee. The visa fee is always fixed on the basis of reciprocity.

FRANCE.

Validity of entrance visa : 2 months.

Visa valid for all points of entrance, except in the event of instructions to the contrary on the visa.

No entrance visa necessary for French nationals.

The fee charged for entrance visa is 10 gold francs, payable once a year, only for countries granting reciprocity.

For nationals of countries not granting this reciprocity, the scale of charges is subject to reciprocity.

GERMANY.

The periods of validity for entrance visas for the Reich are :

- (a) for a single journey (entrance only), a maximum of one month ;
- (b) for a single journey (entrance and exit), a maximum of six months ;
- (c) for any number of journeys, three, six, or twelve months, according to the circumstances of the case.

Persons with entrance visas may cross the frontier of the Reich at any place on the frontier officially recognised for that purpose, so long as it is not stated in the visa that for special reasons (for example, reasons of public security) the frontier must be crossed at a particular place.

The fees for entrance visas are calculated in each case according to the kind of visa and the period of validity. The lowest fee is 2 marks, the highest 60. These rates are charged except where, on grounds of reciprocity, for reasons or circumstances affecting both sides, higher or lower fees are laid down in connection with individual countries.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The period of validity for entrance visas is 12 months, unless limited to a shorter period for special reasons, but in the case of nationals of those countries which do not grant yearly visas to British subjects, a single journey visa only is granted.

The entrance visa is valid at all entrance ports approved for the admission of foreigners into the United Kingdom.

No entrance visa is required for nationals.

The fee charged for an entrance visa is ten gold francs, except for nationals of those countries whose visa fees for British subjects are in excess of this rate. The fees charged in such cases are on a reciprocal basis.

GREECE.

No period of validity is fixed for entrance visas.
The entrance visa is valid at all entrance points on all frontiers unless otherwise stated.
The entrance visa is required for nationals.
The fee charged for obtaining the visa is fixed at 6 gold drachmæ for Greek nationals. The fees for visas on foreign passports are established on the basis of reciprocity.

GUATEMALA.

Two kinds of entrance visas are granted to foreigners : (1) a visa valid for one year, giving right to an unlimited number of journeys, (2) a visa valid for one month and one journey. The entrance visa is valid at all entrance ports approved for the admission of foreigners into Guatemala.

The entrance visa is required of nationals.

The fees charged for visas are :

For visas on foreign passports valid for one year, entitling the holder to enter or leave the country any number of times during that period \$5 (American currency).

For visas on passports entitling the holder to enter or leave the country, valid for one month \$2 (American currency).

For nationals no visa fee is charged.

These fees may be increased or reduced by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, on the basis of reciprocity.

Special regulations issued by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and certain foreign Governments exempting their respective subjects from fees for visas on passports continue to be valid.

HUNGARY.

Two kinds of entrance visas are granted :

(1) Those valid for a single journey which expire only at the end of the validity of the passport itself, unless the authority affixing the visa limits the duration of validity.

(2) So-called " permanent visas " giving the right to an unlimited number of passages across the frontier, and to sojourns in Hungary without any restriction whatever. The latter visa is valid for several months up to one year¹.

Save in exceptional and rare cases — caused by the exigencies of control — the entrance visa is valid at all points of entry on all frontiers.

For nationals no entrance visa is required.

According to Hungarian regulations the ordinary fee for a simple entrance visa is :

4½ gold crowns.

1 gold crown for persons whose financial position may be considered as unfavourable.

In respect of countries demanding higher fees than those indicated above², the fee for an entrance visa into Hungary is increased on a basis of reciprocity. The cost of the permanent visa is as many times the cost of the simple visa as the number of months during which the permanent visa is valid.

For Austrian, Italian and Czechoslovak nationals, States which are, with Hungary, parties to the Passport and Visa Agreement concluded at Graz on January 27th, 1922, and inscribed on May 15th, 1922, under No. 262 in the Official Register of Treaties of the Secretariat of the League of Nations (*Treaty Series*, Volume IX, page 292), the fees for visas conform to those adopted by the Resolution of Paris of 1920 :

Ten gold francs for a permanent visa ; 5 gold francs for a simple entrance visa ; free visa for persons proving that their incomes do not exceed the sum necessary, according to the economic situation of their domicile, for the maintenance of themselves and their families.

INDIA.

An entrance or ordinary visa is valid for one year or such shorter period as may be specified therein for any number of journeys to British India for any legitimate purpose.

Such visa is valid at all entrance points on all frontiers.

No entrance visa is required for nationals.

The fee charged for an entrance visa is Rs. 7. The charge is intended to be universal, but it has been found necessary to levy retaliatory charges on the passports of nationals of certain countries whose fees exceed the standard fees recommended by the League of Nations.

IRISH FREE STATE.

The entrance visa is valid for three months. It is not valid at all entrance points, but only at the approved ports, *viz.*, Merville and Cobh (Queenstown).

No such visa is required for citizens of the Irish Free State or for British subjects.

The fee charged for the entrance visa is reciprocal to the visa charges of the passport holder's country to citizens of the Irish Free State and British subjects.

¹ Contrary to the custom of certain neighbouring States of refusing the permanent visa to many Hungarian subjects, whose moral and material interests necessitate repeated journeys — a custom which has provoked for some years numerous justifiable complaints — the Hungarian Authorities have not ceased to grant permanent visas to foreign subjects in the most liberal manner.

² From Hungarian nationals.

ITALY.

The period of validity of entrance visas varies according to the nationality of the holder. The period is usually the same as that granted to Italian nationals by the country of the applicant.

In principle, the visa is valid on all the frontiers of Italy at all entrance points declared open for the passage of persons provided with passports in order. In the contrary eventuality, a special mention of the fact is made in the foreigner's passport.

The fee charged for a consular entrance visa is 10 gold lire for the well-to-do and 2 gold lire for indigent persons.

These fees, however, are subject to reciprocity. When higher fees are imposed on Italian nationals by other countries, the Italian authorities impose equivalent fees on the nationals of those countries.

The following are exempted from visa charges in virtue of the Italian consular tariff and the regulations relating thereto :

1. Foreign diplomatic and consular agents and official messengers, subject to reciprocity.
2. The principal authorities of the district in which the consul resides.
3. Peasants entering Italy to engage in agricultural labour.
4. Foreigners entitled to exemption in virtue of international conventions.
5. Indigent foreigners obliged to cross Italy in transit to return to their countries.

The Italian Government has already concluded agreements based on the principle of reciprocity with a number of States with a view to reducing the visa charges provided for in the Italian consular tariff. Agreements of this kind have already been concluded with Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Panama (free visa) and Switzerland. The Italian Government is always ready to conclude agreements on the basis of reciprocity with other States with a view to reducing visa fees.

JAPAN.

The entrance visa is valid for one year.

It is valid equally at all points of entry, irrespective of the port or frontier.

Entrance visas are not required for nationals.

The fee charged for the entrance visa is fixed, on the basis of 10 francs, at 4 yen in Japanese currency, or at equivalent amounts in foreign currencies.

This tariff is that generally applied, but, as a result of special arrangements based on reciprocity, a reduction is granted to certain countries. On the other hand, in the case of the nationals of States which fix their visa charges at a sum considerably higher than that of Japan, the authorities charge, as a measure of reciprocity, amounts more or less equivalent to those charged by such States.

LATVIA.

As a rule, the entrance visa gives the right to a stay of two weeks (according to new proposals thirty days).

Entrance visas are valid at all points of entry on all frontiers.

Entrance visas are not required for nationals.

The fees for the entrance visa are charged according to a tariff established on the principle of strict reciprocity, which contains for certain States tolerably high fees, the reduction of which depends entirely on these States themselves.

In order to facilitate the freedom of international communications, the Latvian Government has proposed to the various Governments the introduction of the two categories of permanent visas recommended by the League of Nations, fixing the fees for these visas at 10 gold francs.

According to this agreement, the entrance visa gives the right to a stay of two months, but this period may be prolonged at the request of the bearer to one year. The fee charged for this " permis de séjour " are fixed at 30 gold francs for the entire year or 1 gold franc per week.

This regime has already been adopted between Latvia and Great Britain, Czechoslovakia and Lithuania. The same agreement exists between Latvia and the United States of America, with the exception of the fees charged for the visas, which are fixed at \$10 for permanent entrance visas.

The following are exempted from payment of the fees for visas and " permis de séjour " :

- (a) On the basis of reciprocity, persons travelling on missions on behalf of foreign Governments ;
- (b) Representatives of foreign charitable organisations, if they are occupied exclusively with charitable work ;
- (c) Foreigners travelling for scientific purposes or with missions on behalf of scientific organisations or institutions ;
- (d) Tourists travelling in groups ;
- (e) Members of educational institutions and of governmental and municipal organisations ;
- (f) Persons invited by the Latvian Government ;
- (g) The wives of the persons mentioned in paragraphs (e) and (f) and their children up to 18 years of age.
- (h) Indigent foreigners, with the permission of the Ministry of the Interior in each special case.

LITHUANIA.

From seven days to one year.

Yes, the entrance visa is valid at all entrance points on all frontiers.

Yes, the entrance visa is required for all nationals.

Entrance visa charges are made on the basis of reciprocity.

Yes, the charge is universal.

LUXEMBURG.

The period of validity of the entrance visa is variable ; the minimum is one day ; the maximum, the period of validity of the passport.

As a general rule the entrance visa is valid at all points of entry on all frontiers. The competent agent has, however, the authority to limit its validity to a given point or to several points on the frontier.

Entrance visas are not required for nationals.

The fee for the visa is established on the principle of reciprocity ; it is always the same as that which the foreign country, to which the applicant belongs, demands from nationals of Luxemburg.

Reductions, and even the granting of the visa gratis, may be accorded to indigent persons. Persons travelling officially are granted the visa gratis in all cases.

NETHERLANDS.

As the entrance visa serves at the same time as a "visa de séjour", the period of validity is variable and is stated in the visa itself.

The entrance visa is valid on all frontiers at any point of entry.

No visa is required for nationals.

The fee for an entrance visa is 6 florins as a general rule ; nationals of States which demand a higher fee must pay for such visa a sum more or less equal to that required of Netherland subjects by the Governments of these States. This being so, a special scale of charges has been drawn up for German, American, Polish and Roumanian nationals.

In the case of indigent persons, the entrance visa is granted free of charge. No reduction of fees has been granted to nationals of any State.

NEW ZEALAND.

The charge for an exit visa for the nationals of countries other than those mentioned in the reply to Question 3 is ten gold francs, except for nationals of those countries whose visa fees for British subjects are in excess of that amount, when fees on a reciprocal basis are charged. Foreigners are required to obtain permission to land under the Immigration Restriction Act, 1920, in New Zealand, and must be in possession of a valid passport bearing, in cases where visas are required, a British visa, which is considered as good for twelve months unless otherwise restricted for a short period.

No visa is required for nationals.

NORWAY.

The period of validity of an entrance visa is fixed in each case. It is generally valid for all points of entry on the frontier. Entrance visas are not required for nationals.

The fee charged for an entrance visa is fixed reciprocally, but in each case it must not be less than the minimum Norwegian fee, i.e., 5 crowns in Europe and 10 crowns outside Europe.

PALESTINE.

An entrance visa, when granted to an immigrant, is valid for a single journey during a period of three months, but when granted to persons of non-immigrant categories it may be valid (in approved cases, and where the British reciprocal visa scale does not otherwise require) for any number of journeys during the period of one year.

The entrance visa is valid for admission at all points of the frontiers.

No entrance visa is required by holders of valid Provisional Certificates of Palestinian Nationality.

The fees charged for entrance visas follow the scale of British consular charges in force and are dependent on the nationality of the applicant.

PANAMA.

(No reply given to this question.)

PERSIA.

The duration of validity of the entrance visa is subject to reciprocity.

The entrance visa is valid at all points of entry on all frontiers except for nationals of the countries which indicate the special points of entry on their frontiers for Persian nationals.

The entrance visa is required of nationals.

The fee charged for visas on passports for nationals is 3 krans ; a reduction in the visa fee or even a visa free of charge may be granted on grounds of reciprocity ; for example, the visa on the passports of Austrian nationals without resources is granted without charge on the basis of reciprocity.

POLAND.

Entrance visas are granted either for a single journey or for an indefinite number of journeys each way. The duration of validity of the visa for a single journey does not exceed three months, and that of the visa for an unlimited number of journeys does not exceed one year.

The entrance visa is, in principle, valid at all points of entry on all frontiers. The consulates may, however, in certain exceptional cases, determine the point of entry at which the person holding the visa has the right to cross the frontier.

The fees charged for visas are as follows :

For the visa giving the right to a single journey each way (validity of three months), 10 gold francs.

For the visa giving the right to an unlimited number of journeys (validity twelve months), 20 gold francs.

Consulates have the right to reduce the visa fee to half or to a quarter of the amount, and even to grant visas gratis.

The principle of reciprocity governs the question of fees paid by the nationals of States having a higher tariff than that existing in Poland.

ROUMANIA.

The entrance visa is valid for one month, save for American nationals, for whom the validity is one year.

The entrance visa is valid at all points on the frontier.

It is not required for nationals.

The fee for a visa is 10 gold francs.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

The period of validity of the entrance visa is ordinarily of one, two or three months.

The visa is valid at all points of entry into the Kingdom.

The entrance visa is, in principle, recognised as necessary for nationals of the Kingdom, who may, nevertheless, enter the country without a visa.

The question of the fee charged for an entrance visa is based on the principle of reciprocity. The Royal Government is, however, negotiating an agreement with the object of arriving at the unification of the amount of the fee for the nationals of all countries.

SIAM.

In the case of passports valid for a single journey, the period of validity of the visa is the same as that of the passport. In the case of passports valid for two years, the visa is valid for one year except in special circumstances.

Yes ; the entrance visa is valid at all entrance points on all frontiers.

No entrance visa is required for nationals.

10 gold francs is the fee charged for the entrance visa. This charge is universal.

SWEDEN.

The period of validity of entrance visas is generally three to six months, and gives right to repeated journeys.

The visa is valid at all points of entry on all frontiers.

No visa is demanded from nationals.

The amount of the visa fee is fixed for the different countries on the basis of reciprocity, and is variable.

SWITZERLAND.

The period of validity for entrance visas is the same as that for passports, unless a specific period is mentioned on the visa. Such periods are inserted in the visa valid for more journeys than one (*for instance, three months or one year dating from the date on which the said visa is granted*) and the return visa (see reply to Question 2). In other cases the period of validity of the visa begins to run from the date of entrance. The visa entitles foreigners *not carrying on any trade or business for profit*, and who do not desire to settle in the country, to stay for three months, and other persons to stay for a week.

The entrance visa is valid at all entrance points on the frontier.

The entrance visa is not required for nationals.

Five francs is the fee charged for the entrance visa for one journey, and 15 francs for a number of journeys *during a period of three months*. In agreement with Greece and Czechoslovakia and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Switzerland has fixed at 10 francs the charge for a visa valid for one year (six months for entrance into the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) and entitling the holder to make any number of journeys during this period. Visas of this kind have also been in use for a considerable time with Italy and Portugal.

A single fee is charged for family passports. No charge is made for children under four, and half the ordinary fee is charged for children from four to fifteen. Persons in necessitous circumstances, may, if they submit an application accompanied by a statement of reasons, obtain entrance visas free or at reduced prices.

URUGUAY.

Visas granted by the Consuls of the Republic or by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs have no limit of duration.

The entrance visa has no interest whatever for Uruguay, since no passport is required. The price of visas is 1.50 Uruguayan gold dollars in all cases.

VENEZUELA.

Visas are given gratis within the country. In the case of visas given by diplomatic and consular representatives, the fee is the same as for the issue of passports.

QUESTION 5 :

What is the fee charged for the transit visa ?

What is the duration of validity of the transit visa ?

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

The fees charged are fixed on a basis of reciprocity.

No limit is placed on the validity of a visa for transit through the Union. If the individual concerned can comply with the requirements of the Immigration Laws of the Union, he is free to remain in the Union for any period he desires, provided no special conditions are attached to his admission.

ALBANIA.

The fee charged for one entrance and one departure is 20 gold francs.

For a period of validity of three months (entrance, exit and transit) : 30 gold francs.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

The fee for a transit visa is one dollar.

There is no fixed period of validity for a transit visa, but they are only granted to aliens who do not intend to remain in the American territory longer than the time usually employed for a continuous trip through American territory en route to a foreign destination.

ARGENTINE.

The fee for a transit visa is 3 pesos (gold).

The visa is valid for one year.

AUSTRALIA.

Owing to Australia's geographical position, the question of transit visas does not affect this country to any great extent. Where visas are granted in Australia for transit through British territory to a foreign country, the visa is good only for the single journey, but it is not usual to fix any period of validity.

The usual visa fee of two shillings is charged.

If a British visa is granted outside this country for transit through Australia, the period of validity would be determined by the issuing officer and the fee would be in accordance with the British Passport Regulations, or the regulations in force in the various British self-governing Dominions where the visas are granted.

AUSTRIA.

The fee charged for a visa for a single journey in transit is 1 gold franc.

The duration of validity of the transit visa is equal to that in force in the country of destination.

The nationals of Liechtenstein, Luxemburg and Panama are exempted from payment of the fee for the transit visa.

BELGIUM.

The fee for a through transit visa has been fixed at 1 gold franc, in accordance with the decision of the Conference of Paris. By agreement, German nationals travelling through Belgium and vice versa, must pay a fee of 2.50 gold francs and 2 gold Marks respectively.

A through transit visa does not allow its holder, to reside in Belgian territory ; the visa only has 24 hours' validity. Return transit visas can now be issued for a period not exceeding the validity of the travel ticket, which applicants must produce in support of their request.

Belgian Foreign Service Agents issue visas valid for transit with option of a two days' stay in the port of embarkation ; the fee for these visas is 5 gold francs.

BULGARIA.

The fee for a transit visa in Bulgaria is 80 levas.

The duration of the transit visa is 45 days. Visas granted by Bulgarian Consular Service abroad vary in price on the principle of reciprocity.

CANADA.

No transit visa is necessary.

CHINA.

The fee for a transit visa is fixed on the basis of reciprocity.

CUBA.

There are no transit visas in Cuba.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

The fee for a transit visa is the same as for an entrance visa. In practice, the fees charged for a transit visa are calculated on the basis of strict reciprocity. The validity of the transit visa is, as a rule, the same as that of the visa for the country of destination.

DENMARK.

The fee for a transit visa is 4 Danish crowns, irrespective of the nationality of the bearer.

The transit visa is valid for two journeys (both ways), with the right each time of making a short stay.

ESTHONIA.

The fee for the transit visa is fixed on a basis of reciprocity.

The transit visa is valid for three months. In crossing Esthonia travellers have not the right to remain there for more than 48 hours.

FRANCE.

The fee for a transit visa is 1 gold franc.

The validity is two months.

GERMANY.

The fees for transit visas are graduated according to the kind of visa and the period of validity in each individual case (from 2 to 60 gold marks).

The period of validity for transit visas is fixed in accordance with the circumstances of the case. The shortest period is 3 days and the longest (as for a " permanent " visa) one year.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The fee for a transit visa is one gold franc, except for nationals of those countries whose visa fees for British subjects are in excess of this rate. The fees charged in such cases are on a reciprocal basis.

The transit visa is valid for so long as the entrance visa for the country of destination is valid, but not exceeding twelve months.

GREECE.

A transit visa is not required from persons proceeding to Constantinople through Karagatch and crossing Greek territory without stopping.

GUATEMALA.

Foreigners passing through Guatemala in transit must have their passports visaed before quitting the country; this is done free of charge if the visa already obtained has not expired; otherwise they have to pay the fees required for a fresh visa.

HUNGARY.

The fee charged for transit visas is based on reciprocity. It is 1 gold franc for nationals of Austria, Italy and Czechoslovakia, who have adhered to the Graz Agreement.

The period of validity of the transit visa is ordinarily unlimited, except for the nationals of countries which impose restrictions on Hungarian travellers.

INDIA.

The fee for a transit visa is 1 rupee, but it has been found necessary to levy retaliatory charges on the passports of nationals of certain countries whose fees are in excess of the standard fee recommended by the League of Nations :

The validity of the transit visa is one year or such shorter period as may be specified therein (provided that in no case shall it be valid for a period exceeding the period for which the visa

for the country of ultimate destination is valid), and the visa is good for one or more direct journeys through British India undertaken for the sole purpose of reaching the territory of a foreign State or of another British possession.

IRISH FREE STATE.

No transit visas are given, only entrance visas. As no passport barrier exists between the Irish Free State and Great Britain, an arrangement has been made between the Governments of the two countries that aliens entering the Irish Free State direct from the United States of America and intending to proceed to Great Britain afterwards shall receive the British visa gratis and *vice versa*.

ITALY.

As a general rule, the fee charged for transit visas is the same as the fee charged for entrance visas unless agreements concluded on the basis of reciprocity with other States contain provisions to the contrary.

The Italian Government has concluded agreements of this kind with the following countries :

1. Austria.
2. Czechoslovakia.
3. Hungary.
4. Poland.
5. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (Kingdom of the).
6. Switzerland (free visa).

The Italian Government grants transit visas at the reduced rate of 1 gold lira (in conformity with the recommendations of the Passport Conference held at Paris in 1920 and with the provisions of § 6 of the Geneva Arrangement of July 5th, 1922, regarding the issue of Nansen identity certificates) to Russian nationals provided with the above-mentioned certificates crossing Italy in transit.

The validity of the transit visa is, as a general rule, in proportion to the period of validity of the visa of the country of destination contained in the foreigner's passport.

JAPAN.

The fees charged for transit visas are fixed at one-tenth of those for the entrance visa. The period of validity of the transit visa is one year.

LATVIA.

The fees charged for a transit visa are fixed on the principle of strict reciprocity. Transit visas are valid for 4 days.

LITHUANIA.

The fee charged for the transit visa is determined on the basis of reciprocity.

Subject to reciprocity, the transit visa is given free to Czechoslovak, Esthonian, Latvian and Swiss nationals.

LUXEMBURG.

The fee for a transit visa is fixed on the basis of reciprocity. The period of validity is generally limited to three days.

NETHERLANDS.

The fees for a transit visa amount to Fl. 0.60.

This visa allows a maximum stay of 8 days in the Netherlands.

A transit visa is only required of nationals of States whose Governments have not been recognised by the Netherlands Government. Nationals of all other States no longer require a visa to cross the Kingdom.

NEW ZEALAND.

The fee for a transit visa is one gold franc in general, but is subject to higher rates in the case of those countries whose charges to British subjects are on a higher scale. The transit visa is good for so long as the entrance visa is valid for the country of destination, but not exceeding twelve months.

NORWAY.

The fee for a transit visa is fixed on the basis of reciprocity. In no case, however, is the fee less than 5 crowns in Europe and 10 crowns outside Europe.

It is made valid for the time necessary for the journey, and the duration of the visa is fixed specially in each case.

PALESTINE.

Transit visas are granted at the usual British consular rates and are valid for one year. They entitle their holders merely to pass through the territory to which they admit, not to stay there.

PANAMA.

(No reply given to this question.)

PERSIA.

The charge for a transit visa is fixed on the basis of reciprocity. The same rule applies to the period of validity.

POLAND.

The fee charged for a transit visa is 1 gold franc ; that for a visa giving the right to cross Polish territory and return is 2 gold francs.

The transit visa is valid for one month and allows four days for crossing Polish territory.

ROUMANIA.

The fee for a transit visa is 10 gold francs.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

The fee for the transit visa is based on the principle of reciprocity ¹.

The transit visa is valid only for the passage across the country ; the period of validity is one month.

SIAM.

1 gold franc.

The transit visa is valid for the same period as the entrance visa.

SWEDEN.

The fee for transit visas is fixed on the basis of reciprocity.

The transit visa is only valid for the approximate duration of the journey across Sweden.

SWITZERLAND.

The transit visa is issued free of charge and entitles the holder to cross Switzerland without breaking his journey.

The period of validity is the same as that of the passport.

URUGUAY.

As is the case for entering the country, no document is demanded for traversing it in transit. Nevertheless, when an applicant so desires, the passports may be visaed under the conditions indicated in the previous replies.

VENEZUELA.

No reply.

C. PASSPORTS AND VISAS FOR EMIGRANTS.

QUESTION :

Does the regime of passports and visas for emigrants differ from the ordinary regime of passports and visas ? If so, in what way ?

REPLIES :

AFRICA, UNION OF SOUTH.

No. The Union Government desires to make it quite clear that the grant of a visa for the Union does not guarantee admission, as the admission of all persons to the Union is subject to their ability to meet the requirements of the Union Immigration Act and Regulations on arrival at a Union port or other point of entrance to the Union.

¹ Negotiations have been opened with a view to establishing a uniform fee of one gold franc.

ALBANIA.

The charge for emigrants is two gold francs.

AMERICA, UNITED STATES OF.

Neither passports nor visas are required for departure from the United States.

It should be pointed out that passport visas are only granted to persons in the non-immigrant class as defined in the Immigration Act of 1924, Section 3 of which reads as follows :

“ Sec. 3. When used in this Act the term “ immigrant ” means any alien departing from any place outside the United States destined for the United States, except (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. ”

All immigrant aliens are required to present at a port of entry an immigration visa. Full details respecting immigration visas will be found in the copy of the Immigration Act of 1924, which is kept in the archives of the League of Nations.

ARGENTINE.

No.

AUSTRALIA.

No.

AUSTRIA.

No.

BELGIUM.

Emigrants properly so-called are not required to obtain a transit visa and are supplied instead, gratis, by the emigration agent who engages them, with an emigration card which enables them to travel to the port of embarkation.

BULGARIA.

For Russian and Armenian refugees a special passport regime (Nansen Passports) has been instituted.

CANADA.

Full details respecting immigration visas will be found in the copy of The Immigration Act and Regulations of Canada which is kept in the archives of the League of Nations.

CHINA.

No.

CUBA.

No passport, and therefore no visa, is required of emigrants entering Cuba ; the conditions to be complied with are of another kind.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

No special passports are issued to emigrants. The only difference between emigrants' and ordinary passports is that the former are marked on the first page either with “ E ” (for European States) or with “ Emigrant ” for countries over-seas.

DENMARK.

No. Nevertheless, the rules for travellers crossing Denmark for America or coming from America, have been made less strict.

The visa has been abolished for American and Canadian nationals born in Denmark, Iceland, Norway or Sweden.

Passengers by Scandinavian steamship lines, irrespective of their nationality, may enter Denmark without a visa, if they are proceeding to America, and possess an America entrance

visa and a ticket for the next Scandinavian boat to sail, or if they are coming from America and are in possession of a passport and an entrance visa for the country to which they are proceeding direct from Denmark, on condition that the journey across Denmark be continued without appreciable interruption.

ESTHONIA.

Passports for emigrants are granted in conformity with the decisions taken at the Conference called by Dr. Nansen at Geneva, July 3rd - 5th, 1922.

FRANCE.

(No remarks.)

GERMANY.

The regime of passports for emigrants is in principle governed by the general passport regulations.

For the protection of minors, and particularly for the protection of girl emigrants, the following special rules are laid down :

Minors, with the exception of married women, shall only receive passports on the application or with the consent of their legal guardians.

Before issuing a passport to a girl emigrant under 18, the passport authority within the country must apply for the permission of the Court of Wards (Vormundschaftsgericht) in so far as this is necessary under paragraph 9 of the order for the prevention of abuses in matters of emigration dated February 14th, 1924 (Legal Gazette of the Reich I, page 107).

GREAT BRITAIN.

No difference, but emigrants passing through the United Kingdom as transmigrants under Bond given by steamship companies to Home Office require neither passports nor visas.

GREECE.

There is no special regime for the passports and visas of emigrants.

Emigrants may obtain a Category C passport delivered by the consular authorities and costing 9.60 gold francs, except in the case of indigent emigrants, who may obtain the passport or visa gratis.

GUATEMALA.

Ministers and Consular officials must, before visaing passports of persons who may legally be accepted as immigrants, satisfy themselves regarding the antecedents, honesty and good character of the applicants, and must make them fill up in triplicate an identity form which will be countersigned free of charge by the ministers and consuls, and must contain such particulars as the applicant's name, place of birth, nationality, profession, civil status, wife's name, number of children, last place of residence, profession followed during the past twelve months, whether literate or illiterate, name of ship in which passage is booked, date of sailing, port of destination, place where applicant proposes to reside permanently or temporarily, object of journey, documents and testimonials submitted as evidence of good character and identity, photograph, finger-print and signature.

One copy of the form of application is attached to the passport, the second is filed in the Consulate, and the third is forwarded by post to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which transmits it to the Department of Police (to assist in the detection of undesirable immigrants).

A coloured person (negro) who applies for a visa has to deposit 200 gold pesos as provided in the agreement of October 13th. 1921, besides paying the fees laid down in the present law. A receipt is given to him and the money deposited is forwarded to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs together with a note of his name, the number of the passport and any other suitable particulars. This deposit cannot be recovered if the party has remained for more than six months in the Guatemalan Republic, evidence of the length of his stay being furnished by the passport.

Any coloured immigrant who has made a deposit as above and desires to quit the country less than six months after his entry can apply to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the return of his deposit, and on furnishing the necessary proofs of his identity, is granted an order for payment which becomes effective at the time of embarkation.

Coloured persons (negroes) may not enter the country without making the deposit referred to in Article 13.

Every immigrant arriving in the country must report to the authorities of the Port or frontier station and must produce his passport and the identify form referred to in Article 12, and obtain a visa on both documents.

Immigrants must report themselves to the police within 8 days of reaching their destination ; those failing to comply with these requirements render themselves liable to prosecution.

Immigrants coming to the Republic under colonisation agreements sanctioned by the Government are exempt from passport and visa fees.

HUNGARY.

The passport regime for emigrants does not differ, in general, from the ordinary passport regime, except for certain limitations on the granting of passports due to the restrictions which certain overseas governments impose on the immigration of Hungarian subjects.

The ordinary regime of visas also holds good for emigrants. To emigrants travelling in company a reduction in the cost of the transit visa is granted (1 gold crown).

INDIA.

No.

IRISH FREE STATE.

The regime of passports for emigrants does not differ from the ordinary regime, except that emigrants are in all cases required to produce their birth certificates when making application for passports.

ITALY.

The regime of passports and visas for emigrants differs from the ordinary regime as follows :

(a) The special law on emigration promulgated in 1919 (Article 15) obliges persons classed as emigrants under the said law to be in possession of a passport.

(b) Passports for emigrants are of a special type which for the purposes of emigration statistics differs from the ordinary passport in the following particulars:

1. It contains more detailed information regarding the emigrant (stating whether he is illiterate or not, his position as regards military service, and his destination).

2. It is provided with two coupons, one of "expatriation" and the other of "repatriation", each giving the necessary particulars for compiling emigration and repatriation statistics. These coupons are detached from the passport by the competent authorities at the frontiers and at the ports and the expatriation or repatriation is recorded on the special coupon. The coupons are then forwarded to the Statistical Office of the General Emigration Commission at Rome, which compiles the statistics of emigration and repatriation.

3. It is delivered individually to all persons over 15 years of age even in the case of expatriation in company with parents or husband or wife. Passports for emigrants are issued free of the ordinary passports charge; on the other hand, they are subject to a small special fee (2 lire), which is paid not to the State Treasury but to the emigration fund: *i.e.*, a special fund to meet the expenses of the services responsible for the safeguarding, protection and relief of emigrants at home and abroad.

JAPAN.

No.

LATVIA.

The regulations governing the regime of passports and visas for emigrants are similar to those for the nationals of foreign countries, with the following difference :

Whilst the right of granting entrance visas to the nationals of foreign countries is left entirely to the discretion of diplomatic or consular agents, visas may not be granted to emigrants or to persons without nationality, without the authority of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Travellers without nationality desiring to obtain entrance visas are required to make a deposit, which is returned to them upon departure from Latvia. This measure is due to the fact that last year 4,000 persons entered the country and remained there illegally, thus increasing the already considerable number of unemployed.

With regard to transmigrants, visas are granted on the production of certificates of transit furnished by the shipping companies; these are considered a sufficient guarantee, as there exists between the Government of Latvia and the steamship companies an arrangement whereby the latter pay a fine to the Government for each transmigrant failing to leave Latvia within the prescribed time.

LITHUANIA.

No.

LUXEMBURG.

Emigrants travelling to a Belgian or French port do not need a transit visa to cross the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, if it is proved by their papers that they intend to emigrate.

NETHERLANDS.

All emigrants desirous of entering the Netherlands, like other aliens, must produce a valid passport. Transmigrants, *i.e.*, emigrants in transit through the Netherlands, are exempt from the obligation of producing a transit visa, even though they belong to a State which has not been recognised by the Netherlands Government.

CURAÇAO.

The regime of passports for emigrants does not differ from the ordinary passport regime.

SURINAM.

The regime of passports for emigrants does not differ from the ordinary passport regime.

NEW ZEALAND.

Not applicable to this Dominion.

NORWAY.

No.

PALESTINE.

No.

PANAMA.

(No reply to this question.)

PERSIA.

No.

POLAND.

The regime of passports for emigrants is the same as the ordinary regime, with the single difference that passports for emigrants are free.

ROUMANIA.

Passports for Roumanian emigrants are granted by a special Commission of the Ministry of Labour.

This Commission has in view the protection of emigrants and of the general economic interests of the country.

SERBS, CROATS AND SLOVENES, KINGDOM OF THE.

The regime of passports and visas for emigrants differs from the ordinary regime for passports and visas. Emigrants are provided with a special passport established by the Ministère Royal de la Politique Sociale. The fee charged for the issue of these passports (called Emigrants' Passports), provided with a visa for America or other oversea countries, is 250 dinars. In cases where a person in possession of an Emigrant's Passport is unable to enter the country of destination, by reason of the refusal of the authorities of the country in question to admit him, or returns to the Kingdom within ten months, the difference between the amount of the special emigrant's fee and the fee charged for an ordinary passport valid for six or twelve months will be reimbursed.

SIAM.

There is no special regime for passports and visas for emigrants.

SWEDEN.

There are no formal regulations for passports and visas exclusively applicable to emigrants. However, persons coming from the United States of America or from Canada and crossing Sweden in groups on their way to Germany, Denmark, Esthonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland or Czechoslovakia, or going from these latter countries to the United States or Canada, are, under certain conditions, exempted from the obligation of carrying a visa on their passports.

SWITZERLAND.

In Switzerland there are no special provisions on this subject.

URUGUAY.

The law only requires immigrants to produce a certificate which can be obtained from the Consuls of the Republic or from a local authority of the country of origin. In the latter case, the certificate must be duly legalised.

It should be noted that the granting of the certificate, as well as the legalisation thereof by the Uruguayan authorities is made entirely free of charge.

VENEZUELA.

The law on emigration and colonisation provides that passports are not required for *bona-fide* emigrants.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS.

AUSTRIA.

1. In January 1922 a Conference was held at Graz on the subject of passports and visas, at which the representatives of all the successor States of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy were present. This Conference arrived at an agreement between Austria, Hungary, Italy and Czechoslovakia, which was signed on January 27th, 1922, and put into force on March 27th of the same year. This Agreement has, judged from experience gained up to the present, produced the best of results.

The Federal Government of Austria, in order to establish the measures capable of improving the present passport regime in the interests of the freedom of communications, and of facilitating the deliberations of the new International Conference on Passports envisaged by the Advisory and Technical Committee, recommends to the attention of the Committee the provisions of the above-mentioned Agreement of Graz, which go further than the resolution of the Paris Passport Conference of October 21st, 1920. These are notably in paragraphs 6 (passports not valid for all destinations), 8 (fee charged for an entrance visa for one single journey) and 13 to 17 (granting of special facilities).

2. Under the regulations already referred to, which have been in force since July 20th, 1924, the Federal Government has introduced the system by which the Austrian Diplomatic and Consular Authorities use stamps in place of the official visas required previous to that date. These stamps, which correspond to the visa for entry into the country for a single journey or an unlimited number of journeys and to the transit visa respectively, are affixed to the passport after payment of the prescribed charge and are subsequently defaced by official stamping. No other entry, signature or date is required. The period of twelve months, which is the time for which the visa is valid, dates from the day upon which the frontier is first crossed, this being stamped on the passport by the Control Office on the Austrian frontier.

The stamped visas hitherto used, which are filled in by hand and dated and signed, remain in force for all classes of travellers subject to special regulations, for those in whose cases there is a reduction of the prescribed fees, or exemption from payment, and for those for whom, as an exceptional measure, the period of validity is expressly confined to less than one year.

In order to facilitate business journeys and to promote the visits of foreigners, a certain number of Legations have been authorised, as was stated above, to grant on request to Chambers of Commerce, trading corporations, big touring, sporting and automobile associations belonging to the State to which the said Legations are accredited, the right to sell the stamps referred to. It is for the Legations to decide which of these bodies is regarded as best fitted to undertake this responsibility.

In cases in which this right is conferred, the stamps are delivered to the corporation in question, on payment of the amount of the fees which they represent, without any obligation being incurred towards such corporation, while the latter has to give a written undertaking conscientiously to comply with any provisions which the Legation may think fit to lay down, on this subject, and more especially :

(a) to undertake not to sell visa stamps except to such of its members as are nationals of the State within whose territory it is established, that is, of the State to whose Government the Legation is accredited, for the personal use of such members. In the case of commercial associations, however, this undertaking does not preclude the sale of stamps to the duly authorised agents or employees of their members, for their personal use, the permanent establishment of such persons within the territory of the State being regarded, in their case, as equivalent to the status of national ;

(b) to undertake to sell the said stamps at the cost price, which may be increased by a commission, the amount of which is definitely fixed by agreement with the Legation ;

(c) to undertake to have the said stamps affixed by their organisations to the passports for which they are sold and to have them defaced by them by means of the association's official stamp ;

(d) to undertake to refer any claims in respect of the said stamps to the Legation and to acquiesce in any decision which the latter may think fit to take ;

(e) to undertake to restore immediately to the Legation, should the latter so request, all unsold stamps in hand, on repayment of the corresponding sum.

The obligation to mark stamps sold and affixed to the passport by defacing them with the corporation's official stamp will make it possible, in cases of abuse, easily to ascertain by

whom a stamp was issued. In the case of serious or repeated offence, the Legation has been instructed immediately to cancel the rights of sale granted to the corporation in question and to withdraw any stamps in its possession against repayment of their value.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

With reference to the measures which might be suggested for the improvement of the present regime of passports, the Czechoslovakian Government has the honour to draw the attention of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit to the recommendations regarding the regime of passports and visas made by the Conference of Graz.

GERMANY.

With respect to the suggestion made in the penultimate paragraph of the League's communication, the German Government is of opinion that, so long as there is no question of the complete abolition of visas, important improvements in regard to international communication might be made by adopting the following measures which are already provided for to a great extent in German passport law.

(a) Applications for visas should be dealt with in the shortest possible time — as a general rule within a period of two weeks at the most.

(b) Provision should be made exempting applicants for visas, to whom there is no objection, from appearing in person before the visa authorities ;

(c) Applicants for visas should only be required to fill up reply forms in special and exceptional cases ;

(d) The visa authorities abroad should grant entrance visas without applying for further particulars to the home authorities, unless in individual cases such a step appears to be necessary for special reasons.

(e) Efforts should be made to ensure that the exit and entrance passport formalities on the frontier between two countries should be co-ordinated to a greater extent than formerly.

HUNGARY.

The Hungarian Government is prepared to consider any proposition tending to improve the present regime of passports and visas. It would be very glad to see accede to the Agreement of Graz the Governments of States who have not yet definitely adhered to it. It would be particularly grateful if it were found possible to induce certain neighbouring states to suppress the practice of submitting to a preliminary enquiry the requests for visas of whole categories of Hungarian nationals, and to apply this procedure only in individual and exceptional cases. This practice greatly hinders the passage of persons between Hungary and the neighbouring States and also produces unfortunate incidents.

The Hungarian Government reserves to itself the right to make definite proposals on this subject at the forthcoming Conference.

Appendix.

QUESTIONNAIRE ADDRESSED BY THE ADVISORY AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSIT ON JANUARY 23RD, 1925 (C. L. 5. 1925. VIII), TO ALL THE STATES MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, TO GERMANY, ECUADOR, AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

In pursuance of the work undertaken both at the Conference on Passports, Customs Formalities and Through Tickets, which met at Paris in October 1920 under the auspices of the Provisional Committee for Communications and Transit, and also in conformity with the decisions taken at various times by the Assembly of the League of Nations, and in application of the resolutions adopted by the International Conference on Emigration held at Rome in May last, the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations has the honour to request the Government of to furnish it with the following information concerning the present position as regards passport regulations :

Passports.

1. Has your Government suppressed passports :

(a) Entirely ?

(b) For the nationals of certain countries ?

In the case of (b), please name the countries and say whether such action is subject to reciprocity.

In cases where passports have been suppressed, what documents, if any, take their place? (For instance, identity cards, etc.)

2. Has your Government adopted the type of passport known as the International? (Recommended by the Paris Passport Conference, 1920.)
3. What is the duration of validity of the passport?
4. What fee is charged for the issue of the passport? And for a renewal? In the case of family passports, what fee is charged?

Passport Visas.

1. Has your Government suppressed the visa:

(a) Entirely?

(b) For the nationals of certain countries?

In the case of (b), please name the countries and say whether such action is subject to reciprocity.

2. Where are visas obtained?

In the event of the applicant being resident at a place where no consular agent exists, can the applicant secure a visa by mail or must the applicant apply in person? Is a preliminary visa required? (That is, a visa granted by the authorities issuing the passport or by their representatives).

3. Is an exit visa required for other than nationals?
Is an exit visa required for nationals?
4. What is the period of validity for the entrance visas?
Is the entrance visa valid at all entrance points on all frontiers?
Is the entrance visa required for nationals?
What is the fee charged for the entrance visa?
Is such charge universal? If reduction in price is granted to nationals of certain States, is such reduction subject to reciprocity?
5. What is the fee charged for the transit visa?
What is the duration of validity of the transit visa?

Passports and Visas for Emigrants.

1. Does the regime of passports and visas for emigrants differ from the ordinary regime of passports and visas? If so, in what way?

The Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit would also be glad to receive any suggestions concerning the steps which might be taken to improve the present system from the point of view of freedom of communications, and also suggestions likely to assist the work of a further International Conference on Passports which the Advisory and Technical Committee proposes to convene in the course of 1925.

Replies to the present questionnaire should be sent to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations before April 1st, 1925.

ANNEX 9.

SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO STUDY EMIGRATION QUESTIONS.

REPORT BY M. DEROOVER.

Transit Card for Emigrants.

The Sub-Committee, after recognising that the use of the single card between more than two countries might sometimes involve serious difficulties, particularly as regards the control of emigrants when leaving the country of transit, considered that it would be desirable to adopt the principle of a transit card for each of the countries crossed by the emigrants during their journey to the port of embarkation.

The Sub-Committee agreed to recommend to the Conference the adoption of the following recommendation proposed by the German delegation :

“ The Conference recommends that all possible facilities should be granted for the passage in transit of emigrants leaving Europe for overseas countries. For this purpose, the League of Nations will be requested to prepare, with the assistance of experts of the States most immediately concerned, a draft arrangement based upon the system of transit cards to take the place of the consular visa, this draft to be submitted to the States concerned for examination and, if approved of, signature ”.

Italian proposal concerning the issue of special documents to emigrant workmen.

The Sub-Committee examined the proposal by the Italian delegation with regard to the issue of special documents to emigrant workmen.

In the report, the emigration experts expressed the opinion that, even if passports were entirely abolished, it would not be possible, under the present conditions governing the movement of emigrant workmen, for the latter to leave their country of origin and settle and move freely in the country of immigration without being in possession of documents clearly establishing their nationality, identity and family circumstances.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that various States undertook at the International Labour Conference in 1922 to include in the international emigration statistics the following data :

Sex of emigrant and immigrant, age, occupation, nationality, last country of residence, country where he proposes to settle.

These same States also undertook to conclude agreements, whenever possible, with other States with a view to determining the particulars which should be included in all identity papers issued to emigrants and immigrants by their competent authorities.

In these circumstances the Sub-Committee unanimously adopted the following draft recommendation :

“ The Conference states that it has not dealt with the questions relating to the expediency of introducing special identification documents for foreign emigrants and workmen, and that all decisions or recommendations on this matter have been left either for subsequent agreement between countries or to be dealt with by special meetings of delegates from all the countries concerned ”.

ANNEX 10.

PROPOSAL BY THE HUNGARIAN DELEGATION CONCERNING MUTUAL POLICE ASSISTANCE.

Visas shall not be given for a country which is not entered in the passport as country of destination, except in the legitimate exercise of the right of refuge.

For the purpose chiefly of controlling and directing emigration, persons who desire to travel to a country for which their passports have not been issued should be prevented from crossing the frontier except in the legitimate exercise of the right of refuge.

ANNEX 11

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE ON PASSPORTS, CUSTOMS FORMALITIES AND THROUGH TICKETS IN PARIS ON OCTOBER 21st, 1920.

The International Conference on Passports, Customs Formalities and Through Tickets held under the auspices of the Provisional Committee on Communications and Transit of the League of Nations, and charged with the study of the methods necessary to facilitate international passenger traffic by rail, at present more especially hindered by passport and Customs formalities, as well as by the difficulties of obtaining through tickets :

Convinced that the many difficulties affecting personal relations between the peoples of various countries constitute a serious obstacle to the resumption of normal intercourse and to the economic recovery of the world ;

Being of the opinion, further, that the legitimate concern of every Government for the safeguarding of its security and rights prohibits, for the time being, the total abolition of restrictions and that complete return to pre-war conditions which the Conference hopes, nevertheless, to see gradually re-established in the near future ;

Proposes that the League of Nations should invite the Governments to adopt the following measures with as little delay as possible :

I. PASSPORTS.

A. ISSUE OF PASSPORTS.

1. *The establishment of a uniform type of "ordinary" passport (non-diplomatic), ("international type")* which will be identical for all countries, in order to facilitate control during the journey (model as per Annex I), to be issued at the latest by July 1st, 1921, and to supersede all other types.

2. *Duration of validity of passport.* — The passport will only be issued for a single journey or for a period of two years. The validity of the passport issued for two years may be extended.

3. *Fee to be collected.* — The fee charged shall not be of a fiscal character and will be collected without any discrimination between countries for which the passport is issued, and with absolute equality as between "nationals" and "non-nationals" in the event of a passport being issued by a Government to persons other than its "nationals".

4. *Diplomatic passports.* — Diplomatic passports or visas will only be granted to persons being within the categories mentioned in Annex II, the form of diplomatic passport being left entirely to the discretion of the issuing State.

B. PRELIMINARY VISAS.

5. *Limitation of preliminary visas.* — "Preliminary" visas (*i.e.*, visas granted by the authorities issuing the passport or by their representatives) will only be required in case the validity of the passport is subject to doubt. Such visas will always be given free of charge.

C. EXIT VISA.

6. *Abolition of exit visa* for all except "nationals".

D. ENTRANCE VISA.

7. *Duration of validity of visa.* — For passports issued for a single journey, the duration of validity of the visa will be the same as that of the passport. For passports issued for two years, the visa will be valid for one year, except in absolutely exceptional cases where a Government might deem it advisable to give a visa of less duration of validity in order not to refuse the giving of a visa altogether. Each Government will notify the Secretariat-General of the League of Nations every six months for the information of other Governments the numbers, both of ordinary one-year visas and exceptional visas of a less duration, given by its officials. It is understood, moreover, that duration of validity of a visa does not in any way imply the right to stay or to settle for a corresponding period in the territory of the State granting the visa. Except for special reasons justified by considerations of health or of national security, visas given will always be valid *via* all frontiers.

8. *Fee charged.* — The maximum fee shall be ten francs (gold). This charge will be made irrespective of the nationality of the holder of the passport or of the point of entry into or departure from the territory of the State issuing the visa. Nevertheless, the nationals of a State granting to nationals of another State the benefit of a reduced rate may themselves be accorded reciprocity to the extent of paying an equal rate. Any such reduced rate which may be granted will apply equally to all States granting the same advantages. There shall be no individual reductions of any kind, except in the case of certain categories of persons who may be completely exempted from any charge whatsoever in accordance with rules to be fixed and published, such exceptions being subject to the conditions of equality and reciprocity laid down in the preceding paragraph.

E. TRANSIT VISA.

9. *Issue of visa.* — Transit visas will, unless for exceptional reasons (*e.g.*, undesirables), be issued at once without enquiry solely upon production of the entrance visa for the country of destination in addition to transit visas for the intermediate countries.

10. *Duration of validity of visa.* — The duration of validity of a visa shall always be the same as that of the entrance visa of the country of destination; it being clearly understood, moreover, that the transit visa only authorises one or more journeys of normal duration without voluntary interruption of the journey on the part of the traveller across the territory of transit in question.

11. *Fee charged.* — The maximum fee charged will be 1 franc (gold), and will be subject to the same provisions as contained in Article 8 as regards conditions of equality, reciprocity, the abolition of individual reductions and total exemptions.

F. COLLECTIVE PASSPORTS.

12. *Family passports.* — The provisions of the above paragraph will be applicable to family passports including husband, wife and children under fifteen years of age; a family passport being considered, especially as regards the charges levied, as an individual passport.

13. *Collective passports for emigrants.* — The fees for visas on collective passports for emigrants will be collected without any discrimination whatever based upon either the nationality of the holder or the points of entry into or of exit from the territory of the State issuing the visa, subject, however, to the conditions of reciprocity provided for in Article 8. The provisions of Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 will apply to such passports.

II. CUSTOMS FORMALITIES.

14. *Abolition of examination of registered luggage in transit.* — Registered luggage in transit through the territory of a State will be exempt in that State from any Customs examination. With this object such luggage shall, for example, be either separately sealed by the Customs authorities or isolated from luggage or goods which are not in transit and carried in special waggons and compartments also sealed by the Customs authorities.

15. *Passengers in transit with money and scrip.* — Passengers in transit entering countries where laws exist prohibiting the export of money and scrip will be permitted to claim a certificate setting forth the amount of such money and scrip which are in their possession. They will be entitled, on leaving the country, to take with them such money and scrip on surrendering the above-mentioned certificate. This privilege will be brought to the notice of the travelling public with the same publicity as the regulations prohibiting the export of capital.

III. THROUGH TICKETS.

16. *Through tickets.* — The States through which the Simplon-Orient-Express passes will, with the shortest possible delay, communicate to the League of Nations all technical information with regard to their system for through tickets at present in force, as well as any alterations of detail to such regulations which as a result of their experience may appear to them as indispensable or desirable. Such information will be brought to the notice of all States concerned with a view to facilitating, by means of special agreements, based if necessary on the above system, the extension of through bookings which is now recognised as being of urgent necessity.

IV. GENERAL PUBLICITY.

17. *Periodical information.* — The Governments will forward to the League of Nations every three months any information of practical value concerning passports and Customs

formalities in connection with passenger traffic and their application at the principal frontier stations and on international railway systems, as also any information as to new international services with through tickets, with particulars of the technical means employed to render possible such new services. Such information, if suitable, will be published by the League of Nations for the benefit of the public or of the companies interested.

The Conference proposes that the League of Nations should invite every Government to notify it, within a period of three months after the receipt of the present invitations, as to whether it agrees to carry out the aforesaid measures, in whole or in part, and from what date, specifying, if necessary, whether or not it proposes to limit the benefit of any of such measures to the nationals of States according reciprocal treatment to their own nationals. The reply of each Government will be communicated to every other Government through the medium of the League of Nations and will appear in the *Official Journal* of the League.

Any Government desiring at a future date to withdraw in whole or in part their acceptance of the above-mentioned measures should be invited to notify the League of Nations definitely at least three months in advance of the date when such a decision is to take effect.

The Conference proposes, further, that the League of Nations should bring to the notice of the Governments the following recommendations, the carrying into effect of which would appear highly desirable, but which do not appear to warrant definitive invitations.

Recommendations

I. PASSPORTS.

(a) *Passport exemptions.* — That adjacent States should, whenever possible, enter into mutual agreements with a view to exempting from passport formalities all classes of persons holding papers which in practice can be taken as a guarantee of their identity (e.g., Government and railway officials and persons in possession of marine identity papers, etc.).

(b) *Abolition of entrance visa for nationals.* — That the entrance visa should not be required for nationals.

(c) *Abolition of exit visa for nationals.* — That the exit visa (the abolition of which for persons other than nationals is provided for in the preceding resolution) should, as far as possible, be abolished also in the case of nationals.

(d) *Entrance visa for passports not covering all destinations.* — That, subject to the legitimate exercise of the right of asylum, the Governments should, as far as possible, enter into agreements with a view to preventing the granting by any State of entrance visas into its territory in cases where the passport itself has not been issued for that territory.

(e) *Facilities for sojourn.* — That States should accord to the holders of passports bearing regular visas such facilities for sojourn as are compatible with their health regulations, their economic situation and with the interests of national security and that, with this end in view, States should simplify, as far as possible, the regulations and procedure in force with respect to the sojourn of foreigners admitted into their respective territories.

(f) *Simplification of formalities.* — That States should enter as far as possible into mutual agreements with a view, first, to establishing joint control of passports at points of exit and entry of adjacent countries, pending the complete abolition of control at the point of exit; secondly, to providing that the authorities giving a visa for the country of destination should also undertake the necessary formalities for obtaining other visas, such as those for transit; and, thirdly, to combining passport formalities as far as possible with Customs formalities with a view to reducing to a minimum the time lost on the journey.

II. CUSTOMS FORMALITIES.

(g) *International stations.* — That adjacent States should as far as possible enter into agreements to ensure a common Customs entrance and exit examination by the organisation of joint services.

(h) *Examination of outgoing registered luggage.* — That the examination of outgoing registered luggage should take place as far as possible before departure at important railway centres.

(i) *Examination of incoming registered luggage.* — That the examination of incoming registered luggage should take place as far as possible upon arrival at important railway centres.

(j) *Examination of luggage in general.* — That any further examination of hand and registered luggage should as far as possible take place (whenever this is feasible with number of staff available) on board corridor trains or, in the case of non-corridor trains, in the carriages themselves whilst at frontier stations.

(k) *Limitation of luggage.* — That, with a view to simplifying Customs formalities, the Governments should see that regulations concerning the limitation of weight and the description of articles which may be carried as luggage are strictly enforced.

III. THROUGH SERVICES.

(l) That international through trains and express trains connecting large centres should, as far as possible, be established at the earliest possible moment and that the attention of Governments should be drawn to the importance of taking the necessary measures to this end, if necessary by mutual agreement.

IV. TRANSPORT OF EMIGRANTS.

(m) That the most efficient measures should be taken to ensure that the transport of emigrants be carried out in the conditions most favourable to public health; that corridor trains should be used, as far as possible, for the transportation of emigrants; that prolonged stoppages at frontier or other stations for the purpose of passports, Customs, or sanitary formalities in connection with the transport of emigrants should take place where material facilities exist which permit of this being done without danger to the public health; that authorities issuing passports to emigrants should, at the same time, furnish them with particulars of the sanitary and other conditions to which they will be subject, and the expenses which they will incur *en route* until arrival in the country of destination.

The Conference proposes that the League of Nations should invite the Governments to inform the League in due course of the action taken with respect to any or all of these recommendations.

(Signed) Jhr. J. LOUDON,
President.

(Signed) Robert HAAS,
Secretary-General.

Annex I

TYPE OF "INTERNATIONAL" PASSPORT.

(The model is that of a passport such as would be delivered by the Spanish Government)
(see following page).

The passport is to contain 32 pages. The first four pages only are reproduced herewith. The other 28 pages should all be numbered and should contain the visas of the countries for which the passport is valid.

The passport should be drawn up in at least two languages, *i.e.*, in the national language and in French.

The passport must be bound in cardboard, bearing on the top the name and in the centre the coat of arms of the country and at the bottom the word "Passport", with the addition, according to the desire of the various Governments, of any practical information concerning the regime of passports.

Any passport of which the pages are entirely filled must be replaced by a fresh passport.

Annex II

DIPLOMATIC PASSPORTS.

1. The high dignitaries of the household of a Head of States.
2. Diplomatic officials and their families; consular officials and their families.
3. The members of Governments, Ministers of State, the President and Vice-President of national legislative bodies and their families.
4. The officials of the Foreign Office and their families.
5. Cabinet couriers and persons charged by their Governments with official missions to foreign Governments or to official international bodies.

— 1 —

Este pasaporte contiene
32 páginas
Ce passeport contient
32 pages

(Armes
du
pays)

(timbre
de
l'impôt)

PASAPORTE PASSEPORT

NOMBRE DEL PAIS
NOM DU PAYS

Nº del pasaporte }
Nº du passeport }
Nombre del portador }
Nom du porteur }
Acompañado de su esposa }
Accompagné de sa femme }

y de hijos.
et de enfants.

NACIONALIDAD }
NATIONALITÉ }

— 2 —

SEÑAS PERSONALES SIGNALEMENT

Profesión } Profession }	Esposa - Femme
Lugar y fecha del nacimiento } Lieu et date de naissance }	
Domicilio } Domicile }	
Rostro } Visage }	
Color de los ojos } Couleur des yeux }	
Color del cabello } Couleur des cheveux }	
Señas particulares } Signes particuliers }	

HIJOS - ENFANTS

Nombre Nom	Edad Age	Sexo Sexe
---------------	-------------	--------------

— 3 —

Esposa
Femme

(photo)

(Foto)

timbre
sec

FIRMA DEL PORTADOR
SIGNATURE DU TITULAIRE

Y DE SU ESPOSA
ET DE SA FEMME

Firma del Expedidor :

Signature de l'agent délivrant le passeport :

— 4 —

Países en los cuales es válido este pasaporte
Pays pour lesquels ce passeport est valable

La validez de este pasaporte termina el :
Ce passeport expire le :

a menos que sea renovado.
à moins de renouvellement.

expedido en }
délivré à }
fecha }
date }

RENOVACIONES RENOUVELLEMENTS

1º
2º
3º
4º

The exact size of this passport should be $15 \frac{1}{2} \times 10 \frac{1}{2}$ cm.

ANNEX 12.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE HUNGARIAN DELEGATION CONCERNING FACILITIES TO BE GRANTED SHOULD THE PASSPORT REGIME BE MAINTAINED

1. *Territorial Competence. Personal Applications for Visas.*

Although as a general rule visas are granted by the diplomatic or consular authorities competent for the place of domicile of the applicant, the diplomatic and consular authorities may in cases deserving special consideration grant visas to persons not domiciled in their area.

As far as possible, the said authorities shall not require the applicant to appear in person. In the case of transit visas, the applicant shall only be required to appear in person if the authority granting the visa has doubts regarding the case.

2. *Proof of the Necessity of the Journey.*

The necessity of the journey need not be proved by the applicant for a visa in any but exceptional cases; for example, when the presence of certain persons might constitute a danger to national security or to public health or when internal difficulties of an economic nature require such proof.

3. *Preliminary Enquiry and Approval.*

Visas shall be delivered on the same day and if possible immediately the applicant has made his request. As a general rule, the delivery of a visa shall not be made conditional on the production of an entrance permit or travel authorisation issued by the Government of the country of destination (or by any other authority within that country).

If, in the event of danger to national security or public health, or, in the case of entrance visas, in the event of internal difficulties of an economic nature (labour market), a preliminary enquiry or approval are indispensable, restrictions of this kind shall only be applied in individual cases. They shall not be applied to whole categories of persons on account of their nationality, race, or any other quality.

4. *Simplification of Formalities.*

In so far as they still exist, all fees charged on the occasion of the inspection of passports at the frontiers, in ports, or in the interior, shall be abolished.

Apart from exceptional cases based on considerations of national safety, public health, the economic situation, etc., an entrance visa shall give the right to reside within the country for a period of at least...¹). No charge shall be made for a permit of residence for this minimum period.

(If necessary a rule with regard to residence in the case of a transit visa may be inserted here.)

If, for the reasons above mentioned, a traveller is only allowed a shorter period of residence, mention shall be made of the fact in the text of the visa itself by the diplomatic or consular authority issuing the visa. It is understood that any prolongation of the permits of residence referred to above is a matter for the local authorities.

ANNEX 13.

PROPOSAL BY THE HUNGARIAN DELEGATION CONCERNING THE OBJECTS OF A PASSPORT

1. *A Document of Identity.*

The passport proves the identity of the bearer. It is a public document for international use, the authenticity of which is certified by the authority issuing it.

¹ Hungarian delegate's proposal: two months (60 days).

2. *A Document of Travel.*

In virtue of the authority of the State issuing it, the passport confers the right to travel in the countries mentioned therein.

It is recognised as conferring this right;

- (a) Without any formality by the countries which have abolished the visa system;
- (b) Subject to the affixing of a visa by the countries which maintain the visa system.

3. *A Document of Protection.*

The authority issuing the passport recommends the holder to the protection of the authorities of the countries to which he is authorised to proceed and to the protection of the national diplomatic or consular authorities established in those countries.

4. *Nationality.*

The passport itself does not yet constitute *proof* of the holder's nationality. In doubtful cases the national laws and regulations relating thereto must be referred to.

5. *Emigration.*

It is understood that the passport systems in force in the different countries generally refer only to *travellers'* passports.

Emigrants, that is to say, persons going abroad with a view to permanent residence for the purpose of earning their livelihood, are subject to special emigration regulations.

6. *Diplomatic Passports.*

The regulations relating to passports (and visas) do not apply to diplomatic passports, which are governed by special usage.

ANNEX 14.

SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE QUESTIONS RELATING TO PASSPORT VISAS

REPORT BY M. DE NAVAILLES

The task of the Sub-Committee was to examine the proposals contained in the report of October 5th, 1925, under the heading "Entrance Visa". It was not, however, to give any opinion as to the actual principle of the abolition or retention of these visas, but its work could have no value except on the assumption that the passport visa would not be generally abolished immediately. Furthermore, it was not to consider the questions connected with transit visas; it was obliged, nevertheless, to give its attention to these matters since all the problems which arise in connection with visa formalities are intimately connected.

The Sub-Committee hence felt that it would be logical to preface the draft resolution which it is submitting, with the recommendation, handed to the Chairman of the Committee, that entrance and transit visas should not be suppressed by general measures, but only by way of inter-State agreements. It had made two modifications in the text which you have already had before you; the first, which has been made in order to meet the wishes of the delegate for India, lays down that countries which for any reason are unable to conclude agreements regarding reciprocal abolition of visas may refrain from so doing; the second is intended to bring out the point of view of the delegates who requested that travellers in transit should be allowed to break their journey.

The period of validity for visas has been carefully examined. Certain delegates urged that it should be extended to five years, irrespective of the period to elapse before the expiration of the validity of the passport. Other delegates were of opinion that the period of validity of the visa should never exceed that of the passport. Eventually the Sub-Committee agreed unanimously to a period of two years to run from the date of the affixing of the visa, whether a transit visa or an entrance visa, but opinions were equally divided as to whether the period of validity of the visa could run beyond that of the passport. The Italian delegate maintained that, legally, it was impossible to conceive of a visa remaining valid longer than the passport — that the accessory was tied to the principal and died with it. The Roumanian delegate pointed out the practical difficulties of transferring a visa from an expired to a new passport, but the German, British, and other delegates stated

that that was their existing practice, and mentioned various methods of overcoming the difficulties and transferring the visa. This point will come before the plenary Committee for settlement.

A number of delegates pointed out that it would be necessary to give a careful explanation as to what is meant by period of validity of a visa, and as to the rights which the visa confers upon the holder of the passport on which it is affixed. Let us take the case of a passport bearing an entrance visa with a validity of two years; the holder of the passport will be entitled to enter the country for which the visa has been granted at any time whatever and as often as he wishes during these two years subject to any legal regulations in that country affecting the entry of aliens. But this visa in no way entitles him to take up his abode in the country during the period of two years or to make an unbroken stay in it over a long period; he may only take up his abode in a country so far as he is allowed by the laws and regulations of that country and subject to fulfilling the conditions laid down in these laws and regulations. *A fortiori* an entrance visa for several journeys or for a single journey merely entitles the person concerned to make a number of short stays in the country. The same, of course, applies to transit visas. These visas can be granted for a non-stop journey or they may entitle the person concerned to interrupt his journey for a varying length of time. If the traveller presents himself without entrance or transit visa at the frontier of a country requiring such visa, he is liable to be turned back. Nevertheless, where there is no presumptive evidence of fraud, he is generally allowed to continue his voyage and even to break his journey en route, especially, in cases of maritime transport, in ports of call and while the ship is in harbour. It is, of course, understood that the holder may use his visa up to the end of its period of validity, and that if he enters a country on the last day of that period he may stay there as long as is necessary, subject to the laws and regulations.

With regard to the fee, two tendencies were bound to appear and did in fact show themselves: a liberal tendency towards very reduced rates; the opposite tendency towards a scale of fees approaching those at present in force. The following system found approval: a maximum fee of 10 gold francs for entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to a number of journeys; 5 gold francs for entrance visas valid for a single journey; 1 gold franc for transit visas, whether for a long period, for several journeys, or for a single return journey. The British delegate declared that, where entrance visas valid for one year were granted, British officials levied a fee of 10 gold francs, and that entrance visas valid for two years would be charged for at double rates, *i.e.* 20 gold francs.

The Sub-Committee was unanimously of opinion that, whatever the scale of fees laid down by a country for the issue of visas, such a scale must be applied without distinction to nationals of all countries, and that no discrimination should be made on grounds of nationality. The Committee recognised, however, that a departure might legitimately be made from this principle of equality in two cases: (1) as a measure of reciprocity towards a country not adopting the maximum charges of 10 gold francs, 5 gold francs and 1 gold franc referred to above, and charging particularly high fees; (2) in consequence of mutual agreements reducing the charges below the rates of 10 gold francs, 5 gold francs and 1 gold franc. The Committee also decided that in no way should any difference be made in the scale of fees charged according either to the point at which the frontier was crossed on entering or leaving the country or to the itinerary followed by the traveller or to the flag of the ship upon which he is travelling. The Sub-Committee rejected the proposal that a country should automatically, as a measure of reciprocity, charge nationals of other countries the reduced fees adopted by these countries. The effect of this would be to make the scale of visa fees dependent upon the will of foreign authorities. Similarly, it did not accept the proposal concerning individual reductions in fees, since the particulars obtained on the subject show that such a proposal would nowadays serve no useful purpose.

No objection was raised to the proposal that the formality of affixing a new or other visa to a new passport, with the object of transferring to that passport the unexpired portion of a visa affixed to the expired passport, should be carried out free of charge. On the other hand, it was recognised that any persons allowing a visa to expire would have no claim to a fresh visa free of charge. The individual could only blame himself for his own negligence or lack of foresight. At the same time, the competent authorities would be free to decide whether exceptional circumstances justified a special favour, and whether it should grant a new visa or extend the validity of the original visa free of charge.

Finally, the Sub-Committee considers that it would be desirable to combine in a single resolution the recommendations that the formalities in connection with the issue of passports and the granting of visas should be made as inexpensive and as simple as possible.

The Rapporteur has endeavoured to present in the following recommendations the resolutions of the Sub-Committee which have been briefly analysed above.

The Conference makes the following recommendations:

"1. That the abolition of entrance and transit visas should be made as general as possible by means of inter-State agreements, a reservation being made in the case of countries unable, for special reasons, to make such agreements.

"2. That facilities should as far as possible be granted to travellers enabling them to break their journey in the countries through which they pass, more especially, in ports of call, even though their passport should bear no transit visa.

"3. That both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a minimum period of two years and for the whole period of validity of the passport if that should exceed two years. These visas should, during their period of validity, respectively entitle the person concerned to make an unlimited number of journeys into, or through, the country. The above provisions do not prevent an entrance or transit visa being granted for a limited number of journeys or for a single journey, especially when this is requested by the persons concerned, the said persons being at liberty to undertake the journeys or single journey at any time during the period of validity of the visa, subject to any legal regulations in the country concerned affecting the entry of aliens. Needless to say, the holder of a passport visa in the above-mentioned manner will in no case be entitled to claim the right to reside for the whole period of validity of the visa in the country for which it was granted or to make a prolonged stay therein, basing his claim upon the period of validity of the said visa, since conditions for residence are fixed in each country by laws and regulations and are independent of the period of validity of visas.

"4. That, save for exceptional reasons which are justified by conditions of public health or by considerations of national safety, visas granted should in all cases be valid for all frontiers.

"5. That the visa fee should not exceed 10 gold francs for entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to several journeys, 5 gold francs for entrance visas valid for a single journey, and 1 gold franc for transit visas, whether for a long period, for several journeys, or for a single return journey, the recommendation being made to Governments to reduce this scale still further by means of mutual agreements.

"6. That the fees charged for visas should not vary according either to the nationality of the passport-holder or to the itinerary followed by him or to the flag of the ship upon which he embarks, each State retaining the right either to charge fees on a higher scale than that given in paragraph 5 in the case of nationals of countries charging higher fees, or to charge lower fees as a result of mutual agreements.

"7. That provision for exemption from fees or for reduced fees should be made in public official regulations defining the categories of persons entitled thereto, as also the conditions to be fulfilled to obtain this privilege, such exemptions to be granted in accordance with the principle of equality laid down in paragraph 6.

"8. That, where the validity of a passport expires before that of the visa, the holder should not lose the benefit of such visa in respect of its unexpired period, and that the formalities enabling him to obtain this benefit, notably the affixing of a visa on a new passport, should be carried out free of charge.

"9. That in exceptional cases where, for genuine and legitimate reasons, a visa expires before it has been used, a fresh visa should be granted, or the original visa extended, free of charge.

* * *

"The Conference recommends that the issue of passports, documents of identity and visas should be organised in such manner that travellers and emigrants shall be spared long and costly journeys."

ANNEX 15.

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE WITH REGARD TO "LETTRES DE MISSION"

The Secretary-General of the League has requested me to draw the Conference's attention to the following question in connection with the discussion on visas :

The Council of the League of Nations has decided on various occasions that, in order to allow persons sent on a mission on behalf of the League of Nations to claim this status during their mission, the Secretary-General of the League should supply them with a document which at present takes the form of a "lettre de mission".

In this connection it should be pointed out that in many cases such missions, particularly when they are in relation to the articles of the Covenant concerning threatened breaches of the peace, are of great urgency. At present, owing to the formality of passport visas, which when the person leaves Geneva is usually carried out at Berne (diplomatic visa), the departure

of persons on missions of this kind may be delayed to an extent which may be somewhat serious if the events giving rise to the departure of the mission occur on a Saturday afternoon.

The Conference, or a small committee of experts appointed by it, might perhaps examine the form in which these "lettres de mission" are drawn up, and, while indicating any changes which may appear desirable, might consider whether a recommendation could not be made to the various Governments in order that, in urgent cases, persons carrying these "lettres de mission" and also provided with their ordinary passports may at least provisionally be exempted from the formality of a visa.

Such a measure would facilitate the discharge of the missions entrusted to the League of Nations. On the occasion of a threatened breach of the peace last year, the Council of the League strongly emphasised in the report which it adopted the great importance of rapidity of action on the part of the League's machinery in grave crises.

ANNEX 16.

LETTER DATED MAY 12th, 1926, ADDRESSED BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE PASSPORT CONFERENCE

I have the honour to communicate to you herewith copy of a communication received by me from the President of the International Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations, with the request that you bring it to the notice of the Conference.

Appendix.

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JOURNALISTS ACCREDITED TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

It was with great interest that the Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations learned that the Second Passport Conference had been convened to meet at Geneva on May 12th, under the auspices of the League of Nations, and that one of the subjects to be discussed was the abolition of passport visas.

I can assure you that our members would receive such a measure with profound satisfaction. In the event, however, of certain countries not being prepared at the moment to abolish visas entirely, we venture to draw your attention to the importance of the rapid issue of visas. This is most desirable, for example, when members of the Association are suddenly called upon to proceed to foreign countries to investigate a matter of international interest. As international public opinion depends on the rapid supply of information by the Press, I am certain that you will agree with me that a prompt circulation of accurate news would often contribute to establishing good relations and to dispelling international misunderstandings.

In the majority of cases, however, it is very difficult to obtain a visa rapidly at the present time, particularly on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

We can therefore assure you that anything that the Conference may be able to do to remove the difficulties which in many countries stand in the way of international travelling, in so far as such travelling is affected by the vexatious system of passports at present in force, will be greatly appreciated by all the members of the Association of Journalists accredited to the League of Nations.

Accordingly I have the honour to request you to submit officially to the next Passport Conference the views of the Association as summarised above.

I take this opportunity of reminding you that, in the report which our Association recently forwarded to you with regard to the convocation of a Committee of Press Experts, we drew attention to the importance of this question for many members of our Association in the performance of their duties.

(Signed) R. DE FRANCH,
President.

ANNEX 17.

LETTER DATED MAY 10th, 1926, FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE SECTION
OF INTERNATIONAL BUREAUX AND INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION TO
THE PRESIDENT OF THE PASSPORT CONFERENCE WITH REGARD
TO RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' ORGANISATIONS

I have the honour to communicate to you herewith, for the information of the Passport Conference, an extract from the resolutions adopted by the Meeting of the Representatives of the International Students' Organisations, which was convened by the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation on April 8th, 9th and 10th, 1926.

(Signed) I. NITOBÉ.

Appendix.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION : MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF
THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' ORGANISATIONS

held at Geneva on April 8th, 9th and 10th, 1926.

Extract from the Resolutions adopted at the Fifth Meeting on April 10th, 1926.

The Committee of Representatives of the International Students' Associations, having noted with satisfaction the favourable replies made by a large number of Governments as a result of the Assembly resolutions recommending the granting of travelling facilities to students, expresses its confidence that the progress already made will be continued and that Governments which have not yet acted on the suggestions made by the Assembly will, after having considered them, be able to do so.

It also considers it very desirable that the formalities of whatever kind required in the various countries to enable students to benefit by the facilities provided should as far as possible be identical.

The Committee of representatives requests the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to take such steps as it may consider desirable to secure an international convention on travelling facilities for students, with regard to visas and passports as well as reductions in fares. This convention would be based on the replies made by a large number of Governments to the first appeal issued by the League of Nations on this matter. It would, however, be desirable that the convention should expressly provide that those travelling facilities be granted automatically to any holder of the International Students' Identity Card issued by the International Confederation of Students and approved by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation under the conditions laid down in the resolution adopted at its meeting on July 30th, 1925 (see document C.445.M.165, page 43).

The Committee also expresses its desire that special travelling facilities should immediately be granted to students proceeding to Geneva for the purpose of studying the work of the League of Nations.

ANNEX 18.

DECLARATION OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Czechoslovak Government submits the following recommendations :

1. In view of the practice of certain States, the Czechoslovak Government would desire that the authorities of foreign States should not require the payment of any fee, particularly the stamp duty, when travellers' passports are submitted for the purposes of the declaration to the police and registration.

2. It further desires that no special fee should be charged to foreigners as such for permission to reside within the country.

3. Further, the Czechoslovak Government requests that in the 32 pages which make up the passport, the Czechoslovak practice should be followed of including only particulars of international importance and not those dealing with internal matters, as, for example, the declaration to the police.

4. The term "emigrant" should receive a uniform definition. Until this definition is arrived at, however, it would be expedient that the States taking part in the International Passport Conference at Geneva should communicate to one another through the League Secretariat the groups of persons who will issue emigrants' identity books, should these be brought into use.

ANNEX 19.

FINAL ACT

adopted by the Passport Conference on May 18th, 1926.

The Council of the League of Nations on December 9th, 1925, adopted the following resolution:

"The Council decides, on the proposal of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, to summon a Conference on the Passport Regime to meet on a date between April 15th and May 15th, 1926 — the exact date to be fixed later by the President of the Council after consultation with the Secretary-General of the League and the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee.

"All Governments which were asked to attend the last general Conference on Communications and Transit will be invited to send representatives to this Conference.

"International organisations specially qualified to assist the Conference in its work will also be invited to attend in an advisory capacity; the Chairman of the Advisory and Technical Committee will be asked to give the names of such organisations."

The present Conference, convoked in pursuance of this resolution, met at Geneva from May 12th to 18th, 1926, and the following delegations were present:

The Conference elected as its President M. PUSTA, representative of Esthonia, and as its Vice-Presidents M. DE AGÜERO Y BETHANCOURT, representative of Cuba, and M. POLITIS, President of the Passport Sub-Committee of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations.

The Conference adopted the following resolutions:

RECOMMENDATIONS

SECTION I. — GENERAL QUESTIONS.

I. *Passport Régime.*

With reference to the resolution of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations, the Conference, recognising the value of passports as establishing identity and the right to travel, and taking into account the different opinions which have been expressed regarding the necessity or utility of demanding the production of passports when crossing frontiers, recommends that the passage of frontiers should be facilitated by means of bilateral agreements or agreements between more than two countries.

II. *Facilities to be Granted.*

A. *Issue of Passports.*

1. Type of passport. — The Conference recommends that States which still use a passport of other than the "international type" should, as soon as possible, adopt the model recommended by the present Conference in the report annexed hereto.

2. Duration of validity. — The Conference, noting that a large number of countries have adopted the duration of validity of two years for passports, as proposed by the 1920 Conference, and that a certain number of countries have not yet adopted that period, recommends that all countries should in any event adopt a minimum validity of two years, and, if possible, validity approaching five years, which has already been adopted by certain countries.

3. Extent of validity. — The Conference recommends that, except in certain special or exceptional cases, Governments should issue passports valid for all foreign countries or for as large groups of countries as possible.

4. Fees. — The Conference recommends that the fees charged for the issue of passports should be fixed in such a manner as to bring in revenue to the States not exceeding the expenditure involved in the preparation of the passports and their issue to the persons concerned.

B. *Visas.*

The Conference recommends:

(1) That the abolition of entrance and transit visas should be made as general as possible, by means of inter-State agreements, a reservation being made in the case of countries unable, for special reasons, to make such agreements.

(2) That facilities should as far as possible be granted to travellers enabling them to break their journey in the countries through which they pass, more especially in ports of call, even though their passport should bear no transit visa.

(3) That, although as a general rule visas are granted by the diplomatic or consular authorities competent for the place of domicile of the applicant, the diplomatic and consular authorities may in cases deserving special consideration grant visas to persons not domiciled in their area and that as far as possible the said authorities shall not require the applicant to appear in person. In the case of transit visas, the applicant should only be required to appear in person if the authority granting the visas has doubts regarding the case.

(4) That the necessity of the journey need not be proved by the applicant for a visa in any but exceptional cases; for example, when the presence of certain persons might constitute a danger to national security or to public health or when internal difficulties of an economic nature require such proof or in the case of those countries with regulations governing the entry for foreigners.

(5) That both entrance and transit visas should be valid for a period of two years in general so long as the period of the validity of the visa does not exceed that of the passport. These visas should, during their period of validity, respectively entitle the person concerned to make an unlimited number of journeys into, or through, the country. The above provisions do not prevent an entrance or transit visa being granted for a limited number of journeys or for a single journey, especially when this is requested by the persons concerned, the said persons being at liberty to undertake the journeys or single journey at any time during the period of validity of the visa, subject to any legal regulations in the country concerned affecting the entry of aliens. Needless to say, the holder of a passport visa in the above-mentioned manner will in no case be entitled to claim the right to reside for the whole period of validity of the visa in the country for which it was granted or to make a prolonged stay therein, basing his claim upon the period of validity of the said visa, since conditions for residence are fixed in each country by laws and regulations and are independent of the period of validity of visas.

(6) That, save for special or exceptional reasons which are justified by conditions of public health or by considerations of national safety, visas granted should in all cases be valid for all frontiers.

(7) That the fee should not exceed 10 gold francs for entrance visas having a long period of validity or giving the right to several journeys, five gold francs for entrance visas valid for a single journey, and one gold franc for transit visas, whether for a long period, for several journeys, or for a single return journey, the recommendation being made to Governments to reduce this scale still further by means of mutual agreements.

(8) That the fees charged for visas should not vary according either to the nationality of the passport-holder or to the itinerary followed by him or to the flag of the ship upon which he embarks, each State retaining the right either to charge fees on a higher scale than given in paragraph 7 in the case of nationals of countries charging higher fees, or to charge lower fees as a result of mutual agreements.

(9) That provision for exemption from fees or for reduced fees should be made in public and official regulations defining the categories of persons entitled thereto, as also the conditions to be fulfilled to obtain this privilege, such exemptions to be granted in accordance with the principle of equality laid down in paragraph 8.

(10) That in exceptional cases where, for genuine and legitimate reasons, a visa expires before it has been used, a fresh visa should be granted, or the original visa extended, free of charge.

The recommendations of the 1920 Conference on this subject having been accepted by a large number of States, the Conference is of opinion that the total abolition of exit visas both for nationals and for foreigners might be taken into consideration at the present time.

C. *Facilities for the obtaining of Passports and Visas.*

The Conference recommends that the issue of passports, documents of identity and visas should be organised in such a manner as to simplify formalities and that travellers and emigrants should be spared long and costly journeys. It also recommends that visas be delivered within the shortest possible time.

D. *Control at Frontiers.*

The Conference;

Actuated by the desires expressed at different Conferences on international communications in regard to the simplification of passport control formalities at the frontiers;

Being of opinion that the progress already made in this matter might be carried further by, so far as possible, generally adopting the system of control already applied on certain international lines of communication of particular importance:

Recommends that passport control, both on entering and leaving countries, should be carried out:

(a) while the trains are *in motion*, whenever possible;

(b) when that is impossible, during the *stop* of trains at one of the two frontier stations (station of exit or entry) and in such a way that police inspection by the two countries concerned is effected if possible *simultaneously* or at least *one immediately after the other*.

In order to enable the authorities of either country to exercise their duties in foreign territory, the Conference suggests that agreements should be concluded between States as soon as possible with a view to organising passport control formalities at frontier stations on the lines indicated above.

Finally, the Conference draws the attention of States to the fact that these improvements would be of no effect unless at the same time agreements were also concluded for the accomplishment of Customs formalities under the same conditions of time and place.

SECTION 2. — QUESTIONS RELATING TO EMIGRANTS.

I. *Transit Card for Emigrants.*

The Conference recommends that all possible facilities should be granted for the passage in transit of emigrants leaving Europe for overseas-countries. For this purpose, the League of Nations will be requested to prepare, with the assistance of experts of the States most immediately concerned, a draft arrangement based upon the system of transit cards to take the place of the consular visa, this draft to be submitted to the States concerned for examination and, if approved of, signature.

II. *Special Identity Documents for Emigrants.*

The Conference states that it has not dealt with the questions relating to the expediency of introducing special identification documents for foreign emigrants and workmen, and that all decisions or recommendations on this matter have been left either for subsequent agreement between countries or to be dealt with by special meetings of delegates from all the countries concerned.

SECTION 3. — PERSONS WITHOUT NATIONALITY.

The Conference considers it desirable that certain facilities for travelling should be granted to persons without nationality and requests the League of Nations to prepare, with the assistance of experts of those States most immediately concerned, a draft arrangement based upon the principle of the introduction of an internationally recognised identity document.

SECTION 4. — MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS.

(1) The Conference requests the League of Nations to consider, with the assistance of qualified experts, the questions raised by the proposal of the Hungarian delegate concerning the functions of a passport.

(2) In order to facilitate the rapid movement of missions under the authority of the League of Nations, the Conference recommends that, in urgent cases when it would not be possible to obtain the regular visas, persons in possession of the necessary papers issued by the Secretary-General of the League and also provided with regular passports, should be enabled by the countries of destination or transit to fulfil their duties without delay. In such cases the Secretary-General will immediately notify the Governments concerned.

(3) The Conference asks the sympathetic consideration of Governments in regard to the requests submitted to the Conference by the international students' organisations.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the Representatives of the Conference have signed this Final Act.

Geneva, May 18th, 1926.

(Signed) Robert HAAS,
Secretary-General of the Conference.

(Signed) C. R. PUSTA,
President.

*Signatures*¹

South Africa

G. A. JENKIN.

Germany

Dr. Paul ECKARDT.
Dr. Erich KRASKE.
Johannes KRAUSE.
Bernard WOLFF.
Karl SOMMER.

Argentina

Alejandro M. UNSAIN
(*ad referendum* — as an observer).

Austria

E. PFLÜGL.
H. REINHARDT.

¹ Certain delegates have repeated, when signing the Final Act, observations or reservations which usually only appear in the Minutes of the Conference.

Belgium	H. COSTERMANS. L. GONNE.
Brazil	E. MONTARROYOS. Hildebrando ACCIOLY.
Bulgaria	D. MIKOFF.
Canada	W. A. RIDDELL.
China	CHAO-HSIN CHU.
Cuba	Aristides DE AGÜERO.
Denmark	A. OLDENBURG. (subject to ratification). F. BOECK.
Free City of Danzig	F. SOKAL.
Spain	Emilio DE PALACIOS. F. Ramirez MONTESINOS. J. DE ARENZANA. C. R. PUSTA.
Esthonia	Eino WÄLIKANGAS.
Finland	NAVAILLES.
France	Rowland SPERLING.
Great Britain	D. NIKOLOPOULOS.
Greece	Ladislav DE GÖMÖRY-LAIML.
Hungary	J. W. HOSE.
India	Michael MACWHITE. (<i>ad referendum</i>).
Irish Free State	T. C. GIANNINI. Luigi MIRANDA.
Italy	S. KURUSU (subject to reservations noted in procès-verbaux).
Japan	Charles DUZMANS (making a reservation — <i>ad referendum</i> — as to the following recommendations: Section 1, II A, p. 4, and B, p. 5).
Latvia	Chr. L. LANGE (<i>ad referendum</i>).
Norway	J. F. BOER.
Netherlands	F. SOKAL.
Poland	Antonio Maria Bartholomeu FERREIRA.
Portugal	N. P. COMNÈNE. Stefan BUNGETZIANU.
Roumania	Const. FOTITCH.
Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	Phya SANPAKITCH PREECHA. (Making a reservation—as regards the recommendation made in Section 1, II A, under (2) and declaring himself unable to agree to the recommendation contained in Section 1, II B, under (5).)
Siam	ADLERCREUTZ. WIJNBLADH.
Sweden	H. ROTHMUND. M. RATZENBERGER.
Switzerland	(Making a reservation—concerning the recommendation made in Article II A (2), and in paragraph of the Annex entitled "Number of pages, visas and stamps" in so far as it mentions the validity of the passport—to establish in exceptional cases passports of short validity for a single journey.) Arthur MAIXNER.
Czechoslovakia	

<i>Turkey</i>	Saadoullah FERID
<i>Uruguay</i>	E. E. BUERO. Oscar DEFFEMINIS.
<i>Territory of the Saar</i>	X. FABIANI.
<i>International Chamber of Commerce</i>	J. MARCOTTY.
<i>International Shipping Conference</i>	E. O. DUNNE.
<i>Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit</i>	A. POLITIS.

Annex.

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE STANDARD PASSPORT (INTERNATIONAL TYPE).

Precautions against Fraud.

The Conference has considered various questions connected with the type of passport to be adopted and the precautions to be taken against fraud.

It has agreed that booklets of the type in use in England, Germany, Austria and France, a copy of which is exhibited at the Conference, are to be recommended.

The first-mentioned is perfection itself, but is so expensive that many countries might be unable to adopt it. The other passports mentioned above, though cheaper, afford all necessary safeguards, and might be taken as models. The paper employed is such as to obviate all risks of erasures or falsifications of the writing by the use of chemicals.

The Conference is strongly of opinion, however, that the *cover* should bear the name of the country issuing the passport, the name of the holder and the series number of the passport. It is also essential that the number of pages should be stated, as in the 1920 model. Further, every page should be perforated in one or more places; the system of perforation in use in Austria can be thoroughly recommended. For reasons of economy, the binding required by the resolution of the Paris Conference of 1920 should be optional.

At the suggestion of the Greek delegate, the Conference proposes that every visa should mention the passport-holder's name. This, combined with the numbering of the pages, would prevent cases of fraudulent substitution such as have been found to occur.

Number of Pages, Visas and Stamps.

In order to leave room for all the visas which may be required having regard to the period of the passport's validity (minimum two years), the Conference proposes: (1) that there should be *at least* 16 pages; (2) that the officials concerned should be instructed to place visas in order of issue, and not to use more than half a page for each. The Conference thinks it desirable that stamps placed on passports by frontier officials should be perfectly clear, and should occupy as little room as possible.

Various Entries.

The question of the entries to be made on the passport form has given rise to the following observations:

- (1) Sufficient space should be provided for the full name of the holder;
- (2) Christian names and surnames should be written either in block capitals or in what is known as English roundhand;
- (3) The surname should be underlined.

It is agreed that christian names need not be translated.

The Conference has adopted the Hungarian delegate's proposal that the holder's occupation should be accurately defined, and that space should be left for this description.

It is also essential that his exact height should be shown (this being an important point in the personal description), instead of general indications such as "tall", "average", or "short".

Renewals.

A full page should be left for renewals, whereas the 1920 model leaves only three or four lines. Considerable trouble has been caused by the scattering of successive renewals throughout the book. The renewal page should immediately follow the page on which the period of validity is shown.

Question of Place of Origin ("indigénat").

The States represented at the Conference of Graz strongly recommended that the place of origin ("indigénat") of the holder should be stated on the passport; the Conference observes that there is no reason why this rule should not be followed by the countries concerned, and further points out that the Passport Conference of 1920 agreed that Governments might add on the passport any useful information as to the passport system.

The Conference agrees to complete the above remark as follows: " and any other indications which the Governments may deem necessary. "

Family Passports.

In connection with a suggestion of the German delegate regarding family passports, it is agreed that the head of the family may travel alone with such a passport, but that it cannot be used by his wife and children travelling without him. It is understood that widows should be regarded as heads of families.

Additional Pages prohibited.

The Paris Conference of 1920 decided that, when all the pages of a passport had been used, it should be withdrawn and a new passport issued. The Conference hopes that this decision will be confirmed, the use of additional pages or slips being prohibited.

Collective Lists.

The Conference sees no objection to the use of collective lists in lieu of passports for collective journeys by members of clubs or societies. It is understood that permission must in the first place be applied for from the Governments concerned, who will grant it subject to certain conditions enabling a check to be kept.
