

[Communicated to the Assembly,  
the Council and the Members of  
the League.]

Official No.: **A. 7.** 1933.V.

Geneva, May 30th, 1933.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

**GRADUAL UNIFICATION OF CRIMINAL LAW  
AND CO-OPERATION OF STATES  
IN THE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF CRIME**

*Note by the Secretary-General.*

By a resolution adopted on September 23rd, 1931, the Assembly decided, *inter alia*, to instruct the Secretary-General :

(a) To forward the report on Penal and Penitentiary Questions made to it by its Fifth Committee,<sup>1</sup> with the Minutes of the Committee, to certain international organisations, and to ask them in what manner they considered that " the assistance of the League of Nations might be of value with a view to achieving a gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime " ;

(b) To forward the observations of the organisations so consulted to the Members of the League and to ask them if they desired that the League of Nations should lend its assistance for the purposes specified above.

In execution of the decision mentioned at (a), the Secretary-General consulted the following organisations :

- The International Penal Law Association ;
- The International Bureau for the Unification of Criminal Law ;
- The International Criminal Police Commission ;
- The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission ;
- The Howard League for Penal Reform ;
- The International Law Association ;
- The International Penal Law Union.

Representatives of these organisations met in Geneva on May 10th, 1932, and drew up a joint reply to the Secretary-General in the form of a resolution, which was subsequently approved by the organisations.

This resolution and the draft for the proposed new Statutes of the Bureau for the Unification of Criminal Law which accompanied it are reproduced as an Annex to the present document.

At the Assembly's session of 1932, the resolution of the organisations was referred to the Fifth Committee.<sup>2</sup> It was agreed that no decision should be taken on the substance of the resolution, but that the Secretary-General should proceed to the consultation of the Governments contemplated by the resolution of September 23rd, 1931, sending to them the report of the Fifth Committee in order that they might have before them the opinions expressed in regard to the resolution and calling their special attention to the resolution.

The replies which have been received from the Governments to the enquiry which the Secretary-General has addressed to them in execution of the decisions of the Assembly (Circular Letter No. 174.1932.IV) are reproduced below. Any further replies received will be circulated as supplements to the present document.

<sup>1</sup> Document A.70.1931.V.

<sup>2</sup> Document A.58.1932.IV.

CONTENTS.

REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENTS.

	Page		Page
Union of South Africa . . . . .	3	India . . . . .	5
Belgium . . . . .	3	Latvia . . . . .	5
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . .	3	Lithuania . . . . .	5
Bulgaria . . . . .	4	Netherlands . . . . .	6
China . . . . .	4	Nicaragua . . . . .	6
Colombia . . . . .	5	Norway . . . . .	6
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	7	Poland . . . . .	6
Denmark . . . . .	5	Roumania . . . . .	6
Estonia . . . . .	5	Sweden . . . . .	7
Finland . . . . .	5	Turkey . . . . .	7
France . . . . .	5	Venezuela . . . . .	7
Germany . . . . .	3	Yugoslavia . . . . .	7

ANNEX.

Joint Reply submitted to the Secretary-General by the Seven Organisations consulted	8
---	---

**Union of South Africa.**

LETTER OF FEBRUARY 20TH, 1933.

The Union Government is in sympathy with the proposal that the League of Nations should lend its assistance in attaining a gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime, but is not prepared, at present, to agree to any of the means suggested in the joint reply of May 10th, 1932, if the adoption of such means is to involve the Union in an increased contribution to the finances of the League, nor to any of the means which may involve the Government in increased internal expenditure.

**Germany.**

LETTER OF MAY 11TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The German Government has always followed with great attention the efforts made by the League with a view to securing the effective co-operation of its Members in questions of penal law. Germany has taken an active part in the League's work on these questions. It will therefore be a matter of satisfaction to the German Government if this work can be continued and extended.

The German Government considers, however, that work of this kind should only be undertaken when it serves a manifestly practical purpose, as was the case of the Convention against Counterfeiting Currency and other work of the same kind. Whenever such requirements for the unification of penal law make themselves felt, the German Government will gladly co-operate. In such cases the Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law will be able to do valuable preparatory work.

The German Government feels obliged, however, to warn the League of Nations against any attempt to unify penal law on too large a scale. Germany's own experience has been that such endeavours nearly always encounter serious difficulties in practice.

The German Government also wishes to point out that any attempt to bring about the unification of penal law always involves considerable expense. In this connection it is sufficient to recall how long and difficult were the negotiations with regard to even so comparatively simple a subject as the suppression of counterfeiting currency. This also leads to the conclusion that the League of Nations should only undertake genuinely necessary tasks.

The above remarks in connection with the unification of penal law also apply to the co-operation of States in the sphere of the prevention and suppression of crime.

**Belgium.**

LETTER DATED MARCH 1ST, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Royal Government cannot but welcome any assistance, especially that of the League of Nations, which would lead to an international solution of the questions mentioned.

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.**

LETTER OF APRIL 11TH, 1933.

1. His Majesty's Government has carefully considered the report made to the League by the seven organisations which were consulted.

2. The use of the term "unification of criminal law" gives the impression that the object is to reduce the criminal law of all countries to a uniform system. Such an object seems to His Majesty's Government to be misconceived and impracticable. In the first place, the subject of criminal law must remain a matter for determination by the domestic law of each State and no useful purpose would therefore be served by an attempt to unify the criminal law of States. Secondly, differences in the criminal law of different countries are by no means superficial. Law is a plant of slow growth which is rooted deep in the history and customs of peoples; fundamental conceptions vary from race to race, as will be recognised by those who are familiar with continental as well as English law; and outside Europe there are other examples of divergence.

3. A certain degree of uniformity in criminal law or some special arrangement in regard to the prevention of crime might prove to be practicable for some countries whose law is based on similar juridical principles derived from a common source and who possess the same social outlook and customs. This is recognised in the report referred to (paragraph 1(d)). Any proposals of this character should originate from the countries concerned, and no action by the League seems requisite or desirable unless in special circumstances its assistance were invoked by the countries affected. In that event, the action, if any, to be taken by the League would be a matter which would have to be considered in the light of the character of the proposals made and by reference to all the circumstances.

4. His Majesty's Government recognises that questions affecting police action and criminal procedure may from time to time arise which call for special international action by all States, and that when such questions arise the assistance of the League of Nations is of great value. As examples of such questions, the traffic in women and children, or in dangerous drugs, or the suppression of counterfeit currency may be mentioned. His Majesty's Government is not aware of any other criminal matter at the present time requiring international action in this special way, and deprecates any suggestion that the League should actively co-operate in a general survey of the field of criminal law with a view to selecting subjects for international action. Apart from any other consideration, the League of Nations does not possess the necessary administrative machinery for such a task and to provide it would involve the League in very considerable expenditure. But, even if the League had the necessary expert staff, the problem cannot be approached in this way with any chance of practical success. The only way in which useful results can be attained is by the isolation of some limited and well-defined subject and by considering that subject separately; and, in the view of His Majesty's Government, no action by the League is called for or is likely to be beneficial until occasion arises for an International Convention dealing with a specific subject of practical importance on which there is likely to be a substantial measure of international agreement. This is the method which the League of Nations has pursued hitherto with considerable success, as in the examples quoted above of international conventions relating to traffic in women and children, traffic in dangerous drugs, and the counterfeiting of currency.

5. In this connection it appears to His Majesty's Government that there has been some misconception as to the scope of these international conventions. They do not aim at unification of criminal law; they merely provide that certain offences which are recognised in all countries shall be prosecuted and punished. For example, the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency does not attempt to define in any detail or to unify the offences to which it relates and does not lay down any principles interfering with domestic criminal law. The Convention, in addition to making provision for the exchange of information, merely puts upon the contracting parties the obligation to suppress the counterfeiting of currency and to punish persons engaged in such counterfeiting. Such action is to be taken within the existing framework of domestic law.

6. His Majesty's Government fully recognises the value of international discussions and interchange of views on the subject of criminal law and procedure, but it feels that such activities can best be undertaken by unofficial organisations, and that action by the League should only be undertaken when a *prime facie* case has been made out for the consideration by the League of some specific project which is designed to meet a practical need and is likely to secure substantial support.

7. Finally, the prevention and suppression of crime are primarily the duty of police authorities and, in the view of His Majesty's Government, no special action in regard to these matters is required on the part of the League of Nations. There is already in existence an International Criminal Police Commission which is composed of police experts from different countries; and other questions relating to the prevention or treatment of crime are being dealt with by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, which has been established for over fifty years and is supported by experts in these matters, both official and unofficial, from a large number of countries, including certain States which are not members of the League. In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, it would be a mistake — apart altogether from financial considerations — for the League of Nations to attempt to undertake duties which lie more properly within the sphere of these specialist international organisations. Both these Commissions have made contacts with the League and its Advisory Committees on opium, traffic in women, etc. The wisest course appears to be for the League of Nations to strengthen these contacts as opportunity offers and to make use of the facilities offered by them, but not itself to take any independent action in the spheres which are covered by these organisations.

#### Bulgaria.

LETTER DATED DECEMBER 28TH, 1932.

[*Translation.*]

In my Government's opinion it is desirable that the League of Nations should assist in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

#### China.

LETTER OF MARCH 22ND, 1933.

I have the honour to inform you that my Government would welcome the assistance of the League of Nations in connection with penal and penitentiary matters in China with a view to achieving a gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

**Colombia.**

LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 15TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Colombian Government is agreeable that the League of Nations should lend its assistance in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime to which reference is made. It also desires to state that it will fully support the execution of the reforms proposed either by direct co-operation or by entrusting the study of criminal questions to institutions or bodies set up for that purpose.

The Colombian Government thanks the League Secretariat for having kindly invited it formally to collaborate in questions connected with criminal law.

**Denmark.**

LETTER DATED MARCH 2ND, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

I am instructed by my Government to inform you that it endorses the recommendations made by the seven organisations mentioned in your note in their resolution of May 10th, 1932, to the effect that the League of Nations should assist in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime. As regards the manner in which the League should render assistance, the Danish Government can accept the principles contained in the said resolution.

**Estonia.**

LETTER DATED JANUARY 20TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Estonian Government deeply appreciates the efforts already made by the League of Nations for the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime. It trusts that the important work done by the League in these fields will be continued.

As regards the manner in which this assistance might be rendered, the Estonian Government fully associates itself with the joint reply given by the organisations consulted by the League.

**Finland.**

LETTER DATED MARCH 13TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Finnish Government would be very glad if the League of Nations would assist in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

**France.**

LETTER DATED NOVEMBER 22ND, 1932.

[*Translation.*]

The French Government, considering that this work of gradual unification and international co-operation may be specially valuable and comes within the province of League activities, accepts in principle the proposal submitted to it.

**India.**

LETTER OF APRIL 8TH, 1933.

The Government of India, having considered the resolution of May 10th, 1932, of the seven organisations consulted by the League, have formed the conclusion that there is no occasion to seek the assistance of the League in regard to the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

**Latvia.**

LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 4TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

Our competent authorities believe that it would be highly desirable that the League of Nations should help in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

**Lithuania.**

LETTER DATED MARCH 20TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Lithuanian Government fully agrees that the League of Nations should assist, if necessary, in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

**Nicaragua.**

LETTER DATED JANUARY 5TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Nicaraguan Government is not only glad to approve of the idea suggested, but considers it highly praiseworthy and believes that the co-operation and assistance of the League of Nations for the purpose mentioned would be of great value and efficacy.

**Norway.**

LETTER DATED MARCH 17TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Norwegian Government does not think it desirable for the League of Nations to set up a special committee of experts to deal with the questions referred to.

It wishes, in general, to support the resolution adopted at Geneva on May 10th, 1932, by the seven organisations concerned.

**Netherlands.**

LETTER DATED APRIL 18TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

I have the honour to inform you that, in the Netherlands Government's opinion, the joint reply sent to the Secretary-General by the seven organisations consulted on the questions of the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime forms an appropriate basis for the assistance to be rendered by the League of Nations in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

I take this opportunity of recommending that, when the above-mentioned organisations engage in further consultations between themselves, consideration be given to the question of the desirability of amalgamating the International Penal Law Association and the International Penal Law Union. Both these organisations seem to be working in the same field, and, to avoid overlapping, their fusion would be very desirable.

**Poland.**

LETTER DATED APRIL 4TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Polish Government is quite prepared to support any action of the League of Nations for international collaboration in the progressive unification of criminal law. Such collaboration would be specially valuable in facilitating the suppression of crime, and for this reason all States Members of the League should give it their support.

The Polish Government has noted with satisfaction the resolution of seven organisations consulted on the questions of the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime, and their recommendation that the League should frame a draft Convention on these questions. I venture to remind you that my Government has already, during the discussions in the Fifth Committee of the 1932 Assembly, stressed the importance it attaches to collaboration with these organisations in the suppression of crime.

**Roumania.**

LETTER DATED JANUARY 9TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Roumanian Government notes with great interest the joint reply given on this subject by the seven technical organisations consulted by the League of Nations, to which reply the thirteenth Assembly, in its resolution of October 11th, 1932, directed the special attention of Governments. The Roumanian Government considers it very desirable that the principles laid down at that consultation should be adopted by the League.

Indeed, the Roumanian representatives have already pointed out — at the eighth Assembly in 1927 — that the League could render very valuable assistance in the solution of these two problems.

Believing that the gradual unification of criminal law is the only means of eliminating the divergencies between the various national legislations — divergencies which very often cause international criminals to go unpunished — Roumania took part in the international Conferences for the Unification of Criminal Law at Warsaw (1927), Rome (1928), Brussels (1930) and Paris (1931), and the Roumanian Legislative Council inserted in the new draft Criminal Code (1932) a number of provisions directly based on the texts proposed by those Conferences.

The Roumanian Government also considers that the International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law, of which Roumania is a member, as re-organised in pursuance of the resolutions adopted by the technical organisations consulted by the League, will form an important organ of co-operation to which the League can apply whenever it requires preparatory work to be done for the solution of certain problems relating to the unification of criminal law.

As regards co-operation between States for the prevention and suppression of crime, the Roumanian Government believes that such co-operation cannot be satisfactorily achieved without unification of the rules for extradition, without international police co-operation and without improving the fundamental rules for the execution of penalties and preventive measures involving the loss of liberty.

As most of the questions referred to in the joint opinion of the seven technical organisations have already occupied the League's attention, it would seem that the League's chief function is to co-ordinate the work already being done.

The Roumanian Government would like to conclude these remarks by stating that it is in full agreement with the joint conclusions of the seven technical organisations consulted by the League.

**Sweden.**

LETTER DATED APRIL 5TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Swedish Government has no objection to the League of Nations assisting in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

**Czechoslovakia.**

LETTER DATED APRIL 19TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

In the opinion of the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic, there is no reason why the League of Nations should not continue to follow, as hitherto, the work of the various international organisations for the gradual unification of criminal law, so far as the different circumstances of various States permit, for the creation of international co-operation in the prevention and suppression of crime and possibly for the international regulation of questions concerning the execution of penalties and assistance to discharged prisoners, provided that such work would really help to achieve the basic aims of the League.

In the present circumstances, it would probably be unnecessary to set up for these purposes a special organ within the framework of the League, and it would seem sufficient for the time being to ensure suitable contact between the respective international organisations and the League Secretariat, which could from time to time inform the States Members of the League of the results achieved.

**Turkey.**

LETTER OF APRIL 3RD, 1933.

The Government of the Turkish Republic considers it very desirable that the League of Nations should give its assistance in regard to the matters in question; such assistance would be a valuable factor of progress in the field of prevention and repression of crime.

**Venezuela.**

LETTER DATED DECEMBER 14TH, 1932.

[*Translation.*]

The Venezuelan Government thinks that the League of Nations should afford its assistance in the matter dealt with in the communication in question.

**Yugoslavia.**

LETTER DATED MAY 5TH, 1933.

[*Translation.*]

The Yugoslav Government would be glad if the League of Nations could assist in the gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime.

---

ANNEX.

PENAL AND PENITENTIARY QUESTIONS.

JOINT REPLY SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL BY THE SEVEN ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED ON THE QUESTIONS OF THE GRADUAL UNIFICATION OF CRIMINAL LAW AND THE CO-OPERATION OF STATES IN THE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF CRIME.

The representatives of the organisations consulted by the League — namely, the International Penal Law Association, the International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law, the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, the International Criminal Police Commission, the Howard League for Penal Reform, the International Law Association and the International Penal Law Union — in response to the request made by M. Pella, Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee at the twelfth Assembly of the League, and to the recommendation contained in the report adopted by that Assembly (document A.70.1931.IV);

Having met at Geneva at the League Secretariat on May 8th, 9th and 10th, 1932, and Having considered, with a view to replying to the question contained in the Assembly resolution, “in what manner they consider that the assistance of the League of Nations might be of value with a view to achieving a gradual unification of criminal law and the co-operation of States in the prevention and suppression of crime” :

Have agreed upon the following conclusions :

*Resolution of May 10th, 1932.*<sup>1</sup>

1. The League of Nations could render very valuable assistance with a view to the gradual unification of criminal law by preparing, and inducing States to adopt, conventions dealing in particular with :

(a) The standardisation of the definition of offences, the suppression of which is important from the international point of view ;

(b) The standardisation of the fundamental rules of criminal law, beginning with those intended to ensure the effective suppression of offences of an international character ;

(c) The inclusion in all penal legislations of standardised definitions of offences which States agree to regard as a danger to international relations ;

(d) The more intensive unification of certain branches of criminal law in the case of countries whose civilisation possesses common features.

2. The League's assistance in the co-operation between States for the prevention and suppression of crime should relate primarily to the following points :

(a) The improvement and unification of rules for the extradition of accused and convicted persons ; unification and improvement of the rules for the despatch and execution of letters of request ;

(b) International police co-operation and determination of the methods of this co-operation ;

(c) Improvement of the fundamental rules for the execution of penalties and preventive measures involving the loss of liberty ;

(d) International assistance and agreements for the repatriation of foreigners who have been discharged after being subjected to penalties or preventive measures involving the loss of liberty.

3. Without prejudice to future needs, the development of the League's activities in the matters mentioned under Nos. 1 and 2 does not involve the creation of new organisations which, in certain cases, might overlap the work of existing institutions.

As regards some of the above-mentioned matters, the League might enlist the co-operation of specially qualified organisations. Needless to say, this co-operation would not in any way prevent the League, in certain cases, from entrusting preparatory studies to some particular person, setting up *ad hoc* committees of experts or approaching any institution whose assistance it considered helpful.

(a) With a view to the gradual unification of criminal law, it is recommended that the League should co-operate with the International Bureau for the Unification of Penal Law, which has been re-organised in accordance with the draft statutes attached ;

<sup>1</sup> This resolution, unanimously adopted at the meeting at Geneva, was subsequently ratified individually by each of the organisations represented at the meeting. The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, in ratifying the resolution, adopted a motion to the effect that “this resolution does not limit in any way the independence of the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, which remains free to consider all questions relating to criminal law and penitentiary science”, and that “its ratification does not in any way bind the Governments represented on the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission”.



(b) With a view to international police co-operation, the League might usefully collaborate with the International Criminal Police Commission ;

(c) In questions of applied criminal law, the League might usefully co-operate with the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission ;

(d) The League might also usefully co-operate with the Howard League in the action taken by it in order that the suppression of crime may assume a more and more humanitarian character, might support the efforts of that organisation to assist prisoners and, finally, might encourage the creation of an international federation of the various prisoners' aid associations in each country ;

(e) As regards other questions, it is desirable that the League should develop a policy of co-operation with organisations dealing with the international aspect of penal problems and should submit to those institutions, for their joint study, problems coming within their province, and, in particular, the problem of extradition and cognate questions.

4. In the recommendations contained in points (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of No. 3, it is not intended to draw a hard and fast line between the fields of activity of each institution, since the complex nature of the questions connected with the prevention and suppression of crime often makes it necessary for each of those institutions to deal with problems which are to some extent outside the principal domain of their activities.

## THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CRIMINAL LAW.

### *Draft Statutes.*

*Article I.* — The aims of the International Bureau for the Unification of Criminal Law are :

(1) To examine proposals made by Governments, by organs of the League of Nations or by international institutions, relating to the unification of criminal law ;

(2) To undertake preparatory work in order to decide what matters of criminal law might be made the subject of uniform provisions in the legislations of different States or groups of States ;

(3) To make the necessary arrangements with a view to the summoning of international conferences for the unification of criminal law ;

(4) To provide for continuity of work in the intervals between such conferences ;

(5) To get into touch with the competent authorities in those countries which participate in the international conferences for the unification of criminal law with a view to collecting the necessary material for the work of those conferences.

*Article II.* — Each State which has taken part in the conferences for the unification of criminal law or which has given its support to the work of the Bureau shall be represented in the Bureau by one member.

The members of the Bureau shall be appointed for five years by the Conferences for the Unification of Criminal Law.

They shall be eligible for re-election on the expiry of their term of office.

Two representatives of each of the following organisations shall be *ex officio* members of the Bureau :

- The International Penal Law Association ;
- The International Penal and Penitentiary Commission ;
- The International Criminal Police Commission ;
- The Howard League for Penal Reform ;
- The International Law Association ;
- The International Penal Law Union.

Any organisation working on an international basis and admitted by the Bureau shall be represented on the Bureau by two members.

*Article III.* — Membership of the Bureau lapses :

(1) On resignation ;

(2) On expulsion for serious reasons by the plenary assembly of the members of the Bureau.

*Article IV.* — In case of vacancies, the plenary assembly of the members of the Bureau shall make provisional arrangements for the replacement of these members. This replacement shall be made definite by the next Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law. Members thus elected must be of the same nationality as the members whom they replace. Their powers expire at the end of the period when the term of office of the members replaced would normally have expired.

### *Administration and Working.*

*Article V.* — The plenary assembly of the members of the Bureau shall proceed to the election of the President, of four to six Vice-Presidents, of the Secretary-General and the Treasurer, for a period of five years.

The above officers shall be eligible for re-election on the expiry of their term of office.

The Bureau shall have power to co-opt for any definite enquiry persons whose assistance may appear to it to be of value.

*Article VI.* — The Bureau shall be managed by a committee composed of the President, the Vice-Presidents, the Secretary-General and the Treasurer.

*Article VII.* — The Committee mentioned in the previous article shall elect three Deputy Secretaries.

*Article VIII.* — The plenary assembly of the members of the Bureau shall meet on the summons of the Secretary-General in agreement with the President.

This summons shall be sent out at least one month in advance.

The presence of a quarter of the members of the Bureau shall be essential for the validity of its discussions.

Absent members may arrange to be represented by a special deputy of the same nationality or by another member of the Bureau.

Minutes of the meetings shall be kept. The Minutes shall be signed by the President and the Secretary-General. The records shall be in the charge of the Secretary-General.

The powers of the President shall, in his absence, be exercised by one of the Vice-Presidents, and those of the Secretary-General by one of the senior members of the Bureau.

*Article IX.* — The funds of the Bureau shall consist of the subsidies which may be granted by the States and of the gifts which may be made by associations, foundations and private persons.

For the purpose of settling and regulating official subsidies, the Bureau shall get into touch with the Governments of States which attend the Conferences for the Unification of Criminal Law.

The Bureau shall manage its own funds and property.

The Treasurer of the Bureau shall not pay out any sums, the expenditure of which has not been previously authorised by the Secretary-General.

*Relations of the Bureau with the Unification Conferences, with their Organisation Committee and with Other International Institutions.*

*Article X.* — The members of the Bureau shall be *ex officio* members of the Conferences for the Unification of Criminal Law.

*Article XI.* — The Bureau of the Organisation Committee of the Conference shall also have power to invite any other persons to take part as experts in the work of the Conference.

*Article XII.* — The plenary assembly of the Conference shall be composed of the delegates of States attending the Conference and of the persons mentioned in Article X.

Each State shall be entitled to three votes, but its vote shall be indivisible.

Each of the institutions mentioned in Article II shall be entitled to one vote.

*Article XIII.* — Pending the election of the President of the Conference, the duties of President shall be entrusted to the President of the Bureau.

The President of the Conference shall be assisted in the general execution of his duties by the Secretary-General of the Bureau.

At the opening of each Conference, the Secretary-General of the Bureau shall describe the results achieved in the field of the unification of criminal law and shall propose measures with a view to bringing about such unification.

*Article XIV.* — At each Conference, the Bureau shall constitute the sections of the Conference and shall distribute between them the various questions on the agenda.

The Bureau shall be represented in each section.

The sections shall work simultaneously, and the results of their discussions shall be summarised in the form of draft texts and recommendations for submission to the Plenary Conference.

All States taking part in the Conference may be represented by one or several delegates in each section. The method of voting laid down in Article XII shall also apply to voting in the sections.

*Article XV.* — In fixing the agenda of each Conference, the plenary assembly of the members of the Bureau shall appoint the chairmen of sections and the rapporteurs or joint rapporteurs on each question on the agenda. Some of these appointments may be entrusted to the Organisation Committee of the Conference.

*Article XVI.* — The technical preparations for each Conference shall be entrusted to the Bureau and the Organisation Committee of the Conference.

Members of the Bureau who are nationals of the country in which the Conference takes place shall be *ex officio* members of the Organisation Committee.

*Article XVII.* — The Organisation Committee shall be appointed or recognised by the competent authority of the country in whose territory the Conference takes place.

The Committee's duties shall be as follows :

(1) To send invitations to the Conference to the 'official organs of the different countries ;

(2) To ask the countries which are attending the Conference to send, where possible in a French translation, the texts of their proposals, or of such parts of their current legislation as relate to the questions before the Conference ;

(3) To circulate to the countries attending the Conference, in good time and in the form of preliminary documents, the texts referred to in the previous article, together with the preparatory reports.

*Article XVIII.* — The publication of the preliminary documents and records of each Conference shall be entrusted to the Organisation Committee.

The publication of the records of the Conference shall be effected by the Secretary of the Organisation Committee, under the direction of the President of the Conference and of the Secretary-General of the Bureau.

*Article XIX.* — The resolutions of the Conference shall be submitted to the official organs of the States participating, in order to enable them to form an opinion as to how far the said resolutions can be embodied in new laws or in amendments to existing criminal laws.

The Conference shall decide the procedure to be followed in regard to the transmission of the said resolutions.

*Article XX.* — All resolutions relating to any branch of the activities of the League of Nations shall be communicated to the Secretary-General of the League.

*Article XXI.* — The Bureau or the Organisation Committee shall approach the Secretary-General of the League of Nations with a view to the representation of the latter at the proceedings of the Bureau or of the Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law. The representatives of the Secretariat of the League shall belong to the Bureau *ex officio* as observers.

*Article XXII.* — The resolutions of the Conference shall also be communicated to the international institutions which are concerned with the problems of the unification of criminal law or are in a position to contribute to the realisation of the recommendations of the Conference.

On the proposal of the Bureau, these institutions may be represented at the proceedings of the Conference as observers.

#### *Changes in the Statutes and Dissolution.*

*Article XXIII.* — The present Statutes may not be changed except by the plenary assembly of the members of the Bureau on the written request of one-third of its members. Such requests must be addressed to the Secretary-General of the Bureau at least three months beforehand.

*Article XXIV.* — The same procedure shall be followed, subject to the same conditions, in the event of a request for dissolution.

*Article XXV.* — All questions relating to the work of Conferences for the Unification of Criminal Law for which the present Statutes do not provide shall be settled by the said Conferences.



