

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

C.5.1931.I.

Communicated to
the Members of
the Council.

Geneva,

January 2nd, 1931.

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES.

ANNUAL COMMUNICATION CONCERNING THE RESULT OF THE
EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS BY MINORITIES COMMITTEES.

Note by the Secretary-General.

In accordance with the terms of paragraph 4 (ii) of the Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, the Secretary-General has the honour to circulate, for the information of the Members of the Council, copies of the letters addressed to him for communication to the Members of the Council during the year 1930 under paragraph 4 (i) of this resolution.

The following are the letters in question:-

1. Letter from the Representatives of Italy, Great Britain and Finland, concerning petitions from Mgr. Ierotheos.
(Doc.C.104.1930.I).
2. Letter from the Representatives of Persia, France and Spain, concerning a petition from M. Reinhard Martin.
(Doc.C.109.1930.I).
3. Letter from the Representatives of Italy, Persia and Spain, concerning a petition from the "Union of Intellectuals from the district of Neustadt" and the "Union of Intellectuals from the district of Leobschütz".
(Doc.C.110.1930.I).
4. Letter from the Representatives of Japan, Finland and Spain, concerning a petition from the Armenian Catholic Patriarchate of Cilicia.
(Doc.C.111.1930.I).
5. Letter from the Representatives of Italy, Great Britain and Persia, concerning two petitions from the "Fürsorge Institution für Pensionisten" of Vienna.
(Doc.C.117.1930.I).

6. Letter from the Representatives of Persia, Germany and Peru, concerning a petition from the "Union des Bulgares de Bessarabie en Bulgarie".
(Doc.C.119.1930.I).
7. Letter from the Representatives of France, Italy and Venezuela, concerning a petition from Dr. Dutczak.
(Doc.C.120.1930.I).
8. Letter from the Representatives of Finland, Great Britain and Italy, concerning a petition from 34 persons of Russian origin living in Lithuania.
(Doc.C.173.1930.I).
9. Letter from the Representatives of Cuba, Canada and France, concerning a number of petitions from, respectively, the Russian Monastery of St. Panteleimon, the Bulgarian Monastery "Zograf" and the Russian Skite (Hermitage) of St. Andrew on Mount Athos.
(Doc.C.334.1930.I).
10. Letter from the Representatives of Finland, Canada and Spain, concerning two petitions from the Armenian Catholic Bishops.
(Doc.C.335.1930.I).
11. Letter from the Representatives of Poland, Great Britain and Finland, concerning two petitions from M. Chaleff, M. Ilieff and M. Anastassoff.
(Doc.C.336.1930.I).
12. Letter from the Representatives of Persia, Great Britain and Italy, concerning a petition from M. Witaly.
(Doc. C.361.1930.I.).
13. Letter from the Representatives of Poland, Finland and Venezuela, concerning petitions of M. Emeric Prokopy.
(Doc. C.599.1930.I.).
14. Letter from the Representatives of Yugoslavia, Spain and Venezuela, concerning a petition of M. Philippe Pulyk.
(Doc. C.600.1930.I.).
15. Letter from the Representatives of Venezuela, Great Britain and Italy, concerning a petition of M. Heinrich Busch.
(Doc. C.602.1930.I.).
16. Letter from the Representatives of Poland, France and Peru, concerning two petitions from, respectively, the Russian Monastery of St. Panveleimon and the Bulgarian Monastery "Zograf".
(Doc. C.603.1930.I.).

1. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF ITALY, GREAT BRITAIN
AND FINLAND CONCERNING PETITIONS FROM Mgr. IEROOTHEOS.

Geneva,

January 16th, 1930.

translation.

A Minorities Committee, formed in accordance with the resolution of October 25th, 1930, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine the petitions of Mgr. Ierotheos regarding his personal situation and that of the Orthodox population in Albania, together with the Albanian Government's observations thereon. (See documents C.152, C.159, C.165, C.293 and C.296, 1929.I). At its first meeting on June 10th, 1929, at Madrid, the Committee examined the statements of the petitioner according to which certain persons had been imprisoned or had suffered ill-treatment as the result of their refusal to adhere to the new ecclesiastical organisation established by the Albanian Government. The Director of the Minorities Section was instructed by the Committee to inform the Albanian Government that the Committee would be glad to receive more ample explanations on this point.

The Committee held a further meeting on September 18th, 1929, at which it examined the information communicated by the Albanian Government in its letters dated June 5th and 18th (see documents C.293 and C.296, 1929.I), and lastly in its letter of July 18th, 1929. According to the Albanian Government, the measures it felt constrained to adopt in the case of certain individuals were not dictated by reason of

their religious beliefs, but because they had endeavoured to exploit the religious feelings of the Orthodox population in order to provoke internal disorders that were harmful to the re-organisation of the country and to public peace and security. Moreover, the Government emphasised the national character of the new ecclesiastical organisation which, it said, had been established and unanimously approved by the Orthodox population itself. At this same meeting on September 18th, 1929, the Committee was informed by the Director of the Minorities Section of certain guarantees which the Albanian Minister for Foreign Affairs had himself given you as regards the respecting of all religious beliefs in Albania, and the assurance that no one would be molested in Albania on account of his religion or the denomination to which he desired to belong. These very explicit assurances, given personally by the Albanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, were regarded as satisfactory, seeing that the question on which the Committee felt bound to concentrate its attention was that of ascertaining whether the freedom to profess, in public or private, any creed, religion or belief whose practices were not inconsistent with public order and morals, and the right to change from one religion to another, were ensured in Albania in conformity with the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Albanian Declaration regarding the Protection of Minorities.

In these circumstances, the Committee decided that its members were not called upon to draw the Council's attention to the questions referred to in the petitions from Mgr. Ierotheos concerning his personal situation and that of the Orthodox population in Albania.

As paragraph 4(i) of the Council resolution of June 15th, 1929, provides that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question, without

2. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF PERBIA, FRANCE AND SPAIN, CONCERNING A PETITION FROM Mr. REINHARD MARTIN.

Geneva,

January 16th, 1930.

(Translation)

Under the Council resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine a petition from M. Reinhard Martin concerning the expropriation of the property of his father, M. Julius Martin, at Kowalewo, together with a letter from the Polish Government containing its observations on the petition (see Doc. C.526.1929.I.).

Without going into the question whether or no the Council is competent to give its opinion on the application of the decision arrived at by the qualified authorities in virtue of the Council resolution of June 17th, 1924*, the Committee desires to say that it appears from the Polish Government's observations that M. Martin received no compensation for the expropriation of his property, because the deed of sale whereby the former owner ceded the land to M. Julius Martin had not, it appears, been confirmed by the competent authorities. The reasons why the deed was not confirmed (the refusal to confirm being approved by the Ministry for Agrarian Reforms) have, according to the Polish

* Note by the Secretary-General.

By this resolution, the Council took note of the agreement reached between the Polish Government and a Committee of the Council appointed to settle, in agreement with the Polish Government, the question of the German settlers in Poland. This agreement provided that a lump sum should be distributed as compensation amongst the settlers entitled to claim Polish nationality, and that the apportionment of this sum should be carried out by an homme de confiance of the Polish Government, appointed by the Minister for Agrarian Reforms. This official should deal directly with the settlers concerned or with their personal or collective representatives. His decisions regarding the apportionment of the compensation would be final. (Official Journal, Vth Year, No.7, July 1924, pp. 926 and 1020).

Government, nothing to do with the fact that the petitioner belongs to a minority. Consequently, the Committee did not think that it should take any action in the matter.

As the Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, para: 4.(i) provides that, when the Members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information, we have the honour to ask you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter to the other Members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) M. A. FOROUGHI,
Quinones de LEON,
R. MASSIGLI.

3. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF ITALY, PERSIA AND SPAIN, CONCERNING A PETITION FROM THE "UNION OF INTELLECTUALS FROM THE DISTRICT OF NEUSTADT" AND THE "UNION OF INTELLECTUALS FROM THE DISTRICT OF LEOBSCHUTZ".

Geneva,

January 16th, 1930.

Translation.

Under the Council resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three of which we have had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine a petition dated December 10th, 1928, from the "Union of Intellectuals from the district of Neustadt", and the "Union of Intellectuals from the district of Leobschutz", concerning the language used in teaching members of the minority and at divine service in these districts, together with the German Government's observations thereon (Doc. C.196.1929.I.).

The Committee, which had already come to a decision on the basis of the information which the German Government was good enough to supply on the first point - viz., the use of the Polish and Moravian languages in the districts of Neustadt and Leobschutz, informed the petitioners on September 5th, 1929, through the Secretariat, that, according to the information communicated by the German Government, an application would have to be made by the members of the minority themselves before a minority school could be set up.

As regards the districts where the number of Polish services has been reduced, the Committee, after taking note, at the meeting held on January 14th, of the information communicated by the German Government in its letter of November 11th, 1929, decided that it was not essential to continue its examination of the question.

The Committee, having thus concluded its consideration of the two points dealt with in the petition of the priests Robota and Koziolok of Kattowitz, has decided that there is no need for any of its members to draw the Council's attention to the matters in question.

In terminating its examination of this petition, the Committee expressed the wish that the competent authorities should allow the majority language to be substituted for the minority language at divine service only in cases where, as at Olbersdorf, this was the express desire of the congregation.

As the Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, para: 4.(i), provides that, when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information, we have the honour to ask you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter to the other Members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) PILOTTI,
Quinones de LEON,
M. A. FOROUGHI.

4. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF JAPAN, FINLAND AND SPAIN,
CONCERNING A PETITION FROM THE ARMENIAN CATHOLIC
PATRIARCHATE OF CILICIA.

Geneva,

January 16th, 1930.

translation.

A Minorities Committee set up in virtue of the resolution of October 25th, 1920, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine a petition from the Armenian Catholic Patriarchate of Cilicia concerning the assassination of Father Joseph Emirkhanian and the situation of the Christian population in Turkey, together with the Turkish Government's observations thereon (see Doc. C.508.1929.I.).

At the meeting of the Committee held at Geneva on January 13th, 1930, we carefully considered the Turkish Government's observations, contained in a note dated October 6th, 1929, from the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the effect that the incident constituting the main subject of the petition was a crime under the ordinary law and thus subject to ordinary criminal procedure.

Having regard to these circumstances and to the fact that the allegations contained in the petition concerning the situation of the Christian population in Turkey have already been mentioned in a petition from the Armenian Catholic Bishops in Turkey* under examination by another Committee of the Council, the Committee decided to conclude its examination of this petition without bringing it to the notice of the Council.

As the Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, para:4(i) provides that, when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question, without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information, we have the honour to ask you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter to the other Members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) ITO,
Quinones de LEON,
Hj. J. PRCCOPE.

* See Doc. C.8.1929.I.

5. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF ITALY, GREAT BRITAIN AND PERSIA, CONCERNING TWO PETITIONS FROM THE "FÜRSORGE INSTITUTION FÜR PENSIONISTEN" OF VIENNA.

Geneva,

January 16th, 1930.

translation.

Under the Council resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine two petitions, dated May 25th, and July 8th, 1928 respectively, from the "Fürsorge Institution für Pensionisten" of Vienna, concerning the situation of pensioners from Bukovina belonging to minorities in Roumania and living in Austria, and the Roumanian Government's observations thereon (see Document C.174.1929.I.).

The Committee held three meetings, in June and September 1929 and January 1930. In reply to verbal and written requests made by the Secretariat on behalf of the Committee after its first two meetings, the Roumanian Government sent a letter dated January 4th, 1930, providing certain information regarding the case.

At its third meeting, held on January 13th, 1930, during the present session of the Council, the Committee, having noted the contents of that letter, considered that there was no need for any of its members to refer to the Council the concrete questions raised in these petitions.

The Council resolution of June 13th, 1929 provides (paragraph 4(i)) that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question, without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information. We have therefore the honour to request you to communicate the contents of this letter for the information of the other Members of the Council.

(Signed) PILOTTI,
Hugh DALTON,
M. A. FOROUGHJI.

LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF PERSIA, GERMANY AND PERU
CONCERNING A PETITION FROM THE "UNION DES BULGARES DE
BESSARABIE EN BULGARIE"

Resolution.

Under the Council Resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to consider a petition from the "Union des Bulgares de Bessarabie en Bulgarie", concerning the situation of the population of Bulgarian origin living in Bessarabia, together with the observations of the Roumanian Government relating thereto (see Document C. 578. 1929.I).

The Committee met during the present session of the Council, on January 16th, 1930. At that meeting the Committee, taking into consideration, on the one hand, the information supplied by the Roumanian Government in its observations and, on the other, the general nature of the petition and the absence of details with regard to the grievances stated therein, decided that it was not necessary for any of its members to bring this matter before the Council.

The Council Resolution of June 13th, 1929, paragraph 4 (i) provides that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question, without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information. We have therefore the honour to ask you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter for the information of the other Members of the Council.

(Signed) M.A. FOROUGHI
Dated Geneva, January 17th, 1930.
(Signed) FREYTAC
Dated Geneva, January 17th, 1930.
(Signed) M. H. CORNEJO
Dated Paris, January 24th, 1930.

7. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF FRANCE, ITALY AND VENEZUELA CONCERNING A PETITION FROM Dr. DUTCZAK.

Geneva, January 16th, 1930.

Translation.

Under the Council resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of three, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine a petition dated May 12th, 1928, from Dr. Dutzak of Cernauti, concerning the situation of the Ukrainian minority in Bukovina, and the Roumanian Government's observations thereon (see Document C.18.1929.I).

In March, June and September 1929, the Committee held three meetings, at which it expressed a desire to receive from the Roumanian Government certain additional information. This the Government sent to the Committee by letters dated April 29th and June 27th, 1929, and January 6th, 1930, respectively.

During the present session of the Council the Committee held a fourth meeting at Geneva on January 13th, 1930. At this meeting it noted the new information communicated by the Roumanian Government in its letter of January 6th, 1930, and also certain documents, referred to in the letter, which the Roumanian Permanent Delegation subsequently placed at its disposal. At this meeting the Committee took special note of the passages in the letter in question stating, in particular, that the Roumanian Government contemplated the introduction in Northern Bukovina of school teaching in the Ukrainian language for one hour a day for all children whose parents so desired, and this irrespective of their racial origin; and further that, as regards the general question, the Roumanian Government

proposed to lay before Parliament a law providing a final settlement of the problem of the use of minority languages for administrative, educational and religious purposes. Taking into account, moreover, the Roumanian Government's statement that the measures it contemplated to meet the specific point mentioned above were such as to give full satisfaction to the whole of the Ukrainian population in Bukovina, the Committee decided that in the circumstances, there was no need for it to continue its examination of the question raised in Dr. Dutczak's petition. On concluding its work, however, it instructed the Secretariat to inform the Roumanian Government that the members of the Committee hoped to receive for their information as soon as possible from that Government, the texts of the ministerial decrees the adoption of which was announced in the Government's letter of January 6th, 1930, and of the general law also referred to in that letter.

The Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, provides (paragraph 4 (i)) that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information. We have therefore the honour to request you to communicate the contents of this letter to the other Members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) R. Massigli.
Pilotti,
(for the Representative of Venezuela)
Oscar Aguilar.

8. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF FINLAND, GREAT BRITAIN AND
IRELAND, CONCERNING A PETITION FROM 34 PERSONS OF RUSSIAN ORIGIN
LIVING IN LITHUANIA.

Translation.

In pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Council on January 15th, 1930, the Minorities Committee of which we had the honour to be members, and which had already examined a petition from 34 persons of Russian origin living in Lithuania, dated August 21st, 1928,¹⁾ held a further meeting on January 16th, at which His Excellency M. Zaunius, the Lithuanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, was good enough to give certain verbal explanations with regard to the question submitted to the Committee.

At this meeting, the Committee took note of the information given in the letter from the Lithuanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, dated January 14th, 1930 (Document C.69.1930.I), stating that the confiscations referred to in the petition were effected under Article I, § (d) of the Lithuanian Agrarian Reform Law of March 29th, 1922, which reads as follows:-

Article I.

"For the purposes of agrarian reform, the following lands are taken:

.....
(d) Property of various private persons confiscated by the Russian Government after January 1st, 1918, and distributed to colonists and other persons for the purposes of 'russification' if such property is in the possession of the persons to whom it was given or their heirs."

1) See Documents C. 594.1928.I, C.222, C.227, C.286, C.288, C.487 and C.580. 1929.I. and Documents C.69 and C.75 1930.I.

In his letter, the Lithuanian Minister of Foreign Affairs states that the provisions of this Article apply to all the holders of the territories referred to therein, without distinction of race, language or religion.

On the basis of this information and of the verbal explanation given by His Excellency M. Zaunius, the situation appeared to the Committee to be as follows:-

1. The above-mentioned clause of the Lithuanian Agrarian Law, under which the confiscations referred to in the petition were effected, applies to persons whose land was formerly confiscated by the Russian Government, irrespective of their nationality. Thus, on the one hand, landowners of various nationalities, including Lithuanians, were deprived of their land under this Article of the Law, while, on the other hand, the interests of some 20,000 Lithuanian nationals belonging to the Russian minority were not affected by this Article of the Agrarian Law.

2. The reason nearly all the persons referred to in the petition received no compensation was that they were not in a position to prove that they had paid the Russian Government the whole or part of the sums which they were required to pay for the colonies allotted to them after the confiscations had been effected. A new law has been recently promulgated under which such persons will be granted compensation amounting to 50% of the present value of the expropriated land.

3. A new clause has been recently added to the Lithuanian Agrarian Law, entitling persons whose land was expropriated under Article I, § (d), of that Law to receive

plots as a result of the dividing up of the land effected in application of the agrarian reform.

As a result of these findings, the Committee considered that it should conclude the examination of the question submitted to it without bringing it again to the notice of the Council.

The resolution of June 13th, 1929, paragraph 4 (i) provides that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other members of the Council for their information. We would accordingly request you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter to the other members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) Hj. J. Procope
(dated Helsingfors, February 13th, 1930)

Hugh Dalton.
(dated London, February 19th, 1930).

Grandi.
(dated Rome, February 28th, 1930).

9. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF CUBA, CANADA AND FRANCE,

CONCERNING A NUMBER OF PETITIONS FROM, RESPECTIVELY, THE RUSSIAN
9. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF CUBA, CANADA AND FRANCE,
MONASTERY OF ST. PANTELEIMON, THE BULGARIAN MONASTERY "ZOGRAF"
AND THE RUSSIAN SKITE (HERMITAGE) OF St. ANDREW ON MOUNT ATHOS.

Translation.

Geneva, May 15th, 1930.

In virtue of the Council resolution of October 25th, 1920, two Minorities Committees, which ultimately combined and sat as one Committee and of which we had the honour to be members, examined a number of petitions submitted respectively by the Russian Monastery of St. Panteleimon, the Bulgarian Monastery "Zograf," and the Russian Skite (Hermitage) of St. Andrew on Mount Athos, together with the Greek Government's observations thereon.

The unusually complex points raised in these petitions are dealt with in a number of documents and have necessitated lengthy and exhaustive examination by the aforesaid Committees: it seems expedient, therefore, to deal in some detail with the information placed before us. This may be summarised as follows:

1.- The three Communities had expressly quoted in their petitions the provisions of Article 13 of the Greek Minorities Treaty, signed at Sèvres on August 10th, 1920, which reads as follows:

"Greece undertakes to recognise and maintain the traditional rights and liberties enjoyed by the non-Greek monastic communities of Mount Athos under Article 62 of the Treaty of Berlin of July 13th, 1878."

Article 62 of the Treaty of Berlin contains the following provision:

"The monks of Mount Athos, of whatever country they may be natives, shall be maintained in their former possessions and advantages, and shall enjoy, without any exception, complete equality of rights and prerogatives."

II.-

a) Petitions from the Monastery of St. Panteleimon.

The petition from the Monastery of St. Panteleimon, dated November 25th, 1927, and the three supplementary petitions from that community, dated March 12th and October 14th, 1928, and July 2nd, 1929 (Documents C.155.1928.I., C.322.1928.I., C.78.1929.I., and C.82.1930.I), concerned the expropriation by the Greek Government in 1924 of three "métoques" (dependencies) situated on Greek territory at Kalamaria, Cassandra and Sikia and of a forest situated on the Mount Athos Peninsula, all belonging to that Monastery.

In the first of these petitions the petitioners requested, in particular, the restitution of the "métoques" in the state in which they were on the date of expropriation, or alternatively payment in cash of their entire value on that date.

In their subsequent petitions they pointed out that:

1. The Monastery, unlike the expropriated Greek monasteries to which sums were regularly allocated as rent, had not received any compensation on the expropriation of its "métoques" (petition of March 12th, 1928) :

2. Despite the assurances given by the Greek Government, the work of valuing the expropriated "métoques" had not yet been begun (petition of October 14th 1928);

3. a) The representatives of the community concerned had not been invited to take part in the work of the Commission appointed to value the expropriated "métoques"; this Commission consisted only of two persons, the Deputy Prefect of Chalcidice and the Head of the Settlement Office in the Peninsula, neither of whom possessed the necessary technical qualifications for valuing these properties;

b) the valuation was based on inaccurate and erroneous data, taking into account neither the real value of the expropriated land, buildings and dependencies, nor the income accruing therefrom, nor, in certain cases, the actual area of the land (petition of July 2nd, 1929).

b) Petitions from the Bulgarian Monastery "Zograf."

The petitions from the Bulgarian Monastery "Zograf" dated January 31st and November 5th, 1928 and July 7th, 1929 (Documents C.320.1928.I., C.77.1929.I., and C.81.1930.I), related to the expropriation by the Greek authorities of two "métoques" situated in Greek territory and to the leasing by the same authorities in 1926 of six other "métoques", also situated in Greek territory, for the purpose of refugee settlement.

The "Zograf" Monastery had stated, in its first petition, that it was prepared to consent to the purchase of its "métoques" by the Greek Government on payment of a sum equivalent to their real value on the date of expropriation. It brought forward, in its subsequent petitions, grievances similar to those above described.

c) Petitions from the Russian Skite (Hermitage) of St. Andrew.

The petitions from the Russian Skite of St. Andrew, dated respectively November 24th, 1927, March 12th and November 2nd, 1928 and July 5th 1929, (Documents C.147.1928.I., C.321.1928.I., C.79.1929.I., and C.83.1930.I), related to the expropriation, on January 15th, 1919, by the Greek Government, for the purpose of refugee settlement, of the Nouzla "métoque", situated on Greek territory near Cavalla and belonging to the community.

Recognising the impossibility of having this "métoque" restored to them owing to the transformations which it had undergone, the petitioners, in their first petition, claimed the payment by the Greek Government of the real value of the property. They demanded, further, compensation for having been deprived, during eight years, of the income accruing from the property and damages for the depreciation caused in 1916 during its occupation by the Bulgarian authorities.

The supplementary petitions from the Skite of St. Andrew dated March 12th and November 2nd, 1928, raised the same question as those mentioned in the petitions from the Monastery of St. Panteleimon which are summarised above under paragraphs 1. and 2.

In its further petition, of July 5th, 1929, the Skite of St. Andrew presented a number of arguments in favour of its right of ownership, which the Greek Government contested on the grounds that the community was subordinate to a supreme monastery, the Vatopedion.

A Committee of the Council, consisting of the Representatives of Colombia (replaced first by the representative of Chile and subsequently by the representative of Cuba), Canada and France, examined these petitions at its meetings on June 5th, September 5th, and December 14th, 1928, March 4th, June 13th and September 24th, 1929 and January 14th, and May 12th, 1930. At these meetings it had before it firstly the original observations submitted by the Greek Government, to be found in the relevant Council documents, and, secondly, the information, explanations and texts furnished by that Government in reply to the various requests of the Committee conveyed by letters from the Minorities Section of the Secretariat, dated June 13th and September 13th, 1928, January 25th, March 23rd, April 2nd, July 1st, and November 4th, 1929 and January 18th, 1930. These further observations and supplementary information supplied by the Greek Government are summarised below in chronological order:

Cases of the Monasteries of St. Panteleimon and "Zograf."

Observations of March 8th, and June 1st, 1928 -

The question of the Mount Athos monastic properties was settled by the provisions of the decree of December 2nd, 1926 (ratified

by the Law of December 10th, 1927). This Decree provides:-

1. That compensation for the alienated agricultural properties shall be assessed on the basis of the real value of such properties on the date of expropriation;

2. That the sum payable by way of compensation shall be deposited, in conformity with agreements to be concluded between the Government, the National Bank of Greece and the Mount Athos community, in the form either of cash or of securities at the National Bank of Greece, as an inalienable fund, the several Monasteries being entitled only to such share of the interest as accrues to them.

Note of June 2nd, 1928. - In application of the law of November 10th, 1927, the Minister of Agriculture appointed a Commission to value the "métoques" of the Holy Mountain with a view to the immediate payment to the claimants of compensation by way of final settlement.

Note following the letter of June 2nd 1928. - All the monasteries, without distinction, whose properties have been leased out under a contract, regularly receive in cash the sums specified. Monasteries which have been expropriated will receive, also without distinction, the sums to be allocated to them on assessment. This assessment has been delayed owing to the necessity of similar proceedings in regard to all the properties affected by the Greek agrarian law.

Letter of December 12th, 1928 - The Government has decided to deposit at the National Bank of Greece the sum of five million drachmae in the name of the monasteries concerned.

Letters of February 18th and 25th, 1929. - The Greek Government has paid into the National Bank the sum of five million drachmae to the account of these Monasteries by way of an advance in respect of the value of the expropriated "métoques".

Letter of August 15th, 1929 - The work of valuation criticised in the petitions is simply in the nature of provisional measures with a view to determining the "expropriation rent". The delay in the final valuation of the property in question is due to a request for adjournment submitted by the communities themselves just when the "expropriation rent" was being finally fixed; the Expropriation Commission is still engaged, however, in collecting the material required for the purposes of final valuation. Questions of expropriation are dealt with as a whole by the Greek authorities, in conformity with the laws of the country, no distinction being made between Greek and non-Greek monasteries. The sum of five million drachmae was not paid in only in the name of these particular monasteries but in the name also of other communities in a similar situation.

Letter of November 13th, 1929 - The following sums were allocated as rent for the period 1924/28: to the Monastery of St. Panteleimon, the sums of 537,556 drachmae for the Cassandra "métoque" and 641,865 drachmae for the Kalamaria "métoque" and to the "Zograf" Monastery, the sum of 614,478 drachmae for the Kalamaria "métoque". The two monasteries can now receive the annual rents fixed on the basis of the provisional valuations of their expropriated "métoques".

Letter of January 12th, 1930 - The Government communicates the text of the articles of the Greek Agrarian Law governing expropriation procedure. The Government states that according to the law:

1. the opinion of the Expropriation Commission as regards compensation is purely advisory;
2. the owners are summoned to take cognizance of any act relating to expropriation and to submit observations thereon;

3. the Court of First Instance is alone competent to fix the final amount payable as compensation.

The owners will thus have, states the Government, a maximum guarantee, in that the compensation is fixed by judicial decision.

As regards the particular case of the Monasteries of St. Panteleimon and "Zograf", the Government describes the situation as follows:

It has not yet been possible to make the final valuation of the properties, owing to the difficulties arising out of the extensive survey and valuation work covering the whole of Greek territory. The valuations relating to the expropriated " métoques " are purely provisional and will not effect in any way the final result. The Monasteries can at present receive "expropriation rents", the amount of which is fixed subject to the difference which may be found to exist, to the monasteries' advantage, between the present expropriation rent and the interest on the amount as finally valued.

The Government adds that every effort is being made to carry out this final valuation as quickly as possible "in order that fair compensation may be paid to the expropriated monasteries in conformity with the undertakings entered into".

Case of the Russian Skite of St. Andrew.

Supplementary observations and communications of March 8th, June 1st, July 28th and December 19th, 1928, and July 11th, 1929 - In reply to the first petition from the Skite of St. Andrew, the Greek Government denies that this community has the right to claim on its own account, against

the expropriation of the "métoque" referred to in the petition Skites being subordinate to supreme monasteries and not being allowed under monastic rules, to own property.

Letter of January 12th, 1930 - The Government, while maintaining its point of view as regards the right of ownership of Skites in general, gives in this particular case the assurances summarised below.

1. The value of the Nouzla "métoque" will be taken into account in assessing the compensation to be allocated to the Vatopedion Monastery;

2. The valuation of the Mount Athos Monastery properties will include this particular "métoque", without any discrimination.

3. The Vatopedion Monastery will place at the disposal of the Skite of St. Andrew the proportion of the compensation corresponding to this particular "métoque".

The Government adds: The Skite will thus not suffer any real danger as the result of expropriation, seeing that it will ultimately receive a share of the compensation representing the value of its expropriated "métoque".

On the basis of the information summarised above the Committee found that the position is as follows:

1). The final valuation of the monastic property whose expropriation forms the subject of the Monasteries' petitions will be carried out in conformity with the procedure laid down in the existing law and at the earliest possible date. The sum payable by way of compensation to the Monasteries will be equal to the real value of the property on the date of expropriation, so that there may be

no change in the real assets of the Monasteries. This sum will be deposited, in conformity with agreements to be concluded between the Government, the National Bank of Greece and the Mount Athos community, in the form either of cash or of securities at the National Bank of Greece, as an inalienable fund, the several Monasteries being entitled only to such proportion of the interest as accrues to them. A sum of five million drachmae has been deposited by way of an advance at the National Bank of Greece in the name of all the Mount Athos Monasteries to which expropriation applies.

2). The object of the valuations to which the Monasteries objected in their last supplementary petitions was not, as the Monasteries appear to think, to determine the compensation payable for expropriation, but to fix the "expropriation rent" to be paid to the expropriated Monasteries until the work of final valuation is complete. The Monasteries of St. Panteleimon and "Zograf" have already received sums representing the rent for the years 1924 to 1928 and will continue to receive the rents fixed on the basis of the provisional valuations of their "métoques". These valuations being provisional may be amended, to the advantage of the Monasteries, if a difference is found to exist between the present expropriation rent and the interest on the amount as finally assessed.

3. The Skite of St. Andrew will not suffer any real loss as the result of expropriation seeing that it will ultimately receive through the Vatopedion Monastery, to which it is subordinate, a proportion of the compensation representing the value of its expropriated "métoque".

At its last meeting the Committee was also informed of the highly reassuring statements made by the Greek Prime Minister on the occasion of a recent visit to the Mount Athos Peninsula and was particularly gratified to note that M. Verizelos' intentions, spontaneously expressed, were in harmony with the efforts made by the Committee. In view of this fact and of the position as stated under 1), 2) and 3) above, the members of the Committee decided that it was unnecessary for any one of them to call the Council's attention to the questions raised in the petitions from the Monasteries of St. Panteleimon and "Zograf" and from the Russian Skite of St. Andrew, these questions being already in regular process of solution.

The Council resolution of June 13th, 1929 (paragraph 4 (i)) provides that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question, without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information. We have the honour, accordingly, to request you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter, for information, to the other Members of the Council.

(Signed) A. de AGUIERO y BEHANCOURT.

" R. DANDURAND.

" R. MASSIGLI.

15. Letter from the Representatives of Finland, Canada and Spain
concerning^{two}petitions from the Armenian Catholic Bishops.

Geneva, May 15th, 1930.

(Translation)

The Minorities Committee of which we had the honour to be members, and whose duty it was to examine the petitions from the Armenian Catholic bishops concerning the position of the Armenian Catholic minority in Turkey (Document C.S.1929.I), held five meetings - during the Council sessions in March, June and September, 1929, and January and May 1930.

✕

✕ ✕

At its meeting on March 8th 1929, the Committee conveyed to the Turkish Government, through the Secretary-General, its desire to obtain certain additional information on the following points:

(1) The composition of the Special Joint Commission which, under Article 43, paragraph 2, of the Treaty of Peace of Lausanne, was to determine the family law and personal status of the Armenian Catholic minority;

(2) The right of non-Moslem Turkish nationals to sell or buy immovable property;

(This point was formulated in the petition in the following general terms:

"The special regulations governing property rights ... expressly and explicitly deny to non-Moslems the right to buy or sell immovable property in certain cases and in certain provinces...")

(3) The extent to which the grants referred to in Article 41, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Treaty of Peace of Lausanne are made by the Turkish Government to non-Moslem public schools in those towns and districts where there is a

considerable proportion of Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities.

(On this point the petitioners make the following general statement:

"As regards the Government and municipal grants provided for in Article 41 in favour of the non-Moslem minorities, we need hardly say that the question has not even been considered.")

*

* *

At its last meeting, held on May 13th, 1930, the Committee had before it a letter from the Turkish Government dated January 5th 1930, containing certain information sent in compliance with the desire expressed by the Committee at its meeting in March 1929.

On the first point the Turkish Government states:

"1. The Commission set up under Article 42 of the Treaty of Lausanne to determine the family law and personal status of the Armenian community was composed as follows:

For the Government of the Republic:

Munir Bey
Sevki Bey
Samim Bey

For the Armenian Community:

Herant Bey
Serkis Karakoc Bey
Alexanian Ohanes Bey

"As soon as the Commission met, a strong difference of opinion was observed among the Armenian members. It will be seen from Annex I-A to the petition that the arguments put forward by Alexanian Ohanes Bey as to the necessity of forming a special Commission for the Armenian Catholics - who, in his view, should be regarded as a separate minority within the Armenian minority - aroused protests from the other Armenian members of the Commission, who rejected this proposal to split in two a minority of the same race and speech on the ground of a difference of cult.

"The Government of the Republic endeavoured to reconcile these two views. The different communities, however, realising the uselessness of determining a family law or personal status in view of the adoption of the Swiss Civil Code by the Government of the Republic, presented

petitions for the abolition of the Commissions appointed to determine their status, on the ground that it was determined in an entirely satisfactory fashion by the new Code.

"The relevant provisions of Article 42 of the Treaty of Lausanne ^{having} been inserted because at the time when the Treaty was signed the question of personal status was governed in Turkey by Sheri's law, - as the minutes on the subject bear witness - the Government of the Republic complied with this request, which represents the considered and freely-expressed will of the minorities.

"As the Armenian Catholics also recognised, in a petition dated April 19th 1926 (one of whose signatories was Alexanish Ohanes Bey), the uselessness of determining a special family law or personal status, the whole object of setting up a Commission for the Armenian Catholics was ipso facto destroyed."

With regard to the second point, the Government states that so far as concerns the possession of immovable property, no legislation has been promulgated in the Turkish Republic which could involve differential treatment between its citizens of different races or creeds. The Government adds that:

"Members of the minorities enjoy complete freedom as regards the right of owning immovable property and freely disposing thereof. They may buy, sell, let, hire, mortgage, and in short conduct all lawful operations and transactions inherent in the right of ownership, on the same footing as Moslem Turkish citizens."

On the third point the Turkish Government states that:

"The Ministry of Education draws the grants for minority schools from the funds allotted for that purpose. The figure is fixed according to the needs of the schools and the funds available. The grants are paid to the communities in question for the proper purposes."

*

*

*

The Committee, noting the explanations thus given by the Government of the Turkish Republic, considered that there was no need for any of its members to bring the questions raised

in these petitions to the notice of the Council.

As the Council resolution of June 13th 1929, paragraph 4(i), lays down that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other members of the Council for their information, we have the honour to request you to communicate the contents of this letter to the other Members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) HJ. J. PROCOPE
" R. DANDURAND
" J. QUINONES DE LEON.

LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF POLAND, GREAT BRITAIN AND
FINLAND CONCERNING TWO PETITIONS FROM M. CHALEFF, M. ILIEFF AND
M. ANASTASSOFF.

Geneva, May 15th, 1930.

(Translation).

Under the Council Resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three, of which we had the honour to be members, was called upon to examine two petitions from M. Chaleff, M. Ilieff and M. Anastassoff regarding the situation in the south of the Yugoslav Kingdom, together with a note from the Yugoslav Government containing its reply concerning the communication of these petitions (See C.242.1930.I).

At a meeting held on May 13th, 1930, the Committee noted the views and information contained in the letter from the Yugoslav Government. It specially noted the objections which that Government, while not formally contesting the receivability of the petitions, raises regarding the kind of source from which these documents emanate. Bearing in mind these objections, and without examining, either the concrete complaints made by the petitioners or the preliminary question as to the existence or non-existence of a Bulgarian minority in Yugoslavia, the Committee decided to dismiss the petitions as not offering satisfactory guarantees of their origin.

The Committee also had before it a memorandum submitted to the members of the Council by the Yugoslav Government containing certain information intended to throw light on the situation in Southern Serbia (See Document C.245.1930.I). The Committee duly noted this information and concluded by expressing the conviction that the Yugoslav Government would do all in its power

to mitigate any difficulties prevailing in these districts.

The Council Resolution of June 13th, 1929, § 4. (i) provides that, when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other members of the Council for their information. We would accordingly ask you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter to the other members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) F. SOKAL.

" ARTHUR HENDERSON.

" RUDOLF HOEFTI.

LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF PERSIA, GREAT BRITAIN AND ITALY
CONCERNING A PETITION FROM M. WITALY.

translation).

The Minorities Committee of which we had the honour to be members, and which was entrusted with the examination of the petition of M. Witaly concerning the situation of the Russian Orthodox minority in Poland (Doc.C.177.1930.I), met on May 12th last. At this meeting the Committee noted the information forwarded by the Polish Government with regard to the petition and considered that there was no occasion for any of its members to bring the questions mentioned in the petition to the attention of the Council.

In view of the Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, paragraph 4(i), which provides that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other members of the Council for their information, we have the honour to request you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter to the other members of the Council for their information.

Paris, May 31st, 1930.
(signed) HUSSEIN ALA.

London, June 18th, 1930.
(signed) ARTHUR HENDERSON.

Rome, June 10th, 1930.
(signed) GRANDI.

LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF POLAND, FINLAND AND VENEZUELA
CONCERNING PETITIONS OF M. EMERIC PROKOPEY.

Geneva, September 27th, 1930.

relation).

In accordance with the Council Resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three, of which we had the honour to be members, was appointed to examine the petitions of M. Emeric Prokopy, concerning the use of the Hungarian language, etc., in the communal administration of Subotica, and the observations of the Yugoslav Government thereon. (Documents C.142 and C.410.1930.I). An examination of the Government's observations enabled the Committee at its meeting on September 16th to finish its study of the point referring to the dismissal of Paul Zödy (Petition dated April 10th, 1930 - Document C.410.1930.I.), and of two of the subsidiary points raised in the same petition, viz., applications for naturalisation made by Hungarians, and the refusal to visa the passports of persons wishing to enter Hungary. The Committee further noted that the other two subsidiary points of the same petition, regarding the dismissal of a certain number of teachers of Hungarian race, and the use of Hungarian in intellectual life formed the subject of other more detailed petitions which will shortly be examined by Minorities Committees, and in these circumstances thought it could also the examination of these two points.

The Committee also examined the case of the dismissal of M. Antoine Zödy, a former employee of the Mairie of Subotica, as well as the question of the use of Hungarian in the communal administration of that town. The Committee noted that it could not go into the question whether, and in accordance with what rules,

the use of Hungarian is permitted in the Subotica communal administration, as the Yugoslav Minorities Treaty contains no obligation concerning the use of a minority language in the public administration. The Committee, accordingly, had to examine the circumstances in which the conversation in Hungarian, which constituted one of the reasons for the dismissal of the employee Zödy, took place. On this point the Committee took into consideration the version of the facts contained in the Yugoslav Government's Note of February 4th, 1930 (Document C.142.1930.I), according to which Antoine Zödy persisted "in addressing in Hungarian, in an annoying manner, a person who had spoken to him in the official language and knew no other". The Committee also noted the statement of the Yugoslav Government to the effect that the dismissal was not due to this fact alone but was the sequel to a whole series of offences committed by Zödy. On the basis of this information, the Committee felt that it could not consider ^{that} the measures taken against Antoine Zödy involved restriction of the use of the minority language in private intercourse, or were contrary to the stipulations of Article 7, paragraph 3 of the Yugoslav Minorities Treaty. The Committee therefore resolved to close its examination of this point also without bringing it to the notice of the Council.

As paragraph 4 (i) of the Council's Resolution of June 13th, 1929 provides that, when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question, without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information, we have the honour to request you to communicate the contents of this letter for the information of the other Members of the Council.

(Signed) F. SGKAL.
" HJ. J. PROCOPE.
" C. ZUMETA.

4. Letter from the Representative of Yugoslavia, Spain and Venezuela concerning a petition of M. Philippe Pulyk

Geneva, October 2nd, 1930.

(translation)

The Minorities Committee of which we had the honour to be members and whose duty it was to examine the petition of M. Philippe Pulyk with regard to his personal position (Document C.345.1930.I.), met on September 26th, 1930.

The petitioner complains of the manner in which his pension as a former Austrian official has been fixed by the Polish administrative authorities. From the very detailed explanations given both by the petitioner and by the Government, it seems that the pension was fixed, not in relation to M. Pulyk's salary, but in relation to the class of his official position in the Austrian administration. The Polish Government explains that M. Pulyk's pension was fixed in accordance with the scales and the legal provisions applicable to all Polish nationals. The Committee noted that according to the statements of the petitioner, which are confirmed by the Polish Government, the question, after being submitted to the Government authorities, has been the subject of a decision by the supreme administrative tribunal.

According to the petitioner, this tribunal's decision was based, among other things, on the fact that he had not appealed against the decision notified to him as to his classification in a particular administrative class. He alleges that the decisions with regard to the fixing of pensions which were notified to Polish officials who were retired, contained a clause with reference to appeal, while

decisions notified to Austrian officials contained no such clause. The Committee considered, however, that, even if there was such discrimination, it was not discrimination between the members of a racial, linguistic, or religious minority and the members of the majority, but an inequality of treatment between two classes of officials, and as such could not constitute a violation of the provisions of the Minorities Treaty, since persons belonging to the majority might also come under the category of "Austrian officials".

For the above reason the Committee considered that there was no ground for any of its members to draw the attention of the Council to the question referred to in the petition.

The Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, paragraph 4 (1), provides that, when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information. We have therefore the honour to request you to be good enough to communicate the contents of this letter for information to the other Members of the Council.

(Signed) Dr. V. MARINKOVITCH

" J. QUINONES de LEON

" C. ZUMETA.

15. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF VENEZUELA, GREAT BRITAIN AND
ITALY CONCERNING A PETITION OF M. HEINRICH BUSCH.

Geneva,

October 2nd, 1930.

(translation).

The Minorities Committee of which we had the honour to be members held a meeting on September 27th, 1930, to examine the petition of M. Heinrich Busch of Brodna with regard to a supplementary payment exacted by the Polish fiscal authorities for the sale of alcoholic liquors (Document C.482.1930.I.).

The petitioner raises in very general terms certain points with regard to a withdrawal of a permit to cross the Polish-German frontier, an order given by the Frontier Commissioner to his subordinates forbidding the latter to make purchases from the petitioner, and in particular the fact that a supplementary payment and a fine have been exacted from him by the Polish fiscal authorities for the sale of alcohol. The Polish Government has explained that the steps taken in the case of the petitioner are based on the law of July 15th, 1925, concerning income tax, under which the petitioner was required to obtain a licence of the second, and not of the third, category. The Committee further noted that, according to the statements of the petitioner himself, the question has been the subject of judicial or quasi-judicial decisions in Poland. In these circumstances the Committee could not conclude that there had been any infraction, or danger of infraction, of the clauses relating to equality of treatment in the Polish Minorities Treaty, and decided accordingly to finish the examination of the question without drawing the attention of the Council to the matter.

The Council resolution of June 13th, 1923, paragraph 4 (1), provides that, when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed on the Council's agenda, they will communicate the result of their examination by letter to the other members of the Council for their information. We have the honour, accordingly, to request you to communicate the contents of this letter for information to the other members of the Council.

(Signed) G. ZUMETA.

" Alexander GADOGAN.

" PILOTTI.

16. LETTER FROM THE REPRESENTATIVES OF POLAND, FRANCE AND PERU,
CONCERNING TWO PETITIONS, RESPECTIVELY, FROM THE RUSSIAN
MONASTERY OF ST. PANTELEIMON AND THE BULGARIAN MONASTERY
"ZOGRAF".

Geneva, October 3rd, 1930.

(translation).

In virtue of the Council resolution of October 25th, 1920, a Committee of Three, of which we had the honour to be members was appointed to examine two petitions dated March 12th and 15th, 1930, submitted respectively by the Russian Monastery of St. Pantéléimon and the Bulgarian Monastery "Zograf" on Mount Athos, concerning the position of these two communities.

It was stated in these petitions that the Greek Government had recently tabled with the Chamber of Deputies a Bill, the provisions of which would contravene the traditional rights and privileges guaranteed by the Minorities Treaty to the non-Greek communities on Mount Athos.

The Committee held a meeting on September 30th, 1930, during the present session of the Council. At this meeting the Committee noted a letter, dated July 17th, 1930, from the Greek Chargé d'Affaires in Switzerland, informing it that his Government had no intention of revising the Statute of the communities on Mount Athos in such a way as to affect the rights and privileges which it conferred upon them, and that the Greek Government had long ago withdrawn the Bill mentioned in the petitions from the monasteries.

The Committee considered that in these circumstances it was unnecessary for it to examine the substance of the petitions and therefore decided to finish the examination of this question without referring it to the Council.

The Council resolution of June 13th, 1929, § 4(i) provides that when the members of a Minorities Committee have finished the examination of a question without asking that it be placed upon the Council's agenda, they will communicate the results of such examination by letter to the other Members of the Council for their information. We have the honour, accordingly, to request you to communicate the contents of this letter for information to the other Members of the Council.

(Signed) F. SOKAL.

R. MASSIMI.

J.M. BARRETO.