LIST OF PAPERS

[Unless otherwise specified, the correspondence is *from* or *to* officials in the Department of State.

GENERAL

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Feb. 3 (24)	*To the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Instructions to make advance arrangements for delivery to Foreign Office on February 10 of memorandum and message of President Coolidge, texts of which will be transmitted by telegrams Nos. 25 and 26. (Footnote: The same, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Embassies in Great Britain and Italy; similar instructions to the Embassy in Japan.)	1
Feb. 3 (25)	*To the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Memorandum for French Government (text printed), inquiring whether, as a signatory to the Washington treaty limiting naval armament, France is disposed to empower her delegates on the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, pending the results of the Conference, to negotiate and conclude a further naval limitation agreement, supplementing the Washington treaty and covering the classes of vessels not dealt with by that treaty. (Footnote: Instructions to repeat text of memorandum to Great Britain and Italy. A similar telegram was sent to the Embassy in Japan.)	1
Feb. 3 (14)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Instructions to supplement presentation of memorandum by oral expression of U. S. views.	5
Feb. 3 (26)	*To the Ambassador in France (tel.)* President Coolidge's proposed message to Congress (text printed), outlining the considerations which prompted him to direct the presentation of a proposal for further naval limitation to the Washington treaty signatories. (Footnotes: Instructions to repeat to Great Britain and Italy. A similar telegram was sent to Japan. Information that the President's message was communicated to Congress on February 10.)	6
Feb. 3 (27)	*To the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Instructions to supplement presentation of memorandum by oral expression of U. S. views.	9
Feb. 7 (5)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Transmittal of text of naval limitation memorandum, with instructions to present copy to Foreign Minister on February 10, as a matter of courtesy and for his Government's information. (Footnote: Instructions to repeat to Argentina. A similar telegram was sent to Brazil.)	9

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Feb. 15 (66)	*From the Ambassador in France (tel.)* French reply (text printed), stating inability to accept suggestion for separate naval limitation agreement among signatories of Washington treaty because of conviction that naval limitation can be dealt with effectively only by the Preparatory Commission.	10
Feb. 19	*From the Japanese Embassy* Acceptance of proposal to participate in negotiations for further naval limitation.	13
Feb. 21 (24)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Information that a negative reply has been received from the Italian Government.	14
Feb. 21 (25)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Italian reply (text printed), giving among other reasons for inability to accede to U. S. proposal, the fact that Italy's unfavorable geographical position prevents limitation of her already insufficient naval armament.	14
Feb. 21 (26)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Observation that no effective naval limitation in the Mediterranean can be accomplished until Italo-French relations improve.	16
Feb. 21 (39)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Information from British Ambassador that his Government is sympathetically considering U. S. proposal, but that reply will be delayed because of necessity to consult Dominions. Press reports of favorable attitude of Prime Minister Baldwin and Foreign Secretary Chamberlain and emphatic opposition of Bridgeman, First Lord of the Admiralty; authorization, if deemed wise, to discuss the whole matter with Chamberlain.	17
Feb. 22	*Memorandum by the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs* Conversation in which the Italian Ambassador was told, in reply to his Government's suggestion that Italy would reconsider refusal to participate if assured in advance that Italo-French parity established by Washington treaty would not be disturbed, that it was just such questions which would have to be studied by the Naval Conference. Further outline to Ambassador of reasons why Italy should be interested in participating, and Ambassador's intention to cable his Government.	17
Feb. 22 (20)	*From the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Communication from Argentine Government (text printed), stating that the question of naval limitation should await action of Preparatory Commission.	19
Feb. 24 (7)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Instructions, should suitable occasion be presented, to advise Foreign Minister that Argentine reply to communication of February 7 appears to have been occasioned by some misunderstanding, and that replies are not expected from Brazil or Chile. (Footnote: Sent also, *mutatis mutandis*, to Brazil. The Embassy in Argentina was informed by telegram to the same effect.)	20

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Feb. 24 (46)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Emphatic assurance by Bridgeman of his desire for Naval Conference and indication that favorable British reply may be expected following receipt of answers from Dominions.	20
Feb. 24	*Memorandum by the Under Secretary of State* Conversation in which the Italian Ambassador was informed that the United States could not guarantee in advance that Conference would maintain Franco-Italian parity, even if such guarantee would enable Italy to reconsider refusal to attend Conference.	21
Feb. 25 (48)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Draft of British reply (text printed) accepting U. S. invitation, to be made public on February 28 following receipt of expected favorable replies from Dominions.	22
Mar. 5	*Memorandum by the Under Secretary of State* Report of separate conversations with the British and Japanese Ambassadors, in which each expressed his personal opinion that in spite of French and Italian refusals, his Government would agree to discuss naval limitation with the other two powers. Informal approval by Ambassadors of plan to invite France and Italy to send observers.	23
Mar. 5 (17)	*To the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Information concerning Italian Ambassador's discussions at the Department with regard to Italy's attitude toward naval limitation, and his intention to try to persuade his Government to reconsider refusal. U. S. request of British and Japanese Ambassadors that they ascertain whether procedure upon three-power basis would be agreeable to their Governments. (Footnote: Information that paragraph concerning procedure upon three-power basis was cabled to Embassies in Great Britain and Japan.)	24
Mar. 8 (49)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions to advise Chamberlain that an indication to Japanese Government of British attitude toward Three-Power Conference will facilitate Japanese reply.	26
Mar. 9 (59)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Information that copy of British acceptance of Three-Power Conference proposal has been sent to British Embassy at Tokyo.	26
Mar. 10	*Memorandum by the Under Secretary of State* Conversation in which British Ambassador read his Government's informal acceptance (text printed).	26
Mar. 11	*From the Japanese Embassy* Acceptance of invitation to Three-Power Conference.	27
Mar. 11	*To the Japanese Ambassador* Formal confirmation of Three-Power Conference proposal, with expression of hope that France and Italy may be represented at least informally, and information that discussions will begin at Geneva about June 1. (Footnote: Sent, *mutatis mutandis*, to the British Ambassador.)	28

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Mar. 12 (72)	*To the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Memorandum for Foreign Office (text printed), acknowledging French Government's reply of February 15 and extending invitation to be represented in some manner at Three-Power Conference.	28
Mar. 12 (18)	*To the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Memorandum for Foreign Office (text printed), acknowledging Italian Government's reply of February 21 and extending invitation to be represented in some manner at Three-Power Conference.	30
Apr. 3 (152)	*From the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Foreign Office *note verbale*, April 2 (text printed), explaining why decision concerning representation at Three-Power Conference, even by an observer, must be deferred.	31
Apr. 6 (229)	*From the British Ambassador* British Government's assumption that postponement of meeting to June 1 means that formal Naval Conference, rather than preliminary conversations, will take place on that date at Geneva; plan to send Bridgeman, Viscount Cecil, and Admiral Field as plenipotentiaries.	32
Apr. 6	*From the Japanese Ambassador* Desire that Conference begin no earlier than June 11, in order to allow sufficient time for Japanese delegation to reach Geneva.	33
Apr. 6 (50)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Information that Japanese delegates will be Admiral Viscount Saito and Viscount Ishii.	34
Apr. 13 (116)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Instructions to cable if definite date for Three-Power Conference has been arranged and to give suggestions as to personnel of American delegation; communication of names of British and Japanese delegates.	34
Apr. 14 (241)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Information that definite arrangements have not yet been made as to date or secretariat for Conference; Bridgeman's opposition to Geneva as meeting place.	35
Apr. 20 (121)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Advice that, while United States cannot very well take initiative in suggesting that Conference be held elsewhere than in Geneva, it will not oppose such a suggestion if made by Great Britain or Japan, or if League would be embarrassed by having negotiations there or is unable to provide the necessary facilities.	36
27 (84)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions to inform Chamberlain of unofficial British suggestions for holding Conference elsewhere and of League preference that request for use of facilities come from either Great Britain or Japan as League members.	37

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Apr. 28 (98)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Chamberlain's statement that British Government prefers Geneva and has so notified Japan, and that necessary steps are being taken with regard to use of League facilities.	38
May 5 (93)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions to advise Chamberlain of U. S. assumption that British delegation will either include fully empowered Dominion representatives or will itself be empowered by Dominion Governments.	38
May 6 (105)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Chamberlain's assurance that British delegation will include fully empowered Dominion representatives.	38
May 11 (77)	*From the Chargé in Japan (tel.)* Foreign Minister's emphasis on strong desire of new Japanese Government that naval limitation be effected at Geneva. (Footnote: Information that the ministry of Baron Gi-ichi Tanaka replaced the ministry of Reijiro Wakatsuki in April 1927.)	39
May 17 (66)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Italian memorandum, in reply to invitation to be represented at Conference, reserving right to send naval experts who may at any given time assume the character of observers (text printed). (Footnote: Information that the Department was advised on June 4 that the Italian Government had appointed two unofficial observers; information, also, that a French *Mission d'Information* attended the plenary sessions.)	39
May 23	*To the British Ambassador* Confirmation of arrangement that Three-Power Conference at Geneva will open on June 20. (Footnote: Identic note on the same date to the Japanese Ambassador.)	40
May 27	*To President Coolidge* Recommendations as to membership of American delegation.	40
June 1	*Memorandum by the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs* Record of conference of State and Navy Department officials with President Coolidge in regard to U. S. policy and proposals to be laid before Geneva Conference.	42
June 2 (1)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation* Notification to Mr. Hugh S. Gibson of his appointment as chairman of the American delegation; information that Admiral Hilary P. Jones will be a delegate and that Mr. Hugh R. Wilson will be secretary general; list of State and Navy Department assistants on the delegation; general instructions as to U. S. participation, with emphasis on fact that Conference is most likely to be successful if its deliberations are restricted to the immediate problem of extension of Washington treaty principles and ratios to auxiliary vessels.	43
June 9 (46)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Communication of names of British and Dominion delegates.	45

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 June 20 (11)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Press release (text printed), giving an estimate of tonnage to be scrapped if American proposal for basis of 300,000 tons of cruisers and 250,000 tons of destroyers for the United States and the British Empire, and 180,000 tons of cruisers and 150,000 tons of destroyers for Japan were accepted; information that no scrapping of submarines would be required on basis of 90,000 tons of submarines for the United States and the British Empire and 54,000 tons for Japan.	46
June 20 (12)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* For the President: Message from secretary general of Conference transmitting greetings from the delegates.	47
June 20 (15)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Résumé of first plenary session, at which the chairman of the American delegation was named president of the Conference, organization procedure was decided upon, and the three delegations gave opening statements.	47
June 21 (16)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Executive committee resolution (text printed) recommending the formation of a technical committee to exchange statistics of present cruiser, destroyer, and submarine tonnage of each of the powers, the tonnage now authorized and appropriated for, and other pertinent information.	48
June 22 (22)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Disappointment of American delegation at receptive attitude of Japanese delegation toward British proposals for modification of Washington treaty.	48
June 22 (23)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Japanese desire for upward revision of the ratio assigned to Japan by the Washington treaty.	50
June 23 (25)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for instructions concerning whether it should be suggested to British that U. S. delegation is prepared to sustain adoption by Conference of a decision (draft printed), reserving consideration of the British proposals to the 1931 Conference provided under the Washington treaty.	50
June 23 (26)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* British insistence upon discussion of capital ships at present Conference and upon importance of placing limits upon maximum size of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.	51
June 23 (27)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Belief that Bridgeman desires a plenary meeting soon in order that each power may state naval needs and justification therefor, and that he will argue for preponderant British strength; intention of American delegation to reiterate that naval needs depend on strength of other powers and are purely relative, and by emphasizing certain other factors to bring out in bold relief U. S. willingness not only for real limitation but for reduction as well.	52
June 24 (10)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Approval of suggested action and draft decision set forth in chairman's telegram No. 25, June 23.	53

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 June 24 (31)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Reply of American and Japanese delegates, in response to Bridgeman's inquiry as to suitable time for plenary session debate on British suggestions concerning battleships and aircraft carriers, to effect that since their instructions precluded discussion of Washington treaty revision, they would have to ask their Governments for pertinent instructions.	54
June 24 (11)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Authorization to take action outlined in chairman's telegram No. 27, June 23, if British insist on elaborately defending their demand for a high cruiser tonnage; assurance that United States is sincere in regard to maintaining parity with Great Britain, but on the other hand is unwilling to sign a treaty increasing British cruiser strength by 75 percent and requiring the United States to triple its cruiser strength.	55
June 25 (138)	*To the Chargé in Great Britain (tel.)* Forwarding of chairman's telegram No. 27, June 23, and Department's telegram No. 11, June 24, with instructions to advise Chamberlain informally of U. S. Government's surprise concerning British attitude at Geneva, in view of repeated assurances that Great Britain would accept parity with the United States in all classes of naval vessels.	56
June 26 (32)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Optimistic view of American delegation that obstacles, such as satisfying Japanese *amour-propre* while maintaining Washington treaty ratio and acceding to British desire for no limitation on number of small cruisers, can be overcome; efforts to dispose as soon as possible of British suggestions concerning Washington treaty.	56
June 27 (33)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information, for State and Navy Departments, that comparison of British and American capital ship tonnage on the Washington standard-ton basis shows that excess British tonnage is even greater than was previously indicated.	58
June 27 (35)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion that British delegation might be aided in withdrawal from untenable position regarding revision of Washington treaty, if the Secretary would discuss frankly with British Embassy in Washington, U. S. interest in nonrevision of the treaty, insistence upon parity with Great Britain, and desire for curtailment of naval building program.	59
June 27 (36)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Expression of regret to Japanese delegate that his Government has revised its instructions to permit acquiescence in British proposals for discussion of capital ships.	60
June 27	*From the British Ambassador* Information, supplied at Chamberlain's direction and for communication to President Coolidge, that the British Government aimed, in including in its proposals the question of reducing the size of capital ships, to further the spirit of the Washington treaty, to set an example for the Preparatory Commission to follow, and to effect economy in reduction of armaments.	61

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
June 28	*To President Coolidge* Transmittal of British Ambassador's note of June 27, with comments.	63
June 28 (20)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that it is impossible to carry out the suggestion in chairman's telegram No. 35, June 27, because of absence of British Embassy force from Washington, but that copies of chairman's telegram No. 27, June 23, and the Department's telegram No. 11, June 24, have been forwarded to the American Embassy in London with instructions.	64
June 30	*From President Coolidge* Approval of Secretary's position as set forth in letter of June 28.	64
June 30 (44)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Press interview authorized by Bridgeman (text printed), denying demand for naval supremacy and reiterating principle of U. S.-British parity, but also expressing opinion that while Great Britain's special needs require a higher number in certain types of vessels, the United States has the right to build up to an equal figure in any type of warship.	65
June 30 45)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Summary of developments favorable to American position: British action in preferring postponement of public sessions, end of their insistence on public debate on U. S.-British naval needs, realization that they cannot force Washington treaty revision by rush tactics, and the reasonable spirit exhibited by the technical committees.	65
July 2 (53)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that if the British are disinclined to reduce their excessive demands for 75 cruisers, of either 7,500 or 10,000 tons each, American delegation intends to say that it believes the British should publish their figures, together with their justification therefor, and state quite frankly that it was impossible to come to an agreement, thus leaving the entire matter for general agreement in 1931.	66
July 2 (26)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Instructions to advise British that no proposal which sets total cruiser tonnage figure to be arrived at before 1936 at more than 400,000 tons would make conclusion of an agreement worth while; request for comment on Secretary's intention to consult Canadian and Irish Legations as to any demands for excessive tonnage increases; inquiry regarding possible discussions with the Japanese Ambassador.	69
July 4 (58)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice that British have already been informed of unacceptability of their figures as real limitation, and opinion that neither inquiries to Canadian and Irish Legations nor discussion with Japanese Ambassador would be advantageous.	69
July 5 (147)	*To the Chargé in Great Britain (tel.)* Transmittal of chairman's telegram No. 53, July 2, with instructions to discuss with Baldwin or Chamberlain, if thought advisable, the excessive cruiser tonnage proposed by the British.	70

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 5 (60)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* American delegation's suggestion for eventually reconciling British proposal based on numbers with American proposal based on total tonnage (text printed).	70
July 5 (61)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that Japanese refuse to accept cruiser tonnage basis of 400,000 tons, that they intend to demand that British revise their figures downward, and that the American delegation has promised hearty cooperation in this demand.	72
July 6 (27)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Conversation between the Secretary of State and the British Ambassador, in which each explained the attitude of his respective delegation with regard to the general problems of the Conference and also to the specific question of British cruiser tonnage demands.	72
July 6 (63)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Résumé of interview with British on cruiser question, which ended without a solution having been reached.	74
July 6 (64)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Japanese memorandum (text printed) recommending the adoption of a 450,000-ton basis for auxiliary surface craft for the United States and Great Britain, with 300,000-ton basis for Japan, and 70,000 tons of submarines for Japan.	76
July 6 (65)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Belief that, although the British refuse to accept tonnage figures proposed by the Japanese, they may be induced to reasonableness by knowledge that they stand alone in demand for a large cruiser tonnage.	77
July 7 (156)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Opinion that pressure on Baldwin or Chamberlain will probably be unproductive of results; willingness, however, to impress on them six specific points showing the unfavorable reaction on U. S.-British relations if the British persist in present policy at Geneva.	78
July 7 (151)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Desire that Ambassador discuss situation with British on basis of his suggestions.	79
July 7 (68)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Japanese intention to submit their proposals formally to executive committee and to express determination to abandon Conference if agreement for lower tonnage figures is not reached.	80
July 7 (69)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion that, if break-up of Conference appears inevitable, a private conversation of the chief delegates be called at which a general statement of U. S. position may be given and plans may be made for a public statement of the case of each power, in order that public may have information on which to base study of the issues involved.	80

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 8 (30)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Approval of suggested private conversation should Conference fail; suggestion that a short adjournment might be of value if agreement seems impossible; additional considerations to be included in American delegation's statement to the public meeting if Conference breaks up.	82
July 8 (157)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Substance of conversation with Chamberlain, in which he appeared to be impressed by Ambassador's statement that U. S. public opinion had reacted unfavorably to British proposals. Ambassador's opinion that, should total tonnage be kept under 400,000 tons, it will be a material concession to American views.	84
July 9 (158)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Note from Chamberlain (text printed), reporting discussion with the Prime Minister and colleagues of substance of conversation with American Ambassador, July 8, and stating likelihood that British may ask for short adjournment at Geneva in order to study the points raised in that conversation.	85
July 9	*From the British Embassy* Explanation of attitude of British Government at Geneva, in order to dispel apparent misunderstanding of its policy.	86
July 9 (33)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Telegram from President Coolidge (text printed) directing Secretary to instruct chairman that a clear, strong statement of American position is needed, regardless of where blame falls, and approving suggestions in Secretary's telegram No. 30, July 8, to the chairman.	89
July 9 (78)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Summary of a private conversation of the three delegations, held at instance of British, in which it appeared that a possible way out of the cruiser impasse might be reached; chairman's opinion that a solution may yet be found.	89
July 11 (80)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Indefinite postponement of plenary session scheduled for July 11, as a mark of respect to death of Irish Foreign Minister, who recently participated in the Conference's work.	91
July 11 (41)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Protest of British Ambassador concerning Wythe Williams' article in *New York Times* (excerpts printed), which predicts release by American experts, if Conference fails, of documentary proof that Great Britain has violated Washington treaty terms by overtonnage of battleships.	93
July 11 (100)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Foreign Minister's request that his earnest desire for U. S. assistance to Japanese in bringing about an agreement which will not call for material increases in naval armaments be conveyed to Washington.	94
July 11 (81)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Belief that delegation should concentrate on need to find common ground for agreement between Japanese and British on tonnage levels, and should emphasize U. S. preference for Japanese levels.	94

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 12 (84)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Opinion that the Wythe Williams, article was founded on pure conjecture; information that American delegates have been scrupulous in not revealing confidential information to the press.	96
July 12 (42)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Inquiry as to truth of press reports from English sources (excerpt printed) that representatives of steel plants or manufacturing concerns are in Geneva or are interfering with deliberations by propagandizing American experts.	96
July 12 (162)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* British suggestion (text printed) that agreement should be sought on basis of total tonnage in each class beyond which each party would not go up to 1936. Chamberlain's intention to ask short adjournment and order Bridgeman to London for consultation if agreement cannot be reached along this line; his willingness to meet the Secretary in Geneva if necessary, and if Secretary so requests. (Repeated to Geneva.)	97
July 12 (82)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* American suggestion to mixed committee exploring cruiser problem that the real difficulty lies in British effort to force other navies to accept same type of cruisers as themselves, regardless of individual requirements; reiteration by British of unacceptability of tonnage figures of Japanese.	98
July 12 (83)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Unacceptability to Americans and Japanese of British draft plan (text printed) providing for tonnage limitation of 550,000 tons under certain ages, retention of over-age ships in the amount of 20 percent of this figure, and a limitation of 10,000-ton cruisers to 12–12–8, all other cruisers to be limited to 6,000 tons, mounted with no larger than 6-inch guns.	100
July 12 (159)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Permission to inform Chamberlain of Secretary's concurrence in British suggestion outlined in Ambassador's telegram No. 162, July 12; assumption that by "each class" is meant cruisers, destroyers, and submarines; assertion that while the United States requires 10,000-ton cruisers, it does not object to the smaller-type cruisers preferred by British, provided they do not exceed the total tonnage limitation; opinion that a short adjournment of Conference might serve a useful purpose. (Repeated to Geneva.)	101
July 13 (45)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Reluctance of Ambassador in Great Britain, expressed in a telegram of July 13 (text printed), to inform Chamberlain as directed by Secretary's telegram No. 159, July 12, for fear of consequences unfavorable to the American position at Geneva. Instructions to advise Ambassador of any suggestions chairman plans to make concerning Secretary's telegram and possible adjournment. (Footnote: Information that the Ambassador in Great Britain was informed of the contents of this telegram by Department telegram No. 160, July 13, 5 p. m.)	102

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 13 (86)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Opinion that British delegation is aware that the largest size of cruiser is most suited to U. S. needs; belief that restriction of number of maximum-size cruisers cannot be decided until the total tonnage figure is agreed upon, that short adjournment might cause loss of ground gained by American delegation, and that probably Secretary's influence would continue to be most effective if he remained in Washington. (Copy to London.)	103
July 13 (87)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Japanese proposal for a 30 percent cut in tonnage of auxiliary surface craft now built, building, or authorized, which would result in approximate figure for Great Britain of 484,000 tons, for the United States of 454,000 tons, and for Japan of 310,000 tons. (Copy to London.)	104
July 14 (91)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Doubt that any truth exists in press reports of activities of steel and other interests at Geneva, and opinion that such assertions are British-inspired.	106
July 14 (163)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions, in view of possible misunderstanding of term "class" in British plan, to advise Chamberlain of American interpretation; information that as delegation believes progress is being made, no immediate necessity for adjournment exists.	106
July 15 (99)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Belief that as a last resort Secretary might accept Chamberlain's suggestion to meet in Geneva, but that suggestion may be merely part of British effort to postpone decision; information that as a result of Japanese refusal to discuss a figure exceeding 315,000 tons for their combined cruiser-destroyer tonnage, the British will have to decide either to reduce their figures to approximately 500,000 tons or to accept whatever consequences result.	107
July 16 (166)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Advice that the British proposal is rendered valueless by British Ambassador's explanation that Chamberlain meant by "class" of ships, the different sizes of cruisers rather than the categories of naval craft. (Sent also to Geneva.)	108
July 16 (50)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Telegram No. 165 to the Ambassador in Great Britain (text printed) instructing him to advise Chamberlain that the Secretary foresees no circumstances which would require him to go to Geneva, and advising that the only real question is whether the British can reduce their figures on total cruiser tonnage to meet views of the American and Japanese delegations.	108
July 16 (100)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for comments on chairman's statement to second plenary session, July 14.	109

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 18 (105)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Japanese memorandum (text printed) summarizing the specific propositions set forth by each power in British-Japanese informal conversations.	109
July 18 (53)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Approval of statement to plenary session of July 14; suggestion that if another plenary session becomes necessary, the specific facts to justify American conclusions be stated; instructions as to the nature of statement to be made with regard to American position should Conference break up.	111
July 18 (106)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for instructions as to certain points of Japanese memorandum: (1) Advance in ratio for Japan from 3 to 3.25, (2) question of 8-inch guns, and (3) maximum size of smaller-type cruiser.	113
July 18 (107)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion that the Secretary discuss with the British Ambassador the two conflicting issues which now prevent agreement: (1) British insistence on small-type cruisers and restriction of 8-inch gun, and (2) American insistence on liberty of armament.	114
July 19 (168)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Chamberlain's concurrence in the Secretary's opinion that nothing would be accomplished by a meeting at Geneva between them.	116
July 19 (55)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Opinion that the 5-5-3 ratio must be adhered to, with slight concessions should exact ratio be impractical, and that after reaching agreement on total cruiser tonnage, the United States must retain right to construct within such limits the number and type of cruisers up to 10,000 tons, with such armament up to 8-inch guns as may be necessary. Instructions to cable further data on suggestion in Japanese memorandum that 25 percent of the tonnage totals be retained in over-age vessels.	116
July 19 (108)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Declaration, at meeting for further discussion of Japanese memorandum, of willingness to discuss retention of over-age ships after agreement is reached on the other issues, and of reasons for insistence on liberty of armanent within the tonnage limitations; reiteration of suggestion that treaty might contain a political clause providing for reexamination of the cruiser question in case either of the other powers should become apprehensive in the future as to the quantity of U. S. construction of 8-inch-gun vessels.	117
July 19 (110)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion that, in view of British delegation's recall to London for consultations, a full statement of U. S. position as to tonnage level and liberty of armament within that figure be presented to the British Government either through its Embassy in Washington or through the American Ambassador in London.	119

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 20 (57)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice that the Secretary is hesitant to take up matter again with the British Government, considering instructions to the American Ambassador quoted in telegram No. 50, July 16, but that he will do everything possible to assist in bringing about an agreement. Fear that emphasis on 8-inch guns will lead British to assume U. S. willingness to build cruisers below 10,000 tons armed with 8-inch guns.	120
July 20 (111)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Belief that it would be advisable not to insist on retaining the power to allocate all tonnage to 10,000-ton cruisers, but to indicate willingness to consider possibility of a smaller-size cruiser to be armed with 8-inch guns.	121
July 21 (59)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice that it was not intention to direct delegation to insist on the construction of the entire tonnage in 10,000-ton vessels, and instructions to adhere to right to arm all new cruisers with 8-inch guns.	122
July 21 (60)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Conversation with the British Ambassador, in which the Secretary emphasized that the American delegation had made extensive concessions, but that the British must agree to a total tonnage limitation and mounting of 8-inch guns if any treaty is to be made.	122
July 21 (102)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Foreign Office information that Japanese still hope to bring tonnage figure down to 450,000 tons, that they have not approved British 6-inch gun proposal, and that they recognize the difficulties presented by the obsolete cruiser tonnage clause.	123
July 22	*To President Coolidge* Doubt that Geneva Conference will have any practical results, in view of grave difficulties encountered with regard to the British demands.	124
July 22 (112)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Further explanation of proposal for retention of over-age ships as contained in Japanese memorandum; unacceptability to American delegation of proposal as it now stands, but possibility that modifications might be worked out which would make it a basis for discussion.	127
July 22 (114)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Inquiry as to authorization to accede to Japanese wish for discussion of 5–3 ratio, and possibility of seeking compromise which would satisfy both U. S. demand for maintenance of the Washington treaty ratio and Japanese need to meet domestic political objections regarding its minority ratio.	130
July 23 (115)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for opinion on two drafts of a political clause providing for reexamination of cruiser question (texts printed).	131
July 25 (61)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Preference for the more specific form of political clause, should necessity for it arise.	132

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 25 (62)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Instructions to advise how much variation from Washington treaty ratio the naval advisers would recommend, since political question involved is how much variation from the Washington treaty can be allowed without endangering treaty itself.	133
July 25	*From President Coolidge* Commendation of the Secretary and the American delegation for maintenance of U. S. position at Geneva; belief that the United States should not deviate from its position, especially with regard to 10,000-ton cruisers and 8-inch guns, and assertion that if the other powers cannot accept the U. S. proposal, they will have the responsibility for its rejection.	133
July 26 (63)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Intention to state publicly, if British press continues to blame possible break-down of Conference on alleged U. S. ambitions for a big navy, that Great Britain is the only power seeking a large naval program and that it has refused to accept the proposed tonnage limitation figures.	134
July 26 (116)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Disinclination to consider several suggested alternatives: (1) Two-power agreement between the United States and either Great Britain or Japan, (2) nonrestriction of cruisers and agreement only on submarines and destroyers, (3) nonrestriction of small cruisers and restriction of 10,000-ton cruisers, and (4) negotiation of an arrangement based on building program up to 1931.	135
July 27 (65)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Approval of chairman's attitude toward the suggestions outlined in telegram No. 116, July 26; request for further information on the fourth proposition.	135
July 28 (173)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Official remarks by Chamberlain (excerpt printed), to the effect that, while his Government is willing to have a temporary arrangement concerning cruiser building, it could not permit such an arrangement to be considered so immutable as to constitute a precedent. (Repeated to Geneva.)	136
July 28 (122)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Prediction that break-down of Conference cannot be avoided, in view of information that British have not made any substantial change in their demand for small cruisers and 6-inch armament.	136
July 28 (126)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Deadlock of Conference over 8-inch-gun question resulting from inclusion in new British proposals of the same objectionable proposal for 6,000-ton 6-inch-gun cruisers; unacceptability to British of suggested political clause; fixing of date for plenary session, at which each Government may state its position.	137
July 29	*To President Coolidge (tel.)* Telegram to delegation at Geneva (text printed) suggesting that to avoid disastrous consequences of break-up of Conference, it might be well to abandon the scheduled plenary session and adjourn for a few months to permit time for reflection.	138

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
July 29 (71)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Statement by the President to the press (text printed), basing failure of Conference to reach an agreement thus far on U. S. inability to agree to British proposals calling for the building of a much larger navy than is thought necessary, but expressing opinion that such proposals may be modified in current discussions to an extent enabling the United States to agree.	139
July 30 (137)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for immediate instructions as to desirability of suggesting to Japanese that they propose adjournment to American and British delegations, in order to avoid the unfavorable implications of a weakening in U. S. attitude if its delegation takes initiative in proposing adjournment.	140
July 30 (76)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that the President has disapproved an adjournment and has instructed that a clear, firm statement of U.S. position be given; also information that the chairman's telegram No. 137, July 30, was forwarded to the President. Instructions to advise should either Great Britain or Japan propose an adjournment. (Footnote: Information that a telegram was received from the President at 9:20 p.m., July 30, authorizing the Secretary to use his own discretion as to instructions.)	141
July 31 (82)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice that any suggestion for a naval holiday during a provisional period, as reported in a London press despatch, should be given careful consideration before abandoning Conference.	141
July 31 (139)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Résumé of interviews with British delegates which demonstrate the irreconcilability of American and British views. Information that the final American statement is being prepared for presentation at the plenary session.	142
July 31 (141)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion that, in view of Geneva press reports that Baldwin may consult the U.S. Secretary of State in Washington as to plans to prevent collapse of Conference, Secretary may think it best that plenary session be postponed until after the interview.	145
Aug. 1 (87)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that Secretary has not received any official indication of Baldwin's desire to confer on subject of Conference. British Ambassador's comment that naval holiday plan might offer basis on which the Governments could agree.	145
Aug. 1 (147)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that American delegation is preparing statement to be made at plenary session; that Japanese are apparently unwilling to initiate adjournment idea; and that British seem anxious for Japanese to propose some solution, possibly of a compromise nature. Request for instructions as to attitude toward possible proposal (1) that a final act be adopted setting forth work of Conference and recommending that the whole question be considered in 1931 or (2) that each delegation address to plenary session inoffensive speeches approved in advance by the other delegations. The chairman's preference for first proposal.	146

THREE-POWER CONFERENCE AT GENEVA FOR THE LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMAMENT, JUNE 20–AUGUST 4, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Aug. 3	*To President Coolidge (tel.)* Transmittal of telegram No. 149, August 1, from American delegation, quoting Japanese plan for limitation of auxiliary vessel construction up to 1931, together with delegation's comments and Secretary's reply, to effect that the plan does not appear very satisfactory but that it would be better for Great Britain to turn down the proposal than for the United States to do so (texts printed).	148
Aug. 3	*To President Coolidge (tel.)* Transmittal of Secretary's reply to chairman's telegram No. 147, August 1, agreeing that first proposal should be supported; of chairman's further suggestion for a joint public statement that agreement on cruisers has not been possible and that, therefore, adjournment is being agreed upon in an effort to give a chance for direct negotiations between interested Governments; and of Secretary's approval of latter course of action (texts printed).	150
Aug. 3 (95)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Assurance by Senator Robinson, Democratic leader, that he will support U. S. course at Geneva.	152
Aug. 4 (155)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* British insistence on separate statements; procedure for the final session agreed upon by the three delegations: (1) introductory statement by chairman of the American delegation, (2) statements by British, Japanese, and American delegations, (3) prohibition on debate, and (4) the reading and approval of a joint declaration in which the three delegations recognize the deadlock which makes it wise to adjourn with a frank statement of divergent views and also state their intention to submit the matter to the respective Governments for further study.	152
Aug. 4	*To President Coolidge (tel.)* Joint declaration read at final session (text printed), with recommendation that 1931 Conference provided under Washington treaty be held earlier than August of that year.	153
Aug. 4	*To President Coolidge (tel.)* Statement to press (text printed) with regard to the final session, expressing belief that the discussions will not have been fruitless and that failure to reach agreement will not impair the cordial U. S.-British relations.	155
Aug. 5	*Memorandum by the Secretary of State* Conversation with the Japanese Ambassador concerning proceedings and termination of Conference.	156
Aug. 10	*To President Coolidge* Regret at failure of Conference; opinion that the United States could not have prevented such an outcome in view of British attitude. Belief that apparent British desire for naval supremacy may influence Congress to extend the U. S. building program.	157

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1926		
Dec. 9 (190)	*From the Secretary of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission* Specific references to American delegation's position on questions dealt with by subcommission A (Military, Naval, and Air), as set forth in report of subcommission A, for possible use in preparation of written communication to League Secretariat concerning report of subcommission B (Joint Commission).	159
Dec. 29 (85)	*To the Secretary of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Instructions to address a letter to Secretariat, with request that it be circulated to the governments concerned, informing League that the United States is unable to submit comments before December 31, but that when statement is submitted it will include comments on certain questions which were included in Joint Commission's report and not included in subcommission A's report, with respect to which questions U. S. Government wishes to make clear that it does not accept the conclusions of the Joint Commission's report.	162
1927		
Jan. 11	*To the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives* Information as to aims and work of Preparatory Commission, for purpose of encouraging favorable congressional action on President's recommendation that funds be appropriated for further participation in the Commission by the United States.	163
Feb. 10 (8)	*To the Secretary of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission* Memorandum for Secretary General of the League (text printed), containing American comments on the report of the Joint Commission. (Footnote: Information that the memorandum was circulated by the Secretary General to Preparatory Commission and League members on March 10.)	166
Mar. 7 (57)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Information that British will lay before opening meeting of Commission on March 21 a draft convention embodying plan for the high contracting parties to bring their proposals on strength in land, sea, and air forces before the final Conference, such proposals to be considered separately by appropriate subcommittees.	175
Mar. 21 (186)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Presentation by British delegate of draft convention, and expression by French delegate of intention to submit alternative draft embodying French views.	176
Mar. 22 (95)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Information, in event it becomes necessary to define U. S. attitude toward an economic blockade which League Council could declare under article XVI of the Covenant, that the United States cannot participate in any such blockade; inability of United States to become a party to an agreement involving any form of international supervision or control of armaments.	177

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Mar. 23 (191)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Outline of two possible courses which will be open to United States after British, French, and possibly other texts have been presented for discussion: (1) To continue to present views on all questions with the idea that they be adopted in draft convention, and (2) to set forth views and make known what sort of treaty the United States could accept, leaving to the other delegations the responsibility for adopting draft which would make U. S. participation either possible or impossible; request for instructions.	177
Mar. 23 (194)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* View that if second course outlined in telegram No. 191, March 23, is adopted, American delegation might suggest possibility of dividing the convention into two parts, the United States to adhere to the first part containing the absolute limitation and reduction of armaments, and the League members to adhere, in addition, to the second part concerning enforcement by League agencies.	179
Mar. 24 (195)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Proposed statement to Commission (text printed), offering the idea of a double convention, in case Department approves the second course outlined in telegram No. 191, March 23.	179
Mar. 24 (196)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Request for early decision as to double convention idea, in view of desire of colleagues to broach this idea which they worked out independently.	183
Mar. 25 (98)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Preliminary comment on proposed statement, to the effect that it may be too much of an endorsement of League supervision; intention to send complete comment March 26.	184
Mar. 26 (199)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Opinion that no other course than the one outlined in proposed statement will prevent the United States from incurring the odium of blocking the Conference; request for instructions.	184
Mar. 26 (99)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Objections to statement in present form, and instructions that any statement made should conform to U. S. position of nonaccord with proposals for any form of supervision or control of armaments by any international body, whether League of Nations or any other organization.	186
Mar. 27 (201)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Request for authority to revise statement so as to meet objections outlined in Department's telegram No. 99, March 26, and to present it promptly to Commission.	188

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Mar. 29 (101)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Disinclination of United States to appear before Conference and world as originator of "American plan" calling for joint international supervision and control of armaments for every power except itself; suggestion that other delegations might come forward with the double convention idea if American delegation made a statement to the effect that if powers can find a way to provide such supervision and control for themselves, eliminating it for the United States, the American delegation will cooperate in trying to find a solution.	189
Apr. 4 (214)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Recommendation that when first of the enforcement questions arises, American delegation make a general statement as to inacceptability of whole idea of League machinery and authority, and suggest a treaty confined to disarmament provisions, having previously taken steps to insure at this point that another delegation propose a separate protocol to enforce the treaty between those powers believing in supervision and control.	190
Apr. 5 (109)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Approval of plan and statement proposed in telegram No. 214, April 4.	194
Apr. 5 (216)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Information that Commission took up question of limitation of naval effectives, and that French and Italian delegations intend to submit their proposals as to publicity respecting naval building programs.	194
Apr. 6 (221)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* British preparedness to yield, under certain conditions, to French thesis of limitation of naval effectives; American delegation's opinion that limitation by method of limiting effectives may not be wholly inadmissible.	195
Apr. 7 (110)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Unacceptability to Navy Department of principle of limitation of naval effectives.	196
Apr. 9 (225)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Request for instructions as to possibility of making concessions on naval effectives thesis, providing acceptable agreement can be reached with respect to limitation of tonnage.	196

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Apr. 9 (83)	*From the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Memorandum by naval attaché of conversation with Bridgeman, First Lord of the Admiralty (text printed), in which the latter expressed hope that the United States, Great Britain, and Japan might preserve unanimity in attitude toward questions raised at the Preparatory Commission, and suggested that while he preferred no change in attitude of opposition toward total tonnage or effectives limitation theories, modifications in details might be advisable if the three powers act identically.	196
Apr. 10 (113)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Instructions to yield with regard to French method of limitation of naval effectives if Great Britain and Japan consent to such limitation as one of the elements to be considered in the limitation of naval armaments.	197
Apr. 10 (227)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Belief of chairman of Commission that French and British will amicably agree to short adjournment, in view of new instructions by Great Britain to its delegate as to unacceptability of French proposal and French opinion that discussions of draft convention will be futile until agreement is reached on naval matter.	198
Apr. 11 (71)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions to inform Bridgeman unofficially of American delegation's awareness of desirability that three chief naval powers maintain united front in the current Geneva discussions.	198
Apr. 11 (114)	*To the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Opinion that discussion of other phases of draft convention would be worth while, even though no agreement has been reached on naval matter, but concurrence in adjournment if one is desired.	199
Apr. 11 (230)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Reassurance to Commission, after Bridgeman unexpectedly brought up subject of forthcoming Three-Power Naval Conference, of American delegation's interest in working wholeheartedly for success of the Commission.	199
Apr. 13 (234)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Delivery of statement (text printed) outlined in telegram No. 214, April 4.	200
Apr. 13 (16)	*To the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Department's surprise that the Argentine delegation has apparently reversed its earlier decision to support proposal for limitation of naval armament by classes of ships, and now supports a modification of French thesis of limitation by total tonnage only; instructions to bring matter to Foreign Minister's attention informally and to seek to ascertain reasons for change. (Footnote: Similar instructions to Embassy in Chile.)	203

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Apr. 20 (40)	*From the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Confirmation by Foreign Minister of instructions to Argentine delegation to accept French proposal in principle; Chargé's belief that reversal of position is due to contemplated Argentine naval program.	204
Apr. 26 (260)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Adjournment of Commission.	204
May 16 (65)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Information, in response to instruction of April 13, that misunderstanding of terms of French proposition had occasioned change in Chilean instructions to its delegation, but that new instructions to oppose all propositions inconsistent with limitation by categories will go forward shortly.	205
Aug. 1 (148)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation to the Naval Conference (tel.)* Remark by member of French *Mission d' Information* attending Naval Conference, that if Conference should fail, meeting of Preparatory Commission scheduled for November would have to be postponed; suggestion to him that, until Naval Conference has adjourned, discussion of such a contingency would be somewhat premature.	206
Aug. 2 (89)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation to the Naval Conference (tel.)* Statement that League of Nations, not the United States, should take the responsibility for the Commission's discontinuance or postponement.	206
Oct. 20 (53)	*To the Ambassador in Belgium (tel.)* Instructions to telegraph suggestions as to attitude of American delegation concerning formation of proposed Security Committee by League, and possible American representation.	206
Oct. 25 (144) (L. N. 985)	*From the Minister in Switzerland* Transmittal of League communication inviting attention to fact that nonmembers of League represented on Preparatory Commission may participate in work of Security Committee established by Assembly resolution of September 26. (Footnote: Resolution (excerpt printed) authorizing a committee to assist Preparatory Commission by considering measures required to give all states guarantees of security and arbitration necessary to enable them to reduce armaments to a minimum in an international disarmament agreement.)	207
Oct. 27 (76)	*From the Ambassador in Belgium (tel.)* Observation that criticism of aloofness, certain to be caused by nonparticipation of the United States in Security Committee, might be avoided by accepting invitation, on the understanding that American representative cannot join in written recommendations to League Council or Assembly because of U. S. nonmembership.	207

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORK OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Nov. 8 (54)	*To the Ambassador in Belgium (tel.)* Conclusion that American delegate to Preparatory Commission should be instructed not to take any part in organization of proposed Security Committee and not to accept a place on that Committee; instructions to advise opinion.	208
Nov. 10 (79)	*From the Ambassador in Belgium (tel.)* Opinion that the United States should be represented on Security Committee because its deliberations will come up in subsequent Preparatory Commission meetings, and that when strictly League questions are discussed, American representative can make his nonparticipation clear by a reminder of U. S. nonmembership in the League.	209
Nov. 15 (94)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Instructions to attend fourth session of Preparatory Commission, November 30, as chief of the American representation; to express to Commission, when it becomes necessary, reasons for U. S. Government's inability to cooperate in Security Committee's deliberations; and to advise Secretary General of intention to express views on proposed Security Committee at the forthcoming session of the Preparatory Commission.	210
Nov. 22 (97)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Further reasons for Department's decision as to nonrepresentation of United States on Security Committee. (Instructions to mail copy to Belgium.)	211
Dec. 3 (5)	*From the Chief of the American Representation on the Preparatory Commission (tel.)* Termination of fourth session of Preparatory Commission; information that Security Committee will meet on February 20, and Preparatory Commission on March 15, 1928.	213

MEETING OF THE SPECIAL COMMISSION FOR THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR, GENEVA, MARCH 14–APRIL 25, 1927

1926		
Dec. 17	*From the Secretary General of the League of Nations* Invitation to the United States to appoint a representative to sit on the Special Commission created by the League Council to meet in Geneva, March 14, 1927, for consideration and preparation of a final draft convention on the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war, which might serve as a basis for an international conference.	213
1927		
Feb. 23 (21)	*To the Chargé in Switzerland (tel.)* Communication for League (text printed), accepting invitation, indicating willingness to enter into an international agreement for the publication of statistics on government and private manufacture of arms and ammunition, and advising that Mr. Hugh S. Gibson will represent the United States.	215

MEETING OF THE SPECIAL COMMISSION FOR THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR, GENEVA, MARCH 14–APRIL 25, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Feb. 28 (598)	*To the Minister in Switzerland* Notification of appointment to Special Commission; detailed information as to U. S. disapproval of impractical proposals to control or supervise private arms manufacture; instructions to advise Commission of willingness to conclude a convention for the publication of statistics concerning private and government arms manufacture; belief that such an agreement, in addition to a convention to regulate traffic in arms, would be effective; further instructions to offer no objection if other powers wish to recommend a more elaborate convention, but to express U. S. right to abstain from adherence or to adhere with reservations. (Texts printed of three accompanying memoranda covering comments on preliminary draft convention, categories and statistics of proposed convention, and methods of supplying needs for military equipment.)	216
Mar. 15 (177)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Divided opinions of Commission members as to opposition or support to U. S. principle of publicity for both private and government manufacture; appointment of subcommittee to study all views in attempt to reconcile them.	234
Apr. 21 (248)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Information that delegate did not attend latest meeting of drafting committee because chairman indicated that American condition regarding publicity for governmental manufacture could not be met, but that U. S. delegate has recorded views in memorandum to chairman; belief that since other delegations are quite evenly divided, matter will be referred to June session of Council.	235

STATUS OF TREATIES CONCLUDED AT THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT, AND OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THAT CONFERENCE

1927 May 12 (Dip. Ser. 601)	*To Diplomatic and Consular Officers* Summary of status of treaties concluded at the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament, as regards ratification by signatory powers and adherences by nonsignatory powers; also, status of certain resolutions adopted by Conference which might be adhered to by nonparticipating powers.	236

AMERICAN REPRESENTATION AT THE WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE, GENEVA, MAY 4–23, 1927

1926 Dec. 23 (1055) (L. N. 841)	*From the Chargé in Switzerland* League invitation to United States to participate in International Economic Conference at Geneva, May 4, 1927.	238
1927 Feb. 7 (11)	*To the Chargé in Switzerland (tel.)* President's recommendation to Congress in message of February 5 (excerpt printed) that the United States participate in Conference.	238

AMERICAN REPRESENTATION AT THE WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE, GENEVA, MAY 4–23, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Feb. 8	*Memorandum by Mr. Wallace McClure, Assistant to the Economic Adviser* Conversation with Congressman Cordell Hull, February 7, in which Mr. Hull expressed hearty interest in a discussion by the Conference of a general reduction of import duties and equality of treatment in commercial matters.	239
June 10	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation to the International Economic Conference* Report on the work of the Conference, and annexed list of personnel of the American delegation (texts printed); conclusion that Conference has pointed ways for the removal or modification of obstacles to the natural flow of international trade, and for the lowering of costs of production.	240

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, GENEVA, OCTOBER 17–NOVEMBER 8, 1927

1927		
June 14	*From the Consul at Geneva (tel.)* Decision of League to invite all countries which participated in International Economic Conference to attend Diplomatic Conference for the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions at Geneva, October 17.	246
July 15 (60)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Inquiry whether an invitation to the Conference has been received.	247
July 16 (58)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Information that an invitation was contained in League's circular letter No. 29, April 2, transmitted to Department by the Legation on April 13; and that the League, in a communication of June 27 which was forwarded by the Legation on June 28, requested to be advised whether the United States would participate.	247
July 22 (61)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Instructions to advise Secretariat, in reply to communication of June 27, that the United States cannot consider circular letter No. 29, April 2, as an invitation to any diplomatic conference, because it is a mimeographed, unsigned document, in which even the space for the name of the invited Government is left blank.	247
Aug. 4 (56) (L. N. 933)	*From the Minister in Switzerland* Transmittal of signed duplicate of League circular letter No. 29 of April 2, inviting the United States to participate in a Conference with a view to framing an international convention for abolishing import and export prohibitions and restrictions, and enclosing preliminary draft agreement drawn up by the League Economic Committee (texts printed).	248
Sept. 17 (80)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Communication for Secretary General of League (text printed), advising that United States accepts invitation and has designated Mr. Hugh Wilson, American Minister in Switzerland, as delegate.	254

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, GENEVA, OCTOBER 17–NOVEMBER 8, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Oct. 6 (65)	*To the Minister in Switzerland* Notification of appointment as delegate, and communication of names of assistants; detailed instructions and comments on each of the 12 articles comprising the preliminary draft agreement; information that conclusion of a suitable agreement is desired because of consequent advantages to both American and international commerce.	254
Oct. 17 (1)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Further detailed instructions, in the event that proposal is made to expand scope of draft agreement.	264
Oct. 17 (1)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that the first two sessions of Conference were devoted to general statements.	266
Oct. 18 (4)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Report of proceedings of third and fourth sessions; request for instructions as to Rumanian desire for inclusion in article 1 of a proposed statement (text printed) reserving to each state the right to establish customs duties according to its necessities; Dutch insistence on right to impose restrictions; American delegate's statement to Conference as to necessity for article 6 and intention of offering an amendment thereto.	267
Oct. 19 (5)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Report of proceedings of fifth session, in which American delegate offered amendment to article 6 and introduced redraft of article 3; vigorous debate on inclusion of subparagraph (*e*) in American redraft of article 3.	268
Oct. 19 (5)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Indication that Rumanian text reported in telegram No. 4, October 18, is unsatisfactory because it conflicts with Department's draft article regarding export duties.	269
Oct. 19 (8)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for instructions as to Department's views on compromise text of article 3 offered by French for inclusion in final act of Conference, as a substitute for American delegate's amendment reported in telegram No. 5, October 19.	270
Oct. 20 (6)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Opinion that question raised by Dutch as to level of import tariffs is outside the agenda; approval of action in regard to article 6.	271
Oct. 20 (7)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Desire that article 3 be accepted in form proposed by Department, and opinion that while not objectionable, French draft is not as good as American.	272
Oct. 20 (11)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Declaration by president of Conference at sixth session that discussion of details must be avoided and efforts concentrated on essence of problem; French suggestion that import and export restrictions might be considered separately; information that the day's proceedings have indicated a wide divergence in views and that American delegate cannot make any predictions.	273

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, GENEVA, OCTOBER 17–NOVEMBER 8, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
[Oct. 20] (12)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Extemporaneous statement to sixth session, setting forth American views on articles 4, 5, and 7 and expressing fear that, in its desire to have the maximum number of states adhere, the Conference may sanction international practices which it is convened to abolish.	274
Oct. 21 (8)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Authorization to concur in French suggestion reported in telegram No. 11, October 20, if delegate thinks advisable; approval of statement reported in telegram No. 12, October 20.	275
Oct. 21 (13)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Belief that satisfactory compromise (text printed) has been reached on French text mentioned in telegram No. 8, October 19.	275
Oct. 21 (14)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Recommendation that Egyptian draft of article 11 be supported as being as satisfactory to the United States as can be secured; request for instructions.	276
Oct. 21 (15)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Committee draft of article 1 (text printed).	277
Oct. 21 (16)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Inability of delegate to do other than acquiesce in chairman's request not to insist further at the present time in matter of article 6; opinion that inclusion in final act of a general disclaimer stating that it is not the purpose of the convention to interfere in tariff measures might sufficiently safeguard U. S. rights under section 317 of the Tariff Act; request for instructions.	278
Oct. 22 (9)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Acceptability of compromise regarding article 3, as outlined in telegram No. 13, October 21; instructions to support Egyptian proposal set forth in telegram No. 14, October 21.	279
Oct. 22 (17)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for instructions as to whether the question of "standards" in article 4 may not be covered by a modification in phrasing of paragraph 7 of that article.	279
Oct. 24 (12)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Acceptability of committee draft of article 1 reported in telegram No. 15, October 21; insufficiency of disclaimer unless an exception is also included in text of convention; instructions to agree tentatively to the substitute for "standards" described in telegram No. 17, October 22.	280
Nov. 4 (54)	*From the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Acceptance by Conference of Rumanian reservation as to export of crude oil, American vote being only negative vote; acceptance of American exception as regards helium gas. Request for instructions as to Department attitude toward signing convention at final reading the following Saturday.	281

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE ABOLITION OF IMPORT AND EXPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS, GENEVA, OCTOBER 17–NOVEMBER 8, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Nov. 4 (20)	*To the Chief of the American Delegation (tel.)* Instructions not to sign on Saturday, for reason that U. S. Government has not had sufficient time to give convention due consideration and sees no reason for rushing through a matter of such importance.	282
Nov. 22 (190) (L. N. 1010)	*From the Minister in Switzerland* Report on work of the Conference; observation that while the treaty contains many weaknesses, certain advantages will accrue to American commerce if the United States should become a signatory; recommendation that if the United States decides to sign, it do so before February 1, 1928, in order to express a definite reservation regarding helium. (Footnote: Information that the convention was signed on the part of the United States on January 30, 1928.)	282

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON DOUBLE TAXATION AND TAX EVASION, LONDON, APRIL 4–12, 1927

1927 Jan. 13 (7)	*From the Chargé in Switzerland (tel.)* Desire of Committee of Experts on Double Taxation that an American expert take part in their next meeting at London, April 4; request of League Secretariat to be informed of American expert's name, in order that invitation may be sent.	286
Feb. 17 (19)	*To the Chargé in Switzerland (tel.)* Instructions to advise Secretariat of designation of Professor Thomas S. Adams of Yale University.	286
Mar. 16	*Memorandum by Mr. Wallace McClure, Assistant to the Economic Adviser* Record of conversation of Professor Adams with Department officials, March 10, in which certain questions were discussed in connection with his mission to forthcoming meeting.	286

RADIOTELEGRAPH CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER POWERS, SIGNED NOVEMBER 25, 1927

1927 Nov. 25	*Convention Between the United States of America and Other Powers* For the regulation of radiocommunications.	288

PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY HELD BY THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Nov. 29 (2382/70)	*From the Austrian Minister* Request that recommendation be made to Congress for enactment of legislation authorizing Alien Property Custodian to return Austrian property as soon as it has been ascertained that the money held in trust for the Austrian Government, plus a cash deposit sufficient to bring the total up to 2¼ million dollars, is sufficient to satisfy awards made against Austria by the Tripartite Claims Commission.	301
Dec. 10	*To the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives* Statement, requested by Committee, outlining the considerations involved in the question whether provision should be made for the return of Austrian and Hungarian property at the same time as provision is made for the return of German property; observation that memorandum by American agent, Tripartite Claims Commission (text printed), shows an estimate of the probable awards against Austria and Hungary in excess of the 2¼ million deposit proposed by Austria.	303

ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS, SIGNED OCTOBER 19, 1927, AMENDING THE PAN AMERICAN SANITARY CONVENTION OF NOVEMBER 14, 1924

1927 Oct. 19	*Additional Protocol Between the United States of America and Other American Republics* Additional protocol to the Pan American sanitary convention.	309

CIRCULAR INSTRUCTION TO DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS AND CERTAIN CONSULAR OFFICERS CONCERNING QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THE NEGOTIATION OF FOREIGN LOANS BY AMERICAN BANKERS

1927 Dec. 28 (Dip. Ser. 681)	*To Diplomatic Officers and Certain Consular Officers* Instructions, in response to inquiries and suggestions received from diplomatic officers, as to policy to be followed in connection with the negotiation of foreign loans by American bankers.	312

BOUNDARY DISPUTES

BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY

1927 Feb. 9 (245)	*From the Minister in Paraguay* Acceptance by Bolivia of good offices offered by Argentina to aid in settling the Bolivian-Paraguayan boundary dispute; Minister's opinion that if Argentine good offices result in failure, Paraguay will immediately ask United States to solve the difficulty.	315
Mar. 17 (362)	*To the Minister in Paraguay* Approval of Minister's attitude in avoiding indication or comment as to possibility of U. S. willingness to enter into negotiations looking to settlement of the controversy.	316

BOUNDARY DISPUTES—Continued

BOLIVIA AND PARAGUAY—continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Apr. 29 (275)	*From the Chargé in Argentina* Bolivian-Paraguayan protocol of April 22 (text printed), repeating acceptance of Argentine good offices, agreeing to appointment of plenipotentiaries to meet in Buenos Aires within 90 days after signature, and providing for appointment of an arbitral tribunal to which the matter may be submitted if the plenipotentiaries fail to reach agreement on boundary line. (Footnote: Information that the protocol was approved by the Bolivian and Paraguayan Governments on June 29.)	316
Oct. 3 (26)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina* Advice that Bolivian-Paraguayan plenipotentiaries opened conferences in Buenos Aires on September 29; indications, from press and other sources, that successful outcome of discussions is unlikely because of unyielding attitude on both sides; information that Argentine Government would probably decline to accept membership in arbitral tribunal provided in the protocol.	318
Dec. 6 (92)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina* Information that Bolivian-Paraguayan negotiations appear to have reached an impasse, and that plenary sessions have been suspended while a special committee studies various problems including possible establishment of an arbitral tribunal.	319
Dec. 19 (109)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Argentine suggestion to Bolivia and Paraguay that they agree to submit the boundary matter to arbitration, that they substitute police for military in disputed territory and along frontiers, and that they sign a nonaggression pact to be effective until the difficulty is solved; Bolivian misinterpretation of suggestion as Argentine offer to mediate, and Argentine denial; Paraguayan acceptance of suggestion in principle.	321
Dec. 28 (114)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina* Resolution of Bolivian-Paraguayan conference to suspend proceedings until March 15, 1928 (text printed); information that in the interim both Governments will consider the Argentine suggestions.	322

COLOMBIA AND NICARAGUA

1927 July 28 (181)	*From the Minister in Nicaragua (tel.)* Information that Colombian Minister at Managua is ready to reopen discussions with the Nicaraguan Government concerning the San Andrés Archipelago and that, if the Department so desires, the Nicaraguan President will instruct Foreign Minister to commence preliminary negotiations with the Colombian Minister tending toward the settlement proposed by Colombia as set forth in Department's instruction No. 212, March 21, 1925.	322
Aug. 1	*Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State* Conversation with the Colombian Minister concerning the Colombian-Nicaraguan territorial dispute, as well as U. S. claim to ownership of Quita Sueño, Roncador, and Serranilla Keys.	323

BOUNDARY DISPUTES—Continued

COLOMBIA AND NICARAGUA—continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Aug. 2	*Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State* Conversation in which the Colombian Minister submitted a memorandum outlining three possible formulas for settlement of the territorial questions.	325
Undated [Rec'd Aug. 2]	*From the Colombian Legation* Outline of three possible formulas for settlement of the territorial questions.	328
Aug. 31 (464)	*From the Minister in Nicaragua* Desire of Nicaraguan President and American Legation that Department indicate whether it still considers advisable a settlement such as outlined in instruction No. 212 of March 21, 1925, or whether any additional representations and points might be brought up in negotiations.	329
Sept. 13 (241)	*From the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Inquiry whether Department is now ready to make any suggestion to Nicaraguan Government concerning the San Andrés Archipelago question.	329
Sept. 14 (141)	*To the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Information that Department is giving serious consideration to the question and will forward instructions in the near future.	330
Oct. 4 (260)	*From the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Request by Nicaraguan President that Chargé ascertain when the Department will be ready to express an opinion on the San Andrés Archipelago question.	330
Oct. 6 (151)	*To the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Information that instructions have been delayed because of necessity to await reply from another Department in this connection, but that it is hoped they may be sent before long.	330
Oct. 8 [270]	*From the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Information that apparently the Nicaraguan Government favors proposal by Colombian Minister at Nicaragua for a settlement leaving San Andrés Archipelago to Colombia, and the Corn Islands and Mosquito Coast to Nicaragua, but that it wishes to do nothing until it hears from the Department.	330
Nov. 11 (327)	*From the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Request by Foreign Minister that Chargé inquire again when Department will be ready to express an opinion on the San Andrés Archipelago question.	331
Nov. 11 (190)	*To the Chargé in Nicaragua (tel.)* Information that Department expects to be able to give an answer in the near future.	331

BOUNDARY DISPUTES—Continued

COLOMBIA AND PERU

Date and number	Subject	Page
1926 Dec. 30 (110)	*From the Ambassador in Peru (tel.)* Foreign Minister's assurance to Colombian Minister in Peru that ratification of Colombian-Peruvian boundary treaty will be acted upon by Congress in January; information that American Ambassador has repeatedly urged upon the Peruvian President and Foreign Minister the advisability of prompt ratification.	331
1927 Jan. 6 (1)	*To the Ambassador in Peru (tel.)* Instructions to take up again with Peruvian Government the matter of ratification, particularly as there exists a danger that Colombia may sever diplomatic relations with Peru if treaty is not ratified, after the repeated promises of President Leguía.	332
Jan. 12 (4)	*From the Ambassador in Peru (tel.)* Information that President Leguía told Colombian Minister that he could not submit the boundary treaty to the present Congress because of the delicate situation occasioned by Tacna-Arica question, and that Colombian Minister replied that a dangerous condition of public opinion would be created in Colombia by such delay.	333
June 15	*Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State* Conversation in which the Colombian Minister referred to the continued anxiety of his Government as to Peruvian ratification of the treaty and expressed the hope that the Department would continue to use its good offices.	334
Sept. 7 (39)	*From the Chargé in Peru (tel.)* Intention of Chargé, unless otherwise instructed, to fulfill request of Colombian Minister in Peru that he urge ratification on Foreign Minister.	335
Sept. 9 (28)	*To the Chargé in Peru (tel.)* Information that Department pointed out to Peruvian Ambassador interest of U. S. Government in ratification of the Colombian treaty; authorization to interview Foreign Minister or President, at Chargé's discretion.	335
Sept. 14 (811)	*From the Chargé in Peru* Advice that Chargé discussed ratification with Foreign Minister and was assured that it would take place in October; opinion that while more active steps are now being taken than heretofore, matters are likely to drag on as in the past, unless it is made clear to the Peruvian Government that the United States understands that a definite assurance has been given.	336
Sept. 27	*Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State* Conversation, September 26, in which the Ecuadoran Chargé expressed concern over press reports that the United States is urging Peru to ratify the Colombian-Peruvian treaty, because Ecuador feels that this treaty is contrary to her interests and to spirit of 1916 Colombian-Ecuadoran boundary treaty; Assistant Secretary's reply that Ecuadoran-Peruvian boundary difficulty is an entirely separate matter.	338

BOUNDARY DISPUTES—Continued

COLOMBIA AND PERU—continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Nov. 12 (55)	*From the Chargé in Peru (tel.)* Request for instructions as to whether or not to accede to Colombian Minister's request that Chargé inquire of Peruvian Government as to progress of the treaty and to intimate the hope that ratification will take place before adjournment of Congress on November 17; observation that such an inquiry might be used by those opposing the treaty as evidence that U. S. Government is trying to force hand of Peruvian Government.	341
Nov. 15 (44)	*To the Chargé in Peru (tel.)* Information that Department wishes in any proper way to encourage Peruvian ratification but feels confident that the assurances as to consideration of the treaty by the present Congress will not be ignored; authorization to Chargé to use his own discretion in bringing matter to Peruvian Government's attention.	342
Dec. 22 (1360)	*From the Colombian Minister* Information that the boundary treaty has been approved by Peruvian Congress; expression of appreciation for U. S. good offices.	343
Dec. 22	*From the Peruvian Ambassador* Peruvian Government's telegram (text printed), notifying that boundary treaty has been ratified.	343
1928 Jan. 3	*To the Colombian Minister* Reply to note No. 1360 of December 22, 1927, expressing gratification at Peruvian ratification and hope that Colombia and Brazil will soon settle the boundary question remaining between them.	344
Jan. 11	*To the Peruvian Ambassador* Acknowledgment of note of December 22, 1927.	344

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND HAITI

1927 July 30 (54)	*To the Chargé in Haiti* Instructions to keep Department informed of developments in the Dominican-Haitian boundary question, which is likely to be discussed during the forthcoming visit to Haiti of President Vasquez of the Dominican Republic.	345
Aug. 9 (574)	*From the Chargé in the Dominican Republic* Information from the Haitian Minister that the conversations of President Borno of Haiti with President Vasquez were frank and cordial, and that Minister is optimistic as to a prompt solution of the boundary question, preferably by means of direct negotiations.	345
Aug. 10 (1057, High Commissioner's Series)	*From the Chargé in Haiti* Information that the two Presidents agreed in principle to adopt permanently the *status quo;* Chargé's opinion that their suggested solution of certain frontier difficulties by means of exchange of territory may open up a phase which would indefinitely delay a solution of the entire matter.	346

BOUNDARY DISPUTES—Continued

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND HAITI—continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Sept. 28 (639)	*From the Minister in the Dominican Republic* Information that President Borno suggested during President Vasquez' recent visit that the two countries sign a treaty of amity; apprehension of President Vasquez that the reported disagreement between President Borno and General Russell, American High Commissioner in Haiti, as to certain constitutional amendments may react unfavorably upon an early settlement of the boundary question.	347
Oct. 5 (644)	*From the Minister in the Dominican Republic* Haitian Minister's assurance to President Vasquez that there is no basis for report of disagreement between President Borno and General Russell; Haitian Minister's opinion that it would be preferable to conclude the proposed treaty of amity before entering into formal boundary negotiations, and his explanation that the proposed treaty would consist of a declaration outlawing war and a provision that if friendly negotiations should fail to settle any question between the two Governments, the question will be submitted to a "friendly third power," which would be construed as the United States, or possibly to the League of Nations.	349
Oct. 8 (648)	*From the Minister in the Dominican Republic* Inacceptability to Dominican Government of treaty of amity in its present form, principal objection being to the declaration outlawing war; Foreign Minister's willingness to enter into such a treaty following the settlement of the boundary question or to incorporate the amity treaty provisions in the final boundary treaty.	350
Oct. 27 (187)	*To the Minister in the Dominican Republic* Instructions to advise opinion as to possibility that Dominican Government might suggest to Haitian Government that boundary question be submitted to the League of Nations for arbitration.	352
Nov. 10 (691)	*From the Minister in the Dominican Republic* Information that Haitian efforts to effect conclusion of treaty of amity have been unsuccessful; opinion that Dominican Government does not intend to submit boundary dispute to League, and that no action will be taken on the boundary question itself prior to the forthcoming visit of President Borno to the Dominican Republic.	353
Dec. 31 (747)	*From the Minister in the Dominican Republic* Inauguration of informal Dominican-Haitian conversations in Santo Domingo, December 28, which it is hoped will prepare the way for formal negotiations to settle boundary question.	354

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE REGARDING BOLSHEVIK AIMS AND POLICIES IN MEXICO AND LATIN AMERICA

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Jan. 12	*Statement Left by the Secretary of State With the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations* Discussion of Bolshevik anti-American activity in Mexico and Latin America, as evidenced in party resolutions and publications (excerpts printed). (Footnote: Information that copies of the statement were transmitted to diplomatic officers in Latin America in a circular instruction, January 27.)	356

REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS, HELD AT RIO DE JANEIRO, APRIL 18–MAY 20, 1927

1927 Mar. 15	*To Dr. James Brown Scott* General instructions with regard to duties as a U. S. delegate to the International Commission of Jurists which will meet in Rio de Janeiro in April to study the codification of American public and private international law. (Footnote: Information that an identical instruction was addressed to the other American delegate, Dr. Jesse S. Reeves.)	364
May 11 (17)	*To the Ambassador in Brazil (tel.)* Instructions to ascertain whether Dr. Scott is accurately quoted in press report from Rio de Janeiro (text printed) which states that he announced to Conference that U. S. Secretary of State would propose a convention creating an inter-American arbitration tribunal for the settlement of questions otherwise insoluble; information that the Secretary does not wish to make such a recommendation on his own initiative at this time, and that his instructions to the delegates requested that they take no position on any question which might be construed as committing the U. S. Government in any way whatsoever.	367
May 12 (22)	*From the Ambassador in Brazil (tel.)* Communication from Messrs. Scott and Reeves, stating that while they have given notice of intention to introduce a plan for "arbitrary settlement based wholly on convention of February 7, 1923, establishing a Central American tribunal," they have not yet done so, but intend to introduce plan in forthcoming plenary session, having already arranged with Commission's President that neither discussion nor vote will take place, except possible reference to Sixth Pan American Conference.	368
May 13 (18)	*To the Ambassador in Brazil (tel.)* Communication for Messrs. Scott and Reeves (text printed), instructing them to refrain from introducing the plan for the reason that U. S. Government would be involved in an implied commitment to a plan which it has had no opportunity to examine and would thereby be limited in its freedom of action at the forthcoming Pan American Conference.	369
May 14 (24)	*From the Ambassador in Brazil (tel.)* Communication from Messrs. Scott and Reeves (text printed), stating compliance with Department's telegram of May 13.	369

REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS, HELD AT RIO DE JANEIRO, APRIL 18–MAY 20, 1927—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 June 10	*From the Delegates of the United States to the International Commission of Jurists* Report on procedure and labors of Commission, resulting in a recommendation for 12 projects of public international law and a convention of private international law to be transmitted to the next Pan American Conference; annexed statements by Dr. Scott, to plenary session, May 6, of intention to propose establishment of a Permanent Inter-American Arbitration Tribunal, and to subcommission on public international law, May 19, of decision not to present question (texts printed).	369

REPLY BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO QUESTIONNAIRES ON INTERNATIONAL LAW SUBMITTED BY THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1927 Aug. 17 (489)	*From the British Ambassador* Information that British Government, in reply to a League circular letter of June 7 (excerpt printed), has stated that the proposed revision of classification of diplomatic agents is not considered desirable; belief that U. S. Government will reply in like terms.	410
Dec. 16	*To the British Ambassador* Advice that the U. S. Government concurs in British view and will inform the League of its disapproval of the proposed revision.	411
Dec. 16 (99)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Communication for Secretary General of the League (text printed), disapproving proposals for (1) convention for communication of judicial and extrajudicial acts in penal matters and letters rogatory in penal matters, (2) convention to define legal position and functions of consuls, and (3) revision of classification of diplomatic agents, but approving proposal for a convention concerning competence of the courts in regard to foreign states.	411

OPINION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON STATUS OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS OFFICIALS IN THE UNITED STATES

1927 Sept. 28	*From the Acting Counselor of the British Embassy to the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs* Inquiry as to privileges accorded to officials of the League of Nations in the United States; understanding that in some instances diplomatic visas are granted.	413
Nov. 7	*From the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs to the Acting Counselor of the British Embassy* Information that a League official would customarily be given a diplomatic visa on the basis of his diplomatic passport, but that no assurance can be given that such a visa would entitle the holder to the privileges and immunities conferred upon diplomatic officers of foreign missions by U. S. law.	414

EXEMPTIONS FROM TAXATION AND CUSTOMS DUTIES ENJOYED BY FOREIGN DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Jan. 22	*To the Irish Minister* Information concerning exemptions from taxation and customs duties enjoyed by foreign diplomatic and consular officers in the United States.	414

RIGHT OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO ACQUIRE, WITHOUT RESTRICTION, PROPERTY FOR EMBASSY OR LEGATION PURPOSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1927 Jan. 14 (1332)	*From the Egyptian Chargé* Request for information as to whether U. S. laws restrict in any way the right of foreign governments to own property.	417
Jan. 25	*To the Egyptian Chargé* Information that U. S. Government places no restrictions on the owning of property by foreign governments for Embassy or Legation purposes in the District of Columbia, and that it is exempt from general and special taxes or assessments, but that there are certain other expenses incident to the property, not in the nature of the tax, which must be paid.	417

SUITS AGAINST UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD VESSELS IN FOREIGN COURTS

1927 Aug. 30 (Dip. Ser. 650, G. I. Cons. 1053)	*To Diplomatic and Consular Officers* Instructions to amend previous instructions concerning suits in foreign courts against Shipping Board vessels, in view of pertinent Supreme Court decision of June 7, 1926; instructions, however, that decision does not change the Department's general policy of refraining from claiming immunity in foreign courts for U. S. Shipping Board vessels, and that no request for immunity should be made unless the Department specifically instructs that such action be taken in a particular instance.	418

RULES OF PRECEDENCE AS BETWEEN CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES

1927 Aug. 10	*Executive Order No. 4705* Prescribing rules of precedence as between (1) Ambassadors, Ministers, and Foreign Service officers of the United States, (2) U. S. Army officers, (3) U. S. Navy and Marine officers, and (4) U. S. Foreign Commerce officers.	419

ARGENTINA

Proposed Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Consular Rights Between the United States and Argentina

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Sept. 20 (18)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina* Unwillingness of Argentina to conclude at the present time a treaty containing an unconditional most-favored-nation clause, as evidenced in Foreign Minister's note of September 8 (text printed), which requests U. S. views concerning the signing of a protocol (text printed) which would provide for denunciation, upon 6 months' notice, of the U. S.-Argentine commercial treaty of July 27, 1853.	421

Efforts To Secure for American Firms Equal Consideration With Other Foreign Companies in Bids for Argentine Naval Construction

1926 May 21 (39)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Information that Argentina contemplates construction of several naval vessels, that U. S. naval attaché is following developments closely, and that Embassy is according all proper assistance to Fore River Shipbuilding Corporation's representative in the matter.	424
Sept. 9 (36)	*To the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Instructions, in view of reports of strong foreign competition for submarine contracts, to request appropriate authorities to grant an equal opportunity for American firms to compete for the business.	424
Sept. 11 (63)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Indications that Italy is pressing efforts to have the submarines built in that country; Argentine Foreign Minister's assurance that American bids will receive equal consideration with those of other foreign firms; intention of U. S. naval attaché to take appropriate action with the Ministry of Marine.	425
Oct. 18 (41)	*To the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Understanding that Argentine Government is ready to award contracts for destroyers, submarines, and cruisers; that it is carrying on business with France, Great Britain, and Italy, exclusively; and that it does not intend to give Bethlehem Steel Co. or other American shipbuilders an opportunity to bid. Instructions to make informal but emphatic representations against the discrimination.	425
Oct. 19 (76)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Information from Minister of Marine that American shipbuilders such as Fore River and Cramps are being asked for bids; intention of Ambassador to discuss Bethlehem Steel Co. matter with Foreign Minister.	426
Oct. 19 (77)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina (tel.)* Decision of Ambassador not to make further representations, unless so instructed by Department, because of information from Minister of Marine showing that American shipbuilders have submitted bids and that the Argentine mission in the United States has recently been instructed to request bids from the Bethlehem Steel Co.	426

EFFORTS TO SECURE FOR AMERICAN FIRMS EQUAL CONSIDERATION WITH OTHER FOREIGN COMPANIES IN BIDS FOR ARGENTINE NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Jan. 7	*Memorandum by the Economic Adviser of a Conversation With Mr. Hugh Knowlton of the International Acceptance Bank* Inquiry by American bankers as to whether Department would object to a proposed loan to Argentina for the financing of her naval construction program; bankers' willingness to stipulate that American firms have the fullest and freest opportunity to bid.	427
Jan. 14	*Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State of a Telephone Conversation With Mr. Hugh Knowlton of the International Acceptance Bank* Information that Assistant Secretary told Mr. Knowlton that Department will not object to proposed loan if bankers will put in writing their stipulation as to American opportunity to bid; bankers' reply that they had not been able to obtain such assurance, but that further inquiry will be made in the event there has been a misunderstanding.	428
Mar. 1 (9)	*To the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Opinion of Bethlehem Steel Co. that for political reasons the naval contracts will be divided among France, Great Britain, and Italy, even though the British and French bids, like the Bethlehem bids, are higher than the Italian bids; and that it still seems to be the intention to float the loan in the United States. Instructions to express to Foreign Minister the hope that an equitable share of the business will be given to American firms and to add that proposed loan flotation will be difficult unless a fair share of construction is placed in the United States.	429
Mar. 9 (11)	*To the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Instructions to advise present status of matter.	429
Mar. 10 (27)	*From the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Representations to Foreign Minister as instructed in Department's telegram No. 9, March 1; advice that no contract has yet been signed; opinion that, as Argentine Government has been informed as to U. S. attitude, no further steps can be taken at present.	430
Apr. 7 (261)	*From the Chargé in Argentina* Information that one of the primary reasons for Bethlehem Co.'s failure to reach understanding with Argentine Government is the high cost of manufacture in the United States; that Electric Boat Co. is in a stronger position than Bethlehem because an Argentine commission had previously recommended adoption of *Holland* type of submarine; advice from Foreign Minister that the matter now rests entirely with the President and Minister of Marine.	430
Apr. 15 (38)	*From the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Advice that no contracts have been signed as yet, but that the awards for submarines will probably go to France, sloops and flotilla leaders to Great Britain, and cruisers to Italy; Chargé's comment to Foreign Under Secretary that proposed submarine award would be contrary to Argentine commission's recommendation; information that the loan may possibly be handled by British bankers if their terms are almost as favorable as the American terms.	432

EFFORTS TO SECURE FOR AMERICAN FIRMS EQUAL CONSIDERATION WITH OTHER FOREIGN COMPANIES IN BIDS FOR ARGENTINE NAVAL CONSTRUCTION—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
June 14 (2322)	*To the Ambassador in France* Report from Electric Boat Co. that it has virtually succeeded in obtaining a contract to construct three submarines for the Argentine navy, the construction to be done in a French shipyard under American patents. Instructions, should it become necessary, to assist the company's Paris representative, through informal representations to appropriate French authorities, in selecting a satisfactory yard.	432
July 28 (26)	*To the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Report from Electric Boat Co. that the submarine contract is about to be awarded to an Italian firm; instructions to make informal inquiry, in view of Department's understanding that decision had been made in favor of the American company.	433
Aug. 9 (70)	*From the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Promise of Foreign Under Secretary to inquire into the submarine matter; confidential information that contract is to be awarded to Italian firm because Board of Admirals has reversed its decision and now considers the Italian type superior to the Electric Boat Co.'s submarine; advice that as yet the contracts have not been let.	433
Aug. 18 (31)	*To the Chargé in Argentina (tel.)* Instructions to inform President of Department's sincere hope that no decision will be made until the Electric Boat Co. has had the opportunity to present evidence of the arrangements made by it in France. (Footnote: Information that the Electric Boat Co. advised, August 20, that the Argentine Government had agreed to postpone the final decision.)	434
Oct. 17 (37)	*From the Ambassador in Argentina* Report on the awards which have already been let, including contract for the three submarines to an Italian firm; explanation of the political reasons for awards to British, Italian, and Spanish firms; possibility that Bethlehem Co. will receive contract for four river gunboats, on account of their offer to assemble one boat in Argentina with Argentine workmen; opinion that American firms cannot secure the orders unless they can reduce production costs sufficiently to enable them to meet prices of European rivals.	434

AUSTRALIA

REPRESENTATIONS BY THE AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING ENTRY OF AUSTRALIAN BUSINESSMEN INTO THE UNITED STATES

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Jan. 14	*From the Commissioner for Australia* Desire that the privileges granted to businessmen of the United Kingdom as to entry into the United States to establish and maintain offices, be extended in like manner to citizens of Australia, possibly by extension of U. S.-British commercial treaty of 1815 to Australian citizens, or the conclusion of a special U. S.-Australian treaty for a similar purpose.	437
[Feb. 26]	*To the British Ambassador* Information that the treaty of 1815 relates only to British possessions in Europe and not to British overseas possessions, and that the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 relating to entry under an existing commercial treaty would not apply to a treaty concluded subsequently; assurance that Department is deeply interested and will communicate in this regard at a later date.	439
Undated [Rec'd Nov. 30]	*From the British Embassy* Desire that question of entry of Australian businessmen into the United States be reopened, and inquiry whether the question of amending the Immigration Act of 1924 to permit entry for business purposes without restriction as to length of stay, may not be brought up before the next session of Congress.	440

AUSTRIA

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING SUBORDINATION OF THE AUSTRIAN RELIEF LOAN TO A PROPOSED NEW AUSTRIAN LOAN

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Aug. 30 (1508)	*From the Minister in Austria* Information that Austrian Government contemplates flotation of a new Federal loan for internal improvements, and that such a loan is contingent upon consent of the Austrian Control Committee, the Reparation Commission, and the states having prior liens on Austria because of relief credits; Austrian Government's desire that the competent U. S. law officers investigate in a preliminary way the question as to what action is necessary by the United States to subordinate its existing lien in the form of Austrian Relief Bond of 1920, held on account of food purchased from the U. S. Grain Corporation for relief purposes.	442
Sept. 20 (54)	*From the Minister in Austria (tel.)* Austrian Chancellor's official and urgent request for reply to the question set forth in Minister's despatch No. 1508, August 30.	444

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING SUBORDINATION OF THE AUSTRIAN RELIEF LOAN TO A PROPOSED NEW AUSTRIAN LOAN—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Sept. 20 (1532)	*From the Minister in Austria* Further details in connection with Chancellor's request communicated in telegram No. 54, September 20; inquiry whether the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury has authority under the joint resolution of Congress of April 6, 1922, to subordinate the relief lien to a new Austrian loan, providing such new loan matures within the 25-year period prescribed in the resolution, or whether a new enabling act of Congress would be required; Austrian expectation of speedy and favorable action by Control Committee, Reparation Commission, and Relief Credit Committee composed of the relief credit states other than the United States.	444
Sept. 24	*To the Secretary of the Treasury* Transmittal of copy of Minister's despatch No. 1508, August 30, and information that a telegram has been received from the Minister communicating Chancellor's request for interpretation of the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury under the joint resolution of April 6, 1922.	447
Oct. 17 (1573)	*From the Minister in Austria* Receipt, October 14, of note from Austrian Chancellor (text printed), advising that Control Committee gave consent to the new loan on October 12, that request has been made to Reparation Commission to defer the lien placed on Austrian assets and revenues for reparation purposes under the treaty of St. Germain, and asking that the United States grant a suspension of its lien and postponement until December 31, 1957, of the payments due under relief loan.	448
Oct. 18	*To the Secretary of the Treasury* Informal inquiry by the Austrian Minister whether the Secretary of the Treasury has the power, without further congressional authority, to extend the time of relief-debt payment by Austria for an additional period of 5 years.	450
Oct. 18	*From Mr. R. C. Leffingwell of J. P. Morgan & Co.* Confirmation of telephonic advice that J. P. Morgan & Co. has accepted in principle Austrian request that it issue the portion of the new loan to be floated in the United States; decision by the Committee of Guarantor States, October 12 (text printed), consenting to the new loan, and declaration (text printed) by the Trustees of the Austrian loan of 1923, to the effect that when the negotiations are further advanced, it will be possible to consider whether loan is prejudicial to the holders of 1923 bonds.	450
Oct. 21	*From the Secretary of the Treasury* Opinion by Attorney General that the Secretary of the Treasury is not empowered under the joint resolution to extend the time of payment of the Austrian relief debt, and Secretary's conclusion, therefore, that he could not take any action without further authorization by Congress.	453
Oct. 28 (20)	*To the Minister in Austria (tel.)* Information that law officers of U. S. Government have decided that the Secretary of the Treasury has no power to act further under the joint resolution, and that a new enabling act of Congress would be necessary to enable him to take the suggested action.	454

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING SUBORDINATION OF THE AUSTRIAN RELIEF LOAN TO A PROPOSED NEW AUSTRIAN LOAN—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Oct. 29 (1585)	*From the Minister in Austria* Advice that the Chancellor is being informed in the sense of Department's telegram No. 20, October 28; assumption that the Department will at the proper time take appropriate action to obtain a new congressional enabling act.	454
Nov. 28	*To the Secretary of the Treasury* Transmittal, for information and comment, of copy of Minister's despatch No. 1585, October 29.	455
Nov. 30 (1629)	*From the Minister in Austria* Information that Austria is on the verge of abandoning requests for postponement of payments on relief debt, leaving only to be dealt with by congressional resolution the request for release of Austrian assets pledged for payment of said debt; also, that Austria contemplates the negotiation of a general funding arrangement for the entire relief credits of the states concerned, following flotation of the new federal loan.	456
Dec. 2 (66)	*From the Minister in Austria (tel.)* Abandonment by Austria of request for postponement of relief-debt payments, leaving only its request that assets pledged for payment of the debt be subordinated to the contemplated new Federal loan.	458
Dec. 6 (2423/70)	*From the Austrian Minister* Inquiry whether the United States would be willing to enter into negotiations for the relief-debt funding, by which arrangement payments should not begin until 1943, at which time payment of the whole debt, principal and interest, should begin in 25 equal yearly installments, the installments to include an amount corresponding to the loss of interest which the creditors suffered by nonpayment of agreed-upon installments due prior to 1943.	458
Dec. 8	*To the Secretary of the Treasury* Transmittal of copy of Minister's telegram No. 66, December 2, and copy of a telegram from the Embassy in Paris, December 3, advising that Reparation Commission has postponed discussion of Austrian relief bonds and loan question until its meeting on January 14, 1928.	459
Dec. 14	*From Mr. R. C. Leffingwell of J. P. Morgan & Co.* Reminder that Austrian Government and European relief creditor states are holding discussions in London, and understanding that Austrian Government has suggested that U. S. Government might wish to be represented.	460
Dec. 14 (1656)	*From the Minister in Austria* Information concerning London meetings of International Relief Bonds Committee, December 2 and 12, at which latter meeting it was decided to transmit the Austrian relief-funding proposal to the governments represented on the Committee, and a resolution was passed, without affirmative votes by Dutch or Swiss, authorizing the subordination to the projected new federal loan for a period of 30 years of the Austrian assets pledged for the repayment of the relief credits. Advice that the next step will be the proceedings before the Reparation Commission.	460

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING SUBORDINATION OF THE AUSTRIAN RELIEF LOAN TO A PROPOSED NEW AUSTRIAN LOAN—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Dec. 23	*To the Secretary of the Treasury* Transmittal of Austrian Minister's note of December 6 and American Minister's despatch No. 1629 of November 30; belief that Department might inform the Austrian Minister, if the Secretary of the Treasury concurs, that the U. S. Government is disposed to consider the relief-debt funding proposal, but desires a more specific statement of proposal before giving any further expression of views; request for possible comment on the desirability of the U. S. Government's keeping in touch with the discussions between the Austrian and relief creditor governments.	463
Dec. 23	*To Mr. R. C. Leffingwell of J. P. Morgan & Co.* Nonreceipt from Austria or any of the creditor states of suggestion that the U. S. Government participate in or keep in touch with the London discussions.	465
Dec. 28 (1664)	*From the Minister in Austria* Further details of meetings in London, December 2 and 12, of International Relief Bonds Committee; formal funding proposal submitted to Committee by Austrian Government (text printed); Committee's resolution of December 12 consenting to release of Austrian securities to new federal loan, Committee's communication of December 20 notifying of Netherlands and Swiss consent, and Control Committee's resolution of October 12 consenting to new federal loan (texts printed).	465
Dec. 28 (2531/70)	*From the Austrian Minister* Request for action by the Department to arrange for recommendation to Congress of legislation authorizing the deferment for 30 years of the lien for relief credits extended to Austria; request for reply to Austrian proposal for relief-debt funding.	472
Dec. 29	*From Mr. R. C. Leffingwell of J. P. Morgan & Co.* Advice that London partners have been cabled to advise Austrian Minister in Great Britain of Department's letter of December 23, since it was the Minister's intention to ask if Department wished to be represented in the discussions; additional details concerning nature of the Austrian funding proposal.	473
1928 Jan. 7	*To the Secretary of the Treasury* Transmittal of Austrian Minister's note No. 2351/70, of December 28, 1927, and Mr. R. C. Leffingwell's letter of December 29, 1927; suggestion that, if the Secretary of the Treasury concurs, the Department might inform Austrian Minister in the sense of its letter of December 23 to the Treasury, pointing out that consideration of the proposal to defer the lien would be facilitated by the receipt of more specific information as to the relief-debt funding proposal.	474

ACTION OF THE AMERICAN MINISTER IN AUSTRIA ON THE OCCASION OF THE VIENNA PALACE OF JUSTICE RIOTS

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 July 23 (1477)	*From the Minister in Austria* Information that Minister congratulated Austrian Government upon success in restoring order after the recent riots in Vienna, and that while he received formal notice from the President of Police of the date on which interment of the police officers killed in the outbreak would be held, he consulted with his colleagues and decided not to attend the obsequies.	475
Aug. 15 (609)	*To the Minister in Austria* Approval of action reported in telegram No. 1477, July 23.	476

BOLIVIA

PROPOSED TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE AND CONSULAR RIGHTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND BOLIVIA

1927 Aug. 19 (308)	*To the Minister in Bolivia* Instructions to ascertain, if the Minister perceives no objection, whether Bolivia is disposed to enter into a general treaty of friendship, commerce and consular rights providing for unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.	477
Sept. 26 (1403)	*From the Minister in Bolivia* Advice that discreet inquiry has indicated that Bolivia would not have any objections to the conclusion of a general commercial treaty, but that unsettled conditions in the Ministry of Foreign Relations and Worship due to illness of the Minister, would make negotiations inadvisable at present; intention to keep in close touch with situation and advise Department fully. (Footnote: Information that these negotiations did not result in the signing of any treaty.)	479

CANADA

ESTABLISHMENT OF DIRECT DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA AND OF AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN THE IRISH FREE STATE

1926 Dec. 1 (238)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions to ascertain acceptability to British Government of U. S. intention to appoint Ministers to Canada and the Irish Free State, and to inquire as to whom the Ministers will be accredited and to whom their credentials should be presented.	481
1927 Jan. 10 (1569)	*From the Chargé in Great Britain* Foreign Office note, January 6 (text printed), expressing satisfaction of His Majesty's Governments in Ottawa and Dublin at the proposed appointments, and stating that credentials should be addressed to His Majesty the King and presented to the Governors General of Canada and of the Irish Free State, respectively. (Footnote: Information that Mr. William Phillips presented his credentials as American Minister in Canada on June 1, and that Mr. Frederick A. Sterling presented his credentials as American Minister in the Irish Free State on July 27.)	481

ESTABLISHMENT OF DIRECT DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA AND OF AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN THE IRISH FREE STATE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Jan. 24 (49)	*From the British Ambassador* Information that the appointed Canadian Minister, Mr. Vincent Massey, will arrive in Washington in February; request that the Secretary ascertain when it will be convenient for the President to receive Mr. Massey; desire of the Canadian Government that the British Ambassador accompany Mr. Massey to the White House on this occasion.	482
Jan. 29	*To the British Ambassador* Information that the President will receive Mr. Massey, accompanied by the Ambassador, at 3:30 p. m., February 18; expectation that arrangements will be made for Mr. Massey's presentation to the Secretary and the submittal of text of letter of credence and the remarks he proposes to make to the President; advice that the determination of whether the British Ambassador shall in the future accompany Ministers of Dominions upon presentation of their credentials shall be governed by the desire of the respective Dominion or its representative. (Footnote: Presentation of his credentials by Mr. Massey on February 18.)	483

CONTINUED PROTESTS BY THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT AGAINST INCREASED DIVERSION OF THE WATERS OF THE GREAT LAKES

1927 Sept. 1 (230)	*From the Canadian Chargé* Continued desire of Canadian Government to publish certain correspondence relating to the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago, and advice that the report of the Joint Board of Engineers as to the actual effect of the withdrawal at Chicago has not in any way affected the Canadian Government's attitude of protest against the diversion; unwillingness to entertain U. S. suggestion for a discussion of suitable compensating works, if this course involves assumption that the present diversion is to continue.	484
Oct. 17	*To the Canadian Minister* Information that no objection will be raised to publication of the correspondence in question; advice that the United States is reserving further discussion and opinion as to legal issues involved in the abstraction of water from one watershed and the diversion of it into another until after the Supreme Court renders a decision on closely parallel issues now before it; belief that navigational and power problems might be adjusted by practical engineering measures pending further discussion of the principles involved.	486

PROJECT FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY BY JOINT ACTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Apr. 13	*To the Canadian Minister* Desire of the United States to enter into negotiations for the conclusion with Canada of a convention providing for the improvement of the St. Lawrence Waterway for navigation and power purposes.	487
July 13 (15)	*From the Minister in Canada* Note from the Prime Minister of Canada, July 12 (text printed), stating that his Government's policy as to the proposed improvements cannot be determined until after receipt of report of the National Advisory Committee of Canada, which is now studying the economic and general aspects of the question, after which the Canadian Government will be pleased to discuss the entire matter.	489

PROPOSAL THAT THE PROBLEM OF IMPROVING THE ROSEAU RIVER DRAINAGE SYSTEM BE REFERRED TO THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

1927 Feb. 26	*To the Canadian Minister* Proposal that, in view of contemplated improvements in the portion of the Roseau River lying in Manitoba Province which would aggravate the flooding of the portion of the river lying in Minnesota, the entire problem of the Roseau River drainage system be referred to the International Joint Commission for investigation, report, and recommendations.	490
Apr. 2	*To the Canadian Chargé* Request for views on proposal submitted in Department's note of February 26, because of reports that action is being taken in Canada to obtain appropriations for proceeding immediately with the works of drainage and diking along the Roseau River.	491
Nov. 1 (269)	*From the Canadian Minister* Information that no decision has yet been reached concerning reference of the Roseau River matter to the International Joint Commission, because the question is still under discussion with the Province of Manitoba; advice that the improvement operations now being carried on will not prejudice the situation of the United States, nor are they believed to be contrary to the spirit or provisions of the boundary-waters treaty of 1909.	492
Dec. 12	*To the Canadian Minister* Contrary opinion that the execution of the present construction works will cause extensive damage to a large area in Minnesota and will be in violation of the spirit and provisions of the boundary-waters treaty; renewal of proposal for reference of the entire matter to International Joint Commission, and request that all construction operations on the Roseau River be suspended until the Commission has made an investigation and report.	493

REPRESENTATIONS BY CANADA AGAINST CHANGES IN BORDER CROSSING PRIVILEGES BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Apr. 22	*From the Assistant Secretary of Labor* General Order No. 86 of the Department of Labor, relating to border crossing procedure for aliens residing in foreign contiguous countries and entering the United States to work or seek employment (text printed).	494
Apr. 23 (100)	*From the Canadian Minister* Apprehension over press reports of U. S. intention to make drastic changes in regulations now applicable to persons living in Canada and crossing daily to the United States to work; request that before any decision is taken or announced, an opportunity be given for a conference between representatives of the two countries.	496
May 10	*To the Canadian Minister* Information that a conference will be held at the Department on May 12.	497
Undated	*Memorandum by the Chief of the Visa Office of a Conference Held May 12, 1927, Regarding Canadian Border Travel Difficulties* Conference between Canadian and U. S. State and Labor Department officials, at which tentative agreement was reached on possible bases for a solution to ameliorate the hardships which will be brought on by the application of General Order No. 86.	497
May 28	*To the Canadian Minister* Assurance of sincere desire to maintain the traditional freedom of mutual travel between Canada and the United States as completely as the immigration laws will permit; invitation to continue studies of the situation with Department officials; information that the State and Labor Departments will do their utmost to clear away, so far as possible under existing law, all difficulties and dissatisfaction in regard to border crossing.	499
June 8 (149)	*From the Canadian Minister* Regret that the United States has not considered it possible to modify the terms of General Order No. 86; outline, for purpose of record, of Canadian Government's views on issues involved; hope that, in consequence of study of the problem by the two Governments, a mutually satisfactory arrangement may soon be reached.	502
June 13 (159)	*From the Canadian Minister* Request for interpretation by the appropriate authorities of the U. S. Government of a list of questions which may arise in the operation of General Order No. 86.	506
June 30	*To the Canadian Chargé* Replies to the questions propounded in Minister's Note No. 159, June 13.	507
Nov. 26 (281)	*From the Canadian Minister* Request that the Secretary put into effect his previous assurance of willingness to ask the Secretary of Labor to allow additional time for foreign-born Canadian citizens to secure quota visas, because of understanding that approximately 3,000 persons who have applied for such visas cannot secure them by December 1, the time limit set in General Order No. 86.	508

REPRESENTATIONS BY CANADA AGAINST CHANGES IN BORDER CROSSING PRIVILEGES BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Dec. 9	*To the Canadian Minister* Belief of State and Labor Departments that the situation created by General Order No. 86 has in the main largely disappeared, and that the change made in the priority status of quota commuters who were unable to obtain visas prior to December 1 will afford all needed relief in those cases.	510

DISINCLINATION OF THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE DISCONTINUANCE OF SEINE FISHING IN MISSISQUOI BAY

1926 Apr. 13	*To the British Ambassador* Desire that the Canadian Government prohibit seine fishing in the Canadian waters of Missisquoi Bay, at the northern end of Lake Champlain, during the spawning season, in order to aid in conserving the Lake Champlain fishery; advice that the reestablishment of a previous Order in Council prohibiting all net fishing in Missisquoi Bay would be a source of gratification to the United States.	511
June 7 (393)	*From the British Ambassador* Information that, while some illegal fishing in Lake Champlain was attempted in April, the seines and other apparatus were seized and the conditions are now satisfactory; reminder that the U. S. Senate failed to approve the general regulations concerning fisheries in boundary waters, including Missisquoi Bay, which were issued by a Commission appointed under treaty of 1908; contention that the situation should be dealt with as a whole rather than that Missisquoi Bay should be considered by itself.	513
1927 Mar. 1	*To the Canadian Minister* Belief that the interests of both Canada and the United States require the discontinuance of seine fishing in Missisquoi Bay, independently of the solution of questions relating to fisheries in other boundary waters; request that U. S. views be communicated to the Canadian Government with the suggestion that the United States will appreciate the prohibition of seining in Missisquoi Bay, if such action is found practicable.	514
Mar. 22 (53)	*From the Canadian Minister* Explanation that the Provincial authorities administering Missisquoi Bay are opposed to the prohibition of a reasonable amount of seine fishing therein, although they prohibit fishing during the spawning season; reiteration of contention that the Missisquoi Bay situation should be dealt with in connection with other outstanding matters, and not by itself.	515
Mar. 30	*To the Canadian Minister* Regret that the Canadian Government does not deem it advisable to discontinue the issuance of licenses for seine fishing in Missisquoi Bay at the present time.	516

CHILE

Proposed Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Consular Rights Between the United States and Chile

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Aug. 19 (765)	*To the Ambassador in Chile* Instructions to ascertain whether Chile is disposed to enter into a general treaty of friendship, commerce and consular rights, providing for unconditional most-favored-nation treatment.	517
Oct. 6 (146)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Report that Foreign Office officials indicated the possible exception of both Bolivia and Peru from most-favored-nation treatment, and that they desire the submittal of a draft treaty on the general lines of the U. S.-German commercial treaty of December 8, 1923.	519
Oct. 14 (52)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Detailed instructions for preparing a draft treaty on the basis of the German treaty; advice that the Department is studying the exception of Bolivia and Peru.	520
Oct. 24 (161)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Request for instructions as to whether or not to present draft treaty to Foreign Office.	523
Oct. 27 (56)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Request for opinion whether the negotiations would be prejudiced if submittal of draft treaty were postponed until the middle of November in order that Department may give further consideration to the question of including substance of Senate reservation regarding national treatment of shipping.	523
Oct. 30 (164)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Opinion that postponement is desirable and will promote ultimate success.	523
Nov. 2 (788)	*To the Ambassador in Chile* Transmittal of draft treaty for presentation to Foreign Office, with explanation of the more important differences between the draft and German treaty, for information and use in discussions with Chilean officials; instructions not to present draft until Department so advises.	524

Representations to the Chilean Government Regarding Proposed Legislation Favoring Chilean Mercantile Marine

1927 Aug. 22 (109)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Request for specific instructions concerning Grace Line's desire that Ambassador make informal representations to Chilean Government against the injury likely to result to commercial interests by reason of a plan for preferential customs duties on importations in national vessels, now under consideration by a Chilean commission, for the purpose of promoting a national merchant marine.	526

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING PROPOSED LEGISLATION FAVORING CHILEAN MERCANTILE MARINE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927 Aug. 25 (111)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Synopsis of proposed shipping law, which provides for (1) repayment of Panama Canal tolls, (2) premium to shippers of nitrate in Chilean vessels, (3) 10 percent reduction in customs duties on imports in Chilean vessels, (4) loans to Chilean companies for the purchase of new vessels, (5) effective date of January 1, 1928; desire of Grace Line manager that protest be made, especially with regard to points (1) and (2); request for instructions.	527
Aug. 30 (115)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Information that a project of law embodying all points except point (2) has been submitted to Congress; renewal of request for instructions.	528
Aug. 31 (37)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Belief that objection may properly be made to point (3) and also to preferential export duties or bounties if measures such as those contemplated in point (2) are brought up again; instructions to try to dissuade Chilean Government from applying these contemplated discriminatory measures; instructions to discuss point (1), indicating that the United States would view with concern any step which would tend to substitute for the present regime of equality in the use of Canal one of special advantage; information that Department has no objections to point (4).	528
Sept. 1 (118)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Information that proposed law omitted point (2) because section 17 of nitrate law already empowers the President to pay bounties to producers who ship in Chilean vessels.	529
Sept. 2 (120)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Opinion that a possible tariff reduction under discussion, as well as the proposed shipping law, would stimulate American export trade at least until Chile purchases new ships and establishes services to Europe; assumption that in spite of this consideration, Department wishes Ambassador to comply with its telegram No. 37 of August 31.	530
Sept. 14 (41)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Instructions to continue efforts to dissuade Chilean Government from applying discriminatory import duties in favor of national vessels and bounties provided under section 17 of the nitrate law; request for information as to whether contemplated payments of 7 pesos per metric ton to Chilean ships for nitrate carried to the United States, Canada, and Cuba, would be made to shippers or shipowners.	531
Sept. 17 (133)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Issuance by the President of a decree under sections 17 and 33 of nitrate law, to become effective upon official publication, providing specific bounties for nitrate shipments, according to destination; information that the bounty is to be paid to ship and not to producer, and request that this point be corrected in telegrams Nos. 111 of August 25, and 118 of September 1.	532

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING PROPOSED LEGISLATION FAVORING CHILEAN MERCANTILE MARINE—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Sept. 20 (136)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Report of discussions with Chilean officials and diplomatic colleagues concerning the ship subsidy bill; opinion that before final passage, Canal tolls provision, and possibly preferential duties and bounties, will be stricken out and will be replaced by a provision for lump sum subvention to companies.	532
Sept. 21 (141)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Report of further representations; opinion that ship subsidy law will either be redrafted or replaced by a substitute law granting lump sum subvention or payments for maintenance service on designated routes.	533
Oct. 28 (163)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Synopsis of substitute ship subsidy bill, providing for (1) subventions to Chilean companies which have maintained a regular service through the Canal, (2) share by Government in profits and management, (3) loans for the purchase of new ships, (4) 10 percent increase in consular duties to cover expenses occasioned by this law, (5) effective date, January 1, 1928; opinion that new bill is unobjectionable, but request for instructions.	534
Nov. 9 (172)	*From the Chargé in Chile (tel.)* Information that Congress will convene in special session November 15 and that Chargé has renewed representations concerning effect on American interests of the proposed legislation and tariff revision.	535
Nov. 22 (62)	*To the Chargé in Chile (tel.)* Instructions to advise appropriate authorities that the enactment of shipping or tariff legislation discriminatory to American ships will eliminate the only basis on which the President is empowered to continue in suspension the U. S. law providing for a discriminatory duty of 10 percent on goods imported in foreign ships.	536
Dec. 6	*Memorandum by the Secretary of State* Conversation in which the Chilean Ambassador advised that his Government intends to abandon plan for discriminatory duties and refund of Canal tolls, and stated that if any shipping legislation is enacted, it will probably be in the nature of a straight subsidy.	537

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING EFFECTS OF PROPOSED COAL LAW ON AMERICAN INTERESTS

1927		
Sept. 1 (119)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Receipt by Chilean Congress of a proposed law to aid the coal industry, which includes a provision for heavy increased duties on coal and crude petroleum.	537
Oct. 10 (50)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Instructions to make informal representations against enactment of proposed law, because the heavy progressive duty on oil will injure American copper interests in Chile.	538

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING EFFECTS OF PROPOSED COAL LAW ON AMERICAN INTERESTS—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Oct. 19 (151)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Assurance to Foreign Office by Minister of Hacienda that he will make changes in the law which will save American interests from injury.	538
Nov. 1 (58)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Instructions to investigate and report status of the coal bill, in view of information from American interests that Chilean Government is paying little attention to protests made by their representative in Chile, and recent approval of the measure by the Joint Committee of the Chilean Congress.	539
Nov. 2 (168)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Information that Chilean Government shows unwillingness to modify the proposed measure, but that Ambassador has made further representations and will take additional steps immediately.	539
Nov. 16 (176)	*From the Chargé in Chile (tel.)* Passage of coal bill by Chamber of Deputies, November 15.	540
Dec. 10 (186)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Continued efforts to secure modification of proposed law; understanding that, as a mark of good will, the President may be authorized to suspend or modify application of the law, if in his judgment wise; Foreign Office assurance that the entire situation will be thoroughly studied. (Footnote: Information that the coal law was signed by the President on January 9, 1928.)	540

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING EFFECTS OF PROPOSED INSURANCE LEGISLATION ON AMERICAN INTERESTS

1927		
May 5 (19)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Instructions to inquire of Foreign Office concerning Finance Minister's intention to nationalize insurance, thereby eliminating foreign companies, and to advise Department as to extent to which proposed measure appears to be confiscatory.	541
May 13 (64)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Informal representations to Foreign Minister both prior and subsequent to receipt of Department's telegram No. 19 of May 5; opinion that project does not appear to be confiscatory except in the respect that it destroys property rights by prohibiting the continuance of a business which was established in the past at considerable expense.	542
Aug. 1 (97)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Advice that the insurance bill, modified and made more drastic, has been sent to Congress; information that revised bill permits foreign companies now doing business in Chile to reorganize as national companies, and that section 59 imposes a heavy tax, as well as fines for failure to pay such tax, on policies taken out in foreign companies by foreign owners of property in Chile; request for instructions.	543

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE CHILEAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING EFFECTS OF PROPOSED INSURANCE LEGISLATION ON AMERICAN INTERESTS—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1927		
Aug. 8 (31)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Belief that protest may not be made on grounds of violation of international law; suggestion that Ambassador may wish to urge the elimination of article 59 because it would interfere with free and mutually beneficial intercourse between the United States and Chile.	545
Sept. 12 (129)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Information that Joint Committee has sent amended bill to Chamber of Deputies; understanding that foreign companies will be permitted to function, without reorganizing as national companies, on condition that they invest in easily liquidated Chilean securities or property and pay a tax on premiums 50 percent greater than the tax paid by national companies, and that article 59 has been modified and renumbered 46; request for instructions as to possible protest against the taxation.	545
Sept. 14 (42)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Advice that Department can perceive no good basis for a protest.	546
Sept. 19 (135)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Belief of most insurance agencies that the requirement of increased deposits and heavier taxes, even though discriminatory, will be offset by a large increase in business and profits.	546
Sept. 21 (138)	*From the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Information that insurance bill will come before Senate when special session of Congress opens about October 6; request for instructions whether Department's attitude toward protest would be affected by the legal contention that if insurance contracts on personal property can be taxed, other contracts affecting personal property, such as mortgages and assignments, can also be taxed.	547
Sept. 27 (47)	*To the Ambassador in Chile (tel.)* Advice that no ground exists for formal protest because of lack of discrimination against American firms; authorization to urge informally that the provision be eliminated because it would interfere with business between the two countries.	547
Nov. 17 (179)	*From the Chargé in Chile (tel.)* Passage by Senate, November 16, of bill with modifications which are reported to be acceptable to foreign companies; amendment of article 46 to permit insurance of properties in Chile with local branches of foreign insurance companies, or, if the risk is unacceptable, to permit the local companies to place the insurance abroad without being subject to tax.	548
Nov. 29 (1256)	*From the Ambassador in Chile* Passage of bill by Chamber of Deputies, November 23, with minor change; information that the amendment of article 46 reported in telegram No. 179, November 17, eliminated the most harmful feature of the bill as far as the foreign companies are concerned.	548

DISAGREEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE WITH DECISION OF A CHILEAN COURT THAT A DIPLOMATIC SECRETARY DOES NOT ENJOY DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

Date and number	Subject	Page
1926 Nov. 22 (962)	*From the Chargé in Chile* Decision by the Santiago Court of Appeals, September 24 (text printed), holding that a secretary of the Brazilian Embassy in Santiago was subject to jurisdiction of the Chilean courts in a criminal case, and that he might be arrested and imprisoned for his criminal acts committed in Chilean territory; information that, although the decision remains without practical effect because the secretary was recalled shortly after the case began, the diplomatic corps feels that a dangerous precedent has been set which should not go unchallenged.	549
1927 Jan. 8 (699)	*To the Ambassador in Chile* Belief that U. S. Government need not make a special protest against the precedent set by the case; authorization, however, to express concurrence if diplomatic corps decides to make a joint protest against this action as being a violation of international law.	551